

Study No. 169

IMPACT OF NREGA ON WAGE RATES, FOOD SECURITY  
AND RURAL URBAN MIGRATION IN WEST BENGAL

Jiban Kumar Ghosh



AGRO-ECONOMIC RESEARCH CENTRE  
VISVA-BHARATI  
SANTINIKETAN  
2011

**Study Team**

**Project Leader**

**Dr. Jiban Kumar Ghosh**

**Associates**

Fazlul Haque Khan

Vivekananda Datta

Ashok Sinha

Debanshu Majumdar

Ranjan Biswas

Debajit Roy

## Preface

The present study was undertaken of the instance of Ministry of Agriculture, Government of India, Krishi Bhavana, New Delhi as a co-ordinated study, the act of co-ordination being vested upon ADRTC, Institute for Social and Economic Change, Bangalore. The National Rural Employment Guarantee Act was enacted in 2005 to provide a guaranteed wage employment of 100 days in every financial year to every household whose adult members volunteer to do unskilled manual work. It goes beyond poverty alleviation and recognizes employment as a legal right. The act was enacted to enhance livelihood security in rural areas. Through the process of providing employment on works that addresses causes of chronic poverty such as drought, deforestation and soil erosion, the Act seeks to strengthen the natural resource base of rural livelihood and create durable assets in rural areas. The Act is also likely to arrest rural–urban migration. In view of this, in an attempt to evaluate the performance of NREGA, the present study titled “Impact of NREGA on Wage Rates, Food Security and Rural Urban Migration was entrusted to the Agro-Economic Research Centre, Visva-Bharati by the Ministry of Agriculture, Government of India, New Delhi.

The present work evaluates the functioning of NREGA in the state of West Bengal and highlights the impact of NREGA in terms of its effect on wage rates, food security and rural urban migration. Apart from this, the study addresses the key areas of progress as well as shortcomings of the programme.

The study is based on both primary and secondary data. Secondary data is obtained from the official website of NREGA ([www.nrega.nic.in](http://www.nrega.nic.in)) and data relate to the years 2008-09, 2009-10 and 2010-11. Primary data is collected from 200 participant and 50 non-participant households spread over 5 districts namely Jalpaiguri, Malda, Purulia, Nodia and Howrah in West Bengal.

The study finds that overall; the scheme of NREGA has the great potential in enhancing income and livelihood security of the rural poor. Notably, NREGA has not been able to provide the employment that one would have expected. Despite making provision of 100 days of employment in a year, actual employment generation has been much below than 100 days. Among the selected districts, households completing 100 days of employment are experienced by Purulia district and the figure stood at 5 per cent of households who got employment. In all, for all the sample districts together, the proportion of households completing 100 days of work constituted 1.00 per cent of total sample beneficiary households, similar to the estimate obtained from secondary level macro-data for the year 2010-11. In terms of person days employed under NREGA works, the average number of person days employed per household was of the order of 54 days in the state which is far away from the envisaged 100 days.

The works undertaken in the sample districts are consistent with the eight special types of works listed in the NREGA. As observed in the study, works under NREGA in the state of West

Bengal were mainly concentrated on irrigational development and water conservation related activities apart from the major emphasis on rural connectivity to provide all weather access road. As far as quality of assets is concerned, the majority of households reported that the quality of assets created under NREGA is good.

With regard to payment of unemployment allowance, the present study shows the reluctance of the state government to pay unemployment allowance. Noticeably the unemployment allowance was paid only to a few workers in Malda district.

In the matter of wage payment, in many cases, delay in wage payment is noticed. The primary data collected from the sample districts reveals that the average per day wages obtained by the sample beneficiaries under the scheme varied from Rs. 82.38 to Rs. 84.85 across castes of households. At the aggregate level, for the state as a whole, the average wage rate received by households stood at Rs. 84.42. In all the sample districts, wages received under NREGA were found to be less than the stipulated minimum wage of Rs. 96.00. This is basically due to the fact that persons working under NREGA are mostly given piece rate. Hence wages received under NREGA varied from person to person depending on quantum of work done. However, NREGA wages were higher than market wages for agricultural workers in the state and this has led to distort the wage labour market by exerting upward pressure on market wages. Noticeably, the women workers received the same wages as those of males at the rate of Rs. 84.47 per day.

Overall, the impact of NREGA on labour migration is positive but negligible. NREGA has succeeded in bringing migrated households back to village, although at the same time, there are more instances of out-migration. The incidence of out-migration might have been arrested on providing 100 days of employment to each adult worker within a family during a financial year. As far as reasons for migration is concerned, majority (75 per cent) reported that they have migrated owing to lack of sufficient works in the village, hoping to get work in the city.

In respect of food security, the overall impact of NREGA is positive as it has improved the food security for majority of households, although, some of the households reported worsening situation of food security even after the introduction of NREGA. In the context of ensuring food security, the potential benefit of NREGA might have been greater if households are provided with full one hundred days of employment during the financial year.

Procedural irregularities are noticed at the stage of implementation of the scheme such as irregularities in conducting social audits and gram sabhas. True that NREGA addressed many of the weaknesses of the earlier wage employment programmes through introducing several features in its design. However, as evidenced by the present study, NREGA is also not free from limitations despite having its positive impact on income generation, asset creation and above all improving standard of living. Obviously, if the remedial measures are taken to address the limitations, the effectiveness of NREGA would increase with experience and would go a long way in ensuring

livelihood security to the rural poor in a sustainable manner and in altering the balance of power in rural society. The key lies in proper implementation and planning of the scheme as per the guidelines laid down in the Act.

The study report is the product of support, help and contribution from the study team comprising of Dr. J. K. Ghosh, Sri F. H. Khan, Sri V. Datta, Sri D. Majumder, Sri A. Sinha, Sri Debajit Roy and Sri R. K. Biswas. Dr. J. K. Ghosh, Sr. Research Officer of the centre shouldered the responsibility of organising the study and drafting of the report. The field investigation was done jointly by Sri F. H. Khan, Sri V. Datta, Sri A. Sinha, Sri D. Majumder and Sri R. K. Biswas. Entire computation work of field data was done by Sri D. Majumder. At the stage of tabulation, Sri D. Majumder was actively assisted by Sri F. H. Khan, Sri V. Datta and Sri A. Sinha. Sri D. Das carried out entire tabulation work of secondary data. Sri Debajit Roy, Research Fellow of the centre helped in conducting logit-probit analysis at the computer. Munshi Abdule Khaleque and Sri Nityananda Maji took all the pains for word processing. The secretarial assistance was received from Sarbasri D. Mondal, Sri A. R. Patra and Sri P. K. Hazra.

On behalf of the Centre, the undersigned takes the opportunity to thank the officials of the Department of Panchayet and Rural Development, Government of West Bengal for rendering help and co-operation in conducting the study. I also take this opportunity to thank the sample respondents in the study area of the state of West Bengal for sparing their valuable time at the stage of collecting primary data. Finally, I am especially thankful to Prof. Parmod Kumar, Professor and Head, ADRTC, Institute For Social And Economic Change, Bangalore for his excellent co-ordination in conducting the study.

AER Centre, Visva-Bharati  
Santiniketan  
October, 2011

Debashis Sarkar  
Director

# CONTENTS

Chapter		Page No.
<b>I</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>1 – 11</b>
	1.1: Introduction	1
	1.2 Historical Background	2
	1.3: Main Objectives of the Study	9
	1.4: Data Base and Methodology	9
	1.5: An Overview	10
<b>II</b>	<b>Manpower Employment Generated under NREGA and Its Socio-Economic Characteristics</b>	<b>12-61</b>
	2.1 The Functioning of NREGA (Three phases district-wise)	12
	2.2 Total Employment Generated - Their Socio-Economic Characteristics	14
	2.3 Number of projects completed and total amount spent	16
	2.4 Performance of NREGA- some quantitative indicators	18
<b>III</b>	<b>Household Characteristics and Their Income and Consumption Pattern</b>	<b>62-78</b>
	3.1 Household Profile of the Respondents	62
	3.2 Main Occupation	65
	3.3 Household Net Income	66
	3.4 Household Consumption	68
	3.5 Variability (CV) and Gini Ratios of Income and Consumption	72
	3.6 Determinants of Participation in NREGA–Functional Analysis	74
<b>IV</b>	<b>Work Profile under NREGA, Wage Structure and Migration Issues</b>	<b>79-89</b>
	4.1 Work Profile under NREGA	79
	4.2 How successful has been NREGA providing 100 days employment (to the registered families at their door steps)	79
	4.3 Nature of assets created and their durability:	81
	4.4 Wage differentials under NREGA and its comparison with minimum wage Act	83
	4.5 Wage differentials in different activities, among beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries	83
	4.6 How has NREGA affected labour migration (labour migrating back into village and migrated out of village), direction of migration (rural to urban and vice versa)	87
<b>V</b>	<b>The Functioning of NREGA–Qualitative Aspects</b>	<b>90-105</b>
	5.1: Household Assets Holdings	90
	5.2: Household Status on Borrowings and their Financial Vulnerability	91
	5.3: Some Qualitative Aspects of NREGA	93
	5.3.1: Job Card Issues and Work Applications	94
	5.3.2: Payment of Wages and Related Issues	99
	5.3.3: Worksite Facilities and Economic Usefulness of the Work	99
	5.3.4: Monitoring of the Work	100
	5.3.5: Nature of Assets Created and Their Durability	100
	5.3.6: Labour Migration and NREGA	100
	5.3.7: Respondents’ Awareness about NREGA Implementation	101
	5.3.8: Potential Benefits of NREGA	101
	5.3.9: NREGA and Food Security	102
	5.4: Quantitative Information Related to NREGA Functioning	102
	5.5: Some Qualitative Questions Related to Food Security	104
<b>VI</b>	<b>NREGA Impact on Village Economy</b>	<b>106-117</b>
	6.1 Infrastructure available in the Village	106
	6.2 Changes in Occupational Structure in the Selected Villages	108
	6.3 How has NREGA affected wage rates in the selected villages	109
	6.4 How has NREGA affected changes in wage rates for agricultural operations	110
	6.5: Various Changes in the Village Economy After Implementation of NREGA	111
<b>VII</b>	<b>Concluding Remarks and Policy Suggestions</b>	<b>118-146</b>
	7.1: Background	118
	7.2: Main Objectives of the Study	120
	7.3: Data Base and Methodology	121
	7.4: Major Findings	122
	7.4.1: Total Employment Generated - Their Socio-Economic Characteristics	122
	7.4.2: Number of projects completed and total amount spent	123

7.4.3: Performance of NREGA- some quantitative indicators	124
7.4.4: Household characteristics and their income and consumption pattern	127
7.4.5: Work Profile under NREGA, Wage Structure and Migration Issues	131
7.4.6: The Functioning of NREGA- Qualitative Aspects	135
7.4.7: NREGA Impact on Village Economy	138
7.4.8: Policy Implications	142
Selected Bibliography	<b>147-148</b>

# LIST OF TABLES

Table No.	Title	Page No.
<b>Chapter-II</b>		
2.1	Employment generated through NREGA and its socio-economic characteristics	26-28
2.1b	Employment generated through NREGA and its socio-economic characteristics	29-31
2.2a	District wise works completed/progress under NREGA (number of projects)	32-37
2.2b	District wise works completed/progress under NREGA (number of projects)	38-43
2.3a	District wise works completed/progress under NREGA (amount spent in lakhs)	44-49
2.3b	District wise works completed/progress under NREGA (amount spent	50-55
2.4	Social auditing and inspection of NREGA work	56-58
2.5	The NREGA payment processed through banks/post office	59-61
2.6	Unemployment allowance paid in lieu of not providing employment (2010-11)	62
2.7	Work projection under NREGA for 2010-11	63
<b>Chapter-III</b>		
3.1	Demographic profile of the respondents (% of households)	66
3.2	Main Occupation (% of total man-days per hh)	68
3.3	Household net income (Annual) (Rs per household)	69
3.4a	Household consumption of food items (kgs. per capita per month)	71
3.4b	Monthly consumption expenditure of households	73
3.5	Variability in Consumption and Income	75
3.6.1	Determinants of participation in NREGA (household level OLS regression) Dependent variable: no of days per household worked in NREGA	77
3.6.2	Determinants of participation in NREGA (member level OLS regression) Dependent variable: no of days per household worked in NREGA	77
<b>Chapter-IV</b>		
4.1	The work profile under NREGA (Reference period – Jan-Dec 2009)	80
4.2	The activity in which employed under NREGA and the quality of assets created	82
4.3	Wage differentials among different activities	85-87
4.4	The migration incidents recorded during the Reference period – Jan-Dec 2009	89
<b>Chapter-V</b>		
5.1	Assets Holdings (Rs per household)	
5.2	Borrowings by sample households (Rs. Per household)	
5.3	Household strength on borrowing and other household assets (% of households)	
5.4	Qualitative questions related to functioning of NREGA (Percentage of hh)	
5.5	Quantitative questions related to NREGA functioning (Percentage of hh)	
5.6	Quantitative questions related to food security (percentage of hh)	
<b>Chapter-VI</b>		
6.1	Infrastructure available within the village (percentage of villages)	
6.2	Occupational structure (% of households)	
6.3	Wage rates for different activities (average of all villages) Rs.	
6.4	Prevailing labour charges for agricultural operations (average of all villages)	
6.5	Qualitative questions on changes in the villages during last one year (% of hh)	
6.6	Quantitative questions about the functioning of NREGA	



# **Chapter-I**

## **Introduction**

### **1.1: Introduction**

Planning has been one of the pillars of Indian politics since Independence and the country's strength is derived from the achievements of planning. The policies and programmes have been designed with the aim of alleviation of rural poverty which has been one of the primary objectives of planned development in India. It was realized that a sustainable strategy of poverty alleviation has to be based on increasing the productive employment opportunities in the process of growth itself. Since growth bypasses a few sections of the population, it is felt necessary for State's direct intervention and to formulate specific poverty alleviation programmes for generation of certain minimum level of income for the rural poor.

In 1951, almost half of the Indian population were living below poverty line. Of these eighty per cent inhabited rural areas. In villages, the incidence of poverty was widespread. The enormity of problem was further aggravated by disparities that existed between states, between men and women, between adults and children and between castes. The magnitude of poverty and disparities that existed between various social groups necessitated planned state intervention to provide relief to millions weighed down under oppressive poverty, particularly the disadvantaged and marginalized social groups, such as Scheduled Castes, Scheduled Tribes and other Backward Castes, women, children, physically handicapped and disabled.

The frontal attack on poverty was pursued in three successive phases. In the first phase, lasting from the beginning of the 1950s till the end of the 1960s, the major emphasis was on land reforms viz. abolition of functionless intermediaries; tenancy reforms culminating in the principle of 'land to the tiller'; imposition of ceilings on large holdings and re-distribution of ceiling surplus land among the landless agricultural labourers and marginal farmers. By the late 1960s the second phase of the Poverty Alleviation Programme (PAP) started with measures that promised to address directly and exclusively the poor in rural areas. This target group oriented approach started with the programme for backward regions graduated to the programme for the development of small and marginal farmers, land less labourers, etc and finally culminated in the Integrated Rural Development Programme and National Rural Employment Programme. Serious efforts for poverty alleviation were initiated only during this phase. The distinguishing feature of the poverty alleviation programme during this phase was the emphasis on creating employment opportunities and distributing renewable assets among the poor. This was in sharp contrast to the intentions in the earlier phase i.e. redistributing existing, non-renewable assts. In the third - the latest phase starting from the beginning of the 1990s, emphasis has shifted to measures aimed at accelerating economic growth and on creating an environment for ensuring a 'spread effect'. The dominant thought is to create more wealth and to enable the poor to benefit from the secondary effects of growth which it

is presumed will percolate down and reach the poor. Thus the relative emphasis placed on poverty alleviation programmes has shifted from structural interventions to a target - group oriented approach, to market oriented policies. All the states in India more or less have acted in all these phases.

Unemployment, a perennial problem of the Indian economy has become sharply accentuated in the recent years. But employment programmes were not perceived as major instrument of poverty alleviation until the beginning of the 1980s in most states of the country. They were expanded in the sixth plan period with the introduction of the National Rural Employment Programme (NREP) and the Rural Landless Employment Guarantee Programme (RLEGP).

## **1.2: Historical background**

The first step toward elimination of poverty, injustice and inadequacies present in socio-economic system and for providing better quality of life to rural masses was the introduction of community development programme. It visualized a multi pronged effort at total development of rural life.

During the first three plans (1951-65) the development strategy was geared more towards quickening the pace of overall growth, diversification of economy and reduction of inequalities in private wealth and income. The measures taken during this phase halted the growth in incidence of poverty. The slow rate in attaining the reduction in rural poverty gave rise to scepticism about the efficacy of “trickle down process” to speedily eradicate mass unemployment and poverty bordering on destitution. But no one could ignore the gains made during this period and its impact on the poverty stricken rural masses. One of its major achievements was the elimination of major famines that continued to afflict the country right up to independence.

The next phase in evolution of rural development strategy began in early seventies when it was realized that small farmers, marginal farmers and agricultural labour were not getting their due share from development programmes. In addition there was growing regional imbalances as some areas with favourable agro-climatic and resource endowments advanced rapidly than others. In order to specifically benefit the poor and development of backward areas, a series of programmes both areas specific and beneficiary oriented were introduced.

Since the Sixth Five Year Plan the country has evolved a vast array of poverty alleviation programmes accounting for one sixth to one fifth of public sector outlays by mid 1990's. In the sixth five year plan stress was laid on employment and poverty alleviation. In that respect, Ministry of Rural Development, Government of India launched National Rural Employment Programme (NREP) in October 1980 to generate additional gainful employment in rural areas. The creation of durable assets was an important objective of this Programme.

However, this Programme was not targeted and therefore, it is not known as to how much of this has been directed towards those who are landless and the poorest among the poor. To this

extent, the programme apparently lacked a direct focus on the target-group population, for whom it was meant. The Programme however had a substantial impact in terms of stabilization of wages in the rural areas, containing prices of food grains and the creation of a wide variety of community assets which could be expected to help in raising the levels of living of the rural population.

On 15<sup>th</sup> August 1983 Rural Landless Employment Guarantee Programme (RLEGP) – a programme to supplement NREP was introduced by Ministry of Rural Development, Government of India, with the objective of improving and expanding employment opportunities for the rural landless. The prime objective of this Programme was providing guarantee of employment to at least one member of every landless household up to 100 days in a year and creating durable assets for strengthening the infrastructure so as to meet the growing requirements of the rural economy.

Experience in the Sixth Plan in certain states has shown that if integrated projects are developed this would allow substantial scope for productive works to be planned within a decentralized frame-work at the district level. Hence both the projects viz. NREP and RLEGP were merged as Jawahar Rozgar Yojana (JRY) in the last year of 7<sup>th</sup> Five Year Plan. The primary objective of the programme was generation of additional gainful employment on productive works which would either be of sustained benefit to the poor or contribute to the creation of rural economic infrastructure. Under this programme, Centre's contribution was 80 per cent while States' share was 20 per cent. The JRY was implemented in all villages in the country.

After three years of implementation of JRY, it was felt that the resources were being too thinly spread and adequate attention was not being paid to the backward areas of the country. Accordingly, the scheme was revised in 1993 to include two more streams. The second stream of JRY called Intensified JRY (IJRY) was launched in 120 identified backward districts in the country with the stipulation that the allocation of JRY would not be less than Rs. 700 crores or 20 percent of the funds earmarked for the total JRY. The JRY third stream was also introduced for taking up innovative projects. Later on with the launching of Employment Assurance Scheme (EAS), the second stream of JRY was discontinued by merging the backward districts under EAS. The Indira Awaas Yojana (IAY) and the Million Wells Scheme (MWS) earlier sub-schemes of JRY, were made independent schemes with effect from 1<sup>st</sup> January 1996. Thus in January, 1996 JRY was split into three independent programmes namely Jawahar Rozgar Yojana, Indira Awaas Yojana (IAY) and Million Wells Scheme (MWS). Under the Indira Awaas Yojana (IAY) houses were constructed for the scheduled castes and scheduled tribes and freed bonded labour. Under the scheme dwelling units are provided free of cost to people living below the poverty line. The scheme also seeks to reduce gender inequality and empower women through allotment of houses in the name of female member of the beneficiary household. Under Million Wells Scheme (MWS), the objective was to provide open wells free of cost to poor SC/ST farmers in the category of small and marginal farmers and to freed bonded labourers. However, where such wells were not feasible, the amounts allotted may be utilized for other schemes of minor irrigation like irrigation tanks, water harvesting

structures and also for development of lands of SCs/STs and freed bonded labourers including ceiling surplus and bhoodan lands.

The Employment Assurance Scheme (EAS) was launched on 2<sup>nd</sup> October, 1993 in 1778 identified backward blocks situated in drought prone, desert, tribal and hill areas in which the revamped public distribution system was in operation by District Rural Development Agency (DRDA). Subsequently, the scheme was extended to additional Blocks which included the newly identified Drought Prone Area Programme (DPAP)/Desert Development Programme (DDP) Blocks, Modified Area Development Approach (MADA) blocks having a larger concentration of tribal and Blocks in flood prone areas of Uttar Pradesh, Bihar, Assam and to blocks of Jammu & Kashmir in view of special conditions prevailing there. In addition, 722 non-EAS blocks previously covered under Second Stream of Jawahar Rozgar Yojana (JRY) were also brought under the EAS. The EAS has since been universalized to cover all the rural blocks in the country with effect from 1.4.1997.

The main objective of the EAS was to provide assured employment of 100 days of manual work during the lean agricultural season at statutory minimum wages to the rural poor above the age of 18 years and below 60 years who are in dire need and seek employment on economically productive and labour intensive social and community works. Though, the creation of community assets had important spin offs for rural poverty and development, the impact of these programmes on employment and income was limited. The universalisation of the scheme severely eroded its basic objective of providing assured employment in areas of extreme poverty and chronic unemployment. In many states, the works taken up were not labour-intensive. The efficacy of the programme was also affected by faulty project selection and the absence of a coherent plan which integrated EAS projects in a long term development strategy.

It was however; felt that a stage has come when the development of village infrastructure needs to be taken up in a planned manner. This could best be done by the village Panchayats who are closest to the ground realities and who can effectively determine their local needs. Accordingly, the Government had restructured the existing wage employment programme namely Jawahar Rozgar Yojana (JRY). The new programme – Jawahar Gram Samridhi Yojana (JGSY) was dedicated entirely to the development of rural infrastructure at the village level and implemented by the village Panchayats. This programme came into effect from 1<sup>st</sup> April 1999. The primary objective of JGSY was creation of demand driven community village infrastructure including durable assets at the village level for increasing the opportunities for sustained employment. The secondary objective was generation of wage employment for the unemployed poor in the rural areas. JGSY was least understood by the target groups and was seldom in its goal-oriented implementation. So, JGSY lasted only for a short time which was being merged into a new scheme, the Sampoorna Grameen Rozgar Yojana (SGRY).

In practice, there was little difference between the JGSY and EAS in terms of both objectives and implementation failures, with the only the major difference being administrative. The JGSY was implemented by village level institutions (PRIs) while the EAS relied on the State Administrative apparatus. In September 2001, EAS and JGSY were merged into a new scheme, the Sampoorna Grameen Rozgar Yojana (SGRY). The objectives of SGRY were to provide additional wage employment in rural areas and also food security, alongside the creation of durable community, social and economic assets and infrastructure development. The SGRY also encompasses all food for work programs in the country since it includes a special component for augmenting food security through additional wage employment in calamity affected rural areas.

The Planning Commission identified 150 most backward districts of the country on the basis of prevalence of poverty indicated by SC/ST population, agricultural productivity per worker and agricultural wage rate. Most of them happen to be tribal districts. There was a need for substantial additional investment in these districts to convert their surplus labour into required capital formation solving livelihood issues. The National Food for Work Programme (NFFWP) started on January 2000-01 by Ministry of Rural Development, Government of India, was such an attempt. Substantial resources in the form of cash and food grains were being provided under the programme to generate additional supplementary wage employment and to create productive assets in these 150 identified districts. Through the programme, an attempt was made to coordinate among different on-going schemes which had wage employment potential, so that the focused approach provides a solid base for the districts to take-off on their own. The major objective was to provide additional resources apart from the resources available under the Sampoorna Grameen Rozgar Yojana (SGRY) to 150 most backward districts of the country so that generation of supplementary wage employment and provision of food-security through creation of need based economic, social and community assets in these districts was further intensified. Wages under SGRY and NFFWP Programmes were paid partly in cash and partly in the form of food grains valued at BPL rates. It was felt that there was an excess flow of food grains for the poor through the wage employment schemes.

National Rural Employment Guarantee Act (NREGA) was passed in the year 2005. The ongoing programmes of Sampoorna Grameen Rozgar Yojana and National Food for Work Programme were subsumed within this programme in the 200 of the most backward districts of the country. The act was enacted to enhance livelihood security in rural areas by providing 100 days of guaranteed wage employment in a financial year to every household whose adult members volunteer to do unskilled manual work. In the past, wage employment programmes targeted at the poor are generally identified with poverty alleviation programmes. Such programmes treated as schemes have failed to bring any security in people's lives. Often people were not even aware of them. The NREGA goes beyond poverty alleviation and recognizes employment as a legal right. It

is a step towards legal enforcement of the right to work, as an aspect of the fundamental right to live with dignity.

At the national level, the Ministry of Rural Development oversees the implementation of the act. The states are supposed to first formulate the state specific Employment Guarantee Scheme conforming to the provisions of the act and the operational parameters delineated in the guidelines of the Central Ministry. For each state there will be a State Employment Guarantee Council (SEGC) which acts as an advisory body on the matters of implementation, evaluation and monitoring of NREGA.

The thrust of NREGA is to build a model of governance based on the principles of transparency and grassroots democracy. As per the act, the village, intermediate and district panchayats will be principal authorities for planning and implementation of the scheme. The district programme co-ordinator at district level and the programme officer at the block level (BDO or equivalent officer) co-ordinate the implementation of NREGA.

The following are the main provisions of the NREGA Act. Local administrations are legally bound to provide work on demand to any worker or group of workers who apply for work, within 15 days of receipt of a work application on public works operated under the NREGA. In the event that the local administration fails to provide work, an unemployment allowance is to be paid to the workers. While 90 percent of the cost is borne by the central government, payment of unemployment allowances is borne by the State Governments at their own cost. Under NREGA, emphasis has been placed on labour intensive works prohibiting the use of contractors and machinery.

As per the provision of the Act, Gram Sabha is supposed to assist in identification of households, identify and recommend developmental works and conduct social audit of the programme. Based on the gram sabha's recommendation, the village panchayat (gram panchayat) will identify a shelf projects to be taken up in its area, and will forward to the programme officer for scrutiny. The district co-ordinator is supposed to finalize and approve block-wise shelf of projects to be taken up for implementation. Although the list of permissible works under the NREGA is quite restricted, there is ample scope for undertaking projects that provide economically useful assets. There are several provisions which are of special interest to women workers. First, the act mandates that at least one-third of the workers should be women. Second, the wage earned is equal for both men and women. Beside this, the NREGA also provides for childcare facilities at the worksite. Further in order to monitor wage payments under NREGA, the Government of India has shifted from cash payment of wages to settlement through bank accounts. Thus NREGA includes a range of transparency measures to maximize vigilance of public funds by workers themselves.

The cost sharing is done on the following basis: The Central Government is required to pay for the wages of labourers employed under NREGA and for three-fourths of the material costs. The

State Government has to pay for one-fourth of the material costs, and also the unemployment allowance. If the labour-material ratio is 60:40 (the “minimum” ratio under the Act.), this means that State Government will pay 10 percent of the employment costs, plus the unemployment allowance.

The key processes in the implementation of NREGA are the following:

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

In India, NREGA was implemented in three phases:

I Phase – notified 200 districts with effect from February 2<sup>nd</sup> 2006.

II Phase – extended to 130 districts in the financial year 2007-08 (113 districts from April 1<sup>st</sup> 2007 and 17 districts of UP were notified with effect from May 15<sup>th</sup> 2007).

III Phase–remaining districts in all the States/UTs were notified from April 1<sup>st</sup> 2008.

In West Bengal, NREGA became operational from February 2006 with the notification by the Government of West Bengal as West Bengal Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme, 2006. In the state, the NREGA scheme had been introduced in phases, the latest addition being the Howrah district. Initially, in the first phase, the scheme was introduced in ten districts, namely, Jalpaiguri, Uttar Dinajpur, Dakshin Dinajpur, Malda, Murshidabad, Purulia, Birbhum, Bankura, Paschim Midnapore and South 24-Parganas. In the second phase, from 1<sup>st</sup> April 2007 seven more districts namely, Coochbehar, Darjeeling, Burdwan, Nadia, North 24-Parganas, Hooghly, Purba Midnapore were brought under its coverage. One more district viz. Howrah was added in the third phase from 1<sup>st</sup> April 2008. Thus the scheme is operational in all districts of the state w.e.f. 1<sup>st</sup> April 2008.

There have been a dearth of studies designed to assess the performance of National Rural Employment Scheme ever since the Act came into force in the country (Ambasta,P,et.al,2008,

Gopal,2009, Jha,et.al.2008, Mehrotra,2008, Chakraborty,2007). While some studies have drawn attention to huge leakage in the implementation of the scheme, namely inflated or fake muster roll entries, embezzlement of funds, non-payment of minimum wages, delayed wage payments beyond the stipulated period of 15 days, non-payment of unemployment allowance, irregularities in conduct of social audit etc., others are not that critical, rather have been hopeful recognizing that the programme effectiveness will increase with experience. With the guarantee of demand-driven fund allocation, NREGA scheme opens up tremendous possibilities of creating a livelihood resource base of the rural poor. The scheme has high expectations in terms of employment generation, alleviation of poverty, food security, halting migration and overall rural development. As the scheme is in its initial stages, there is a need for the study to evaluate the performance of the scheme for its impact on rural poor. Based on this background, the study is conceptualized and is undertaken in West Bengal with the following objectives:

### **1.3: Main objectives of the study**

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

### **1.4: Data base and methodology**

The study is based on both primary and secondary data. Primary data is collected from five districts of the state of West Bengal namely Jalpaiguri, Malda, Purulia, Nadia and Howrah. From each district, two villages are selected keeping into account their distance from the main city/town. One village is selected from the nearby periphery of around 5 kilometers of the district/city headquarters and the second village is selected from a farthest location of 20 kilometers or more than that. From each selected village, primary survey is carried out on 20 participants in NREGA and 5 non-participants working as wage employed. In this fashion, from the state 10 villages are selected and total number of 250 households are surveyed in detail with the help of structured household questionnaire. For selecting participant households, a list of all beneficiaries (participants) in the village is obtained from the Gram Panchayat in the village along with the information of caste



factor of the workers. After getting the list, a Stratified Random Sampling Method is adopted for selection of the participant households giving proportionate representation to the Caste, i.e. (i) Schedule Caste (ii) Schedule Tribe (iii) Other Backward Caste (iv) Forward Castes (others). A due representation is also given to the gender factor. For the selection of non-participants, no such list is available. Therefore, criterion for selecting non-participant households is that these households are not participating in NREGA but constitute the similar caste and gender characteristics as that of selected participant households. In selecting the districts utmost care is given to the fact how many districts implemented NREGA in the first Phase and how many did in the second and third Phase in order to give proper representation to all the three Phases of the NREGA implementation. While the data is collected through questionnaires, the collected data is analyzed through performing tabular analysis. Suitable statistical techniques are also used in analyzing data.

In addition to household questionnaire, a Village Schedule is canvassed in order to capture the general changes that have taken place in the village during the last decade and to take note of increase in labour charges for agricultural operations after the implementation of NREGA. The village schedule also contained qualitative questions related to change in life style of the villagers taking place during the last one decade. One village schedule in each village is filled up with the help of a Group Discussion with the Panchayat Members, Officials, educated and other well informed people available in the village being surveyed.

### **1.5: An Overview**

Unemployment is a perennial problem of the Indian Economy. Further, in recent years, employment scenario has got worsened as evidenced by the survey data furnished by NSSO pertaining to the years 1993-94 and 1999-2000. During the period between 1993-94 and 1999-2000, rural employment grew at the annual rate of 0.58 percent which was far below the rate of growth of rural population. In the past, public employment programmes viz. National Rural Employment Programme (NREP), Jawahar Rozgar Yojana (JRY), Employment Assurance Scheme (EAS), Sampoorna Grameen Rozgar Yojana (SGRY), National Food for Work Programme (NFFWP), among others were targeted at the poor and were generally indentified with poverty alleviation programmes. Such programmes were treated as schemes which did not involve any legal entitlements. By contrast, the NREGA goes beyond poverty alleviation and recognizes employment as a legal right.

For the first time, the Act, provides employment opportunities of rural labourers as a matter of right. The work guarantee is limited to 100 days per household per year. One hundred days of guaranteed employment is not a great privilege but it would matter for those who live on the margin of subsistence. Among the potential benefits of NREGA, firstly, the Act would help to protect rural households from poverty and hunger. Secondly, the Act is likely to lead to a substantial reduction of rural-urban migration. That is, if work is available in the village, many families will stay in the village instead of heading for the towns or cities. Thirdly, the employment guarantee Act is an

opportunity to create useful durable assets in rural areas which would strengthen the livelihood resource base of the rural poor. Fourthly, guaranteed employment can be a major source of empowerment for women through providing them economic independence. Lastly, but not the least, guaranteed employment is likely to act as a means of strengthening the bargaining power of unorganized workers resulting in a change of power equations in the rural society. In sum, the employment guarantee Act has high expectations in terms of employment generation, alleviation of poverty, food security, halting migration and overall rural development.

There have been good number studies designed to assess the performance of NREGA ever since the Act came into force in the country. While some studies have provided good success stories of NREGA noting a significant difference to the lives of the people, some other studies are rather critical drawing attention to leakages, inflated or fake muster roll entries, embezzlement of funds under the system of cash payments by the implementing agency, non-payment of unemployment allowance, irregularities in conduct of social audits etc. Against this backdrop, there is a need to investigate the performance of NREGA and to study the impact of the scheme on rural poor on a much wider scale covering a sizable number of sample households participating in NREGA. Keeping these things in mind, the present study is undertaken in West Bengal as a co-ordinated study, the act of co-ordinating being vested upon ADRT unit, Institute for social economic change, Bangalore.

### **Organization of the study report**

The present study is divided into seven chapters. Chapter-I is the introductory chapter which spells out the background, objectives, data base and methodology of the study. Chapter-II describes the functioning of NREGA covering various aspects of NREGA inclusive of manpower employment generated under NREGA, the socio-economic characteristics of the participants, projects completed under NREGA and various other performance indicators relating to the implementation of NREGA. Chapter-III analyses the characteristics of sample households, their income and consumption pattern. It also examines the determinants of participation in NREGA. Chapter-IV presents work profile under NREGA and examines the issues of wage structure and migration. Chapter-V analyses the qualitative responses of the households relating to the functioning of NREGA. Chapter-VI, discusses the overall impact of NREGA on village economy. Finally, Chapter-VII provides concluding remarks and policy implications emerging from the study.

## **Chapter–II**

### **Manpower Employment Generated under NREGA and Its Socio-Economic Characteristics**

Since agriculture is becoming un-remunerative in the state, the livelihood pattern in rural West Bengal is changing now a day. For a substantial percentage of rural workforces, agriculture is no longer the mainstay of living. Between 1991 and 2001, the work participation has in fact increased in rural West Bengal (census, 1991, 2001). The data however indicates that the increase was due to the increase in the percentage of marginal workers across gender. According to the National Sample Survey Organization (NSSO), 61<sup>st</sup> round, 2004-05, in rural West Bengal 8 percent of the households still remain landless, 84.3 percent of the households possess less than one hectare land per household. Small farmers (land size 1-2 ha) account for 6 percent of rural households in West Bengal and the rest 1.7 percent constitute the families within semi-medium and large holdings. Thus the state of West Bengal is now basically an economy dominated by marginal farmers (92.3 percent) who depend mostly on wage employment with high incidence of marginal workers both among males and females. Given the fact that sizable number of workers in West Bengal finds their livelihoods by offering themselves as wage labourer in the labour market, implementation of National Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme in extending employment guarantee of 100 days per household per financial year is expected to provide a decent livelihood to the people. In the past, public employment programmes in India were targeted at the poor and treated as poverty alleviation programmes. The NREGA goes beyond poverty alleviation and recognizes employment as a legal right.

#### **2.1: The functioning of NREGA (three phases district-wise)**

The National Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme (NREGS) came into existence after the enactment of a parliament Act ‘National Rural Employment Guarantee Act’ (2005) in September 2005. It provides statutory guarantee under the provisions of the National Rural Employment Guarantee Act (NREGA) for 100 days of employment every year to the adult members of any rural household willing to do unskilled manual work at the statutory minimum wage. The scheme came into force in 200 districts of the country on 2<sup>nd</sup> February, 2006. The act has been universalized with effect from 1<sup>st</sup> April, 2008 and now covers the entire country.

In West Bengal, the scheme became operative from February, 2006. The scheme was introduced in ten districts in the first phase namely Jalpaiguri, Dinajpur (North), Dinajpur (South), Malda, Murshidabad, Purulia, Birbhum, Bankura, Midnapore (West) and 24 Parganas (South). In the second phase, seven more districts, namely Coachbehar, Darjeeling, Nadia, 24 Parganas (North), Hooghly, Midnapore (East) and Burdwan were brought under its coverage with effect from 1<sup>st</sup> April 2007. The scheme is operational in all the districts of the state with effect from 1<sup>st</sup> April 2008, the latest addition being Howrah district and Darjeeling Gorkha Hill Council in the third phase.

The significance of NREGA lies in the fact that it makes employment a right for the people and in case of failure to provide wage Employment within 15 days of the date of receipt of the application, the State Government is liable to pay an unemployment allowance at the rate prescribed in the Act. There has been a plethora of studies designed to assess the performance of National Rural Employment Programme ever since the Act came into force in the country (Ambasta, P, et.al, 2008, Gopal, 2009, Jha, et.al. 2008, Mehrotra, 2008, Chakraborty, 2007). While some studies have drawn attention to huge leakage in the implementation of the scheme, others are not that critical, rather has been hopeful recognizing that the programme effectiveness will increase with experience. Against this backdrop, the present section intends to examine the functioning of NREGA, in the state as whole as well as across the phases of districts. In order to examine the functioning of NREGA, secondary data is obtained from the official website of NREGA ([www.nrega.nic.in](http://www.nrega.nic.in)). Data used in the study relate to the years 2008-09, 2009-10 and 2010-11 (till Dec' 2010).

As per the provisions of NREGA, the work guarantee under the Act is a Universal entitlement – any adult who is willing to do unskilled manual labour at the statutory minimum wage is entitled to apply. As per the guidelines, households intending to participate in NREGA works are required to register their names with the Gram Panchayet. If a household applies for registration, it is the duty of the Gram Panchayet to register it and issue a 'job card'. The job card will ensure that workers are in possession of a written record of the number of days they have worked, wages paid, unemployment allowances received and so on. Notably, the unit of registration is the 'household' while applications for work are individual applications. The Act defines a household as "the members of a family related to each other by blood, marriage or adoption and normally residing together and sharing meals or holding a common ration card. Members of a 'joint family who live together and share a ration card may be treated as a single household, even if the household is quite large. They will be entitled to the same 100 days of work per year as small households even if their needs are much larger. As per the guidelines, every nuclear family is a separate household.

First of all, we discuss worker's entitlement related data like issuing of Job cards. The demand side or the preference for the participation in NREGA scheme among rural households may be captured by enrolment for the work under NREGA scheme. Enrolment is done on the basis of application to the panchayet for a job card by the person demanding employment. The number job cards issued by the panchayet thus would be indicative of the demand or preference for participation in NREGA scheme. Official data furnished in table - 2.1 reveals that till the latest reporting month of December of the financial year 2010 – 11, a total of 106,59,024 households has been issued job cards out of which 30,17,843 (28.3 percent) are from scheduled caste background, 8,27,796 (7.8 percent) are from scheduled Tribe background and 68,13,385 (63.9 percent) coming from others background. By the end of the financial year 2009-10, a total of 103, 51,948 job cards were issued. Among them 36, 05,922 (34.8 percent) were from the categories of SC population; 10, 74,766 (10.4 percent) were from scheduled tribe population and 56, 71,260 (54.8 percent) were

from others background. The corresponding figures for the financial year 2008-09 were 33, 77,386 (35.3 percent) for SC category, 10,16,700 (10.5 percent) for ST category and 51,61,981 (54.00 percent) for others category and thus totalling the figure of 95,56,067. Notably, in respect of issuing of job cards i.e. enrolment for employment guarantee, population other than SC/ST recorded majority in all the years under study. The share of scheduled caste and scheduled Tribe population was around 36.10 percent in 2010-11 which were 45.2 percent and 45.8 percent in 2009-10 and 2008-09 respectively. Across the districts classified by phases of implementation of the scheme, a total of 61, 29,685 job cards were issued till the month of December, 2010-11 in phase 1 districts as against the figures of 60, 24,856 in 2009-10 and 57, 14,710 in 2008-09. In phase 2 districts, the corresponding figures were 42, 07,891 in 2010-11 (till Dec' 2010), 40, 18,117 in 2009-10 and 36, 69,736 in 2008-09. In phase 3 district viz. Howrah the figure reached the total of 2,18,482 till the month of December, 2010-11 which was 2,08,837 in 2009-10 and 1,71,621 in 2008-09. Let us examine the performance of NREGA in the state as well as across the phase of districts using selected indicators including some qualitative indicators in the following analyses.

## **2.2: Total employment generated-their socio-economic characteristics**

Primarily the implementation of NREGA can be evaluated in terms of jobs demanded and provided. The official data shown in table- 2.1 shows that during the financial year 2010-11 (till December 2010) a cumulative total of 44.21 lakh households demanded employment and among them 43.80 lakh households (99.1 percent), were provided wage employment under the scheme in the state. The performance shown in terms of Jobs demanded and provided has been more or less uniform across the phase 1, phase 2 and phase 3 districts. Phase 1 and phase 2 districts which have more experience, of running the programme do not show any variation over the years viz. 2008-09, 2009-10 and 2010-11 in respect of providing jobs in relation to demand.

In terms of person days of employment generated under the scheme, the state of West Bengal generated a cumulative total of 910.65 lakh person days during the financial year 2010-11 (till Dec' 2010) under NREGA out of which 328.35 lakh person days (36.1 percent) has been for scheduled caste, 98.85 lakh days (10.9 percent) for schedule tribe and the rest 910.65 lakh days (53.1 percent) for people belonging to other castes. The act mandates that at least one-third of the workers should be women. Notably, in the state, 284.08 lakh days of employment were generated for women which imply that women obtained 31.2 percent of the wage opportunities with their male counterpart getting the remaining 68.8 percent. The Act places no restriction on how each household's quota of 100 days is shared within the household, means that there is ample scope for women's participation in NREGA works. In fact while the women workers participation rate (2001) is barely 3.19 percent in rural West Bengal, women workers shared 31.2 percent of total person days generated under NREGA during the year 2010-11. While the share of Scheduled Castes (SCs) in West Bengal population is 23.02 percent, their share in NREGA employment is 36.1 percent as recorded in the financial year 2010-11. Again, while the share of Scheduled Tribes (STs) in the total

population is only 5.50 percent, they constituted 10.9 percent of the total employment days generated under the NREGA.

Importantly, during the study period between 2008-09 and 2010-11, all the districts in phase 1, 2 and 3 respectively showed highest employment generation during 2009-10. There is a consistent decline in total person days generated in all the districts in 2010-11 compared to the year 2009-10 while almost all the districts have generated much less employment in 2008-09 as compared to 2009-10.

During the study period 2008-09 to 2010-11, the state of West Bengal as a whole had generated 786.62 lakh person days in 2008-09 and made significant improvement in the following year 2009-10 creating 1551.68 lakh person days but fell back to 910.65 lakh during 2010-11. In respect of person days of employment generated per household (by those households who demanded work), the state of West Bengal shows only 21 person days of work had been generated during the financial year 2010-11 (till December 2010) which was 44 days in 2009-10 and 26 days on an average in 2008-09 (Table-2.1b). Across the districts, in terms of average person days generated per household, Bankura stood first (29 days) and Coochbehar stood last (11 days) among all the 18 districts in west Bengal during the year 2010-11. Phase 1 districts obtained employment in the range of 14-29 days followed by 11 – 14 days in phase 2 districts. Phase 3 district called Howrah obtained employment to the tune of 15 days during the year. The year 2009-10 however, experienced more employment generated under NREGA. Whereas average person days generated for the state as a whole during the year was 44 days, the range of employment varied from 29-64 days in phase 1 districts, 18-55 days in phase 2 districts and 15 days in phase 3 district viz. Howrah. During the year 2008-09 only 26 days of employment were generated on an average in the state as a whole which did not vary much across the districts. However as compared to earlier employment programmes, the total employment generated under the NREGA is much larger. For example Sampoorna Grameen Rozgar Yojana (SGRY), the earlier programme for wage employment which has been merged with NREGA from September 2007, generated 484.61 lakh man days in 2004-05, 531.59 lakh man days in 2005-06, 308.74 lakh man days in 2006-2007. In contrast, under the NREGA, the figure stood at 786.62 lakh person days in 2008-09, 1551.68 lakh person days in 2009-10 and 910.65 lakh person days in 2010-11 (till December, 2010).

The primary objective of the scheme is to provide 100 days guaranteed wage employment in a financial year to every household whose adult members volunteer to do unskilled manual work. The quota of 100 days per household per year can be shared between adult members of the household provided their combined days of employment do not exceed 100 days in the financial year. However, despite making provision of 100 days of employment in a financial year, there has been wide deviation in term of actual employment generation in all the districts of West Bengal. Among various districts, Bankura and Purulia in phase I districts, Burdwan in phase II district provided largest number of households with full 100 days of employment in the year 2010-11 (till

Dec. 2010). During the study period 2008-09 to 2010-11, households completing 100 days of work in the state was highest in 2009-10 when the figure was 72123 (2.1 percent of households who got employment) as against the figures of 23050 (0.8 percent of households who got employment) in 2008-09 and 42142 (1.00 percent of households who got employment) in 2010-11. That the actual employment generation is much below than 100 days in a year has been experienced by all the districts in the state.

### **2.3: Number of projects completed and total amount spent**

The works carried out under the scheme suggested that a total of 65,673 works in different work categories have been accomplished during the financial year 2010-11 (till December, 2010) in the state (table – 2.2a). The corresponding figure was much higher for the year 2009-10, which stood at 1, 21,858 followed by the figure of 54526 in 2008-09. The works undertaken and completed during the financial year 2010-11 indicated that agricultural development related activities accorded top priority which accounted for the maximum share in total number works completed during the year. As evidenced by secondary data, water conservation (27.72 percent), renovation of traditional water bodies (14.92 percent), land development (9.58 percent) minor irrigation (4.69 percent), drought proofing (4.63 percent) flood control (4.23 percent) and provision of irrigation facility to land development (4.09 percent) together constituted 69.86 percent of total works undertaken and completed (table-2.2b). The next in importance was the emphasis on rural connectivity which alone constituted 28.98 percent of total works accomplished during the year. Across the districts, works relating to the development agriculture were given utmost priority, during the year 2010-11. Agriculture development related activities accounted for 73.43 percent in total works in phase 1 districts, 66.41 percent in phase 2 districts and 61.36 percent in phase 3 districts. In phase 1 and phase 2 districts, water conservation and water harvesting followed by renovation of traditional water bodies and land development were the major work categories among the agricultural development related activities. In phase 3 districts, drought-proofing followed by minor irrigation and renovation of traditional water bodies constituted the major share of works undertaken among agriculture related activities. Rural connectivity works singly constituted the major activity among all the works undertaken and completed in phase 1, phase 2 and phase 3 districts. Thus in West Bengal works under NREGA mainly concentrated on agriculture related activities designed to ensure future growth in agricultural sector followed by rural connectivity works providing access to all weather roads.

Notably, the works undertaken in the NREGA were consistent with the eight categories of works listed under NREGA. These included (1) water conservation and water harvesting; (2) drought proofing including afforestation; (3) irrigation canals including micro and minor irrigation works; (4) provision of irrigation facility to land owned by households belonging to the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes, beneficiaries of land reforms and beneficiaries of Indira Awas Yojana (IAY); (5) renovation of traditional water bodies including desilting of tanks; (6) land development;

(7) flood control and protection works including drainage in water logged areas; and (8) rural connectivity to provide all weather access and (9) any other work which may be notified by the Central Government in consultation with the State Government.

As can be seen from table-2.3a an amount of Rs. 48662.8 lakhs was spent for completed works under NREGA during 2010-11 (till December 2010) in the state which was in fact a decrease of 65.90 percent from the figure of 142685.27 lakhs in the previous year 2009-10. Further amount spent during the year 2008-09 was only 70211.07 lakh which rose by 103.22 percent in 2009-10. Thus during the period 2008-11, the year 2009-10 recorded the largest amount of rupees spent for carrying out the activity. As recorded for the year 2010-11, water conservation and water harvesting activities accounted for the largest share (29.96 percent) in total expenditure incurred for carrying out different activities followed by rural connectivity (29.26 percent), renovation of traditional water bodies (20.68percent), land development (5.91 percent) and flood control (5.08 percent). As a whole agriculture related activities comprising of water conservation, land development, flood control, drought proofing, micro-irrigation, provision of irrigation facility and renovation of traditional water bodies accounted for the major share of 70.10 percent of total amount spent in the activities undertaken and completed under NREGA, in the state (table-2.3b). In terms of amount spent in different activities phase 1 districts represented the state average picture where water conservation topped the list (33.45 percent) followed by rural connectivity (29.11), and renovation of traditional water bodies (19.14 percent). The same applies to phase 2 districts in terms of priority given in Rupees spent, the exception being phase 3 districts covering Howrah district and Darjeeling Gorkha Hill council (DGHC) where rural connectivity providing all weather roads connectivity to the habitations accorded top priority (47.44 percent) followed by micro irrigation (16.03 percent), flood control (10.43 percent), renovation of water bodies (9.10 percent) and land development (7.34 percent). Notably, in all the years under study, major emphasis has been placed on the development of agriculture related activities with the objective of ensuring sustainable growth in agriculture. The emphasis on building water harvesting structures through labour intensive methods under NREGA indicates that under the Act, useful durable affects are created designed to strengthen the livelihood resource base of the poor.

## **2.4: Performance of NREGA- some quantitative indicators**

### **Social Auditing**

An innovative feature of the National Rural Employment Guarantee Act is that it gives a central role to 'social audits' as a means of continuous public vigilance. One simple form of social audit is a public assembly where all the details of a project are scrutinized.

The actors involved in implementation and monitoring of NREGA are the state employment guarantee council, the district programme co-ordinator, the programme officer, the gram panchayet, the gram sansad, and gram unnayan samiti (beneficiary committee). There is an elaborate division



of responsibilities between these different authorities. gram panchayet is the main implementing agency.

The role of gram sabha and gram unnayan samity in case of West Bengal is of great importance in the implementation of the scheme. The act provides that it is the gram sabha that should recommend the gram panchayet in the preparation of the development plan and maintenance of a shelf of possible works to be taken up under the scheme as and when the demand for work arises. It should monitor the execution of the works as well as conduct regular social audits of the projects under the scheme within the gram panchayet. It is the duty of gram panchayet to provide all the relevant documents including muster roll, bill, voucher, the estimate, timeframe, copies of sanction order and all other relevant details to the Gram unnayan samity (beneficiary committee). Under the process report of the gram unnayan samiti is required to be attached to the completion certificate of the work and need to be placed in the meeting of the gram sansad. Gram panchayat will be guided by the works selected in gram sansad meeting. Social audits thus can be seen as a means of promoting some basic norms in public works namely, transparency, participation and accountability.

As can be seen from table-2.4, a total of 3604 social audits of NREGA have been conducted in 2008-09 as against 8275 in 2009-10 and 6136 in 2010-11. However, social audits have not been done in all the districts uniformly. In conducting social audits, phase 3 district viz. Howrah is the leader followed by phase 2 and phase 1 districts in 2008-09. In the year 2009-10 phase 1 districts came next to phase 3 districts where social audits have taken place, while in the year 2010-11 phase 2 districts performed better and occupied the position after phase 3 districts.

Monitoring of NREGA works has also involved muster roll verification. Gram Panchayets are required to maintain muster rolls for every works issued by programme officer in which name of the person on work, his job card number /by-number, days of work, payment made are entered. Signature or thumb impression of the payees are also recorded in the muster roll. However, in the muster roll verification (table-2.4), out of the total of 1084133 muster rolls for the year 2010-11, a total of 706863 (65.20 percent) muster rolls are verified in the state as a whole. The corresponding figures for verified muster roll for the year 2009-10 and 2008-09 were 1111032 (53.89 percent) and 378759 (54.74 percent) respectively. Across the district phase 3 district viz. Howrah has gone much ahead compared to phase 2 and phase 1 district in respect of muster roll verification. As between phase 1 and phase 2 districts, the latter districts have progressed much in muster roll verification in all the year under study.

For effective implementation of NREGA scheme the state, district and block level officers are supposed to monitor programme at every stage of implementation through field visit. Each district is supposed to draw a schedule of inspection to ensure that district level and sub-divisional/block level officers together inspect the works separately. In the state of West Bengal, it was found that about 41.29 percent of works in 2010-11 were inspected by district level and block level

officers together as against the figure of 46.54 percent in 2009-10 and 51.91 percent in 2008-09 (table-2.4). However, there exists considerable variation across the districts. Here again phase 3 district viz. Howrah has gone much ahead than phase 1 and phase 2 district and as between phase 1 and phase 2 districts the latter districts performed better than the former districts. The state of West Bengal is thus a good performer in respect of monitoring the execution of works.

Social audits and vigilance works must be institutionalized in the sense that they must be regularly carried out by Gram Sabhas through the participatory process. In the state of West Bengal, verification of NREGA records is made by Gram Unnayan Samiti or the Beneficiary committee formed for the purpose. Report of the Gram Unnayan Samiti is placed in the meeting of Gram Sansad and Gram Sabha meetings organized by Gram panchayat are held twice in a year every 6 months interval. Gram Sabha is expected to monitor the work of gram panchayat and also to participate in the planning process. In particular the gram sabha will prioritise the works to be taken up, conduct regular social audits of all works carried out in the panchayat and verify that all the relevant norms are being observed. As can be seen from table 2.4, as against a total number of Gram Panchayats 3239 in West Bengal, Gram Sabha meeting held numbered 2222 in 2010-11, 10675 in 2009-10 and 8436 in 2008-09. Thus so far official data is concerned, Gram Sabha meeting held in ensuring transparency in planning and implementation of scheme is considerably less in 2010-11 as compared to the previous years. Across the districts there exists wide variation in this respect. During the year 2010-11 phase 2 district lead in holding gram sabha meeting numbering 1607 as against the figures of 469 for phase 1 districts and 146 for phase 2 districts.

In contrast, during the year 2009-10, when quite a large number of gram sabha meetings were held, phase 1 districts appeared to be the best performer in this regards followed by phase 2 and phase 3 districts. Again the year 2009-10 as a whole as well as across phase 1, phase 2 and phase 3 districts experienced sharp improvement in conducting gram sabha meeting as compared to the previous year 2008-09 which again show consistent decline in almost all the districts in the year 2010-11. More importantly, during the year 2010-11 the mandatory gram sabha meeting has not taken place in some of the district viz. Dinajpur (north), Jalpaiguri in phase 1 districts. Nadia in phase 2 district while no information is received in the districts of Bankura, Murshidabad and Midnapore (west) in phase 1 districts and Coachbeher in phase 2 districts. Another critical finding relates to conduct of VMC meetings (gram unnayan samiti or beneficiary committee meetings) in running the programme of NREGA. As per the provision of NREGA, VMC meeting needs to be conducted for the participation of all affected persons in the process of decision making and validation. Evidently however, in the state, the participatory process, the main route to insuring transparency has not been taken seriously by the implementing authority. During the year 2010-11, only a total of 191 VMC meetings were held as against the corresponding figures of 6472 and 6216 in 2009-10 and 2008-09 respectively (table-2.4). In many of the districts, VMC (beneficiary committee) meetings were not held at all during the year 2010-11. In phase 1 districts, 5 districts

out of a total of 10 have not conducted VMC meeting during the year while no such information was available in 3 districts. Within the group of phase 2 districts, information was not available in one district out of a total of 7 districts in the category and for the rest of 6 districts, VMC meeting were held only in one district. Information in this regard were available for all the districts during the year 2009-10. During the year too VMC meetings were not held in 6 districts in the phase 1 districts and in one district in the phase 2 districts. The year 2008-09 is not the exception in this regard during which 5 districts in the phase 1 districts and 4 districts in the phase 2 districts did not conduct VMC meetings at all . During the period under the review i.e. 2008-2011, the state of West Bengal comparatively fared well in number of VMC meetings held during the year 2009-2010 and in that year, the districts faring well included Jalpaiguri and Mindnapore (West) in the phase 1 districts; Coachbeher, Nadia and Midnapore (East) in the phase 2 districts. In the following year i.e. during 2010-11 however, all the districts have shown worst performance in respect of conducting VMC meeting.

The Act requires that a complaint register will be maintained at the gram panchayat and in the offices of the programme officer and the district programme co-ordinator. In this respect, the official data shows that in the year 2010-11 a total of 865 complaints were lodged of which a total of 690 cases (79.76 percent of the complaints) disposed of. In the earlier year 2009-10, the number of complaints lodged stood considerably higher figure at 2443 with the phase 1 districts showing the largest figure of 1498 followed by 882 in phase 2 districts and 42 in phase 3 districts (Howrah). However, more than 80.00 percent of the complaints have been disposed of. In the year 2008-09, relatively less number of complaints as compared to 2009-10 figuring 1451 were received and about 77 percent of them were disposed of (table-2.4).

### **Bank accounts**

The Act includes various provisions for transparency and accountability. For instance, apart from regular social audits of all NREGA works, wages are to be paid through banks or post offices. Prior to the introduction of bank payments, NREGA wages were paid in cash based on the entries made in the “muster roll” i.e. attendance sheet by the implementing agency - the gram panchayat. The muster roll is a record of the number of days worked and wages due to each labourer. After the muster roll is submitted to the block officer, funds are transferred to the gram panchayat account. The money is then withdrawn by the implementing agency to make cash payments to the labourers. Under this system of wage payments, the implementing and payment agencies are the same. This make embezzlement of funds easier. Against this backdrop, in order to monitor wage payments under this system, the NREGA introduced bank payments or post office payments as safeguards against corruption in wage payments to the labourers. Ideally there should be a separate account for each person listed on the job card and in the case of joint accounts, all members including women should be included, otherwise women workers might be deprived of the opportunity to collect and keep their own wages. Official data for the year 2010-11 shows that post office accounts constituted

the major which accounted for 52.44 percent of total accounts opened(table-2.5). Further a larger majority of the accounts are individual accounts either at banks (78.97 percent) or of post office (85.06 percent) and the rest are joint accounts (21.03 percent for banks and 14.94 percent for post offices) which of course included the names of female members of the household. Across the districts, the incidence of post office accounts is longest is phase 1 districts (58.96 percent) followed by phase 3 (45.62 percent) and phase 2 (44.38 percent) districts. Thus phase 2 and phase 3 districts are dominated by bank account rather than post office accounts. Moreover across the districts, phase 2 districts lead the figure of 19.44 percent in respect of opening of joint accounts followed by phase 1 (17.34 percent) with phase 3 districts being the lowest (3.55 percent). Again data for the year 2010-11 shows that three districts viz. Birbhum, Purulia and Dinajpur (south) in phase 1 districts, two districts viz. Nadia and Darjeeling in phase 2 districts had entirely individual accounts. Exceptionally, as recorded for the year 2010-11 in the district of Coachbeher, bank or post office accounts had not been opened. Disbursal of wages through the banking system was to the tune of 52.65 percent of total wage payments during the year 2010-11 although in terms of number of accounts opened, post office accounts accounted for the major. Across the districts, payments through post offices took the lead in phase 1 districts (51.73 percent) followed by phase 3 (48.24 percent) and phase 2 (42.34 percent) districts.

In the year 2009-10, total accounts opened numbered 8234283 as against the figure of 5821724 during the previous year 2008-09. Thus the year 2009-10 recorded an improvement of 41.44 percent compared to the previous year in terms of opening of accounts with the financial institutions which again increased to 8251619 during 2010-11. In all the years under review, post office accounts accounted for the major share in the total number of accounts opened. With regard to type of accounts, a large majority of workers' accounts are individual bank or post office accounts.

### **Unemployment allowance**

Under the Act, there is a provision for paying unemployment allowance by the State Government in case the employment demanded is not provided during the stipulated period. The unemployment allowance is to be paid not later than fifteen days from the date on which it became due for payment. The unemployment allowance is to be fixed by the State Government. The level of unemployment allowance must be no less than one-fourth of the wage rate for the first thirty days and not less than one-half of the wage rate after that. However, official data in this regard shows the reluctance of the State Government to disburse unemployment allowance (table-2.6). In the state, where unemployment allowances were due for payment for the period of 3679 days in 2010-11 it was paid for 6 days only in the district of Coachbeher costing Rs. 273.00. In other districts unemployment allowance were not paid at all.

## **Work projection**

The well-coordinated planning in advance is key to successful implementation of the scheme. While timely provision of employment (within 15 days of demand) is of utmost importance, the design and selection of work should be such that good quality assets are created under the scheme. Under the act, the gram panchayats are required to forward annual proposal of development project to the programme officer. The programme officer shall scrutinize the annual plan for its technical feasibility and also to make sure that it meets the likely demand for employment. The annual plan clearly indicates works ongoing and works proposed for the next year, likely costs etc. In the state of West Bengal, gram panchayats are guided by the works selected in the gram sansad meeting which are identified and prioritized by the gram unnayan samiti (beneficiary committee) and placed in the gram sansad meeting. If the proposals are within the parameters of the Act, the programme officer and the panchayat samiti maintain the priority of works indicated by the gram panchayat. Table 2.7 displays the works projected under NREGA for the year 2010-11. As can be seen from the table, number of works proposed for the next financial year (2011-12) numbered 525071 at an estimated cost of 14.66 crores which would generate person days of employment to the tune of 18.76 crores, more than doubling of the actual man days generated during the financial year 2010-11 (till December 2010) (table – 2.1). The type of works projected is found to be consistent with the eight specific types of works listed in the NREGA. In the shelf of works projected, top most priority is given to agricultural development related activities. Renovation of traditional water bodies (51.37 percent) water conservation (9.12 percent), land development (6.44 percent) provision of irrigation facility (6.10 percent), drought proofing (5.12 percent), micro-irrigation works (3.16 percent) together constituted about 80 percent of all works proposed. Rural connectivity to provide all weather road access constituted singly another 14 percent.

Table 2.1: Employment generated through NREGA and its socio-economic characteristics

1	2	3				4	5	6	7					8
		A	B	C	D				A	B	C	D	E	
SL. NO	Name of the District	Cumulative No. of HH issued job cards (Till the reporting month)				Cumulative No. of HH demanded employment (Till the reporting month)	Cumulative No. of HH provided employment (Till the reporting month)	No. of HH working under NREGA during the reporting month	Cumulative Person days generated (Till the reporting month)					Cumulative No. of HH completed 100 days (Till the reporting month)
		SCs	STs	Others	Total				SCs	STs	Others	Total	Women	
<b>Phase – I (2010-11)</b>														
1	24 Parganas South	163807 (21.4)	5092 (0.7)	595268 (77.9)	764167 (100.00)	87257	85957 (98.5)	4288	267027 (18.2)	11119 (0.8)	1187660 (81.0)	1465806 (100.00)	279906 (19.1)	274 (0.3)
2	Bankura	217399 (40.3)	67730 (12.6)	253692 (47.1)	538821 (100.00)	277874	273595 (98.5)	18893	4228592 (53.0)	1268703 (15.9)	2479666 (31.1)	7976961 (100.00)	3273955 (41.0)	8730 (3.2)
3	Birbhum	215612 (33.7)	50488 (7.9)	374514 (58.5)	640614 (100.00)	421502	418928 (99.4)	16100	3399687 (40.6)	768009 (9.2)	4203579 (50.2)	8371275 (100.00)	1959087 (23.4)	3191 (0.8)
4	Dinajpur Dakshin	80033 (27.7)	55896 (19.3)	153054 (53.0)	288983 (100.00)	71360	70724 (99.1)	867	354929 (27.6)	254544 (19.8)	674684 (52.5)	1284157 (100.00)	369066 (28.7)	350 (0.5)
5	Dinajpur Uttar	123148 (28.4)	21056 (4.8)	290034 (66.8)	434238 (100.00)	80564	80320 (99.7)	856	427322 (36.6)	44493 (3.8)	695572 (59.6)	1167387 (100.00)	374376 (32.1)	229 (0.3)
6	Jalpaiguri	212690 (33.7)	101071 (16.0)	317192 (50.3)	630953 (100.00)	288415	285267 (98.9)	13529	1441804 (32.5)	762183 (17.2)	2237584 (50.4)	4441571 (100.00)	1683667 (37.9)	240 (0.1)
7	Maldah	95321 (16.4)	36087 (6.2)	449015 (77.4)	580423 (100.00)	81597	81176 (99.5)	4753	340992 (25.4)	139331 (10.4)	862262 (64.2)	1342585 (100.00)	443111 (33.0)	249 (0.3)
8	Murshidabad	131122 (13.2)	15668 (1.6)	848010 (85.2)	994800 (100.00)	412694	408771 (99.0)	2203	1127059 (14.3)	136434 (1.7)	6605516 (83.9)	7869009 (100.00)	1225853 (15.6)	2793 (0.7)
9	Paschim Medinipore	169528 (20.6)	142357 (17.3)	511753 (62.1)	823638 (100.00)	445725	443047 (99.4)	23539	2485060 (24.7)	1801537 (17.9)	5778616 (57.4)	10065213 (100.00)	3350953 (33.3)	3917 (0.9)
10	Purulia	79329 (18.3)	78876 (18.2)	274843 (63.5)	433048 (100.00)	167725	167330 (99.8)	13159	806174 (18.4)	997151 (22.8)	2572694 (58.8)	4376019 (100.00)	1899532 (43.4)	4233 (2.5)
	Sub -Total	1487989 (24.3)	574321 (9.4)	4067375 (66.4)	6129685 (100.00)	2334713	2315115 (99.2)	98187	14878646 (30.8)	6183504 (12.8)	27297833 (56.4)	48359983 (100.00)	14859506 (30.7)	24206 (1.0)
<b>Phase – II</b>														
1	24 Parganas North	197504 (28.6)	31051 (4.5)	461239 (66.9)	689794 (100.00)	265395	264818 (99.8)	60151	1961880 (32.1)	270105 (4.4)	3883046 (63.5)	6115031 (100.00)	1536772 (25.1)	2474 (0.9)
2.	Burdwan	388440 (41.4)	87056 (9.3)	462784 (49.3)	938280 (100.00)	648277	645651 (99.6)	29175	8013575 (51.8)	2003535 (12.9)	5467019 (35.3)	15484129 (100.00)	4762099 (30.8)	10649 (1.6)
3.	Coochbehar	304285 (51.9)	5607 (1.0)	276518 (47.2)	586410 (100.00)	219049	205591 (93.9)	37178	1285891 (54.2)	24070 (1.0)	1060669 (44.7)	2370630 (100.00)	514603 (21.7)	103 (0.1)
4.	Hooghly	250300 (43.0)	52606 (9.0)	278927 (47.9)	581833 (100.00)	348113	347198 (99.7)	10104	4223701 (53.4)	809047 (10.2)	2877665 (36.4)	7910413 (100.00)	2602688 (32.9)	2360 (0.7)
5.	Nadia	193022 (27.7)	17293 (2.5)	487680 (69.9)	697995 (100.00)	259128	257693 (99.4)	17238	1418912 (33.3)	152059 (3.6)	2695157 (63.2)	4266128 (100.00)	1181104 (27.7)	631 (0.2)
6.	Purpa Medinipur	97008 (15.3)	5020 (0.8)	530809 (83.9)	632837 (100.00)	232961	231930 (99.6)	1896	674804 (15.3)	32785 (0.7)	3706722 (84.0)	4414311 (100.00)	2151057 (48.7)	874 (0.4)
7.	SiliguriMahakuma parisad	37364 (46.3)	21315 (26.4)	22063 (27.3)	80742 (100.00)	19381	18880 (97.4)	1433	140044 (57.1)	47544 (19.4)	57852 (23.6)	245440 (100.00)	139088 (56.7)	16 (0.1)
	Sub Total	1467923 (34.9)	219948 (5.2)	2520020 (59.9)	4207891 (100.00)	1992304	1971761 (99.0)	157175	17718807 (43.4)	3339145 (8.2)	19748130 (48.4)	40806082 (100.00)	12887411 (31.6)	17107 (0.9)
<b>Phase – III</b>														
1.	Darjeeling Gorkha Hill Council (DGHC)	7209 (7.0)	32521 (31.6)	63236 (61.4)	102966 (100.00)	44229	43807 (99.0)	365	69498 (5.9)	360042 (30.6)	745991 (63.5)	1175531 (100.00)	513266 (43.7)	716 (1.6)
2.	Howrah	54722 (25.0)	1006 (0.5)	162754 (74.5)	218482 (100.00)	49882	49798 (99.8)	5441	168070 (23.2)	1879 (0.3)	553585 (76.5)	723534 (100.00)	147981 (20.5)	113 (0.2)
	Sub – Total	61931 (19.3)	33527 (10.4)	225990 (70.3)	321448 (100.00)	94111	93605 (99.5)	5806	237568 (12.5)	361921 (19.1)	1299576 (68.4)	1899065 (100.00)	661247 (34.8)	829 (0.9)
	Grand Total	3017843 (28.3)	827796 (7.8)	6813385 (63.9)	10659024 (100.00)	4421128	4380481 (99.1)	261168	32835021 (36.1)	9884570 (10.9)	48345539 (53.1)	91065130 (100.00)	28408164 (31.2)	42142 (1.0)

Note : 1. Figures in brackets are percentages , 2. Percentage figures in col- 5 relate to the figures of col-4, 3. Percentages figures in col-8 relate to the figures of col-5.

Contd.....

Contd... Table 2.1: Employment generated through NREGA and its socio-economic characteristics

1	2	3				4	5	6	7					8
		A	B	C	D				A	B	C	D	E	
		Cumulative No. of HH issued job cards (Till the reporting month)							Cumulative No. Of HH demanded employment (Till the reporting month)	Cumulative No. Of HH provided employment (Till the reporting month)	No. Of HH working under NREGA during the reporting month	Cumulative Person days generated (Till the reporting month) in lakhs		
SCs	STs	Others	Total	SCs	STs	Others	Total	Women						
<b>Phase – I (2009-10)</b>														
1	24 Parganas South	309669 (40.8)	19543 (2.6)	430290 (56.7)	759502 (100.00)	138467	138467 (100.0)	42472	16.91 (42.0)	1.95 (4.8)	21.36 (53.1)	40.22 (100.00)	4.34 (10.8)	686 (0.5)
2	Bankura	260198 (46.2)	93890 (16.7)	209266 (37.1)	563354 (100.00)	221440	221440 (100.0)	97989	53.38 (54.8)	19.51 (20.0)	24.59 (25.2)	97.48 (100.00)	42.12 (43.2)	5765 (2.6)
3	Birbhum	244091 (38.3)	54519 (8.6)	338612 (53.1)	637222 (100.00)	234371	234371 (100.0)	179143	54.59 (41.6)	14.57 (11.1)	62.01 (47.3)	131.17 (100.00)	48.55 (37.0)	5535 (2.4)
4	Dinajpur Dakshin	94569 (35.2)	58478 (21.8)	115784 (43.1)	268831 (100.00)	56388	56388 (100.0)	33065	8.87 (29.7)	6.36 (21.3)	14.61 (49.0)	29.84 (100.00)	11.26 (37.7)	1117 (2.0)
5	Dinajpur Uttar	149762 (34.7)	28001 (6.5)	254213 (58.8)	431976 (100.00)	75931	75931 (100.0)	7090	9.48 (37.0)	2.02 (7.9)	14.14 (55.1)	25.64 (100.00)	10.77 (42.0)	1017 (1.3)
6	Jalpaiguri	274191 (44.8)	160065 (26.1)	177945 (29.1)	612201 (100.00)	250452	250452 (100.0)	125197	72.42 (45.1)	43.77 (27.3)	44.36 (27.6)	160.55 (100.00)	74.81 (46.6)	8528 (3.4)
7	Maldah	155565 (27.5)	50485 (8.9)	359350 (63.6)	565400 (100.00)	138930	138930 (100.0)	24853	17.99 (32.7)	7.09 (12.9)	29.93 (54.4)	55.01 (100.00)	17.5 (31.8)	1667 (1.2)
8	Murshidabad	169589 (17.5)	21418 (2.2)	777097 (80.3)	968104 (100.00)	370841	366146 (98.7)	135592	19.16 (17.8)	3.19 (3.0)	85.17 (79.2)	107.52 (100.00)	10.28 (9.6)	2788 (0.8)
9	Paschim Medinipore	216893 (27.5)	184867 (23.4)	388361 (49.2)	790121 (100.00)	342500	342500 (100.0)	175607	52.85 (29.7)	44.4 (24.9)	80.87 (45.4)	178.12 (100.00)	53.5 (30.0)	10315 (3.0)
10	Purulia	105458 (24.6)	109726 (25.6)	212961 (49.7)	428145 (100.00)	164870	164870 (100.0)	79724	27.8 (26.5)	28.42 (27.1)	48.49 (46.3)	104.71 (100.00)	43.01 (41.1)	10086 (6.1)
	Sub –Total	1979985 (32.9)	780992 (13.0)	3263879 (54.2)	6024856 (100.00)	1994190	1989495 (99.8)	900732	333.45 (38.5)	171.28 (18.4)	425.53 (45.7)	930.26 (100.00)	316.14 (34.0)	47504 (2.4)
<b>Phase – II</b>														
1	24 Parganas North	203027 (31.6)	41406 (6.4)	398495 (62.0)	642928 (100.00)	223705	223705 (100.0)	99748	33.77 (28.1)	8.45 (7.0)	77.87 (64.8)	120.09 (100.00)	18.18 (15.1)	7316 (3.3)
2.	Burdwan	394087 (44.9)	99825 (11.4)	384362 (43.8)	878274 (100.00)	329317	329317 (100.0)	221585	88.85 (49.5)	27.5 (15.3)	63.26 (35.2)	179.61 (100.00)	82.91 (46.2)	7194 (2.2)
3.	Coochbehar	324893 (56.4)	4241 (0.7)	246518 (42.8)	575652 (100.00)	205173	203735 (99.3)	112119	38.17 (58.8)	0.57 (0.9)	26.21 (40.4)	64.95 (100.00)	15.87 (24.4)	251 (0.1)
4.	Hooghly	243572 (45.0)	58242 (10.8)	238917 (44.2)	540731 (100.00)	196779	196779 (100.0)	104579	31.57 (53.4)	6.43 (10.9)	21.1 (35.7)	59.1 (100.00)	18.59 (31.5)	3400 (1.7)
5.	Nadia	224345 (32.5)	25575 (3.7)	439604 (63.8)	689524 (100.00)	181137	181137 (100.0)	82164	24.62 (29.2)	3.69 (4.4)	56.04 (66.4)	84.35 (100.00)	19.42 (23.0)	2956 (1.6)
6.	Purpa Medinipur	116440 (19.0)	5999 (1.0)	491758 (80.1)	614197 (100.00)	222980	222980 (100.0)	167754	15.05 (17.2)	1.22 (1.4)	71.44 (81.5)	87.71 (100.00)	38.2 (43.6)	2410 (1.1)
7.	SiliguriMahakuma parisad	36286 (47.2)	21970 (28.6)	18555 (24.2)	76811 (100.00)	23696	23696 (100.0)	9175	2.24 (51.1)	0.9 (20.5)	1.24 (28.3)	4.38 (100.00)	2.13 (48.6)	12 (0.1)
	Sub Total	1542650 (38.4)	257258 (6.4)	2218209 (55.2)	4018117 (100.00)	1382787	1381349 (99.9)	797124	234.27 (39.0)	48.76 (8.1)	317.16 (52.8)	600.19 (100.00)	195.3 (32.5)	23539 (1.7)
<b>Phase – III</b>														
1.	Darjeeling Gorkha Hill Council (DGHC)	11887 (11.9)	35414 (35.4)	52837 (52.8)	100138 (100.00)	56465	53150 (94.1)	37346	1.27 (10.0)	3.12 (24.6)	8.3 (65.4)	12.69 (100.00)	5.36 (42.2)	955 (1.8)
2.	Howrah	71400 (34.2)	1102 (0.5)	136335 (65.3)	208837 (100.00)	55921	55921 (100.0)	14024	2.94 (34.4)	0.02 (0.2)	5.58 (65.3)	8.54 (100.00)	1.82 (21.3)	125 (0.2)
	Sub – Total	83287 (27.0)	36516 (11.8)	189172 (97.1)	308975 (100.00)	112386	109071 (97.1)	51370	4.21 (19.8)	3.14 (14.8)	13.88 (65.4)	21.23 (100.00)	7.18 (33.8)	1080 (1.0)
	Grand Total	3605922 (34.8)	1074766 (10.4)	5671260 (54.8)	10351948 (100.00)	3489363	3479915 (99.7)	1749226	571.93 (36.9)	223.18 (14.4)	756.57 (48.8)	1551.68 (100.00)	518.62 (33.4)	72123 (2.1)

Note : 1. Figures in brackets are percentages , 2. Percentage figures in col- 5 relate to the figures of col-4, 3. Percentages figures in col-8 relate to the figures of col-5.

Contd.....

Contd... Table 2.1: Employment generated through NREGA and its socio-economic characteristics

1	2	3				4	5	6	7					8
		A	B	C	D				A	B	C	D	E	
		Cumulative No. of HH issued job cards (Till the reporting month)							Cumulative No. of HH demanded employment (Till the reporting month)	Cumulative No. of HH provided employment (Till the reporting month)	No. of HH working under NREGA during the reporting month	Cumulative Person days generated (Till the reporting month) in lakhs		
SCs	STs	Others	Total	SCs	STs	Others	Total	Women						
<b>Phase – I (2008-09)</b>														
1	24 Parganas South	273917 (37.0)	22210 (3.0)	444190 (60.0)	740317 (100.00)	128414	128414 (100.0)	43544	10.6 (43.6)	0.77 (3.2)	12.92 (53.2)	24.29 (100.00)	2.37 (9.8)	147 (0.1)
2	Bankura	230707 (47.0)	73844 (15.0)	186443 (38.0)	490994 (100.00)	204181	204181 (100.0)	63833	32.12 (55.4)	11.47 (19.8)	14.4 (24.8)	57.99 (100.00)	20.63 (35.6)	1891 (0.9)
3	Birbhum	244091 (38.3)	54519 (8.6)	338612 (53.1)	637222 (100.00)	185743	185743 (100.00)	62342	31.07 (44.3)	7.94 (11.3)	31.13 (44.4)	70.14 (100.00)	17.33 (24.7)	690 (0.4)
4	Dinajpur Dakshin	87941 (35.7)	56632 (23.0)	101725 (41.3)	246298 (100.00)	70156	70156 (100.0)	26357	4.69 (27.1)	3.24 (18.7)	9.38 (54.2)	17.31 (100.00)	4.58 (26.5)	197 (0.3)
5	Dinajpur Uttar	149761 (34.7)	28001 (6.5)	254144 (58.8)	431906 (100.00)	57116	57116 (100.0)	2932	6.21 (45.3)	1.23 (9.0)	6.77 (45.7)	13.71 (100.00)	5.03 (36.7)	784 (1.4)
6	Jalpaiguri	271214 (46.0)	152240 (25.8)	166302 (28.2)	589756 (100.00)	221578	221578 (100.0)	0	24.23 (43.1)	17.5 (31.1)	14.54 (25.8)	56.27 (100.00)	22.62 (40.2)	661 (0.3)
7	Maldah	142911 (26.6)	48621 (9.1)	344986 (64.3)	536518 (100.00)	96296	96296 (100.0)	36250	4.89 (30.5)	1.93 (12.0)	9.22 (57.5)	16.04 (100.00)	3.28 (20.4)	107 (0.1)
8	Murshidabad	157439 (17.7)	20095 (2.3)	711487 (80.0)	889021 (100.00)	184127	184127 (100.0)	37039	5.64 (14.7)	1.84 (4.8)	30.91 (80.5)	38.39 (100.00)	4.07 (10.6)	62 (0.0)
9	Paschim Medinipore	206388 (27.9)	177398 (24.0)	356089 (48.1)	739875 (100.00)	319753	319753 (100.0)	132500	25.9 (29.9)	20.57 (23.7)	40.22 (46.4)	86.69 (100.00)	22.12 (25.5)	2027 (0.6)
10	Purulia	102446 (24.8)	106995 (25.9)	203362 (49.3)	412803 (100.00)	123571	123571 (100.0)	40093	10.36 (27.4)	11.68 (30.9)	15.75 (41.7)	37.79 (100.00)	14 (37.0)	3003 (2.4)
Sub -Total		1866815 (32.7)	740555 (13.0)	3107340 (54.4)	5714710 (100.00)	1590935	1590935 (100.0)	444890	155.71 (37.2)	78.17 (18.7)	184.74 (44.1)	418.62 (100.00)	116.03 (27.7)	9569 (0.6)
<b>Phase – II</b>														
1	24 Parganas North	168043 (33.7)	40273 (8.1)	290121 (58.2)	498437 (100.00)	163353	163353 (100.0)	77570	16.82 (24.4)	4.05 (5.9)	48.12 (69.7)	68.99 (100.00)	3.95 (5.7)	856 (0.5)
2.	Burdwan	374922 (46.2)	98062 (12.1)	338545 (41.7)	811529 (100.00)	412065	412065 (100.0)	221578	66.08 (47.8)	24.2 (17.5)	47.85 (34.6)	138.13 (100.00)	48.13 (34.8)	9152 (2.2)
3.	Coochbehar	310060 (59.8)	4000 (0.8)	204605 (39.4)	518665 (100.00)	228955	228955 (100.0)	42490	16.88 (48.5)	1.16 (3.3)	16.8 (48.2)	34.84 (100.00)	7.23 (20.8)	12 (0.0)
4.	Hooghly	228849 (49.7)	53845 (11.7)	177625 (38.6)	460319 (100.00)	148856	148856 (100.0)	8250	15.33 (51.8)	3.13 (10.6)	11.11 (37.6)	29.57 (100.00)	7.81 (26.4)	592 (0.4)
5.	Nadia	214048 (32.7)	23848 (3.6)	416935 (63.7)	654831 (100.00)	116426	116426 (100.0)	116426	9.55 (27.2)	1.3 (3.7)	24.2 (69.0)	35.05 (100.00)	4.9 (14.0)	130 (0.1)
6.	Purpa Medinipur	108486 (19.1)	6187 (1.1)	454729 (79.9)	569402 (100.00)	261424	261424 (100.0)	129823	8.47 (20.0)	0.38 (0.9)	33.54 (79.1)	42.39 (100.00)	13.71 (32.3)	2266 (0.9)
7.	SiliguriMahakuma parisad	46308 (29.6)	49151 (31.4)	61094 (39.0)	156553 (100.00)	68138	68138 (100.0)	14137	4.46 (28.1)	4.16 (26.2)	7.25 (45.7)	15.87 (100.00)	6.64 (41.8)	473 (0.7)
Sub Total		1450716 (39.5)	275366 (7.5)	1943654 (53.0)	3669736 (100.00)	1399217	1399217 (100.0)	610274	137.59 (37.7)	38.38 (10.5)	188.87 (51.8)	364.84 (100.00)	92.37 (25.3)	13481 (1.0)
<b>Phase – III</b>														
1.	Darjeeling Gorkha Hill Council (DGHC)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (100.00)	0	0 (100.0)	0	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (100.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.0)
2.	Howrah	59855 (34.9)	779 (0.5)	110987 (64.7)	171621 (100.00)	35702	35702 (100.0)	12531	1.25 (39.6)	0 (0.00)	1.91 (60.4)	3.16 (100.00)	0.27 (8.5)	0 (0.0)
Sub – Total		59855 (34.9)	779 (0.5)	110987 (64.7)	171621 (100.00)	35702	35702 (100.0)	12531	1.25 (39.6)	0 (0.00)	1.91 (60.4)	3.16 (100.00)	0.27 (8.5)	0 (0.0)
Grand Total		3377386 (35.3)	1016700 (10.5)	5161981 (54.0)	9556067 (100.00)	3025854	3025854 (100.0)	1067695	294.55 (37.4)	116.55 (14.8)	375.52 (47.7)	786.62 (100.00)	208.67 (26.5)	23050 (0.8)

Note : 1. Figures in brackets are percentages , 2. Percentage figures in col- 5 relate to the figures of col-4, 3. Percentages figures in col-8 relate to the figures of col-5.



Table 2.1 b: Employment generated through NREGA and its socio-economic characteristics

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
SL. NO	Name of the District	Cumulative No. of HH demanded employment (Till the reporting month)	Cumulative No. of HH provided employment (Till the reporting month)	Cumulative Person days generated (Till the reporting month)	Employment generated per H.H. Demanded	Employment generated per H.H. Provided
				Total		
<b>Phase – I (2010-11)</b>						
1	24 Parganas South	87257	85957	1465806	17	17
2	Bankura	277874	273595	7976961	29	29
3	Birbhum	421502	418928	8371275	20	20
4	Dinajpur Dakshin	71360	70724	1284157	18	18
5	Dinajpur Uttar	80564	80320	1167387	14	15
6	Jalpaiguri	288415	285267	4441571	15	16
7	Maldah	81597	81176	1342585	16	17
8	Murshidabad	412694	408771	7869009	19	19
9	Paschim Mednipur	445725	443047	10065213	23	23
10	Purulia	167725	167330	4376019	26	26
Sub -Total		2334713	2315115	48359983	21	21
<b>Phase – II</b>						
1	24 Parganas North	265395	264818	6115031	23	23
2	Burdwan	648277	645651	15484129	24	24
3	Coochbehar	219049	205591	2370630	11	12
4	Hooghly	348113	347198	7910413	23	23
5	Nadia	259128	257693	4266128	16	17
6	Purpa Medinipur	232961	231930	4414311	19	19
7	SiliguriMahakuma parisad	19381	18880	245440	13	13
Sub Total		1992304	1971761	40806082	20	21
<b>Phase – III</b>						
1	Darjeeling Gorkha Hill Council	44229	43807	1175531	27	27
2	Howrah	49882	49798	723534	15	15
Sub – Total		94111	93605	1899065	20	20
<b>Grand Total</b>		<b>4421128</b>	<b>4380481</b>	<b>91065130</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>21</b>

Contd.....

Contd..... Table 2.1 b: Employment generated through NREGA and its socio-economic characteristics

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
SL. NO	Name of the District	Cumulative No. of HH demanded employment (Till the reporting month)	Cumulative No. of HH provided employment (Till the reporting month)	Cumulative Person days generated (Till the reporting month)	Employment generated per H.H. Demanded	Employment generated per H.H. Provided
				Total		
<b>Phase – I (2009-10)</b>						
1	24 Parganas South	138467	138467	4022000	29	29
2	Bankura	221440	221440	9748000	44	44
3	Birbhum	234371	234371	13117000	56	56
4	Dinajpur Dakshin	56388	56388	2984000	53	53
5	Dinajpur Uttar	75931	75931	2564000	34	34
6	Jalpaiguri	250452	250452	16055000	64	64
7	Maldah	138930	138930	5501000	40	40
8	Murshidabad	370841	366146	10752000	29	29
9	Paschim Mednipur	342500	342500	17812000	52	52
10	Purulia	164870	164870	10471000	64	64
Sub -Total		1994190	1989495	93026000	47	47
<b>Phase – II</b>						
1	24 Parganas North	223705	223705	12009000	54	54
2	Burdwan	329317	329317	17961000	55	55
3	Coochbehar	205173	203735	6495000	32	32
4	Hooghly	196779	196779	5910000	30	30
5	Nadia	181137	181137	8435000	47	47
6	Purpa Medinipur	222980	222980	8771000	39	39
7	SiliguriMahakuma parisad	23696	23696	438000	18	18
Sub Total		1382787	1381349	60019000	43	43
<b>Phase – III</b>						
1	Darjeeling Gorkha Hill Council	56465	53150	1269000	22	24
2	Howrah	55921	55921	854000	15	15
Sub – Total		112386	109071	2123000	19	19
Grand Total		3489363	3479915	155168000	44	45

Contd.....

Contd..... Table 2.1 b: Employment generated through NREGA and its socio-economic characteristics

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
SL. NO	Name of the District	Cumulative No. of HH demanded employment (Till the reporting month)	Cumulative No. of HH provided employment (Till the reporting month)	Cumulative Person days generated (Till the reporting month)	Employment generated per H.H. Demanded	Employment generated per H.H. Provided
				Total		
<b>Phase – I (2008 - 09)</b>						
1	24 Parganas South	128414	128414	2429000	19	19
2	Bankura	204181	204181	5799000	28	28
3	Birbhum	185743	185743	7014000	38	38
4	Dinajpur Dakshin	70156	70156	1731000	25	25
5	Dinajpur Uttar	57116	57116	1371000	24	24
6	Jalpaiguri	221578	221578	5627000	25	25
7	Maldah	96296	96296	1604000	17	17
8	Murshidabad	184127	184127	3839000	21	21
9	Paschim Mednipur	319753	319753	8669000	27	27
10	Purulia	123571	123571	3779000	31	31
Sub -Total		1590935	1590935	41862000	26	26
<b>Phase – II</b>						
1	24 Parganas North	163353	163353	6899000	42	42
2	Burdwan	412065	412065	13813000	34	34
3	Coochbehar	228955	228955	3484000	15	15
4	Hooghly	148856	148856	2957000	20	20
5	Nadia	116426	116426	3505000	30	30
6	Purpa Medinipur	261424	261424	4239000	16	16
7	SiliguriMahakuma parisad	68138	68138	1587000	23	23
Sub Total		1399217	1399217	36484000	26	26
<b>Phase – III</b>						
1	Darjeeling Gorkha Hill Council	0	0	0	0	0
2	Howrah	35702	35702	316000	9	9
Sub – Total		35702	35702	316000	9	9
Grand Total		3025854	3025854	78662000	26	26

Table 2.2a: District wise works completed/progress under NREGA (number of projects)

2010-11		Phase -I										
District		24Pgs (S)	Bankura	Birbhum	Dinajpur (S)	Dinajpur (N)	Jalpaigugi	Maldah	Murshidabad	Purulia	Midnapore (W)	Sub Total
Rural Connectivity	comp.	469	854	2224	269	369	918	375	609	263	1939	8289
	Ongoing/Suspended	10625	4995	5748	1087	842	2727	1018	4426	3389	12398	47255
Flood Control	comp.	196	55	149	16	10	223	4	28	0	155	836
	Ongoing/Suspended	2760	342	449	50	45	846	21	234	29	843	5619
Water Conservation And Water Harvesting	comp.	104	1614	2415	235	275	291	148	583	1287	2648	9600
	Ongoing/Suspended	1976	5754	5823	700	443	1265	288	2803	11076	7138	37266
Drought Proofing	comp.	37	144	309	28	153	245	59	7	104	232	1318
	Ongoing/Suspended	1749	1446	1268	254	239	1365	544	397	1089	2505	10856
Micro Irrigation	comp.	57	435	316	20	5	394	8	22	4	361	1622
	Ongoing/Suspended	1560	793	1148	125	22	1107	69	183	41	1281	6329
Provision of Irrigation facility to Land development	comp.	21	42	13	1	0	50	16	0	254	1420	1817
	Ongoing/Suspended	2144	206	46	19	2	168	158	4	1559	2005	6311
Renovation of Traditional Water Bodies	comp.	12	850	1744	116	83	216	227	121	70	2210	5649
	Ongoing/Suspended	1306	3368	2117	426	116	387	274	1027	439	5046	14506
Land development	comp.	29	281	267	52	80	590	57	103	611	1320	3390
	Ongoing/Suspended	1215	866	789	344	133	2482	222	493	921	2897	10362
Any Other Activity Approved by MRD	comp.	4	31	168	17	0	158	0	7	5	90	480
	Ongoing/Suspended	353	254	643	23	10	341	26	100	105	775	2630
Rajiv Gandhi Seva Kendra	comp.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Ongoing/Suspended	5	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	15
Total	comp.	929	4306	7605	754	975	3085	894	1480	2598	10375	33001
	Ongoing/Suspended	23693	18024	18037	3028	1852	10688	2620	9667	18650	34890	141149

Contd.....

Contd.....Table 2.2a: District wise works completed/progress under NREGA (number of projects)

2010-11		Phase -II								Phase -III			Grand Total
District		24 Pgs (N)	Burdwan	Cooch-behar	Siliguri Mahakuma Parisad	Midnapore (E)	Hooghly	Nadia	Sub Total	Darjeeling Gorkha Hill Council (DGHC)	Howrah	Sub Total	
Rural Connectivity	comp.	3163	1503	856	35	1863	1055	1861	10336	23	382	405	19030
	Ongoing/Suspended	8643	5680	3385	228	4133	2303	4091	28463	586	462	1048	76766
Flood Control	comp.	537	564	2	16	384	268	93	1864	3	76	79	2779
	Ongoing/Suspended	1640	2454	101	45	808	681	238	5967	56	53	109	11695
Water Conservation And Water Herversting	comp.	4233	1803	23	10	1525	791	170	8555	2	45	47	18202
	Ongoing/Suspended	10270	3674	77	42	1604	867	358	16892	8	9	17	54175
Drought Proofing	comp.	63	437	60	14	718	109	112	1513	2	210	212	3043
	Ongoing/Suspended	35657	3397	568	98	2588	490	456	43254	62	146	208	54318
Micro Irrigation	comp.	128	433	31		419	217	65	1293	2	164	166	3081
	Ongoing/Suspended	432	1676	56	67	988	442	206	3867	19	96	115	10311
Provision of Irrigation facility to Land development	comp.	6	83	51	2	681	1	43	867	0	0	0	2684
	Ongoing/Suspended	13	146	103	6	962	0	50	1280	4	1	5	7596
Renovation of Traditional Water Bodies	comp.	368	1247	36	2	699	1266	445	4063	0	86	86	9798
	Ongoing/Suspended	1105	2549	87	10	849	1212	660	6472	5	29	34	21012
Land development	comp.	1417	306	245	9	468	141	263	2849	6	47	53	6292
	Ongoing/Suspended	4132	1127	982	50	893	306	617	8107	53	24	77	18546
Any Other Activity Approved by MRD	comp.	51	39	29	1	92	5	57	274	0	0	0	754
	Ongoing/Suspended	140	302	356	5	71	104	223	1201	0	7	7	3838
Rajiv Gandhi Seva Kendra	comp.	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	4
	Ongoing/Suspended	43	0	0	0	1	0	1	45	0	0	0	60
Total	comp.	9970	6415	1333	89	6849	3853	3109	31624	38	1010	1048	65673
	Ongoing/Suspended	62075	21005	5715	551	12897	6405	6900	115548	793	827	1620	258317

Contd..... Table 2.2a: District wise works completed/progress under NREGA (number of projects)

2009 - 10		Phase -I										
District		24Pgs (S)	Bankura	Birbhum	Dinajpur (S)	Dinajpur (N)	Jalpaipugi	Maldah	Murshidabad	Purulia	Midnapore (W)	Sub Total
Rural Connectivity	comp.	965	1707	2607	565	1175	3844	1479	1647	1637	7521	23147
	Ongoing/Suspended	327	1242	1793	384	322	846	249	1201	1635	3275	11274
Flood Control	comp.	799	217	316	72	63	1209	50	485	3	850	4064
	Ongoing/Suspended	220	109	168	47	13	215	5	163	11	350	1301
Water Conservation And Water Herversting	comp.	258	928	1759	203	296	1404	149	1042	3350	2964	12353
	Ongoing/Suspended	53	543	1285	120	194	369	40	379	3041	1314	7338
Drought Proofing	comp.	138	430	631	173	180	793	281	154	642	755	4177
	Ongoing/Suspended	323	333	488	177	62	112	47	77	519	420	2558
Micro Irrigation	comp.	174	366	908	170	17	605	26	239	1514	1190	5209
	Ongoing/Suspended	80	148	262	78	6	128	2	92	1480	350	2626
Provision of Irrigation facility to Land development	comp.	300	153	352	33	24	450	1	53	402	1604	3372
	Ongoing/Suspended	142	129	335	49	7	86	5	29	555	1147	2484
Renovation of Traditional Water Bodies	comp.	143	1656	1822	381	45	414	379	1091	687	3177	9795
	Ongoing/Suspended	90	1257	1178	156	19	30	22	427	703	2071	5953
Land development	comp.	295	314	372	91	162	3148	116	659	1084	1712	7953
	Ongoing/Suspended	94	235	785	78	40	415	11	170	276	647	2751
Any Other Activity Approved by MRD	comp.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	3
	Ongoing/Suspended	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	0	14
Rajiv Gandhi Seva Kendra	comp.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Ongoing/Suspended	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	comp.	3072	5771	8767	1688	1962	11867	2481	5370	9322	19773	70073
	Ongoing/Suspended	1329	2829	5206	1023	734	2261	449	2201	7621	7593	31246

Contd.....

Contd..... Table 2.2a: District wise works completed/progress under NREGA (number of projects)

2009 - 10		Phase -II							Phase -III			Grand Total	
District		24 Pgs (N)	Burdwan	Coochbehar	Siliguri Mahakuma Parisad	Midnapore (E)	Hooghly	Nadia	Sub Total	Darjeeling Gorkha Hill Council (DGHC)	Howrah		Sub Total
Rural Connectivity	comp.	4214	3359	1369	165	3605	1979	2298	16989	122	602	724	40860
	Ongoing/Suspended	3019	1461	1566	55	2280	545	524	9450	298	175	473	21197
Flood Control	comp.	1431	1802	95	19	557	703	305	4912	99	143	242	9218
	Ongoing/Suspended	475	418	94	18	588	179	159	1931	65	43	108	3340
Water Conservation And Water Herversting	comp.	3294	3089	103	30	1644	667	456	9283	2	36	38	21674
	Ongoing/Suspended	1344	1151	78	17	1515	37	172	4314	3	11	14	11666
Drought Proofing	comp.	522	2307	11	100	1287	587	792	5606	12	132	144	9927
	Ongoing/Suspended	349	530	67	13	1044	184	236	2423	8	126	134	5115
Micro Irrigation	comp.	384	1067	26	13	704	378	604	3176	2	243	245	8630
	Ongoing/Suspended	126	230	18	11	487	49	212	1133	10	92	102	3861
Provision of Irrigation facility to Land development	comp.	139	79	168	21	599	31	391	1428	1	4	5	4805
	Ongoing/Suspended	2	74	43	10	682	11	195	1017	0	3	3	3504
Renovation of Traditional Water Bodies	comp.	1640	1178	24	4	961	636	614	5057	1	70	71	14923
	Ongoing/Suspended	736	481	45	3	697	83	253	2298	0	27	27	8278
Land development	comp.	1372	581	497	58	715	383	205	3811	20	30	50	11814
	Ongoing/Suspended	643	163	368	18	529	28	128	1877	15	21	36	4664
Any Other Activity Approved by MRD	comp.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	4	7
	Ongoing/Suspended	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	3	17
Rajiv Gandhi Seva Kendra	comp.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Ongoing/Suspended	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	comp.	12996	13462	2293	410	10072	5364	5665	50262	263	1260	1523	121858
	Ongoing/Suspended	6048	4117	2324	232	7215	1123	1716	22775	492	1728	2220	56241

Contd.....

Contd.....Table 2.2a: District wise works completed/progress under NREGA (number of projects)

2008 - 09		Phase -I										
District		24Pgs (S)	Bankura	Birbhum	Dinajpur (S)	Dinajpur (N)	Jalpaiguri	Maldah	Murshidabad	Purulia	Midnapore (W)	Sub Total
Rural Connectivity	comp.	468	1395	1896	118	465	1822	337	975	535	4515	12526
	Ongoing/Suspended	472	1022	1191	87	63	898	646	431	1253	2479	8542
Flood Control	comp.	449	160	158	0	71	473	7	132	30	700	2180
	Ongoing/Suspended	383	83	183	2	8	165	14	57	14	400	1309
Water Conservation And Water Herversting	comp.	283	372	1192	68	241	415	33	316	555	950	4425
	Ongoing/Suspended	132	539	1128	85	40	255	51	132	1431	593	4386
Drought Proofing	comp.	276	340	922	32	266	580	163	95	384	500	3558
	Ongoing/Suspended	330	230	781	51	19	115	186	7	324	220	2263
Micro Irrigation	comp.	222	215	231	0	23	582	7	32	25	450	1787
	Ongoing/Suspended	138	149	122	21	1	131	14	25	93	280	974
Provision of Irrigation facility to Land development	comp.	175	140	77	0	16	55	1	9	21	450	944
	Ongoing/Suspended	98	46	9	1	1	38	2	4	127	85	411
Renovation of Traditional Water Bodies	comp.	125	1174	864	97	59	131	33	235	111	750	3579
	Ongoing/Suspended	78	1353	795	96	5	128	102	116	385	543	3601
Land development	comp.	217	144	261	2	99	203	12	127	203	600	1868
	Ongoing/Suspended	134	111	212	35	38	117	41	121	357	350	1516
Any Other Activity Approved by MRD	comp.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Ongoing/Suspended	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Rajiv Gandhi Seva Kendra	comp.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Ongoing/Suspended	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	comp.	2215	3940	5601	317	1240	4261	593	1921	1864	8915	30867
	Ongoing/Suspended	1765	2258	3704	360	248	1797	1032	855	3677	4485	20181

Contd.....



Contd.... Table 2.2a: District wise works completed/progress under NREGA (number of projects)

2008 - 09		Phase -II								Phase -III			Grand Total
District		24 Pgs (N)	Burdwan	Coochbehar	Siliguri Mahakuma Parisad	Midnapore (E)	Hooghly	Nadia	Sub Total	Darjeeling Gorkha Hill Council (DGHC)	Howrah	Sub Total	
Rural Connectivity	comp.	1001	2369	635	157	1465	512	290	6429	0	95	95	19050
	Ongoing/Suspended	1232	1862	900	86	2621	814	282	7797	0	188	188	16527
Flood Control	comp.	341	1627	145	19	270	144	65	2611	0	32	32	4823
	Ongoing/Suspended	414	654	110	17	520	261	79	2055	0	39	39	3403
Water Conservation And Water Herversting	comp.	321	1949	75	27	836	302	152	3662	0	0	0	8087
	Ongoing/Suspended	249	1500	50	17	1133	325	140	3414	0	9	9	7809
Drought Proofing	comp.	159	3256	120	62	804	64	74	4539	0	34	34	8131
	Ongoing/Suspended	385	1337	148	28	651	191	60	2800	0	48	48	5111
Micro Irrigation	comp.	157	967	30	23	388	56	117	1738	0	20	20	3545
	Ongoing/Suspended	259	311	8	4	430	169	51	1232	0	137	137	2343
Provision of Irrigation facility to Land development	comp.	37	152	7	8	88	13	81	386	0	0	0	1330
	Ongoing/Suspended	82	26	6	5	403	8	42	572	0	0	0	983
Renovation of Traditional Water Bodies	comp.	664	888	25	8	555	378	140	2658	0	1	1	6238
	Ongoing/Suspended	882	565	26	1	491	473	156	2594	0	24	24	6219
Land development	comp.	137	562	280	20	336	41	75	1451	0	3	3	3322
	Ongoing/Suspended	332	287	200	16	512	142	130	1619	0	7	7	3142
Any Other Activity Approved by MRD	comp.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Ongoing/Suspended	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Rajiv Gandhi Seva Kendra	comp.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Ongoing/Suspended	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	comp.	2817	11770	1317	324	4742	1510	994	23474	0	185	185	54526
	Ongoing/Suspended	3031	6055	1500	251	6348	1988	862	20035	0	1781	1781	41997

Table 2.2b: District wise works completed/progress under NREGA (number of projects)

(Figures are percentages)

2010-11		Phase -I										
District		24Pgs (S)	Bankura	Birbhum	Dinajpur (S)	Dinajpur (N)	Jalpaiguri	Maldah	Murshidabad	Purulia	Midnapore (W)	Sub Total
Rural Connectivity	comp.	50.48	19.83	29.24	35.68	37.85	29.76	41.95	41.15	10.12	18.69	25.12
	Ongoing/Suspended	44.84	27.71	31.87	35.90	45.46	25.51	38.85	45.78	18.17	35.53	33.48
Flood Control	comp.	21.10	1.28	1.96	2.12	1.03	7.23	0.45	1.89	0.00	1.49	2.53
	Ongoing/Suspended	11.65	1.90	2.49	1.65	2.43	7.92	0.80	2.42	0.16	2.42	3.98
Water Conservation And Water Herversting	comp.	11.19	37.48	31.76	31.17	28.21	9.43	16.55	39.39	49.54	25.52	29.09
	Ongoing/Suspended	8.34	31.92	32.28	23.12	23.92	11.84	10.99	29.00	59.39	20.46	26.40
Drought Proofing	comp.	3.98	3.34	4.06	3.71	15.69	7.94	6.60	0.47	4.00	2.24	3.99
	Ongoing/Suspended	7.38	8.02	7.03	8.39	12.90	12.77	20.76	4.11	5.84	7.18	7.69
Micro Irrigation	comp.	6.14	10.10	4.16	2.65	0.51	12.77	0.89	1.49	0.15	3.48	4.92
	Ongoing/Suspended	6.58	4.40	6.36	4.13	1.19	10.36	2.63	1.89	0.22	3.67	4.48
Provision of Irrigation facility to Land development	comp.	2.26	0.98	0.17	0.13	0.00	1.62	1.79	0.00	9.78	13.69	5.51
	Ongoing/Suspended	9.05	1.14	0.26	0.63	0.11	1.57	6.03	0.04	8.36	5.75	4.47
Renovation of Traditional Water Bodies	comp.	1.29	19.74	22.93	15.38	8.51	7.00	25.39	8.18	2.69	21.30	17.12
	Ongoing/Suspended	5.51	18.69	11.74	14.07	6.26	3.62	10.46	10.62	2.35	14.46	10.28
Land development	comp.	3.12	6.53	3.51	6.90	8.21	19.12	6.38	6.96	23.52	12.72	10.27
	Ongoing/Suspended	5.13	4.80	4.37	11.36	7.18	23.22	8.47	5.10	4.94	8.30	7.34
Any Other Activity Approved by MRD	comp.	0.43	0.72	2.21	2.25	0.00	5.12	0.00	0.47	0.19	0.87	1.45
	Ongoing/Suspended	1.49	1.41	3.56	0.76	0.54	3.19	0.99	1.03	0.56	2.22	1.86
Rajiv Gandhi Seva Kendra	comp.	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	Ongoing/Suspended	0.02	0.00	0.03	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.01
Total	comp.	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
	Ongoing/Suspended	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

Contd.....

Contd. .... Table 2.2b: District wise works completed/progress under NREGA (number of projects)

(Figures are percentages)

2010-11		Phase -II								Phase -III			Grand Total
District		24 Pgs (N)	Burdwan	Coochbehar	Siliguri Mahakuma Parisad	Midnapore (E)	Hooghly	Nadia	Sub Total	Darjeeling Gorkha Hill Council (DGHC)	Howrah	Sub Total	
Rural Connectivity	comp.	31.73	23.43	64.22	39.33	27.20	27.38	59.86	32.68	60.53	37.82	38.65	28.98
	Ongoing/Suspended	13.92	27.04	59.23	41.38	32.05	35.96	59.29	24.63	73.90	55.86	64.69	29.72
Flood Control	comp.	5.39	8.79	0.15	17.98	5.61	6.96	2.99	5.89	7.89	7.52	7.54	4.23
	Ongoing/Suspended	2.64	11.68	1.77	8.17	6.27	10.63	3.45	5.16	7.06	6.41	6.73	4.53
Water Conservation And Water Herversting	comp.	42.46	28.11	1.73	11.24	22.27	20.53	5.47	27.05	5.26	4.46	4.48	27.72
	Ongoing/Suspended	16.54	17.49	1.35	7.62	12.44	13.54	5.19	14.62	1.01	1.09	1.05	20.97
Drought Proofing	comp.	0.63	6.81	4.50	15.73	10.48	2.83	3.60	4.78	5.26	20.79	20.23	4.63
	Ongoing/Suspended	57.44	16.17	9.94	17.79	20.07	7.65	6.61	37.43	7.82	17.65	12.84	21.03
Micro Irrigation	comp.	1.28	6.75	2.33	0.00	6.12	5.63	2.09	4.09	5.26	16.24	15.84	4.69
	Ongoing/Suspended	0.70	7.98	0.98	12.16	7.66	6.90	2.99	3.35	2.40	11.61	7.10	3.99
Provision of Irrigation facility to Land development	comp.	0.06	1.29	3.83	2.25	9.94	0.03	1.38	2.74	0.00	0.00	0.00	4.09
	Ongoing/Suspended	0.02	0.70	1.80	1.09	7.46	0.00	0.72	1.11	0.50	0.12	0.31	2.94
Renovation of Traditional Water Bodies	comp.	3.69	19.44	2.70	2.25	10.21	32.86	14.31	12.85	0.00	8.51	8.21	14.92
	Ongoing/Suspended	1.78	12.14	1.52	1.81	6.58	18.92	9.57	5.60	0.63	3.51	2.10	8.13
Land development	comp.	14.21	4.77	18.38	10.11	6.83	3.66	8.46	9.01	15.79	4.65	5.06	9.58
	Ongoing/Suspended	6.66	5.37	17.18	9.07	6.92	4.78	8.94	7.02	6.68	2.90	4.75	7.18
Any Other Activity Approved by MRD	comp.	0.51	0.61	2.18	1.12	1.34	0.13	1.83	0.87	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.15
	Ongoing/Suspended	0.23	1.44	6.23	0.91	0.55	1.62	3.23	1.04	0.00	0.85	0.43	1.49
Rajiv Gandhi Seva Kendra	comp.	0.04	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.01
	Ongoing/Suspended	0.07	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.01	0.04	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.02
Total	comp.	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
	Ongoing/Suspended	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

Contd.....

Contd.....Table 2.2b: District wise works completed/progress under NREGA (number of projects)

(Figures are percentages)

2009 - 10		Phase -I										
District		24Pgs (S)	Bankura	Birbhum	Dinajpur (S)	Dinajpur (N)	Jalpaiguri	Maldah	Murshidabad	Purulia	Midnapore (W)	Sub Total
Rural Connectivity	comp.	31.41	29.58	29.74	33.47	59.89	32.39	59.61	30.67	17.56	38.04	33.03
	Ongoing/Suspended	24.60	43.90	34.44	37.54	43.87	37.42	55.46	54.57	21.45	43.13	36.08
Flood Control	comp.	26.01	3.76	3.60	4.27	3.21	10.19	2.02	9.03	0.03	4.30	5.80
	Ongoing/Suspended	16.55	3.85	3.23	4.59	1.77	9.51	1.11	7.41	0.14	4.61	4.16
Water Conservation And Water Herversting	comp.	8.40	16.08	20.06	12.03	15.09	11.83	6.01	19.40	35.94	14.99	17.63
	Ongoing/Suspended	3.99	19.19	24.68	11.73	26.43	16.32	8.91	17.22	39.90	17.31	23.48
Drought Proofing	comp.	4.49	7.45	7.20	10.25	9.17	6.68	11.33	2.87	6.89	3.82	5.96
	Ongoing/Suspended	24.30	11.77	9.37	17.30	8.45	4.95	10.47	3.50	6.81	5.53	8.19
Micro Irrigation	comp.	5.66	6.34	10.36	10.07	0.87	5.10	1.05	4.45	16.24	6.02	7.43
	Ongoing/Suspended	6.02	5.23	5.03	7.62	0.82	5.66	0.45	4.18	19.42	4.61	8.40
Provision of Irrigation facility to Land development	comp.	9.77	2.65	4.02	1.95	1.22	3.79	0.04	0.99	4.31	8.11	4.81
	Ongoing/Suspended	10.68	4.56	6.43	4.79	0.95	3.80	1.11	1.32	7.28	15.11	7.95
Renovation of Traditional Water Bodies	comp.	4.65	28.70	20.78	22.57	2.29	3.49	15.28	20.32	7.37	16.07	13.98
	Ongoing/Suspended	6.77	44.43	22.63	15.25	2.59	1.33	4.90	19.40	9.22	27.28	19.05
Land development	comp.	9.60	5.44	4.24	5.39	8.26	26.53	4.68	12.27	11.63	8.66	11.35
	Ongoing/Suspended	7.07	8.31	15.08	7.62	5.45	18.35	2.45	7.72	3.62	8.52	8.80
Any Other Activity Approved by MRD	comp.	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.03	0.00	0.00
	Ongoing/Suspended	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.18	0.00	0.04
Rajiv Gandhi Seva Kendra	comp.	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	Ongoing/Suspended	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Total	comp.	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
	Ongoing/Suspended	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

Contd.....

Contd.....Table 2.2b: District wise works completed/progress under NREGA (number of projects)

(Figures are percentages)

2009 - 10		Phase -II							Phase -III			Grand Total	
District		24 Pgs (N)	Burdwan	Coochbehar	Siliguri Mahakuma Parisad	Midnapore (E)	Hooghly	Nadia	Sub Total	Darjeeling Gorkha Hill Council (DGHC)	Howrah		Sub Total
Rural Connectivity	comp.	32.43	24.95	59.70	40.24	35.79	36.89	40.56	33.80	46.39	47.78	47.54	33.53
	Ongoing/Suspended	49.92	35.49	67.38	23.71	31.60	48.53	30.54	41.49	60.57	10.13	21.31	37.69
Flood Control	comp.	11.01	13.39	4.14	4.63	5.53	13.11	5.38	9.77	37.64	11.35	15.89	7.56
	Ongoing/Suspended	7.85	10.15	4.04	7.76	8.15	15.94	9.27	8.48	13.21	2.49	4.86	5.94
Water Conservation And Water Herversting	comp.	25.35	22.95	4.49	7.32	16.32	12.43	8.05	18.47	0.76	2.86	2.50	17.79
	Ongoing/Suspended	22.22	27.96	3.36	7.33	21.00	3.29	10.02	18.94	0.61	0.64	0.63	20.74
Drought Proofing	comp.	4.02	17.14	0.48	24.39	12.78	10.94	13.98	11.15	4.56	10.48	9.46	8.15
	Ongoing/Suspended	5.77	12.87	2.88	5.60	14.47	16.38	13.75	10.64	1.63	7.29	6.04	9.09
Micro Irrigation	comp.	2.95	7.93	1.13	3.17	6.99	7.05	10.66	6.32	0.76	19.29	16.09	7.08
	Ongoing/Suspended	2.08	5.59	0.77	4.74	6.75	4.36	12.35	4.97	2.03	5.32	4.59	6.87
Provision of Irrigation facility to Land development	comp.	1.07	0.59	7.33	5.12	5.95	0.58	6.90	2.84	0.38	0.32	0.33	3.94
	Ongoing/Suspended	0.03	1.80	1.85	4.31	9.45	0.98	11.36	4.47	0.00	0.17	0.14	6.23
Renovation of Traditional Water Bodies	comp.	12.62	8.75	1.05	0.98	9.54	11.86	10.84	10.06	0.38	5.56	4.66	12.25
	Ongoing/Suspended	12.17	11.68	1.94	1.29	9.66	7.39	14.74	10.09	0.00	1.56	1.22	14.72
Land development	comp.	10.56	4.32	21.67	14.15	7.10	7.14	3.62	7.58	7.60	2.38	3.28	9.69
	Ongoing/Suspended	10.63	3.96	15.83	7.76	7.33	2.49	7.46	8.24	3.05	1.22	1.62	8.29
Any Other Activity Approved by MRD	comp.	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.52	0.00	0.26	0.01
	Ongoing/Suspended	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.61	0.00	0.14	0.03
Rajiv Gandhi Seva Kendra	comp.	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	Ongoing/Suspended	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Total	comp.	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
	Ongoing/Suspended	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

Contd.....Table 2.2b: District wise works completed/progress under NREGA (number of projects)

(Figures are percentages)

2008-09		Phase -I										
District		24Pgs (S)	Bankura	Birbhum	Dinajpur (S)	Dinajpur (N)	Jalpaipugi	Maldah	Murshidabad	Purulia	Midnapore (W)	Sub Total
Rural Connectivity	comp.	21.13	35.41	33.85	37.22	37.50	42.76	56.83	50.75	28.70	50.64	40.58
	Ongoing/Suspended	26.74	45.26	32.15	24.17	25.40	49.97	62.60	50.41	34.08	55.27	42.33
Flood Control	comp.	20.27	4.06	2.82	0.00	5.73	11.10	1.18	6.87	1.61	7.85	7.06
	Ongoing/Suspended	21.70	3.68	4.94	0.56	3.23	9.18	1.36	6.67	0.38	8.92	6.49
Water Conservation And Water Harvesting	comp.	12.78	9.44	21.28	21.45	19.44	9.74	5.56	16.45	29.77	10.66	14.34
	Ongoing/Suspended	7.48	23.87	30.45	23.61	16.13	14.19	4.94	15.44	38.92	13.22	21.73
Drought Proofing	comp.	12.46	8.63	16.46	10.09	21.45	13.61	27.49	4.95	20.60	5.61	11.53
	Ongoing/Suspended	18.70	10.19	21.09	14.17	7.66	6.40	18.02	0.82	8.81	4.91	11.21
Micro Irrigation	comp.	10.02	5.46	4.12	0.00	1.85	13.66	1.18	1.67	1.34	5.05	5.79
	Ongoing/Suspended	7.82	6.60	3.29	5.83	0.40	7.29	1.36	2.92	2.53	6.24	4.83
Provision of Irrigation facility to Land development	comp.	7.90	3.55	1.37	0.00	1.29	1.29	0.17	0.47	1.13	5.05	3.06
	Ongoing/Suspended	5.55	2.04	0.24	0.28	0.40	2.11	0.19	0.47	3.45	1.90	2.04
Renovation of Traditional Water Bodies	comp.	5.64	29.80	15.43	30.60	4.76	3.07	5.56	12.23	5.95	8.41	11.59
	Ongoing/Suspended	4.42	59.92	21.46	26.67	2.02	7.12	9.88	13.57	10.47	12.11	17.84
Land development	comp.	9.80	3.65	4.66	0.63	7.98	4.76	2.02	6.61	10.89	6.73	6.05
	Ongoing/Suspended	7.59	4.92	5.72	9.72	15.32	6.51	3.97	14.15	9.71	7.80	7.51
Any Other Activity Approved by MRD	comp.	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	Ongoing/Suspended	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Rajiv Gandhi Seva Kendra	comp.	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	Ongoing/Suspended	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Total	comp.	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
	Ongoing/Suspended	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

Contd.....

Contd.....Table 2.2b: District wise works completed/progress under NREGA (number of projects)

(Figures are percentages)

2008-09		Phase -II								Phase -III			Grand Total
District		24 Pgs (N)	Burdwan	Coochbehar	Siliguri Mahakuma Parisad	Midnapore (E)	Hooghly	Nadia	Sub Total	Darjeeling Gorkha Hill Council (DGHC)	Howrah	Sub Total	
Rural Connectivity	comp.	35.53	20.13	48.22	48.46	30.89	33.91	29.18	27.39	0.00	51.35	51.35	34.94
	Ongoing/Suspended	40.65	30.75	60.00	34.26	41.29	40.95	32.71	38.92	0.00	10.56	10.56	39.35
Flood Control	comp.	12.11	13.82	11.01	5.86	5.69	9.54	6.54	11.12	0.00	17.30	17.30	8.85
	Ongoing/Suspended	13.66	10.80	7.33	6.77	8.19	13.13	9.16	10.26	0.00	2.19	2.19	8.10
Water Conservation And Water Herversting	comp.	11.40	16.56	5.69	8.33	17.63	20.00	15.29	15.60	0.00	0.00	0.00	14.83
	Ongoing/Suspended	8.22	24.77	3.33	6.77	17.85	16.35	16.24	17.04	0.00	0.51	0.51	18.59
Drought Proofing	comp.	5.64	27.66	9.11	19.14	16.95	4.24	7.44	19.34	0.00	18.38	18.38	14.91
	Ongoing/Suspended	12.70	22.08	9.87	11.16	10.26	9.61	6.96	13.98	0.00	2.70	2.70	12.17
Micro Irrigation	comp.	5.57	8.22	2.28	7.10	8.18	3.71	11.77	7.40	0.00	10.81	10.81	6.50
	Ongoing/Suspended	8.55	5.14	0.53	1.59	6.77	8.50	5.92	6.15	0.00	7.69	7.69	5.58
Provision of Irrigation facility to Land development	comp.	1.31	1.29	0.53	2.47	1.86	0.86	8.15	1.64	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.44
	Ongoing/Suspended	2.71	0.43	0.40	1.99	6.35	0.40	4.87	2.86	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.34
Renovation of Traditional Water Bodies	comp.	23.57	7.54	1.90	2.47	11.70	25.03	14.08	11.32	0.00	0.54	0.54	11.44
	Ongoing/Suspended	29.10	9.33	1.73	0.40	7.73	23.79	18.10	12.95	0.00	1.35	1.35	14.81
Land development	comp.	4.86	4.77	21.26	6.17	7.09	2.72	7.55	6.18	0.00	1.62	1.62	6.09
	Ongoing/Suspended	10.95	4.74	13.33	6.37	8.07	7.14	15.08	8.08	0.00	0.39	0.39	7.48
Any Other Activity Approved by MRD	comp.	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	Ongoing/Suspended	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Rajiv Gandhi Seva Kendra	comp.	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	Ongoing/Suspended	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Total	comp.	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	0.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
	Ongoing/Suspended	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	0.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

Table 2.3a: District wise works completed/progress under NREGA (amount spent in lakhs)

2010-11		Phase -I										
District		24Pgs (S)	Bankura	Birbhum	Dinajpur (S)	Dinajpur (N)	Jalpaiguri	Maldah	Murshidabad	Purulia	Midnapore (W)	Sub Total
Rural Connectivity	comp.	437.41	660.60	1338.40	311.07	358.51	620.40	478.80	942.74	161.02	943.20	6252.15
	Ongoing/Suspended	1245.69	2744.47	3671.37	480.86	732.07	1969.39	464.17	3774.42	1730.32	3748.85	20561.59
Flood Control	comp.	171.11	113.68	65.63	32.71	7.07	211.63	6.44	25.29	0.00	82.10	715.66
	Ongoing/Suspended	407.53	209.82	366.20	11.49	44.41	1130.07	25.28	223.60	11.94	422.65	2852.99
Water Conservation And Water Herversting	comp.	40.63	1102.46	1845.15	265.57	261.86	223.39	180.39	848.72	571.30	1846.15	7185.61
	Ongoing/Suspended	51.47	3107.32	3459.19	502.70	298.44	543.70	94.35	3606.04	4232.94	1887.54	17783.69
Drought Proofing	comp.	7.58	36.32	52.86	15.79	55.30	71.53	17.76	4.45	3.49	36.34	301.43
	Ongoing/Suspended	42.02	279.41	246.14	94.67	89.94	318.41	238.42	313.77	234.88	306.84	2164.49
Micro Irrigation	comp.	59.15	163.76	120.44	19.89	7.60	291.85	12.25	64.35	2.49	191.55	933.33
	Ongoing/Suspended	127.55	330.73	451.64	52.61	28.97	498.54	15.81	297.25	11.10	461.25	2275.45
Provision of Irrigation facility to Land development	comp.	23.20	10.59	2.34	0.00	0.00	36.72	12.26	0.44	27.20	509.58	622.33
	Ongoing/Suspended	26.40	53.26	6.64	0.00	0.30	49.50	38.38	4.73	247.40	615.41	1042.02
Renovation of Traditional Water Bodies	comp.	5.61	811.65	1158.31	103.80	102.43	49.80	349.34	196.90	8.31	1324.38	4110.54
	Ongoing/Suspended	69.06	2338.37	1306.78	174.83	116.34	130.66	100.98	1159.02	152.75	2348.04	7896.83
Land development	comp.	10.92	101.71	105.58	58.96	49.66	247.34	22.69	157.01	60.34	351.21	1165.43
	Ongoing/Suspended	69.82	256.10	304.14	62.11	51.18	783.94	69.30	395.55	165.63	579.22	2736.98
Any Other Activity Approved by MRD	comp.	0.79	8.30	49.93	37.00	0.00	73.69	0.00	4.94	2.21	17.88	194.74
	Ongoing/Suspended	33.27	25.55	164.35	12.75	0.00	125.99	1.11	46.73	18.41	91.10	519.26
Rajiv Gandhi Seva Kendra	comp.	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	Ongoing/Suspended	0.00	0.00	13.05	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.40	6.65	21.10
Total	comp.	756.41	3009.07	4738.63	844.79	842.43	1826.34	1079.94	2244.85	836.37	5302.38	21481.22
	Ongoing/Suspended	2072.80	9345.03	9989.51	1392.01	1361.66	5550.19	1047.79	9821.10	6806.76	10467.55	57854.40

Contd.....



Contd....Table 2.3a: District wise works completed/progress under NREGA (amount spent in lakhs)

2010-11		Phase -II								Phase -III			Grand Total
District		24 Pgs (N)	Burdwan	Coochbehar	Siliguri Mahakuma Parisad	Midnapore (E)	Hooghly	Nadia	Sub Total	Darjeeling Gorkha Hill Council (DGHC)	Howrah	Sub Total	
Rural Connectivity	comp.	1925.15	1382.17	338.08	31.08	1126.98	1084.87	1731.94	7620.27	52.21	315.75	367.96	14240.38
	Ongoing/Suspended	2307.59	5715.25	2307.60	90.12	1371.45	1673.89	1465.14	14931.03	1829.33	386.67	2215.99	37708.61
Flood Control	comp.	393.34	465.09	0.00	14.31	185.89	429.56	189.41	1677.60	2.80	78.12	80.92	2474.18
	Ongoing/Suspended	869.86	1702.91	318.10	21.39	568.83	452.53	192.87	4126.50	311.37	52.25	363.61	7343.10
Water Conservation And Water Herversting	comp.	2213.66	2825.66	17.43	13.73	992.44	1072.63	218.85	7354.40	8.90	30.22	39.13	14579.14
	Ongoing/Suspended	1383.72	3566.67	68.21	16.98	476.44	780.74	239.25	6532.01	15.20	4.32	19.52	24335.22
Drought Proofing	comp.	32.19	95.36	24.63	4.80	67.85	33.99	25.82	284.62	0.28	35.58	35.86	621.91
	Ongoing/Suspended	380.62	895.73	250.30	49.06	175.18	97.07	74.80	1922.76	27.48	37.44	64.92	4152.17
Micro Irrigation	comp.	148.55	461.35	15.30	4.69	257.65	314.14	116.48	1318.17	19.90	104.44	124.34	2375.84
	Ongoing/Suspended	115.63	1346.24	31.45	51.71	248.15	360.21	80.44	2233.82	36.93	39.37	76.31	4585.58
Provision of Irrigation facility to Land development	comp.	1.71	68.89	25.06	2.41	360.89	0.00	44.54	503.49	0.00	0.00	0.00	1125.82
	Ongoing/Suspended	0.34	110.64	34.66	3.11	477.39	0.00	13.54	639.68	1.26	0.00	1.26	1682.96
Renovation of Traditional Water Bodies	comp.	240.39	2273.98	21.77	3.10	550.24	2122.14	672.01	5883.62	0.00	70.56	70.56	10064.72
	Ongoing/Suspended	99.25	2761.08	51.07	3.54	337.89	1360.97	341.48	4955.28	4.40	11.93	16.34	12868.45
Land development	comp.	423.92	292.94	160.07	11.07	294.01	158.63	310.64	1651.28	21.25	35.65	56.90	2873.61
	Ongoing/Suspended	352.71	921.25	449.16	15.20	205.29	146.40	234.18	2324.18	163.76	18.74	182.51	5243.67
Any Other Activity Approved by MRD	comp.	5.22	11.00	20.95	0.37	40.30	0.82	28.40	107.05	0.00	0.00	0.00	301.79
	Ongoing/Suspended	8.30	24.73	137.72	1.52	50.02	8.77	34.99	266.07	0.00	3.61	3.61	788.94
Rajiv Gandhi Seva Kendra	comp.	5.42	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	5.42	0.00	0.00	0.00	5.42
	Ongoing/Suspended	32.16	0.00	0.00	0.00	3.00	0.00	0.00	35.16	0.00	0.00	0.00	56.26
Total	comp.	5389.53	7876.44	623.28	85.55	3876.26	5216.79	3338.07	26405.92	105.34	670.32	775.66	48662.80
	Ongoing/Suspended	5550.18	17044.48	3648.27	252.64	3913.65	4880.57	2676.70	37966.49	2389.74	554.33	2944.07	98764.96

Contd.....

Contd.....Table 2.3a: District wise works completed/progress under NREGA (amount spent in lakhs)

2009-10		Phase -I										
District		24Pgs (S)	Bankura	Birbhum	Dinajpur (S)	Dinajpur (N)	Jalpaiguri	Maldah	Murshidabad	Purulia	Midnapore (W)	Sub Total
Rural Connectivity	comp.	442.05	2541.63	2854.10	667.43	1788.24	8349.17	4495.76	4017.28	2499.27	6884.00	34538.93
	Ongoing/Suspended	594.87	1859.97	2293.68	438.45	200.39	2275.14	561.14	1978.65	3072.72	2487.43	15762.44
Flood Control	comp.	522.10	4277.70	627.47	124.02	87.65	2245.05	164.49	1156.11	3.10	1066.00	10273.69
	Ongoing/Suspended	511.90	2057.31	304.33	46.31	26.75	363.01	35.76	494.10	11.22	250.42	4101.11
Water Conservation And Water Herversting	comp.	127.14	1225.31	2716.61	378.08	444.00	1064.69	358.08	1051.07	2366.98	3135.00	12866.96
	Ongoing/Suspended	80.28	1043.39	1960.52	206.57	155.20	284.50	60.21	651.96	2172.64	530.00	7145.27
Drought Proofing	comp.	134.84	221.52	277.17	215.22	207.00	95.58	95.43	199.29	282.50	749.00	2477.55
	Ongoing/Suspended	337.89	340.24	342.30	52.58	14.26	13.00	30.25	168.77	355.00	170.00	1824.29
Micro Irrigation	comp.	130.95	2559.54	723.50	186.26	34.00	735.67	41.51	353.96	387.20	690.00	5842.59
	Ongoing/Suspended	325.39	234.45	393.67	28.51	1.50	146.43	2.04	188.49	163.00	80.00	1563.48
Provision of Irrigation facility to Land development	comp.	345.91	1001.08	338.14	59.55	28.80	228.56	1.15	83.29	116.90	1952.00	4155.38
	Ongoing/Suspended	435.35	121.21	311.83	29.26	2.45	37.38	1.98	52.61	89.66	305.00	1386.73
Renovation of Traditional Water Bodies	comp.	89.81	2250.00	2546.96	589.47	60.81	363.63	681.25	1205.13	590.60	2624.00	11001.66
	Ongoing/Suspended	276.43	1688.64	671.55	200.55	6.65	28.51	61.99	697.79	518.88	480.00	4630.99
Land development	comp.	240.14	2990.32	561.55	180.23	283.50	3005.94	205.90	502.92	410.36	1080.00	9460.86
	Ongoing/Suspended	349.43	260.28	186.75	62.20	16.80	389.15	18.36	184.98	337.28	182.00	1987.23
Any Other Activity Approved by MRD	comp.	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.90	0.00	1.90
	Ongoing/Suspended	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	3.24	0.00	3.24
Rajiv Gandhi Seva Kendra	comp.	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	Ongoing/Suspended	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Total	comp.	2032.94	17067.10	10645.50	2400.26	2934.00	16088.29	6043.57	8569.05	6658.81	18180.00	90619.52
	Ongoing/Suspended	2911.54	6193.28	6069.51	1140.31	693.78	3785.04	986.17	3995.99	6481.19	4281.28	36538.09

Contd.....

Contd.....Table 2.3a: District wise works completed/progress under NREGA (amount spent in lakhs)

2009 - 10		Phase -II							Phase -III			Grand Total	
District		24 Pgs (N)	Burdwan	Coochbehar	Siliguri Mahakuma Parisad	Midnapore (E)	Hooghly	Nadia	Sub Total	Darjeeling Gorkha Hill Council (DGHC)	Howrah		Sub Total
Rural Connectivity	comp.	5304.46	4375.37	2919.55	160.28	3088.64	2665.23	3495.84	22009.37	377.54	501.21	878.75	57427.05
	Ongoing/Suspended	3219.38	3583.20	3722.01	61.21	1710.63	652.82	1359.89	14309.14	994.34	149.89	1144.23	31215.81
Flood Control	comp.	1642.86	1503.44	126.38	24.89	470.24	956.15	405.91	5129.87	335.17	149.19	484.36	15887.92
	Ongoing/Suspended	725.37	1104.65	143.25	19.32	554.57	316.99	223.91	3088.06	144.03	42.90	186.93	7376.10
Water Conservation And Water Herversting	comp.	224.98	4171.86	184.31	32.47	1094.52	1028.61	530.97	7267.72	8.70	21.08	29.78	20164.46
	Ongoing/Suspended	900.87	2500.96	92.28	18.19	488.90	22.04	237.96	4261.20	2.73	6.76	9.49	11415.96
Drought Proofing	comp.	234.63	971.66	17.12	69.43	298.43	258.62	838.99	2688.88	23.67	30.83	54.50	5220.93
	Ongoing/Suspended	174.30	344.24	46.72	23.46	392.35	54.26	286.86	1322.19	6.01	31.58	37.59	3184.07
Micro Irrigation	comp.	441.88	1129.14	48.98	13.08	580.34	417.87	445.94	3077.23	2.92	147.02	149.94	9069.76
	Ongoing/Suspended	119.71	437.45	23.88	9.19	374.27	70.34	187.95	1222.79	16.24	113.21	129.45	2915.72
Provision of Irrigation facility to Land development	comp.	87.99	100.22	311.33	25.39	361.17	38.93	527.46	1452.49	3.75	5.87	9.62	5617.49
	Ongoing/Suspended	4.40	56.25	68.78	6.66	149.92	6.75	296.37	589.13	0.00	1.82	1.82	1977.68
Renovation of Traditional Water Bodies	comp.	1522.36	1645.75	14.99	0.21	573.74	1187.24	706.98	5651.27	4.50	46.36	50.86	16703.79
	Ongoing/Suspended	565.66	1504.61	62.97	3.28	305.41	53.88	259.98	2755.79	0.00	22.30	22.30	7409.08
Land development	comp.	789.81	634.27	333.43	54.02	478.61	435.25	328.97	3054.36	40.88	21.47	62.35	12577.57
	Ongoing/Suspended	305.50	648.55	769.85	13.90	253.23	31.49	199.98	2222.50	39.74	14.70	54.44	4264.17
Any Other Activity Approved by MRD	comp.	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	14.40	0.00	14.40	16.30
	Ongoing/Suspended	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.26	0.00	0.26	3.50
Rajiv Gandhi Seva Kendra	comp.	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	Ongoing/Suspended	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Total	comp.	10248.97	14531.71	3956.09	379.77	6945.69	6987.90	7281.06	50331.19	811.53	923.03	1734.56	142685.27
	Ongoing/Suspended	5725.96	8951.73	5143.20	428.36	4200.30	1431.12	3069.35	28950.02	1479.78	2049.50	3529.28	69017.39

Cond.....

Contd..... Table 2.3a: District wise works completed/progress under NREGA (amount spent in lakhs)

2008 - 09		Phase -I										
District		24Pgs (S)	Bankura	Birbhum	Dinajpur (S)	Dinajpur (N)	Jalpaipugi	Maldah	Murshidabad	Purulia	Midnapore (W)	Sub Total
Rural Connectivity	comp.	311.62	170.91	1137.15	62.24	493.60	2845.42	519.38	2113.21	558.64	4138.00	12350.17
	Ongoing/Suspended	445.32	1657.43	2006.16	392.95	120.12	1022.75	1197.56	235.85	1361.08	713.97	9153.19
Flood Control	comp.	386.83	1401.53	81.37	0.00	87.35	984.96	6.39	210.20	20.53	885.00	4064.16
	Ongoing/Suspended	376.77	8751.23	538.17	21.87	8.09	307.97	36.31	84.28	28.08	90.00	10242.77
Water Conservation And Water Herversting	comp.	92.48	3402.56	519.92	66.81	243.87	332.97	51.71	799.66	361.20	965.00	6836.18
	Ongoing/Suspended	146.95	7004.09	1884.15	244.48	22.76	194.50	46.63	119.70	775.17	45.00	10483.43
Drought Proofing	comp.	100.64	6201.07	69.82	13.37	257.85	48.13	41.76	21.03	221.50	505.00	7480.17
	Ongoing/Suspended	126.65	6830.90	214.47	27.30	17.97	8.75	47.68	1.16	142.87	190.00	7607.75
Micro Irrigation	comp.	74.34	9832.80	184.17	0.00	29.85	479.28	5.50	122.83	10.67	473.00	11212.44
	Ongoing/Suspended	153.24	4887.06	196.45	29.66	1.54	89.55	8.57	34.24	25.13	90.00	5515.44
Provision of Irrigation facility to Land development	comp.	76.28	75.59	4.12	0.00	20.55	27.10	0.22	23.05	4.24	604.00	835.15
	Ongoing/Suspended	108.49	16.48	6.78	4.50	0.75	12.31	0.20	5.11	15.04	55.00	224.66
Renovation of Traditional Water Bodies	comp.	77.60	1152.10	235.86	126.08	57.62	50.67	45.80	704.15	101.85	778.00	3329.73
	Ongoing/Suspended	116.07	1403.84	718.34	362.54	0.99	39.65	131.38	106.22	200.51	120.00	3199.54
Land development	comp.	110.20	1186.75	128.70	1.30	100.15	271.85	11.42	96.50	122.65	530.00	2559.52
	Ongoing/Suspended	86.10	111.52	156.79	264.17	27.78	148.34	28.47	93.23	167.30	250.00	1333.70
Any Other Activity Approved by MRD	comp.	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	Ongoing/Suspended	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Rajiv Gandhi Seva Kendra	comp.	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	Ongoing/Suspended	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Total	comp.	1229.99	23423.31	2361.11	269.80	1290.84	5040.38	682.18	4090.63	1401.28	8878.00	48667.52
	Ongoing/Suspended	1559.59	29374.78	5119.04	1101.00	315.08	1900.24	1481.49	689.64	2630.74	1550.04	45721.64

Contd.....

Contd.....Table 2.3a: District wise works completed/progress under NREGA (amount spent in lakhs)

2008 - 09		Phase -II							Phase -III			Grand Total	
District		24 Pgs (N)	Burdwan	Coochbehar	Siliguri Mahakuma Parisad	Midnapore (E)	Hooghly	Nadia	Sub Total	Darjeeling Gorkha Hill Council (DGHC)	Howrah		Sub Total
Rural Connectivity	comp.	1071.87	1975.69	1400.26	165.06	1052.40	504.23	493.10	6662.61	0.00	113.60	113.60	19126.38
	Ongoing/Suspended	1023.95	1126.81	1550.23	75.04	1120.58	635.49	312.18	5844.28	0.00	101.78	101.78	15099.25
Flood Control	comp.	397.44	1185.37	585.24	27.63	208.40	167.14	168.40	2739.62	0.00	34.69	34.69	6838.47
	Ongoing/Suspended	576.51	576.84	650.23	44.77	302.91	211.91	21.68	2384.85	0.00	20.89	20.89	12648.51
Water Conservation And Water Herversting	comp.	319.52	997.66	105.53	42.19	316.83	284.08	439.30	2505.11	0.00	0.00	0.00	9341.29
	Ongoing/Suspended	205.36	915.43	150.36	25.97	212.81	333.44	128.78	1972.15	0.00	6.61	6.61	12462.19
Drought Proofing	comp.	34.56	1968.68	125.52	56.75	122.34	12.58	263.20	2583.63	0.00	12.48	12.48	10076.28
	Ongoing/Suspended	122.31	683.97	96.32	15.78	155.95	62.54	104.98	1241.85	0.00	15.78	15.78	8865.38
Micro Irrigation	comp.	162.22	855.96	85.51	24.38	206.70	34.23	474.30	1843.30	0.00	13.52	13.52	13069.26
	Ongoing/Suspended	140.92	598.86	78.23	2.50	172.38	82.98	33.58	1109.45	0.00	86.23	86.23	6711.12
Provision of Irrigation facility to Land development	comp.	31.90	436.25	25.12	14.74	45.61	11.64	101.40	666.66	0.00	0.00	0.00	1501.81
	Ongoing/Suspended	25.66	87.64	44.24	5.03	68.80	9.92	13.18	254.47	0.00	0.00	0.00	479.13
Renovation of Traditional Water Bodies	comp.	595.97	686.99	26.23	3.63	280.04	391.70	274.80	2259.36	0.00	1.09	1.09	5590.18
	Ongoing/Suspended	966.79	502.96	75.24	0.65	122.43	356.70	6.78	2031.55	0.00	12.08	12.08	5243.17
Land development	comp.	120.83	962.64	610.36	18.93	179.64	32.85	181.70	2106.95	0.00	0.93	0.93	4667.40
	Ongoing/Suspended	225.41	575.97	370.25	8.42	154.36	91.58	27.28	1453.27	0.00	7.95	7.95	2794.92
Any Other Activity Approved by MRD	comp.	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	Ongoing/Suspended	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Rajiv Gandhi Seva Kendra	comp.	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	Ongoing/Suspended	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Total	comp.	2734.31	9069.24	2963.77	353.31	2411.96	1438.45	2396.20	21367.24	0.00	176.31	176.31	70211.07
	Ongoing/Suspended	2436.19	4681.59	3055.93	293.58	2303.86	1543.93	757.73	15072.81	0.00	1643.08	1643.08	62437.53

Table 2.3b: District wise works completed/progress under NREGA (amount spent)

(Figures are percentages)

2010-11		Phase -I										
District		24Pgs (S)	Bankura	Birbhum	Dinajpur (S)	Dinajpur (N)	Jalpaigugi	Maldah	Murshidabad	Purulia	Midnapore (W)	Sub Total
Rural Connectivity	comp.	57.83	21.95	28.24	36.82	42.56	33.97	44.34	42.00	19.25	17.79	29.11
	Ongoing/Suspended	60.10	29.37	36.75	34.54	53.76	35.48	44.30	38.43	25.42	35.81	35.54
Flood Control	comp.	22.62	3.78	1.38	3.87	0.84	11.59	0.60	1.13	0.00	1.55	3.33
	Ongoing/Suspended	19.66	2.25	3.67	0.83	3.26	20.36	2.41	2.28	0.18	4.04	4.93
Water Conservation And Water Herversting	comp.	5.37	36.64	38.94	31.44	31.08	12.23	16.70	37.81	68.31	34.82	33.45
	Ongoing/Suspended	2.48	33.25	34.63	36.11	21.92	9.80	9.00	36.72	62.19	18.03	30.74
Drought Proofing	comp.	1.00	1.21	1.12	1.87	6.56	3.92	1.64	0.20	0.42	0.69	1.40
	Ongoing/Suspended	2.03	2.99	2.46	6.80	6.61	5.74	22.75	3.19	3.45	2.93	3.74
Micro Irrigation	comp.	7.82	5.44	2.54	2.35	0.90	15.98	1.13	2.87	0.30	3.61	4.34
	Ongoing/Suspended	6.15	3.54	4.52	3.78	2.13	8.98	1.51	3.03	0.16	4.41	3.93
Provision of Irrigation facility to Land development	comp.	3.07	0.35	0.05	0.00	0.00	2.01	1.14	0.02	3.25	9.61	2.90
	Ongoing/Suspended	1.27	0.57	0.07	0.00	0.02	0.89	3.66	0.05	3.63	5.88	1.80
Renovation of Traditional Water Bodies	comp.	0.74	26.97	24.44	12.29	12.16	2.73	32.35	8.77	0.99	24.98	19.14
	Ongoing/Suspended	3.33	25.02	13.08	12.56	8.54	2.35	9.64	11.80	2.24	22.43	13.65
Land development	comp.	1.44	3.38	2.23	6.98	5.89	13.54	2.10	6.99	7.21	6.62	5.43
	Ongoing/Suspended	3.37	2.74	3.04	4.46	3.76	14.12	6.61	4.03	2.43	5.53	4.73
Any Other Activity Approved by MRD	comp.	0.10	0.28	1.05	4.38	0.00	4.03	0.00	0.22	0.26	0.34	0.91
	Ongoing/Suspended	1.61	0.27	1.65	0.92	0.00	2.27	0.11	0.48	0.27	0.87	0.90
Rajiv Gandhi Seva Kendra	comp.	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	Ongoing/Suspended	0.00	0.00	0.13	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.02	0.06	0.04
Total	comp.	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
	Ongoing/Suspended	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

Contd.....

Contd....Table 2.3b: District wise works completed/progress under NREGA (amount spent)

(Figures are percentages)

2010-11		Phase –II								Phase -III			Grand Total
District		24 Pgs (N)	Burdwan	Coochbehar	Siliguri Mahakuma Parisad	Midnapore (E)	Hooghly	Nadia	Sub Total	Darjeeling Gorkha Hill Council (DGHC)	Howrah	Sub Total	
Rural Connectivity	comp.	35.72	17.55	54.24	36.33	29.07	20.80	51.88	28.86	49.56	47.10	47.44	29.26
	Ongoing/Suspended	41.58	33.53	63.25	35.67	35.04	34.30	54.74	39.33	76.55	69.75	75.27	38.18
Flood Control	comp.	7.30	5.90	0.00	16.73	4.80	8.23	5.67	6.35	2.66	11.65	10.43	5.08
	Ongoing/Suspended	15.67	9.99	8.72	8.47	14.53	9.27	7.21	10.87	13.03	9.43	12.35	7.43
Water Conservation And Water Herversting	comp.	41.07	35.87	2.80	16.05	25.60	20.56	6.56	27.85	8.45	4.51	5.04	29.96
	Ongoing/Suspended	24.93	20.93	1.87	6.72	12.17	16.00	8.94	17.20	0.64	0.78	0.66	24.64
Drought Proofing	comp.	0.60	1.21	3.95	5.61	1.75	0.65	0.77	1.08	0.27	5.31	4.62	1.28
	Ongoing/Suspended	6.86	5.26	6.86	19.42	4.48	1.99	2.79	5.06	1.15	6.75	2.21	4.20
Micro Irrigation	comp.	2.76	5.86	2.45	5.48	6.65	6.02	3.49	4.99	18.89	15.58	16.03	4.88
	Ongoing/Suspended	2.08	7.90	0.86	20.47	6.34	7.38	3.01	5.88	1.55	7.10	2.59	4.64
Provision of Irrigation facility to Land development	comp.	0.03	0.87	4.02	2.82	9.31	0.00	1.33	1.91	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.31
	Ongoing/Suspended	0.01	0.65	0.95	1.23	12.20	0.00	0.51	1.68	0.05	0.00	0.04	1.70
Renovation of Traditional Water Bodies	comp.	4.46	28.87	3.49	3.62	14.20	40.68	20.13	22.28	0.00	10.53	9.10	20.68
	Ongoing/Suspended	1.79	16.20	1.40	1.40	8.63	27.89	12.76	13.05	0.18	2.15	0.56	13.03
Land development	comp.	7.87	3.72	25.68	12.94	7.58	3.04	9.31	6.25	20.17	5.32	7.34	5.91
	Ongoing/Suspended	6.35	5.40	12.31	6.02	5.25	3.00	8.75	6.12	6.85	3.38	6.20	5.31
Any Other Activity Approved by MRD	comp.	0.10	0.14	3.36	0.43	1.04	0.02	0.85	0.41	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.62
	Ongoing/Suspended	0.15	0.15	3.77	0.60	1.28	0.18	1.31	0.70	0.00	0.65	0.12	0.80
Rajiv Gandhi Seva Kendra	comp.	0.10	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.02	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.01
	Ongoing/Suspended	0.58	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.08	0.00	0.00	0.09	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.06
Total	comp.	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
	Ongoing/Suspended	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

Contd.....

Contd....Table 2.3b: District wise works completed/progress under NREGA (amount spent)

(Figures are percentages)

2009-10		Phase -I										
District		24Pgs (S)	Bankura	Birbhum	Dinajpur (S)	Dinajpur (N)	Jalpaigugi	Maldah	Murshidabad	Purulia	Midnapore (W)	Sub Total
Rural Connectivity	comp.	21.74	14.89	26.81	27.81	60.95	51.90	74.39	46.88	37.53	37.87	38.11
	Ongoing/Suspended	20.43	30.03	37.79	38.45	28.88	60.11	56.90	49.52	47.41	58.10	43.14
Flood Control	comp.	25.68	25.06	5.89	5.17	2.99	13.95	2.72	13.49	0.05	5.86	11.34
	Ongoing/Suspended	17.58	33.22	5.01	4.06	3.86	9.59	3.63	12.36	0.17	5.85	11.22
Water Conservation And Water Herversting	comp.	6.25	7.18	25.52	15.75	15.13	6.62	5.92	12.27	35.55	17.24	14.20
	Ongoing/Suspended	2.76	16.85	32.30	18.12	22.37	7.52	6.11	16.32	33.52	12.38	19.56
Drought Proofing	comp.	6.63	1.30	2.60	8.97	7.06	0.59	1.58	2.33	4.24	4.12	2.73
	Ongoing/Suspended	11.61	5.49	5.64	4.61	2.06	0.34	3.07	4.22	5.48	3.97	4.99
Micro Irrigation	comp.	6.44	15.00	6.80	7.76	1.16	4.57	0.69	4.13	5.81	3.80	6.45
	Ongoing/Suspended	11.18	3.79	6.49	2.50	0.22	3.87	0.21	4.72	2.51	1.87	4.28
Provision of Irrigation facility to Land development	comp.	17.02	5.87	3.18	2.48	0.98	1.42	0.02	0.97	1.76	10.74	4.59
	Ongoing/Suspended	14.95	1.96	5.14	2.57	0.35	0.99	0.20	1.32	1.38	7.12	3.80
Renovation of Traditional Water Bodies	comp.	4.42	13.18	23.93	24.56	2.07	2.26	11.27	14.06	8.87	14.43	12.14
	Ongoing/Suspended	9.49	27.27	11.06	17.59	0.96	0.75	6.29	17.46	8.01	11.21	12.67
Land development	comp.	11.81	17.52	5.27	7.51	9.66	18.68	3.41	5.87	6.16	5.94	10.44
	Ongoing/Suspended	12.00	4.20	3.08	5.45	2.42	10.28	1.86	4.63	5.20	4.25	5.44
Any Other Activity Approved by MRD	comp.	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.03	0.00	0.00
	Ongoing/Suspended	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.05	0.00	0.01
Rajiv Gandhi Seva Kendra	comp.	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	Ongoing/Suspended	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Total	comp.	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
	Ongoing/Suspended	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

Contd.....



Contd.....Table 2.3b: District wise works completed/progress under NREGA (amount spent)

(Figures are percentages)

2009 - 10		Phase -II							Phase -III			Grand Total	
District		24 Pgs (N)	Burdwan	Coochbehar	Siliguri Mahakuma Parisad	Midnapore (E)	Hooghly	Nadia	Sub Total	Darjeeling Gorkha Hill Council (DGHC)	Howrah		Sub Total
Rural Connectivity	comp.	51.76	30.11	73.80	42.20	44.47	38.14	48.01	43.73	46.52	54.30	50.66	40.25
	Ongoing/Suspended	56.22	40.03	72.37	14.29	40.73	45.62	44.31	49.43	67.20	7.31	32.42	45.23
Flood Control	comp.	16.03	10.35	3.19	6.55	6.77	13.68	5.57	10.19	41.30	16.16	27.92	11.13
	Ongoing/Suspended	12.67	12.34	2.79	4.51	13.20	22.15	7.30	10.67	9.73	2.09	5.30	10.69
Water Conservation And Water Herversting	comp.	2.20	28.71	4.66	8.55	15.76	14.72	7.29	14.44	1.07	2.28	1.72	14.13
	Ongoing/Suspended	15.73	27.94	1.79	4.25	11.64	1.54	7.75	14.72	0.18	0.33	0.27	16.54
Drought Proofing	comp.	2.29	6.69	0.43	18.28	4.30	3.70	11.52	5.34	2.92	3.34	3.14	3.66
	Ongoing/Suspended	3.04	3.85	0.91	5.48	9.34	3.79	9.35	4.57	0.41	1.54	1.07	4.61
Micro Irrigation	comp.	4.31	7.77	1.24	3.44	8.36	5.98	6.12	6.11	0.36	15.93	8.64	6.36
	Ongoing/Suspended	2.09	4.89	0.46	2.15	8.91	4.92	6.12	4.22	1.10	5.52	3.67	4.22
Provision of Irrigation facility to Land development	comp.	0.86	0.69	7.87	6.69	5.20	0.56	7.24	2.89	0.46	0.64	0.55	3.94
	Ongoing/Suspended	0.08	0.63	1.34	1.55	3.57	0.47	9.66	2.03	0.00	0.09	0.05	2.87
Renovation of Traditional Water Bodies	comp.	14.85	11.33	0.38	0.06	8.26	16.99	9.71	11.23	0.55	5.02	2.93	11.71
	Ongoing/Suspended	9.88	16.81	1.22	0.77	7.27	3.76	8.47	9.52	0.00	1.09	0.63	10.74
Land development	comp.	7.71	4.36	8.43	14.22	6.89	6.23	4.52	6.07	5.04	2.33	3.59	8.81
	Ongoing/Suspended	5.34	7.24	14.97	3.24	6.03	2.20	6.52	7.68	2.69	0.72	1.54	6.18
Any Other Activity Approved by MRD	comp.	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.77	0.00	0.83	0.01
	Ongoing/Suspended	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.02	0.00	0.01	0.01
Rajiv Gandhi Seva Kendra	comp.	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	Ongoing/Suspended	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Total	comp.	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
	Ongoing/Suspended	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

Contd.....

Contd.....Table 2.3b: District wise works completed/progress under NREGA (amount spent)

(Figures are percentages)

2008 - 09		Phase -I										
District		24Pgs (S)	Bankura	Birbhum	Dinajpur (S)	Dinajpur (N)	Jalpaigugi	Maldah	Murshidabad	Purulia	Midnapore (W)	Sub Total
Rural Connectivity	comp.	25.34	0.73	48.16	23.07	38.24	56.45	76.14	51.66	39.87	46.61	25.38
	Ongoing/Suspended	28.55	5.64	39.19	35.69	38.12	53.82	80.83	34.20	51.74	46.06	20.02
Flood Control	comp.	31.45	5.98	3.45	0.00	6.77	19.54	0.94	5.14	1.47	9.97	8.35
	Ongoing/Suspended	24.16	29.79	10.51	1.99	2.57	16.21	2.45	12.22	1.07	5.81	22.40
Water Conservation And Water Herversting	comp.	7.52	14.53	22.02	24.76	18.89	6.61	7.58	19.55	25.78	10.87	14.05
	Ongoing/Suspended	9.42	23.84	36.81	22.21	7.22	10.24	3.15	17.36	29.47	2.90	22.93
Drought Proofing	comp.	8.18	26.47	2.96	4.96	19.98	0.95	6.12	0.51	15.81	5.69	15.37
	Ongoing/Suspended	8.12	23.25	4.19	2.48	5.70	0.46	3.22	0.17	5.43	12.26	16.64
Micro Irrigation	comp.	6.04	41.98	7.80	0.00	2.31	9.51	0.81	3.00	0.76	5.33	23.04
	Ongoing/Suspended	9.83	16.64	3.84	2.69	0.49	4.71	0.58	4.96	0.96	5.81	12.06
Provision of Irrigation facility to Land development	comp.	6.20	0.32	0.17	0.00	1.59	0.54	0.03	0.56	0.30	6.80	1.72
	Ongoing/Suspended	6.96	0.06	0.13	0.41	0.24	0.65	0.01	0.74	0.57	3.55	0.49
Renovation of Traditional Water Bodies	comp.	6.31	4.92	9.99	46.73	4.46	1.01	6.71	17.21	7.27	8.76	6.84
	Ongoing/Suspended	7.44	4.78	14.03	32.93	0.31	2.09	8.87	15.40	7.62	7.74	7.00
Land development	comp.	8.96	5.07	5.45	0.48	7.76	5.39	1.67	2.36	8.75	5.97	5.26
	Ongoing/Suspended	5.52	0.38	3.06	23.99	8.82	7.81	1.92	13.52	6.36	16.13	2.92
Any Other Activity Approved by MRD	comp.	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	Ongoing/Suspended	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Rajiv Gandhi Seva Kendra	comp.	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	Ongoing/Suspended	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Total	comp.	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
	Ongoing/Suspended	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

Contd.....

Contd. .... Table 2.3b: District wise works completed/progress under NREGA (amount spent)

(Figures are percentages)

2008 - 09		Phase -II							Phase -III			Grand Total	
District		24 Pgs (N)	Burdwan	Coochbehar	Siliguri Mahakuma Parisad	Midnapore (E)	Hooghly	Nadia	Sub Total	Darjeeling Gorkha Hill Council (DGHC)	Howrah		Sub Total
Rural Connectivity	comp.	39.20	21.78	47.25	46.72	43.63	35.05	20.58	31.18	0.00	64.43	64.43	27.24
	Ongoing/Suspended	42.03	24.07	50.73	25.56	48.64	41.16	41.20	38.77	0.00	6.19	6.19	24.18
Flood Control	comp.	14.54	13.07	19.75	7.82	8.64	11.62	7.03	12.82	0.00	19.68	19.68	9.74
	Ongoing/Suspended	23.66	12.32	21.28	15.25	13.15	13.73	2.86	15.82	0.00	1.27	1.27	20.26
Water Conservation And Water Herversting	comp.	11.69	11.00	3.56	11.94	13.14	19.75	18.33	11.72	0.00	0.00	0.00	13.30
	Ongoing/Suspended	8.43	19.55	4.92	8.85	9.24	21.60	17.00	13.08	0.00	0.40	0.40	19.96
Drought Proofing	comp.	1.26	21.71	4.24	16.06	5.07	0.87	10.98	12.09	0.00	7.08	7.08	14.35
	Ongoing/Suspended	5.02	14.61	3.15	5.38	6.77	4.05	13.85	8.24	0.00	0.96	0.96	14.20
Micro Irrigation	comp.	5.93	9.44	2.89	6.90	8.57	2.38	19.79	8.63	0.00	7.67	7.67	18.61
	Ongoing/Suspended	5.78	12.79	2.56	0.85	7.48	5.37	4.43	7.36	0.00	5.25	5.25	10.75
Provision of Irrigation facility to Land development	comp.	1.17	4.81	0.85	4.17	1.89	0.81	4.23	3.12	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.14
	Ongoing/Suspended	1.05	1.87	1.45	1.71	2.99	0.64	1.74	1.69	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.77
Renovation of Traditional Water Bodies	comp.	21.80	7.57	0.89	1.03	11.61	27.23	11.47	10.57	0.00	0.62	0.62	7.96
	Ongoing/Suspended	39.68	10.74	2.46	0.22	5.31	23.10	0.89	13.48	0.00	0.74	0.74	8.40
Land development	comp.	4.42	10.61	20.59	5.36	7.45	2.28	7.58	9.86	0.00	0.53	0.53	6.65
	Ongoing/Suspended	9.25	12.30	12.12	2.87	6.70	5.93	3.60	9.64	0.00	0.48	0.48	4.48
Any Other Activity Approved by MRD	comp.	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	Ongoing/Suspended	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Rajiv Gandhi Seva Kendra	comp.	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	Ongoing/Suspended	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Total	comp.	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	0.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
	Ongoing/Suspended	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	0.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

Tale 2.4: Social auditing and inspection of NREGA work

Sl. No.	Name Of The District	Must Roll Verified		Social Audit		Inspections Conducted			Gram Sabha Held			Complaints	
		NO of Muster Rolls Used	Verified	Total Gram Panchayats	Social Audit held	Total Works Taken up	NO. of Works Inspected at District Level	NO. of Works Inspected at Block Level	Total Gram Panchayats	No. of Gram Sabhas held	No. of VMC metings held	No. of Complaints Received	No of Complaints Disposed
Phase –I 2010-11													
1	24 Pgs (S)	20636	7767	312	300	2654	4	1187	312	312	0	22	19
2	Bankura	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3	Birbhum	158866	53599	167	123	12873	185	3253	167	36	0	130	105
4	Dinajpur (S)	38164	16888	65	65	1623	141	283	65	65	65	51	24
5	Dinajpur (N)	3492	2180	98	72	1077	120	693	98	0	0	24	13
6	Jalpaiguri	14881	0	146	0	2784	0	0	146	0	0	5	2
7	Maldah	24252	15036	146	45	1774	124	365	146	42	56	15	15
8	Murshidabad	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
9	Medinipur (W)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
10	Purulia	91203	27731	170	162	16310	192	1445	170	14	0	267	174
Sub Total		351494	123201	1838	767	39095	766	7226	1838	469	121	514	352
Phase –II													
11	24 Pgs (N)	107043	31753	200	123	20068	152	3644	200	42	0	25	17
12	Burdwan	416502	406542	277	171	16173	972	14484	277	277	0	45	41
13	Coochbehar	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
14	Hooghly	54084	44922	207	317	5324	762	1665	207	247	0	13	38
15	Nadia	35832	15245	187	2	811	301	510	187	0	0	68	49
16	Medinipur (E)	57309	31881	223	2243	13250	392	6194	223	904	0	179	175
17	Darjeeling	5270	2968	22	17	428	7	85	22	137	2	4	4
Sub Total		676040	533311	1244	2873	56054	2586	26582	1244	1607	2	334	324
Phase –III													
18	Darjeeling Gorkha Hill Council	33785	31211	221	197	1006	781	1006	221	0	0	8	7
19	Howrah	22814	19140	157	2299	1611	252	1167	157	146	68	9	7
Sub Total		56599	50351	378	2496	2617	1033	2173	378	146	68	17	14
West Bengal Total		1084133	706863	3239*	6136	97766	4385	35981	3239*	2222	191	865	690

\*Excluding Darjeeling Gorkha Hill Council.

Contd.....

Contd....Tale 2.4: Social auditing and inspection of NREGA work

Sl No.	Name Of The District	Must Roll Verified		Social Audit		Inspections Conducted			Gram Sabha Held			Complaints	
		NO of Muster Rolls Used	Verified	Total Gram Panchayats	Social Audit held	Total Works Taken up	NO. of Works Inspected at District Level	NO. of Works Inspected at Block Level	Total Gram Panchayats	No. of Gram Sabhas held	No. of VMC metings held	No. of Complaints Received	No of Complaints Disposed
Phase –I 2009-10													
1	24 Pgs (S)	73247	14411	312	230	3072	0	1541	312	312	0	88	62
2	Bankura	48346	23696	190	190	9767	188	1002	190	606	0	201	152
3	Birbhum	207222	140701	167	167	15061	311	7574	167	167	0	212	167
4	Dinajpur (S)	100178	68515	65	65	2203	250	827	65	65	20	36	35
5	Dinajpur (N)	1092	634	98	85	1962	150	1181	98	0	0	14	12
6	Jalpaiguri	163835	20031	146	146	14068	750	931	146	146	2075	54	49
7	Maldah	73590	51701	146	132	2862	232	1034	146	89	92	87	82
8	Murshidabad	104273	41738	254	254	6829	142	1738	254	742	0	285	154
9	Medinipur (W)	243087	93312	290	2565	29347	517	11662	290	4575	1885	256	215
10	Purulia	156421	25128	170	125	17556	99	2464	170	68	0	265	197
Sub Total		1171291	479867	1838	3959	102727	2639	29954	1838	6770	4072	1498	1125
Phase –II													
11	24 Pgs (N)	137345	50135	200	200	19690	104	5779	200	400	185	151	133
12	Burdwan	298735	289254	277	255	17970	1114	17260	277	277	0	71	64
13	Coochbehar	95008	36608	128	128	500	2262	1209	128	1044	846	44	40
14	Hooghly	62680	48575	207	196	8246	455	1693	207	689	113	39	37
15	Nadia	170823	124862	187	148	3998	531	3467	187	809	231	427	407
16	Medinipur (E)	66066	32802	223	3106	6645	140	6505	223	223	223	146	132
17	Darjeeling	8208	4870	22	14	555	14	171	22	105	1	4	2
Sub Total		838865	587106	1244	4047	57604	4620	36084	1244	3547	1599	882	815
Phase –III													
18	Darjeeling Gorkha Hill Council	26035	21768	112	112	665	72	665	112	0	665	21	16
19	Howrah	25580	22291	157	157	1758	328	1378	157	358	136	42	40
Sub Total		51615	44059	269	269	2423	400	2043	269	358	801	63	56
West Bengal Total		2061771	1111032	3239*	8275	162754	7659	68081	3239*	10675	6472	2443	1996

\*Excluding Darjeeling Gorkha Hill Council.

Contd.....

Contd.....Tale 2.4: Social auditing and inspection of NREGA work

Sl No.	Name Of The District	Must Roll Verified		Social Audit		Inspections Conducted			Gram Sabha Held			Complaints	
		NO of Muster Rolls Used	Verified	Total Gram Panchayats	Social Audit held	Total Works Taken up	NO. of Works Inspected at District Level	NO. of Works Inspected at Block Level	Total Gram Panchayats	No. of Gram Sabhas held	No. of VMC meetings held	No. of Complaints Received	No of Complaints Disposed
Phase –I 2008-09													
1	24 Pgs (S)	18146	5283	312	151	3980	66	409	312	312	92	111	107
2	Bankura	37941	6739	190	279	5800	154	2635	190	161	0	72	27
3	Birbhum	78532	56341	167	38	10022	272	5834	167	82	0	137	54
4	Dinajpur (S)	4888	3135	65	8	639	113	471	65	413	0	3	3
5	Dinajpur (N)	3742	2135	98	55	842	208	634	98	872	0	10	10
6	Jalpaiguri	35665	13616	146	143	6108	503	3154	146	146	2075	48	48
7	Maldah	25891	17078	146	56	1649	174	475	146	39	14	18	17
8	Murshidabad	52085	22680	254	24	2814	194	752	254	24	0	103	67
9	Medinipur (W)	150362	55356	290	774	13865	180	3366	290	3086	3086	254	230
10	Purulia	44470	14556	170	131	5848	45	821	170	33	1	130	86
Sub Total		451722	196919	1838	1659	51567	1909	18551	1838	5168	5268	886	649
Phase –II													
11	24 Pgs (N)	23215	6730	200	200	1981	1040	941	200	200	200	51	51
12	Burdwan	40250	40250	277	258	18372	2081	17989	277	277	0	53	50
13	Coochbehar	38541	31288	128	118	2578	250	674	128	887	0	24	23
14	Hooghly	22382	18199	207	187	4360	252	1030	207	211	0	25	22
15	Nadia	62982	58052	187	74	2245	429	872	187	291	131	172	157
16	Medinipur (E)	31711	15389	223	911	11503	105	1688	223	1140	563	130	61
17	Darjeeling	9755	4192	22	13	498	33	202	22	102	0	13	10
Sub Total		228836	174100	1244	1761	41537	4190	23396	1244	3108	894	468	374
Phase –III													
18	Darjeeling Gorkha Hill Council	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
19	Howrah	11378	7740	157	184	637	175	443	157	160	54	97	95
Sub Total		11378	7740	157	184	637	175	443	157	160	54	97	95
West Bengal Total		691936	378759	3239*	3604	93741	6274	42390	3239*	8436	6216	1451	1118

\*Excluding Darjeeling Gorkha Hill Council.

Table 2.5: The NREGA payment processed through banks/post office

Sl.No.	Name Of The District	NO. of Bank Account Opened		Amount of wages Disbursed through bank Accounts (Rs. in Lakhs)	No. of Post Office Account Opened		Amount of Wages disbursed through post office Accounts (Rs. in lakhs)	Total Accounts			Total Amount Disbursed (Rs.in lakhs)
		Individual	Joint		Individual	Joint		Individual	Joint	Total	
Phase – 1 2010-11											
1	24 Pgs (S)	168530	34618	1028.88	123573	26681	903.4	292103	61299	353402	1932
2	Bankura	130178	9698	4358.51574	192590	36015	6596.03257	322768	45713	368481	10955
3	Birbhum	201872	0	5312.59617	352078	0	5841.5232	553950	0	553950	11155
4	Dinajpur (S)	49705	0	550.236	120875	0	1283.884	170580	0	170580	1834
5	Dinajpur (N)	59845	14962	511.57	53922	120019	1176.72	113767	134981	248748	1689
6	Jalpaiguri	90766	842	415.37985	449072	5907	2451.28581	539838	6749	546587	2866
7	Maldah	106871	16511	510.01668	199376	9432	887.25207	306247	25943	332190	1397
8	Murshidabad	356137	53576	4449.1812	309210	36841	1483.0604	665347	90417	755764	5932
9	Medinipur (W)	89587	299090	5651	92546	122892	3178.11	182133	421982	604115	8829
10	Purulia	180501	0	437.31	425847	0	1098.42	606348	0	606348	1535
	Sub Total	1433992	429297	23224.686	2319089	357787	24899.688	3753081	787084	4540165	48124
Phase - II											
11	24 Pgs (N)	168363	74580	3085.96	219757	63096	3416.34	388120	137676	525796	6502
12	Burdwan	151091	254351	9266.94	154979	201426	8554.08	306070	455777	761847	17821
13	Coochbehar	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
14	Hooghly	419422	54523	6220.48903	81268	20425	1386.60544	500690	74948	575638	7607
15	Nadia	224688	0	1070.45	611440	0	3075.33	836128	0	836128	4145
16	Medinipur (E)	573553	7210	4835.553355	146418	600	1312.3352	719971	7810	727781	6148
17	Darjeeling	7031	0	37.0964	44270	0	258.48095	51301	0	51301	295
	Sub Total	1544148	390664	24516.489	1258132	285547	18003.172	2802280	676211	3478491	42518
Phase - III											
18	Darjeeling Gorkha Hill Council	24607	158	492.704	54940	85	828.193	79547	243	79790	1321
19	Howrah	96701	5224	578.7251	48450	2798	171.12255	145151	8022	153173	750
	Sub Total	121308	5382	1071.4291	103390	2883	999.31555	224698	8265	232963	2071
	Grand Total	3099448	825343	48812.60353	3680611	646217	43902.17519	6780059	1471560	8251619	92713

Contd.....

Contd....Table 2.5: The NREGA payment processed though banks/post office

Sl.No.	Name Of The District	NO. of Bank Account Opened		Amount of wages Disbursed through bank Accounts (Rs. in Lakhs)	No. of Post Office Account Opened		Amount of Wages disbursed through post office Accounts (Rs. in lakhs)	Total Accounts			Total Amount Disbursed (Rs.in lakhs)
		Individual	Joint		Individual	Joint		Individual	Joint	Total	
Phase – 1 2009-10											
1	24 Pgs (S)	162567	35464	1551.2658	125392	21295	1158.68004	287959	56759	344718	2710
2	Bankura	122305	8406	3507.57794	179569	33824	5010.86691	301874	42230	344104	8519
3	Birbhum	201872	0	5202.16529	352078	0	6604.86966	553950	0	553950	11807
4	Dinajpur (S)	49705	0	757.299	120875	0	1767.03	170580	0	170580	2524
5	Dinajpur (N)	0	74807	862.41	0	173941	1303.82	0	248748	248748	2166
6	Jalpaiguri	87691	805	2350.5678	434242	5715	12280.8516	521933	6520	528453	14632
7	Maldah	102116	16511	1618.93353	191405	8454	3027.42993	293521	24965	318486	4646
8	Murshidabad	318679	41182	5579.54741	270112	23914	1859.84913	588791	65096	653887	7440
9	Medinipur (W)	22471	358180	9780.21	29573	189056	5440.15	52044	547236	599280	15220
10	Purulia	172000	0	1535.23	420826	0	5354.74	592826	0	592826	6890
Sub Total		1239406	535355	32745.207	2124072	456199	43808.287	3363478	991554	4355032	76554
Phase - II											
11	24 Pgs (N)	145347	63407	5813.11	194640	56936	5879.46	339987	120343	460330	11692
12	Burdwan	135966	228890	8461.02	148730	193304	7810.17	284696	422194	706890	16271
13	Coochbehar	152286	39180	2598.6675	217260	42941	3463.40323	369546	82121	451667	6062
14	Hooghly	323280	119535	4598.944	69393	15146	908.77337	392673	134681	527354	5508
15	Nadia	249168	0	2416.01	574004	0	4728.61	823172	0	823172	7145
16	Medinipur (E)	508114	0	6252.21885	144611	0	1583.27878	652725	0	652725	7835
17	Darjeeling	6645	0	51.980835	38463	10	354.301365	45108	10	45118	406
Sub Total		1520806	451012	30191.951	1387101	308337	24727.997	2907907	759349	3667256	54919
Phase - III											
18	Darjeeling Gorkha Hill Council	26671	0	0	40433	0	0	67104	0	67104	0
19	Howrah	91714	4790	549.9427	45700	2687	233.4263	137414	7477	144891	783
Sub Total		118385	4790	549.9427	86133	2687	233.4263	204518	7477	211995	783
Grand Total		2878597	991157	63487.10066	3597306	767223	68769.7103	6475903	1758380	8234283	132256

Contd.....



Contd.....Table 2.5: The NREGA payment processed though banks/post office

Sl.No.	Name Of The District	NO. of Bank Account Opened		Amount of wages Disbursed through bank Accounts (Rs. in Lakhs)	No. of Post Office Account Opened		Amount of Wages disbursed through post office Accounts (Rs. in lakhs)	Total Accounts			Total Amount Disbursed (Rs.in lakhs)
		Individual	Joint		Individual	Joint		Individual	Joint	Total	
Phase – I 2008-09											
1	24 Pgs (S)	109682	29748	326.52672	71166	6668	144.81347	180848	36416	217264	472
2	Bankura	0	98815	706.43	0	112688	1016.57	0	211503	211503	1723
3	Birbhum	168484	0	2134.22	372631	0	3042.45	541115	0	541115	5176
4	Dinajpur (S)	33324	0	42.3456	100651	0	1352.7904	133975	0	133975	1395
5	Dinajpur (N)	0	50143	255.65	114567	0	387.3	114567	50143	164710	643
6	Jalpaiguri	43332	350	140.01	219626	550	783.51	262958	900	263858	924
7	Maldah	64036	10273	399.70023	110926	7245	505.70503	174962	17518	192480	906
8	Murshidabad	205842	22672	510.29072	142718	8705	169.36372	348560	31377	379937	679
9	Medinipur (W)	0	347141	2398.05	0	185349	1344.31	0	532490	532490	3742
10	Purulia	114804	0	104.5	308673	0	305.25	423477	0	423477	409
Sub Total		739504	559142	7017.7233	1440958	321205	9052.0626	2180462	880347	3060809	16069
Phase - II											
11	24 Pgs (N)	47992	109577	0	56431	112861	0	104423	222438	326861	0
12	Burdwan	104809	183548	1692.75	115293	166838	1908.85	220102	350386	570488	3602
13	Coochbehar	113152	43267	147.94306	170549	55353	342.764165	283701	98620	382321	491
14	Hooghly	209195	90978	270.4185	46777	10685	0	255972	101663	357635	270
15	Nadia	149739	0	0	371630	0	0	521369	0	521369	0
16	Medinipur (E)	370420	0	294.7032	85544	0	23.95075	455964	0	455964	319
17	Darjeeling	5472	0	36.908145	28861	10	170.75764	34333	10	34343	208
Sub Total		1000779	427370	2442.7229	875085	345747	2446.3226	1875864	773117	2648981	4890
Phase - III											
18	Darjeeling Gorkha Hill Council	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
19	Howrah	70940	3967	148.1075	35024	2003	60.1505	105964	5970	111934	208
Sub Total		70940	3967	148.1075	35024	2003	60.1505	105964	5970	111934	208
Grand Total		1811223	990479	9608.556175	2351067	668955	11558.5352	4162290	1659434	5821724	21167

Table 2.6: Unemployment allowance paid in lieu of not providing employment (2010-11)

District	Un Employment Allowance Due	Unemployment Allowance Paid	
	No. of Days	No. of Days	Amount
Phase - I			
24 Pgs (S)	22	0	0
Bankura	198	0	0
Birbhum	474	0	0
Dinajpur (S)	305	0	0
Dinajpur (N)	154	0	0
Jalpaiguri	246	0	0
Maldah	63	0	0
Murshidabad	1250	0	0
Purulia	42	0	0
Medinipur (W)	12	0	0
Sub Total	2766	0	0
Phase - II			
24 Pgs (N)	33	0	0
Burdwan	433	0	0
Coochbehar	299	6	273
Siliguri Mahakuma Parisad	0	0	0
Medinipur (E)	133	0	0
Hooghly	8	0	0
Nadia	5	0	0
Sub Total	911	6	273
Phase - III			
Darjeeling Gorkha Hill Council	0	0	0
Howrah	2	0	0
Sub Total	2	0	0
Grand Total	3679	6	273

Table 2.7: Work projection under NREGA for 2010-11

Name of State	Shelf of works Through Which Employment to be Provided	Total No. of Spill over Works From Previous year	Total No. of New Works Taken up in Current Year	No. of Works Likely to Spill Over From Current Financial Year to Next financial	No. Of New Works Proposed for next financial year	Benefit Achieved Unit	Persondays To be Generated	Estimated Cost (In Lakhs)		
								On Unskilled Wage	On Material including skilled and semiskilled wages	Total
WEST BENGAL	Rural Connectivity	30257	61530	18896	75326	124277127.4	50259998	14031149.88	11783395	25814544.64
	Flood Control and Protection	4788	16484	5248	20830	571521.63	17147167	27314826.09	13465492	40780318.17
	Water Conservation and Water Harvesting	11176	34705	9101	47904	96203472.13	33409925	22071267.51	2404124	24475391.16
	Drought Proofing	5813	18541	6390	26883	154340.42	13394048	6789143.19	1763397	8552540.45
	Micro Irrigation Works	3663	12938	4291	16610	6207051.81	12417417	6037713.3	2004444	8042156.85
	Provision of Irrigation facility to Land Owned by	4747	11664	3316	32027	703960.39	10210218	1921758.25	113698.2	2035456.47
	Renovation of Traditional Water bodies	7302	21897	7797	269744	106824296.3	31133940	19938247.04	2701980	22640226.61
	Land Development	5237	20505	6401	33820	1252822.47	19179114	6363661.95	1171069	7534730.6
	Any Other activity Approved by MRD	10	187	12	1927	256512.43	520865	1222508.42	5558669	6781177.47
	Bharat Nirman Rajiv Gandhi Sewa Kendra	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Total	72993	198451	61452	525071	336451104.9	187672692	105690275.6	40966267	146656542.4

## Chapter–III

### Household Characteristics and Their Income and Consumption Pattern

The purpose of this chapter is to give an account of sample household characteristics and to analyze their income and consumption pattern. More precisely, this chapter analyzes demographic and social characteristics of households, occupational structure, household net income and consumption expenditure and variability in income and consumption across the households. Finally, this chapter intends to look into the determinants of participation in NREGA based on household and member level primary data.

#### 3.1: Household profile of the respondents

A close look at the demographic profile of the respondents reveals that the size of the household varies among the beneficiary and non-beneficiary households (table–3.1). The relatively larger size is to be found among beneficiary households who have an average size of 4.53 members per household. In contrast, the non-beneficiary households have an average size of 4.21. The number of earners works out to 2.42 per beneficiary household where as for non-beneficiary households the figure comes to 2.12. Beneficiary households are composed of 153 male households and 47 female households, female households thus forming 23.50 percent of the total beneficiary households. This stand in sharp contrast with 41 males and 9 females for non-beneficiary households comprising 82 percent male households and 18 percent female households. The age distribution in broad groups is also given in table 3.1. It would be seen from the table that respondents in the age group 16–60 form 94 percent for beneficiary households which is higher than the percentage (88.00) for the corresponding group of non-beneficiary households. The rest of the persons belong to the age group above 60 both for beneficiary households (6.00 percent) and non-beneficiary households (12.00 percent). A striking feature is that majority of the beneficiary members of households belong to the productive age group 16–60 and there is no indication of the predominance of beneficiary persons in the minor age group. Among the respondents, both to beneficiary and non-beneficiary households, heads of households constitute the majority accounting for 96.00 percent while others account for 4.00 percent only. Average education level of the beneficiaries is observed to be relatively low. Close to three-fourth of the beneficiaries (76.50 percent) are either illiterate or studied only up to primary standard. A mere 23.50 percent of beneficiaries had studied up to secondary level. Non-beneficiary households are relatively better educated where persons receiving education beyond 10<sup>th</sup> standard constituted 32 percent while the rest were either illiterate or studied up to primary level. Caste composition of households reveals that 37.50 percent of beneficiary households belong to scheduled castes, 6.50 percent of the households belong to scheduled tribes, and 4.50 percent belong to other backward castes whereas the balance 51.50 percent of the households goes to general castes. Caste composition of non-

beneficiary households is not exactly similar to those of beneficiary households. For such households scheduled castes account for 30 percent of households. The proportion of scheduled tribe and OBC households is of the order 16.00 percent and 4.00 percent respectively whereas the balance of 50 percent of the households constitutes general castes.

The introduction of the targeted public distribution system (in short TPDS) in 1997 divided the population into two card holding categories: above poverty line (APL) and below process line (BPL) groups. PDS is a food subsidy programme explicitly targeted towards the poor. Under the revamped public distribution system i.e. targeted public distribution scheme, the states are directed to complete the identification of BPL (below poverty line) and APL families and accordingly issuing of ration cards. This apart, Antyodaya Anna Yojana (AAY) was introduced in early' 2001. It is addressed to the poorest of the poor and under the scheme Antyodaya households are provided with a special ration card which entitles the households to receive 35 kg. of grain per month at highly subsidized prices (Rs. 2/ kg. for wheat and Rs. 3/kg. for rice). In our sample data, beneficiary households holding BPL and AAY card accounted for 42.50 percent and 5.50 percent respectively. Among beneficiary households, APL card holding households constituted the major accounting for 50 percent of total beneficiary households. The rest of the households hold neither BPL or AAY card. Among the non-beneficiaries, BPL and AAY card holding households together constituted 44 percent of total non-beneficiary households. On the other hand a total of 50 percent of non-beneficiary households are APL card holders, the remaining 6.00 percent being without holding any card in the identified group.

The scheme of NREGA has the transformative potential for women in enhancing economic and social security and thus the scheme can alter the balance of power in the rural family. However, empowerment of women would be easier for the families where the decision maker in the family is the female member. In our sample households, in case of both beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries male members are the decision makers in majority of the families (76.50 percent for beneficiary families and 82.00 percent for non-beneficiary families).

**Table -3.1: Demographic profile of the respondents (% of households)**

Characteristics		West Bengal		
		Beneficiaries	Non beneficiaries	Aggregate
No of HH		200	50	250
Household size (numbers)		4.53	4.21	4.46
Average numbers of earners		2.42	2.12	2.36
Gender	Male	153	41	194
	(%)	<b>76.50</b>	<b>82.00</b>	<b>77.60</b>
	Female	47	9	56
	(%)	<b>23.50</b>	<b>18.00</b>	<b>22.40</b>
Age group	<16	0	0	0
	(%)	0.00	0.00	0.00
	16-60	188	44	232
	(%)	94.00	88.00	92.80
	>60	12	6	18
(%)	<b>6.00</b>	<b>12.00</b>	<b>7.20</b>	
Identity of respondent	Head	192	48	240
	(%)	96.00	96.00	96.00
	Others	8	2	10
	(%)	4.00	4.00	4.00
Education status	Illiterate	92	18	110
	(%)	46.00	36.00	44.00
	Up to primary	61	16	77
	(%)	<b>30.50</b>	<b>32.00</b>	<b>30.80</b>
	Up to secondary	47	11	58
	(%)	<b>23.50</b>	<b>22.00</b>	<b>23.20</b>
	Up to graduate	-	5	5
	(%)	-	<b>10.00</b>	<b>2.00</b>
	Above graduate	-	-	-
(%)	-	-	-	
Caste	SC	75	15	90
	(%)	<b>37.50</b>	<b>30.00</b>	<b>36.00</b>
	ST	13	8	21
	(%)	<b>6.50</b>	<b>16.00</b>	<b>8.40</b>
	OBC	9	2	11
	(%)	<b>4.50</b>	<b>4.00</b>	<b>4.40</b>
	General	103	25	128
(%)	<b>51.50</b>	<b>50.00</b>	<b>51.20</b>	
Card holding	AAV	11	2	13
	(%)	5.50	4.00	5.20
	BPL	85	20	105
	(%)	42.50	40.00	42.00
	APL	100	25	125
	(%)	50.00	50.00	50.00
	None	4	3	7
(%)	2.00	6.00	2.80	
Decision maker	Male	153	41	194
	(%)	76.50	82.00	77.60
	Female	47	9	56
	(%)	23.50	18.00	22.40
Main occupation	Farming	39	10	49
	(%)	<b>19.50</b>	<b>20.00</b>	<b>19.60</b>
	Self business	5	4	9
	(%)	<b>2.50</b>	<b>8.00</b>	<b>3.60</b>
	Salaried/pensioners	1	4	5
	(%)	<b>0.50</b>	<b>8.00</b>	<b>2.00</b>
	Wage earners	139	26	165
	(%)	<b>69.50</b>	<b>52.00</b>	<b>66.00</b>
Others	16	6	22	
(%)	<b>8.00</b>	<b>12.00</b>	<b>8.80</b>	
Involved in migration during the year 2009		43	7	50
(%)		<b>21.50</b>	<b>14.00</b>	<b>20.00</b>

Note: Figures relate to beneficiary and non-beneficiary respondents

Judging by the primary occupation of the head of the households, our survey data showed that among the beneficiary households, 69.50 percent of households belong to the class of wage earner, 19.50 percent have the main occupation farming, 2.50 percent are engaged in self-business and the rest belonged to the category 'others'. Within the group of non-beneficiary households, majority accounting for 52 percent are wage earners, 20 percent are engaged in farming, 8 percent are employed in self-business, another 8 percent are salaried persons and the rest 12 percent belong to the category of 'others'.

Out-migration has been the result of lack of employment opportunities within the village. With the commencement of NREGA works, which has ensured employment in their native places, the incidence of outmigration is expected to come down. In our survey data among the sample beneficiary families, 43 families (21.50 percent) have out-migrated while 7 families (14.00 percent) among non-beneficiaries have out-migrated.

### **3.2: Main occupation**

The concept of household forms the basis of our analysis. Our approach has therefore been to allocate the working force of the household among occupations on an individual basis. In table - 3.2 households have been allocated occupations on the basis of main pursuit of the heads of households and of other working members in the household measured in terms of man days employed in the occupation. Thus each occupational class relate to primary occupation of the heads of households and other working members if any who have their primary occupation in that class. Within the group of the beneficiary households, the more important among the occupational groups are in order of non-agricultural casual labour (36.57 percent) agricultural casual labour (24.24 percent) and self-employed in agriculture (9.80 percent) (table-3.2). Occupationally, NREGA works employed 12.31 percent of total man days employed. A comparison of beneficiary and non-beneficiary households reveals that due to implementation of NREGA, there is an increase in overall employment level of beneficiary households by 7.88 percent from 406 man days of employment for non-beneficiary to 438 man days for beneficiary households.

In contrast, among the non-beneficiary households the most important occupation is non-agricultural occupation working as casual labour (34.21 percent), followed in order, by self-employed in non-farming (16.87 percent), agricultural casual labour (16.18 percent), self-employed in agriculture (12.44 percent). Among other occupations, households working as migrant worker assume greater importance (9.99 percent), followed by regular/salary job (7.18 percent) and self-employment in livestock (3.12 percent) (table-3.2).

**Table-3.2: Main occupation (% of total man-days per hh)**

Occupation	West Bengal		
	Beneficiaries	Non-beneficiaries	Aggregate
Agricultural casual labour	106.3	65.8	98.2
(%)	24.24	16.18	22.72
Non agricultural casual labour	160.4	139.1	156.1
(%)	36.57	34.21	36.12
Work for public work programmes other than NREGA	0	0	0
(%)	0.00	0.00	0.00
Self employed in non farming	19.0	68.6	28.9
(%)	4.33	16.87	6.69
Self employed in agriculture	43.0	50.6	44.6
(%)	9.80	12.44	10.32
Self employed in livestock	20.8	12.7	19.2
(%)	4.74	3.12	4.44
Regular/salary job	16.4	29.2	19.0
(%)	3.74	7.18	4.40
Worked as a migrant worker	18.9	40.6	23.2
(%)	4.31	9.99	5.37
Worked under NREGA	54.0	0	43.2
(%)	12.31	0.00	10.00
Any other work	0	0	0
(%)	0.00	0.00	0.00
Total	438.8	406.6	432.2
(%)	(100.00)	(100.00)	(100.00)

**3.3: Household net income**

The analysis of occupational structure will not be complete unless some light is thrown on the distribution of income by occupations. In regard to income the study uses the concept of net income available for personal and household expenditure or savings. The figures of income shown against each occupational class relate to the income derived by household working members as a whole. Across the beneficiary and non-beneficiary households, annual income per non-beneficiary households is higher by 34.11 percent from Rs. 36904.24 for beneficiary households to 49493.22 for non-beneficiary households. For beneficiary households wage income from non-agricultural pursuits accounted for the major (36.99 percent) share in total household income. Importantly, net income from works under NREGA accounted for 14.23 percent of the total household income and the remaining receipts are from wage income in agriculture (21.65 percent), income from agriculture (13.44 percent), income from wages as migrant workers (7.38 percent), income from self-employed in non-farming (2.97 percent) and income from regular job (2.01 percent) in order of importance (table -3.3).



**Table-3.3: Household net income (Annual) (Rs per household)\***

	West Bengal					
	Average Income	CV (across HH)	Average Income	CV (across HH)	Average Income	CV (across HH)
	Beneficiaries		Non beneficiaries		Aggregate	
Income from work under NREGA	5252.42	71.99	-	-	4201.94	94.77
(%)	14.23	-	-	-	10.66	-
Income from wages in agriculture	7989.42	77.91	4766.28	112.03	7344.79	84.20
(%)	21.65	-	9.63	-	18.63	-
Income from wages in non-agriculture	13651.91	94.14	9890.28	124.04	12899.54	99.24
(%)	36.99	-	19.98	-	32.72	-
Income from livestock	424.46	264.09	280.00	276.29	395.56	268.18
(%)	1.15	-	0.57	-	1.00	-
Income from wages as migrant workers	2724.52	370.56	3324.00	229.33	2488.41	338.95
(%)	7.38	-	6.72	-	6.31	-
Income from self employed in non farming	1096.28	468.76	12227.20	326.97	3122.46	557.28
(%)	2.97	-	24.70	-	7.92	-
Income from agriculture	4960.86	187.20	9485.64	186.34	5865.81	197.12
(%)	13.44	-	19.17	-	14.88	-
Income from regular job/salary/pension	741.90	561.89	10160.00	455.39	2625.52	807.42
(%)	2.01	-	20.53	-	6.66	-
Income from OTHER sources	62.50	903.59	360.00	707.11	122.00	1018.60
(%)	0.17	-	0.73	-	0.31	-
Total	36904.24	49.69	49493.22	105.42	39422.04	73.08
(%)	(100.00)	-	(100.00)	-	(100.00)	-

Note: Figures in parentheses are respective percentage of total income

\* Income from wages in non agriculture/income from migrant workers is calculated after subtracting their transportation cost, while income from agriculture also includes income from hiring out assets if any.

In case of non-beneficiary households, income per household obtained from self-employment in non-farm activity accounted to Rs. 12,227.20 and constituted the major accounting for 24.70 percent of total household income followed by income from regular job (20.53 percent), wage income from non-agricultural pursuits (19.98 percent), income from agriculture (19.17 percent), wage income from agriculture activity (9.63 percent) and income form wages as migrant workers (6.72 percent) in order. Notably, non-beneficiary households on account of their non-participation in NREGA works relied more on self-employment in non-farm activity and derived considerably higher income (24.70 percent) as compared to beneficiary households participatory in NREGA (2.97 percent) (table – 3.3).

As measured by the coefficient of variation, income derived from each pursuit exhibited higher degree of variation across the households both for beneficiary and non-beneficiary households (table – 3.3). Further it is interesting to note that occupationally low income per

household is associated with high variance in income across the households. This holds true particularly for the beneficiary households.

### **3.4: Household consumption**

The following analyses attempt to examine the living standard of households across beneficiary and non-beneficiary households depending on consumption expenditure data collected in course of the study. Apart from this, for the sake of comparison, consumption expenditure data furnished by NSS is used. Most of the contemporary studies of level of living and poverty have concentrated on state-level averages drawing data on consumption expenditure furnished by NSSO. This is understandable because the NSS is the only source which provides more or less comparable time series information on the levels and patterns of consumption. The information is gathered by a nation-wide field organization on the basis of scientific sampling procedure and using a rather elaborate questionnaire. Very few studies have attempted any district level analysis based on NSS data because of the very nature of the sampling design followed by NSSO. It was only in the 61<sup>st</sup> round survey of NSS (2004-05) that the sample design had taken districts as strata in both rural and urban sectors which makes it possible to get unbiased estimates of important socio-economic parameters at the district level, adequately supported by the sample design. However, among the state-level studies conducted in recent years some have highlighted the reduction in poverty (among others Sundaram and Tendulkar, 2003) while some others have expressed anguish over the rising economic inequality (Deaton and Dreze, 2002, Sen and Himanshu, 2004).

Now we proceed to analyze household consumption expenditure data separately on food and non-food items which was collected in course of the study. Firstly, we concentrate on household consumption on food items expressed in terms of kgs per capita per month. The figures of consumption expenditure on different food articles separately for beneficiary and non-beneficiary households along with similar data furnished by NSS for the years 1993-94, 1990-2000 and 2004-05 are presented in table-3.4A.

The item-wise distribution of expenditure shows that cereal intake of the household population is the largest component of expenditure on food items both for beneficiary and non-beneficiary households, rice being the major among cereals followed by wheat. This pattern does not vary across the beneficiary and non-beneficiary households in terms of the level of monthly consumption per capita. However, there are large differences when the comparison is made by specific non-cereal food items viz. liquid milk, poultry meat & egg, fruits, vegetables and confectionery or beverages. The monthly per capita expenditure on these food items is significantly higher for non-beneficiary households, the difference ranging from 28.57 percent in vegetables to 70.97 percent in liquid milk. In case of poultry meat & egg it is higher by 56.41 percent in case of non-beneficiary households. In terms of cereals consumption per capita per month, NSS data (2004-05) gives relatively higher figure by about 20.85 percent. As a whole NSS estimates of food-grains consumption is 20.60 percent higher than implied in our survey estimate. In most other food items,

viz. sugar, oils, spices and meat NSS shows lower level of consumption than our survey estimates, the difference ranging from 8.33 percent in edible oils to 33.74 percent in spices. NSS estimates of liquid milk consumption is 42.45 percent higher than implied in our estimate while NSS estimate of poultry meat and egg consumption is lower than our estimate by 30.30 percent.

**Table-3.4A: Household consumption of food items (kgs. per capita per month)**

Item	West Bengal					
	Beneficiaries	Non beneficiaries	Aggregate	NSS <sup>2</sup> 1993-94	NSS <sup>2</sup> 1999-00	NSS <sup>2</sup> 2004-05
Rice	10.806	10.740	10.793	12.59	11.62	12.38
Wheat	1.494	1.520	1.500	1.07	1.04	1.15
Other cereals	0.170	0.199	0.176	0	0	0
Total cereals *	12.470	12.459	12.468	13.66	13.59	15.07
Total pulses	0.442	0.454	0.445	0.4	0.46	0.5
Sugar & Gur	0.494	0.488	0.493	0.42	0.47	0.41
Edible oils <sup>1</sup>	0.521	0.521	0.521	0.34	0.43	0.48
Liquid milk <sup>1</sup>	0.927	1.594	1.061	1.54	1.31	1.51
Milk products**	0.073	0.040	0.066	0	0	0
Spices <sup>2</sup>	53.464	74.322	57.636	61	0	43.09
Poultry-meat & egg	0.386	0.614	0.431	0.23	0.29	0.33
Fruits	0.119	0.169	0.129	0	0	0
Vegetables	6.159	7.920	6.511	0	0	0
Confectionery /Beverages	0.233	0.314	0.249	0	0	0

1. Edible oil and liquid milk is in litres
2. Spices in gms

\*Rice & Wheat only  
\*\* Ghee only

To carry this analysis a bit further we have compared the monthly per capita consumption expenditure of households by broad commodity items groups under food and non-food (table-3.4B). First of all, it is observable that the average level of monthly per capita consumption expenditure (food and non-food) is higher for non-beneficiary households which is of the order of Rs. 539.68 for beneficiary households and Rs. 651.23 for non-beneficiary counterpart. In terms of food intake, the pattern of expenditure shows again higher value figure of monthly per capita consumption expenditure for non-beneficiary (434.94) as compared to beneficiary (376.50). The pattern of expenditure distribution by broad commodity groups as food and non-food appear somewhat different across the beneficiary and non-beneficiary households. Although, the pattern shows a larger share of expenditure on food items in case of both beneficiary and non-beneficiary households, the observed behavioral tendency of non-beneficiary households has been to expend more on non-food items as compared those of beneficiary households. In case of non-beneficiary households, more consumption on non-food consumer goods involves greater sacrifice in food consumption as compared to beneficiary households. Notably, the estimates of consumption expenditure on non-food items for non-beneficiary households is 32.55 percent higher than implied in non-food expenditure of beneficiary households (table-3.4B). The item-wise distribution of monthly per capita consumption expenditure of households shows that food items together accounted for 69.76 percent of the total expenditure of beneficiary households with cereals alone accounting for 31.11 percent, rice (27.78 percent) being the major among cereals. The point to note is that comparatively the share of per capita monthly intake of food item is higher for non-

beneficiary households (66.79 percent) with lesser consumption by cereals (26.36 percent) and accordingly more on non-cereals. With regard to the expenditure on non-food items, both the absolute level as well as the proportion of expenditure on each of the non-food items varied between the beneficiary and non-beneficiary households. In respect of all the items excluding education, the absolute levels as well as the percentage shares of expenditure were higher for non-beneficiary households.

The monthly per capita consumption expenditure data (2004-05) furnished by NSS is also used for the sake of comparison. The NSS consumption expenditure data have given sensible results in various types of analyses and are based on comprehensive sample size. It is however generally believed that the estimates of cereals consumption obtained from NSS consumer expenditure enquiry are on the higher side. Here an attempt is made to carry out the comparisons of household consumption expenditure data collected by us with those of NSS data.

Evidently, NSS data on consumption expenditure are broadly in close agreement with our survey data in respect of total monthly per capita consumption expenditure of households. The NSS figure of per capita monthly consumption expenditure is estimated at Rs. 562.11 (food and non-food) as against our estimate of Rs. 561.99 combining beneficiary and non-beneficiary households together. As opposed to general belief, NSS estimate for cereal consumption is on the lower side by nearly 5.14 percent than the figure derived from our estimate. Both the beneficiary and non-beneficiary households ranked ahead of NSS estimate in respect of per capita cereals consumption of households. The monthly per capita consumption of pulses in 2004-05 as revealed by NSS is exceptionally below the estimate made in our enquiry. It is nearly 53.12 percent less than those of our estimate obtained for all the households together. Notably, the differences is about 51.89 percent in case of beneficiary households and 58.13 percent in case of non-beneficiary households. The monthly per capita consumption of sugar, cooking oil, milk products, spices, poultry meat & egg and vegetable as obtained from NSS estimate is uniformly below the levels of our estimates. In respect of total expenditure on food items, the NSS estimate of Rs. 329.93 per capita per month is below the estimate of our enquiry of Rs. 388.19 by as much as 17.66 percent. Hence if we rely on the NSS estimate, it would appear that monthly per capita consumption expenditure on food items increased by 17.66 percent during the period after 2004-05. The likely increase in food intake as evidenced by our consumption expenditure data is more for non-beneficiary households (31.83 percent) than beneficiary households (14.12 percent). However, NSS pattern of consumption expenditure shows relatively larger monthly per capita expenditure on non-food items (Rs. 232.18) compared to the corresponding estimate of our survey meant for both beneficiary (Rs. 163.18) and non-beneficiary (Rs. 216.29) households.

**Table- 3.4B: Monthly consumption expenditure of households**

	West Bengal						
	Monthly per capita (Rs)	Coeffi-cient of variation	Monthly per capita (Rs)	Coeffi-cient of variation	Monthly per capita (Rs)	Coeffi-cient of variation	NSS 2004-05 (Rs)
	Beneficiaries		Non beneficiaries		Aggregate		
<b>Food Item</b>							
Rice	149.91	18.85	152.47	21.50	150.42	19.39	126.23
%	27.78		23.41		26.77		22.46
Wheat	15.72	58.19	16.57	58.23	15.89	58.13	10.12
%	2.91		2.54		2.83		1.80
Other cereals	2.24	200.04	2.62	171.52	2.32	193.32	0.00
%	0.42		0.40		0.41		0.00
Total cereals	167.87	17.37	171.66	21.59	168.63	18.30	160.38
%	31.11		26.36		30.01		28.53
Pulses	24.56	37.89	25.57	31.38	24.76	35.58	16.17
%	4.55		3.93		4.41		2.88
Sugar etc	12.49	27.67	12.66	30.77	12.53	28.27	7.70
%	2.31		1.94		2.23		1.37
Cooking oil	32.46	29.89	34.09	41.29	32.79	32.66	27.44
%	6.01		5.23		5.83		4.88
Lqd.milk	13.62	138.36	20.90	103.84	15.07	130.15	17.38
%	2.52		3.21		2.68		3.09
Milk prods	1.83	193.26	5.08	356.83	2.48	352.45	1.50
%	0.34		0.78		0.44		0.27
Spices	10.69	55.34	14.86	105.97	11.53	77.40	9.80
%	1.98		2.28		2.05		1.74
Poultry-meat &Egg	35.76	40.45	61.95	130.61	41.00	96.53	17.69
%	6.63		9.51		7.30		3.15
Fruits	2.05	98.04	3.81	119.48	2.40	116.33	6.05
%	0.38		0.59		0.43		1.08
Vegetables	45.70	62.46	51.19	65.33	46.80	63.24	47.02
%	8.47		7.86		8.33		8.36
Confectionery	11.65	49.19	15.71	84.66	12.47	64.05	22.91
%	2.16		2.41		2.22		4.08
Total food	376.50	22.81	434.94	41.06	388.19	29.05	329.93
%	69.76		66.79		69.07		58.69
<b>Non Food Items</b>							
Education	25.45	136.33	20.31	166.19	24.42	141.28	18.12
%	4.72		3.12		4.35		3.22
Clothing	27.01	34.10	37.73	80.48	29.16	56.12	29.00
%	5.01		5.79		5.19		5.16
Footwear	8.19	44.96	11.41	102.15	8.83	70.92	0.24
%	1.52		1.75		1.57		0.04
Other items*	75.35	53.37	112.28	113.43	82.74	82.89	135.92
%	13.96		17.24		14.72		24.18
Fuel**	27.18	53.00	34.56	82.29	28.65	63.76	48.90
%	5.04		5.31		5.10		8.70
Total Non food	163.18	37.04	216.29	89.42	173.80	59.61	232.18
%	30.24		33.21		30.93		41.31
Gross total	539.68	23.84	651.23	55.23	561.99	35.89	562.11
%	100.00		100.00		100.00		100.00

\* Other items- Total non-food-(education+clothing+footwear+fuel) only for NSS data

\*\* Fuel=fuel & light total-(electricity+ candle) only for NSS data

Note: Figures of percentages are percentages of gross total

Data furnished above may be used for drawing a statistical picture of the level of living of the sample households. In fact what is regarded a minimum level of living in rural India? The official poverty lines for India and its states are based on a calorie norm of 2400 calories per capita per day for rural areas. If one regards the level of per capita monthly consumption expenditure of Rs. 382.82 (official poverty line for 2004-05 for the state of West Bengal based on expert group method, 1993) as the bare minimum, then beneficiary households lie below the poverty line even after their participation in NREGA scheme.

### 3.5: Variability (CV) and gini ratios of income and consumption

There is considerable amount of variation across the households in the consumption of food and non-food items between beneficiary and non-beneficiary households and consequently in the per capita intake of food and non-food items in the consumption basket. Variation is measured by the technique of coefficient of variation as it is commonly used in empirical literature. It would be seen from table – 3.5 that in respect of per capita monthly consumption of food items, variation across the households is quite larger (41.06 percent) for non-beneficiary households as compared to those of beneficiary households (22.81 percent). In respect of non-food items too, the variation is quite wide (89.42 percent) in case of non-beneficiary households and is quite small (37.04 percent) in case of beneficiary households. As a whole, non-beneficiary households exhibited high degree of variation in monthly per capita consumption expenditure across the households being associated with higher level of mean income as well as expenditure in comparison with beneficiary households. Within the group of food items, variation in consumption expenditure across households is more observed in non-cereal items both in the case of beneficiary and non-beneficiary households with relatively higher degree of variation for the latter group of households.

**Table -3.5: Variability in consumption and income**

Description	West Bengal		
	Beneficiary	Non-beneficiary	Total
Average household Income during the reference year (Rs)	37343.12	49963.22	39867.14
Average household consumption during the reference year (Rs)	28766.24	32494.41	29511.87
Coefficient of variation in income across households	55.04	104.57	75.26
Coefficient of variation in consumption across households	34.78	67.41	45.03
Gini coefficient of income	0.495	0.48	0.49
Gini coefficient of consumption	0.495	0.49	0.49

It is now intended to carry the analysis of disparities in living standards a bit further. The focus is on examining the inequality in income and consumption across the households categorized into beneficiary and non-beneficiary households. The so-called poverty line is drawn in the light of the minimal standard of living which is influenced by the average income level. Given the average level of income, a higher level of inequality will tend to be associated with a higher level of poverty. Poverty measures thus involves an aspect of relative inequality incorporating the distributional aspect apart from the level of income.

Of the several measures of inequality that have been used in empirical literature, the co-efficient of variation, the standard deviation of logarithms, the Gini co-efficient, have been the more favored ones. But since alternate income distributions are not similarly ranked by these measures their relative merits and demerits are widely discussed in the theoretical literature. For our purpose we intend to use co-efficient of variation as a measure of variability and Gini co-efficient (or the Lorenz Ratio as it is frequently called) as the measure of inequality. From the point of view of measuring inequality, the most satisfactory measure is the Gini Co-efficient or Lorenz Ratio (LR) which measures the extent to which the actual distribution deviates from a perfectly egalitarian distribution of consumption or income. The Gini co-efficient is widely used as a measure of inequality because the Gini Co-efficient comparisons are always conclusive, since, one real number must be greater than, equal to, or less than another. But what does it stand for? Higher the value of the Gini Co-efficient, higher the inequality either in income or in consumption.

Estimates of the average household income and consumption during the reference year and their variation across the households in the category of both beneficiary and non-beneficiary are presented in table-3.5. The estimates of the degree of inequalities (Gini Ratios) in income and consumption are also given in the same table. Broadly speaking, the average household consumption expenditure is lower than household income both for beneficiary and non-beneficiary households. There are however variations in income and consumption across the households as captured by the co-efficient of variation, the extent of variation being greater for non-beneficiary households both in income and consumption. The striking conclusion emerging from the table is that higher household income/ consumption is associated with higher degree of variance as happened in the case of non-beneficiary households. In contrast, beneficiary households with comparatively lower level of income and consumption are accompanied by lower variance showing low level of variation in income and consumption. As between household income and consumption, the extent of variation tended to be lower in consumption than in income both in the case of beneficiary and non-beneficiary households.

The Gini ratio as a measure of inequality does not vary between income and consumption. In fact, there are no major instances of savings or dissavings (transfer of income through loans) that could cause the measures of inequality for consumption and income to diverge. However, the degree of inequality both in income and consumption is high and this does not vary much across the beneficiary and non-beneficiary households, although, comparatively it is a little bit smaller for non-beneficiary households. Thus talking from the angle of poverty, measured in terms of both per capita income/expenditure and the degree of inequality, creation of employment opportunities under NREGA has failed to provide any impact on both absolute and relative poverty, either through increase in mean income above the poverty line or through reducing income/consumption inequality. Cross section data across beneficiary and non-beneficiary households does not provide

adequate basis for talking about the dynamics of change taking place in rural areas from the situation of a high to a low incidence of poverty on account of the implementation of NREGA.

### 3.6: Determinants of participation in NREGA–functional analysis

In order to analyse the determinants of participation of members in NREGA, the Logit and Probit functions were used at the households as well as at the member level. In both the Logit and Probit regression models, dummy participation in NREGA (participation = 1, non-participation = 0), has been taken as dependent variable. Tables -3.6.1 and 3.6.2 show the predictor variables (explanatory variables) used and significantly related to the dependent variable. The estimated results are similar for both the models in case of household and member levels analysis. Value of R<sup>2</sup> is also found to be low in both cases.

**Table- 3.6.1: Determinants of participation in NREGA at the household level (Logit and Probit function)**

**Dependent variable: dummy participation in NREGA (Participation=1, Non-participation= 0)**

Variable name	Logit function		Probit function	
	Coefficient	'Z' value	Coefficient	'Z' value
Employment other than NREGA	-0.000726	-1.04	-0.0003993	-0.96
Household income other than NREGA	-0.0000083	-0.93	-0.0000053	-1.02
Household size	0.2926746*	2.03	0.1236554*	1.87
Land ownership dummy	0.4231228	1.04	0.2337272	1.07
Value of household asset	-0.0000043*	-3.61	-0.00000243*	-3.63
Dummy AAY card holding	0.3931668	0.44	0.2853212	0.57
Dummy BPL card holding	0.1547558	0.41	0.065405	0.32
Dummy SC	-0.1081977	-0.26	-0.0128881	-0.06
Dummy ST	-1.599452*	-2.92	-0.8947272*	-2.78
Dummy OBC	-0.4867938	-0.57	-0.2681335	-0.58
Intercept	1.326209*	2.09	0.9694128*	3.06
Number of observations	250		250	
Pseudo R <sup>2</sup>	0.1680		0.1637	
Log likelihood	-104.08778		-104.62065	
LR Chi <sup>2</sup> (10)	42.03		40.96	

Note: \*indicates significant at 5% level of significance

**Table-3.6.2: Determinants of participation in NREGA at the member level (Logit and Probit function)**

**Dependent variable: dummy participation in NREGA (Participation=1, Non-participation= 0)**

Variable name	Logit function		Probit function	
	Coefficient	'Z' value	Coefficient	'Z' value
Age	-0.0081	-1.02	-0.0044	-0.96
Education	-0.0698*	-2.74	-0.0392*	-2.71
Household size	-0.0358	-0.66	-0.0191	-0.66
Dummy AAY card holding	0.5420	1.15	0.3071	1.19
Dummy BPL card holding	0.1272	0.62	0.0833	0.72
Dummy sex	0.0771	0.40	0.0466	0.42
Dummy SC	0.4291*	1.98	0.2434*	2.02
Dummy ST	-1.0661*	-3.32	-0.6285*	-3.27
Dummy OBC	0.3446	0.61	0.1650	0.54
Intercept	1.9906*	4.22	1.1591*	4.43
Number of observations	737		737	
Pseudo R <sup>2</sup>	0.0353		0.0354	
Log likelihood	-351.16742		-351.14642	
LR Chi <sup>2</sup> (9)	25.73		25.77	

Note: \*indicates significant at 5% level of significance



At the household level the predictor variables which were found significant are household size, asset value, dummy for ST. Household size has a positive coefficient suggesting that the larger the household size, the higher the probability of participation in NREGA. The dummy for ST has a negative and significant coefficient implying that the STs are less likely to participate in NREGA relative to 'others'. Asset holding of household is negatively related to the household's participation in NREGA and also turned out to be statistically significant. This suggest that the larger the asset holding, the lower is the probability of participation in NREGA. The overall specification of the model is validated by the log likelihood based chi square test.

Member level Logit Probit estimates of regression coefficients are reported in Table -3.6.2. At the member level analysis the predictor variables included were age, education, household size, AAY card holding dummy, BPL card holding dummy, sex dummy, dummy for SC, dummy for ST and dummy for OBC. The results are similar for both the models. Among the predictor variables, the coefficients of level of education and caste dummies for SC and ST turned out to be statistically significant. Education, as expected is negatively related to NREGA participation. The dummy for SC has a positive and significant coefficient suggesting that the SCs are more likely to participate in NREGA works. On the other, the dummy for ST has a statistically significant negative coefficient which implied that STs are less likely to participate in NREGA. The log likelihood based chi-square test used for testing goodness of fit suggests that the model used is a good predictor model.

Overall, the Logit Probit analysis conducted at both household and member levels suggest that a set of household specific characteristics such as caste (whether a member of SC, ST or 'others'), educational attainment, number of members in the household (household size), household asset holding explain the household's participation status (whether participating in NREGA or not). Our econometric exercise confirms one thing that the targeting of the NREGA programme was not unsatisfactory. The disadvantaged groups proxied by the SC and ST had significantly high probabilities of participation in NREGA. This does not however imply that relatively affluent households were excluded. In fact, the probability of participation was higher in case of SC and ST households.

The analysis has also been undertaken with the help of OLS (Ordinary Least Square) method. For OLS regression analysis at household level, number of days per household worked in NREGA is taken as the dependent variable. Among the explanatory variables, four are continuous variables and seven are dummy variables. The continuous variables are employment other than NREGA (no of working days), household income other than NREGA (Rs per household), household size (number), household assets (Rs per household). The dummy variables are land holding dummy (have land = 1, otherwise = 0) AAY card holding (having AAY card = 1, otherwise = 0), BPL card holding (having BPL card = 1, otherwise = 0), schedule caste dummy (SC = 1, otherwise = 0), schedule tribe dummy (ST = 1, otherwise = 0), OBC dummy (OBC =1, otherwise = 0). The results of the household level OLS estimates are presented in table -3.6.3.

**Table-3.6.3: Determinants of participation in NREGA (household level OLS regression)**  
**Dependent variable: no of days per household worked in NREGA**

Explanatory variables	Coefficient	Standard error of estimate	T value	Significant/insignificant
Intercept	47.4130	8.2650	5.7366	Sig.
Employment other than NREGA (no of working days)	0.0205	0.0120	1.7440	Insig.
Household income other than NREGA (Rs.)	-0.0003	0.0000	-1.8650	Insig.
Household size	-0.1120	1.8280	-0.0610	Insig.
Land holding dummy	5.7960	5.1430	1.1270	Insig.
Value of household assets (Rs.)	0.00009	0.0000	3.6990	Insig.
Dummy for AAY card holding (Y=1, N=0)	5.7950	10.4770	0.5530	Insig.
Dummy for BPL card holding (Y=1, N=0)	1.8030	5.1080	0.3530	Insig.
Caste dummy for SC (Y=1, N=0)	-7.3460	5.3320	-1.3780	Insig.
Caste dummy for ST (Y=1, N=0)	-11.5140	9.8380	-1.1700	Insig.
Caste dummy for OBC (Y=1, N=0)	-11.9180	11.7570	-1.0140	Insig.

R<sup>2</sup> = 0.146      No of observations = 199  
 F value 3.228 with 10 and 189 df.

**Table-3.6.4: Determinants of participation in NREGA (member level OLS regression)**  
**Dependent variable: no of days per household worked in NREGA**

Explanatory variables	Coefficient	Standard error of estimate	T value	Significant/insignificant
Intercept	38.342	5.394	7.108	Sig.
Age in years	-0.075	0.089	-0.836	Insig.
Level of Education	1.350	1.167	1.156	Insig.
Household size (no)	-0.472	0.677	-0.697	Insig.
Dummy for AAY card holding (Y=1, N=0)	-7.580	6.001	-1.263	Insig.
Dummy for BPL card holding (Y=1, N=0)	2.602	2.569	1.013	Insig.
Sex dummy (male=1, female=0)	-1.137	2.179	-0.522	Insig.
Dummy for SC (Y=1, N=0)	-9.321	2.120	-4.397	Sig.
Dummy for ST (Y=1, N=0)	-7.793	4.163	-1.872	Insig.
Dummy for OBC (Y=1, N=0)	-5.054	5.276	-0.958	Insig.

R<sup>2</sup> = 0.073      No of observations = 348  
 F value 2.947 with 9 and 339 df.

It can be seen that although some of the explanatory variables have positive coefficients, none of the coefficients are found to be statistically significant. The variables which are positively related to the dependent variable are land holding dummy and dummies for AAY card holding and BPL card holding. The positive coefficient of land holding dummy suggested that households with land holdings are likely to have more NREGA working days relative to others. The positive coefficients for AAY and BPL card holding implied that holding of BPL cards or APL cards influenced employment under NREGA. Variables which have negative influence on NREGA employment are household size, household income other than NREGA and caste dummies for SC, ST and OBC. Caste dummies have negative coefficients, suggesting that SC, ST and OBCs have lesser participation days in NREGA relative to other castes. Again larger the household size and larger the household income other than NREGA, the lower is the NREGA participation days.

At the member level analysis (table-3.6.4), the explanatory variables included the continuous variables like age (in years), level of education, household size (number) and the dummy variables inclusive of dummy for AAY card holding, dummy for BPL card holding, sex dummy, dummies for SC, ST and OBC. At the individual member level only one variable i.e. dummy for the SC was found to statistically influence the NREGA employment. Here again, SC dummy is negatively related to NREGA employment days.

## Chapter–IV

### Work Profile under NREGA, Wage Structure and Migration Issues

The present chapter deals with the issues of wage structure and migration after presenting a work profile under NREGA. The examination of the issue of wage structure dealt with wage differentials under NREGA and its comparison with the minimum wage provided under the Statutory Minimum Wage Act. It also includes the analysis of wage differentials in different activities among beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries. One important issue involved in this context is the wage rate offered under the NREGA. Depending upon the prevailing wages in the village and outside the households would take decision regarding out-migration. Thus the issue of labour migration after the implementation of NREGA is also analyzed with reference to the data obtained from the sample districts.

#### 4.1: Work profile under NREGA

The act provides that every rural household will be given 100 days of wage employment during a financial year. In order to get the employment an applicant has to be registered who will be issued a Job Card. He has to apply for work and then it is the duty of the implementing agency to provide work to the applicant within 15 days from the receipt of the application. There is also a provision for unemployment allowance by the State Government in case the Government fails to provide work within 15 days of his application seeking employment. In the following section, work profile under NREGA is presented describing caste-wise data regarding number of members per household employed, number of days per household employed, wage rate obtained, average distance of work place from the residence and assets created under NREGA including their durability.

#### 4.2: How successful has been NREGA providing 100 day's employment (to the registered families at their door steps)

As shown in table–4.1, the size of working members employed per household numbered 2 on an average in the state. Across the districts the number of workers per household employed in the NREGA works varied from 1 to 2. Households employing only one worker are observed in the districts of Nadia and Howrah belonging to phase 2 and phase 3 districts respectively. Across the caste categories, greater size of worker employed under NREGA is located in case of scheduled caste households followed by general caste and schedule tribe households respectively. Evidently, despite making provision of 100 days of employment in a financial year, it is seen that there have been wide deviation in terms of actual employment generation. Among the selected districts, households completing 100 days of employment are experienced by Purulia district and the figure stood at 5 per cent of households who got employment. In all, for all the sample districts together, the proportion of households completing 100 days of work constituted 1.00 per cent of total sample

beneficiary households, similar to the estimate obtained from secondary level macro-data for the year 2010-11

In terms of person days employed under NREGA works, the average number of person days employed per household was of the order of 54 days in the state which is far away from the envisaged 100 days. Person days employed per household was highest for general caste households (59 days) followed by schedule caste (50days), scheduled tribe (47 days) and OBC (45 days). The number of person days employed per household for women was about 24 days which remained well below their male counterpart in all the categories of households.

**Table-4.1: The work profile under NREGA (Reference period – Jan-Dec 2009)**

Characteristics		Howrah	Jalpaiguri	Malda	Nadia	Purulia	West Bengal
No of members per hh employed during the year	Aggregate	1.18	2.10	1.83	1.30	2.35	1.74
	General	1.21	2.00	1.50	1.33	2.26	1.65
	SC	1.00	2.20	1.93	1.30	2.64	1.89
	ST	1.00	2.00	1.67	-	2.00	1.62
	OBC	-	2.00	1.60	0.50	-	1.44
	Women	0.65	0.83	0.78	0.35	1.20	0.76
	Men	0.53	1.27	1.05	0.95	1.15	0.98
No of days per hh employed during the year	Aggregate	42.80	75.70	39.60	32.50	79.20	54.00
	General	42.50	73.30	22.00	35.70	91.70	58.60
	SC	39.00	78.50	43.70	20.70	54.30	50.00
	ST	65.00	76.70	24.70	-	48.00	46.50
	OBC	-	65.00	42.40	42.00	-	44.80
	Women	25.80	27.00	18.70	5.70	40.90	23.60
	Men	17.00	48.70	20.90	26.80	38.30	30.40
% of hh employed 100 or more days		0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	5.00	1.00
Wage rate obtained (Rs)	Aggregate	90.00	90.00	81.00	81.00	81.00	84.42
	General	90.00	90.00	81.00	81.00	81.00	84.85
	SC	90.00	90.00	81.00	81.00	81.00	84.13
	ST	90.00	90.00	81.00	-	81.00	84.18
	OBC	-	90.00	81.00	81.00	-	82.38
	Women	90.00	90.00	81.00	81.00	81.00	84.47
Average distance from residence where employed (Kms)		0.80	0.74	0.68	0.63	1.23	0.80

The district wise figures for person days of employment per household are also summarized in table- 4.1 which shows considerable variation across the districts. Among the selected districts, Purulia the phase 1 district is showing the highest number of person days of employment (79 days per household) followed by another phase 1 district called Jalpaiguri (76 days per household). For other selected districts, employment per household varied in between 33 days to 43 days. Caste-wise general caste households among the selected districts, received highest employment in Purulia (92 days) and lowest employment (22 days) in malda, both are phase 1 districts. For scheduled caste households, the district of Jalpaiguri recorded highest employment days (79 days per household)

followed by the Purulia district (54 days per household), while the district of Nadia, phase 2 district showed lowest employment days (21 days). Scheduled tribe households received highest employment (79 days per household) in Jalpaiguri followed by Howrah (65 days per household) and Purulia (48 days per household). Other backward classes (OBCs) obtained highest employment in Jalpaiguri district (65 days per household) followed by Malda (42days per household) and Nadia (42 days per household). Thus given the fact that majority of the poor in our country are either SCs,STs, or OBCs, the coverage in terms of employment provided per household is rather poor for SC, ST and OBC in the selected districts, the exception being the district of Jalpaiguri which belongs to phase 1 district.

#### **4.3: Nature of assets created and their durability**

Eight types of works are permitted to be carried out under the NREGA. There is however provision for undertaking any other new work, other than the permissible eight with the concurrence of the central ministry of rural development. Evidently, the works undertaken in the sample districts are consistent with the eight special types of works listed in the NREGA. The works undertaken consisted of (i) rural connectivity (ii) Flood control and protection (iii) water conservation and water harvesting (iv) drought proofing (v) micro-irrigation works (vi) provision of irrigation facility to land owned by panchayat (vii) renovation of traditional water bodies (viii) land development and (ix) any other work approved by the ministry of rural development. As observed in the study, overall in the state, the works undertaken mainly related to rural connectivity followed by renovation of traditional water bodies and water conservation and water harvesting. However, there existed variation across the sample districts in respect of works undertaken under NREGA. In the district of Jalpaiguri equal importance was attached to rural connectivity, renovation of traditional water bodies are land development where one-third of the sample households were found to be employed in each of the activities. In the district of Malda, majority of the households were employed in rural connectivity works followed by renovation of traditional water bodies. In Purulia works given priority were rural connectivity followed by renovation of traditional water bodies and micro-irrigation works where households employed accounted for 50.00 percent, 25.00 percent and 19.12 percent respectively. In Nadia, proportion of households employed accounted for the largest share in rural connectivity (45.35 percent) followed by water conservation and water harvesting (32.56 percent) and micro-irrigation works (20.93 percent). In the district of Howrah, priority was given to rural connectivity where 51.67 percent of households were found to be employed and the next in importance was water conservation and water harvesting in which 33.33 percent of households were employed. Thus works under NREGA in the state of West Bengal were mainly concentrated on irrigational development and water conservation related activities apart from the major emphasis on rural connectivity to provide all weather access road. NREGA works in the state should yield fruits in future through exerting influence on agricultural productivity.

One issue that needs attention is the quality of the assets created under NREGA works. In fact, quality works would ensure increase in land productivity as well as labour productivity. In this regard, the opinions received from the sample beneficiary households are summarized in table-4.2 quality of the assets is ranked in the sequence of very good, good, bad and worst. Evidently, the maximum households in all the sample districts ranked ‘good’ about the assets created under NREGA. The incidence of non-reporting households regarding the quality of assets is quite large in Howrah, the phase 3 district in respect of implementation of the scheme.

**Table-4.2: The activity in which employed under NREGA and the quality of assets created**

		(Reference period – Jan-Dec 2009) (% of hh)					
Characteristics		Howrah	Jalpaiguri	Malda	Nadia	Purulia	West Bengal
Name of the activity under which employed	1. Rural connectivity	51.67	33.00	55.00	45.35	50.00	47.01
	2. Flood control and protection	-	-	-	-	-	-
	3. Water conservation and water harvesting	33.33	-	-	32.56	-	14.37
	4. Drought proofing	-	-	-	-	-	-
	5. Micro irrigation works	-	-	-	20.93	19.12	9.28
	6. Provision of irrigation facility to land owned by (Panchayat)	-	-	-	1.16	-	0.30
	7. Renovation of traditional water bodies	-	33.33	45.00	-	25.00	19.16
	8. Land development	-	33.33	-	-	-	5.99
	9. Any other activity approved by the Ministry of Rural Development	15.00	-	-	-	5.88	3.89
Quality of the assets created through NREGA activities	1. Very good	-	45.00	-	-	20.00	13.00
	2. Good	42.50	50.00	82.50	92.50	75.00	68.50
	3. Bad	7.50	-	-	-	-	1.50
	4. Worst	-	-	-	-	-	-
	5. Not reported	50.00	5.00	17.50	7.50	5.00	17.00
Average unemployment allowance received by the households for not getting work under NREGA after registration (Rs.per hh)		-	-	12.12	-	-	2.43

It has been specified in the Act that if the applicant seeking employment is not provided such employment within 15 days of his application he/she shall be entitled to receive a daily unemployment allowance which will be paid by the state government. As specified in the Act, the rate of unemployment allowance must be no less than one-fourth of the wage rate for the first thirty days, and not less than one-half of the wage rate after that. It has to be paid not later than fifteen days from the date on which it became due for payment. The present study however noticed that the unemployment allowance was paid only to a few workers in Malda district. Thus the reluctance of the state government to pay unemployment allowance was noted in West Bengal.

#### **4.4: Wage differentials under NREGA and its comparison with minimum wage Act**

According to NREGA Act, persons working under the scheme are entitled to receive the statutory minimum wage fixed by the state government applicable to agricultural workers in the

state, unless the central government overrides this by notifying a different wage rate. In West Bengal, the state government has fixed the minimum wage of Rs. 80.98 during the financial year 2008-09 which is enhanced to Rs. 96.00 in year 2009-10. The unskilled wages offered under NREGA ranged from as low as Rs. 62.00 to Rs. 100.00 during the period between 2006-07 and 2009-10. During the year 2009-10, NREGA wages varied between Rs. 81.00 and Rs. 100.00.

The primary data collected from the sample districts presented in table – 4.1 reveals that the average per day wages obtained by the sample beneficiaries under the scheme varied from Rs. 82.38 to Rs. 84.85 across castes of households. At the aggregate level, for the state as a whole, the average wage rate received by households stood at Rs. 84.42. Across the districts, wage rates received in aggregate are higher in Howrah and Jalpaiguri districts as compared to State average whereas those in Malda, Nadia and Purulia are lower. Noticeably, the women workers received the same wages as those of males at the rate of Rs. 84.47 per day. In all the sample districts, wages received under NREGA were found to be less than the stipulated minimum wage of Rs. 96.00. This is basically due to the fact that persons working under NREGA are mostly given piece rate. Hence wages received under NREGA varied from person to person depending on quantum of work done. Obviously, the underperformance of workers caused them to receive wages less than the stipulated minimum wage. However, NREGA wages were higher than market wages for agricultural workers in the state and this has led to distort the wage labour market by exerting upward pressure on market wages.

The average distance of the work places from the residences of workers was found to be within 5 km. as provided under the Act. The average distance of work place from residence is on an average 0.80 km. The distance is relatively higher in Purulia district (1.23 km.)

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

Wage rates accruing to different activities among workers in beneficiary and non-beneficiary households are presented in table–4.3. These data relate to the wage rate received by the workers. With increasing casualisation of the workforce in rural areas, the incidence of agricultural casual labour is increasing, majority of them coming from marginal land holdings households. On the other hand, with the diversification of activities, diversification of workforce into the non-agricultural sector is taking place in the rural labour market. The employment potentials created under NREGA has been the added dimension in the rural labour market creating upward pressure in agricultural wage rate. Thus agricultural and non-agricultural wage rates of both males and females are presented (table– 4.3). Evidently, non- agricultural casual labour wage rates compares unfavourably to agricultural wage rates for males, while the wage gap between the non-agricultural and agricultural activities for females is showing close to each other. The ratio of non-agricultural to agricultural wage rates of males works out to 1.17 while for females the ratio is close to 1.0. Across the category of households, the ratio stood at 1.19 for male beneficiary and 1.10 for male non-beneficiary counterpart. In case of females, non-agriculture agriculture wage ratio varied

prominently across beneficiary and non-beneficiary households, the ratio being 1.02 for beneficiary and 0.84 for non-beneficiary households.

The gender issue has figured prominently in respect of receiving wage rate both in agricultural and non-agricultural activities. For agricultural operations, on an average, female wage rate formed 85.00 percent of male wage rate while for non-agricultural activities, female wage rates fell behind male wage rate by 72.55 percent. In receiving agricultural wage rates, male-female differences are sharper for non-beneficiary households as compared to beneficiary households. Migrant workers received relatively higher wage rate. Here again, wage received by an average female worker was lower than the wage received by a male worker. Under the NREGA females are paid the same wage rates as males which stood at Rs. 84.38. It is noticeable that NREGA wage rates are significantly higher than market wage rates for agricultural casual labour. This is especially noticeable in the case of females who are paid markedly lower market wage rates as compared to males in agricultural activities working as casual labourer. As a whole female–male wage ratio for agricultural wages showed lower gender disparity compared to non-agricultural wages while under NREGA wage payments, gender disparity is totally removed.

Variations in wage rates in different activities across gender for beneficiary and non-beneficiary households are also presented in table–4.3. Variation is examined by calculating the coefficient of variation (CV). Evidently, variation in agricultural wages appear to be lower than in the case of non-agricultural wages both for males and females. Across beneficiary and non-beneficiary households, the observed variation does not differ indicating higher variation in non-agricultural wages as compared to agricultural wages both for males and females. In respect of NREGA wage rates, the coefficient of variation is estimated to be the same for males (5.61 percent) and females (5.74 percent) and the variation whatever observed is due to different wage rates prevailing in the same financial year.

**Table- 4.3: Wage differentials among different activities**

**Howrah**

Occupation		Beneficiaries		Non beneficiaries		Aggregate	
		Average	CV	Average	CV	Average	CV
Wage rate in agricultural casual labour (Rs)	Male	89.62	2.19	90.00	0.00	89.68	2.00
	Female	87.50	5.08	86.67	6.66	87.39	5.14
Wage rate in non agri casual labour (Rs)	Male	92.94	24.96	88.50	28.19	92.21	25.31
	Female	51.50	56.00	25.50	47.65	47.17	60.13
Wage rate in public work programmes (Rs)	Male	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Female	-	-	-	-	-	-
Wage rate earned by migrant workers (Rs)	Male	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Female	-	-	-	-	-	-
Wage rate under NREGA (Rs)	Male	91.35	4.87	-	-	91.28	4.87
	Female	89.88	5.71	-	-	86.91	5.71
Any other work (Rs)	Male	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Female	-	-	-	-	-	-



**Table- 4.3: Wage differentials among different activities****Jalpaiguri**

Occupation		Beneficiaries		Non beneficiaries		Aggregate	
		Average	CV	Average	CV	Average	CV
Wage rate in agricultural casual labour (Rs)	Male	85.00	8.32	90.00	-	85.16	8.23
	Female	82.33	7.44	-	-	82.33	7.44
Wage rate in non agri casual labour (Rs)	Male	112.50	13.28	150.00	-	113.57	14.11
	Female	98.00	21.48	-	-	98.00	21.48
Wage rate in public work programmes (Rs)	Male	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Female	-	-	-	-	-	-
Wage rate earned by migrant workers (Rs)	Male	133.83	23.11	62.50	13.33	120.87	32.86
	Female	120.00	-	-	-	120.00	-
Wage rate under NREGA (Rs)	Male	90.00	0.00	-	-	90.00	0.00
	Female	90.00	0.00	-	-	90.00	0.00
Any other work (Rs)	Male	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Female	-	-	-	-	-	-

**Table- 4.3: Wage differentials among different activities****Malda**

Occupation		Beneficiaries		Non-beneficiaries		Aggregate	
		Average	CV	Average	CV	Average	CV
Wage rate in agricultural casual labour (Rs)	Male	74.18	5.42	76.36	4.23	74.58	5.30
	Female	55.64	11.58	51.8	6.98	54.95	11.25
Wage rate in non agri casual labour (Rs)	Male	85.24	16.94	83.93	10.44	85.04	16.08
	Female	59.29	12.59	55	0.00	58.75	12.10
Wage rate in public work programmes (Rs)	Male	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Female	-	-	-	-	-	-
Wage rate earned by migrant workers (Rs)	Male	128.21	49.44	104.00	10.42	121.84	45.31
	Female	-	-	-	-	-	-
Wage rate under NREGA (Rs)	Male	81.52	3.68	-	-	81.52	3.68
	Female	80.5	3.58	-	-	80.50	3.58
Any other work (Rs)	Male	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Female	-	-	-	-	-	-

**Table -4.3: Wage differentials among different activities****Nadia**

Occupation		Beneficiaries		Non beneficiaries		Aggregate	
		Average	CV	Average	CV	Average	CV
Wage rate in agricultural casual labour (Rs)	Male	77.06	5.90	80.00	0.00	77.46	5.60
	Female	80.00	0.00	80.00	-	80.00	0.00
Wage rate in non agri casual labour (Rs)	Male	122.40	43.62	103.33	14.78	118.31	40.49
	Female	137.50	12.86	-	-	137.50	12.86
Wage rate in public work programmes (Rs)	Male	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Female	-	-	-	-	-	-
Wage rate earned by migrant workers (Rs)	Male	89.44	14.37	-	-	89.44	14.37
	Female	-	-	-	-	-	-
Wage rate under NREGA (Rs)	Male	81.00	0.00	-	-	81.00	0.00
	Female	81.00	0.00	-	-	81.00	0.00
Any other work (Rs)	Male	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Female	-	-	-	-	-	-

**Table- 4.3: Wage differentials among different activities****Purulia**

Occupation		Beneficiaries		Non beneficiaries		Aggregate	
		Average	CV	Average	CV	Average	CV
Wage rate in agricultural casual labour (Rs)	Male	70.00	0.00	70.00	0.00	70.00	0.00
	Female	58.25	5.36	59.00	1.81	58.35	5.04
Wage rate in non agri casual labour (Rs)	Male	76.55	12.25	73.85	8.36	75.98	11.61
	Female	60.20	16.69	62.86	4.25	60.78	14.79
Wage rate in public work programmes (Rs)	Male	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Female	-	-	-	-	-	-
Wage rate earned by migrant workers (Rs)	Male	83.33	-	175.00	-	129.17	50.18
	Female	-	-	-	-	-	-
Wage rate under NREGA (Rs)	Male	81.80	7.18	-	-	81.80	7.18
	Female	80.78	1.02	-	-	80.78	1.02
Any other work (Rs)	Male	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Female	-	-	-	-	-	-

**Table- 4.3: Wage differentials among different activities****West Bengal**

Occupation		Beneficiaries		Non beneficiaries		Aggregate	
		Average	CV	Average	CV	Average	CV
Wage rate in agricultural casual labour (Rs)	Male	77.49	10.44	77.19	9.59	77.45	10.30
	Female	67.05	20.95	60.45	21.05	66.23	21.18
Wage rate in non agri casual labour (Rs)	Male	91.92	26.57	85.01	23.63	90.84	26.30
	Female	68.35	39.77	50.50	35.23	65.90	40.58
Wage rate in public work programmes (Rs)	Male	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Female	-	-	-	-	-	-
Wage rate earned by migrant workers (Rs)	Male	121.25	37.31	94.50	38.16	116.10	38.40
	Female	120.00	-	-	-	120.00	-
Wage rate under NREGA (Rs)	Male	84.38	5.61	-	-	84.38	5.61
	Female	84.42	5.74	-	-	84.42	5.74
Any other work (Rs)	Male	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Female	-	-	-	-	-	-

#### **4.6: How has NREGA affected labour migration (labour migrating back into village and migrated out of village), direction of migration (rural to urban and vice versa)**

One major concern particularly, in rain-fed areas is distress-induced seasonal migration. NREGA scheme provides local opportunities for employment and thus workers do not need to migrate to other areas. Manual works provided under NREGA are thus expected to bring down the level of out-migration. It can be seen that among the five surveyed districts, out-migration has taken place mainly in three districts viz. Jalpaiguri, Malda and Nadia and marginally in Purulia district. Of course such migration has been the result of lack of employment opportunities within the village. The number of family members (per beneficiary household) who migrated due to non-availability of work in the village under NREGA (table-4.4) was seen to be very low (below 1). Among the four districts where out-migration has taken place, the number per household was comparatively higher in Jalpaiguri district (0.13) followed by Malda (0.07), Nadia (0.06) and Purulia (0.005). At the same time, with the commencement of NREGA works which has ensured employment in the native places, in-migration also has taken place in the same districts where out-migration occurred. The degree of in-migration was also seen to be lower similar to that of out-migration measured in terms of number of family members per household migrated. The net effect in respect of migration has thus been negligible even if NREGA ensured employment within the village.

**Table-4.4: The migration incidents recorded during the Reference period–Jan-Dec 2009**

Characteristics		Howrah	Jalpaiguri	Malda	Nadia	Purulia	West Bengal
No of members migrated from the village because of not getting work under NREGA even after registration (per household)		-	0.13 (23)	0.07 (14)	0.06 (9)	0.005 (1)	0.05 (47)
No of out-migrated members returned back to village because of getting work in NREGA (per household)		-	0.13 (23)	0.06 (13)	0.06 (9)	0.005 (1)	0.05 (46)
In the case some members returned back to the village to work under NREGA where were they earlier working (% of returned members)	Nearby village	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Nearby town	-	-	-	54.6	-	17.14
	Same district	-	-	33.33	18.2	-	14.29
	Same state	-	-	-	27.2	-	8.57
	Other state	-	100.00	66.7	-	-	60.00
	Other country	-	-	-	-	-	-
In the case some members returned back to the village to work under NREGA which activity earlier working in (% of returned members)	Const/manufacturing/mining	-	84.62	91.67	-	-	70.21
	Trading/services and transport	-	15.38	-	-	-	8.51
	Private work/self business	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Other government work	-	-	8.33	-	-	2.13
	Agriculture labour	-	-	-	100.00	-	19.15
	Any other	-	-	-	-	-	-
Year in which shifted (% of shifted hh)	Shifted last year	-	86.67	88.89	81.82	-	85.71
	Shifted before last year	-	13.33	11.11	18.18	-	14.29
Is your family better off now compared to previous occupation (% of shifted hh)	yes	-	100.00	88.89	100.00	-	97.14
	no	-	-	11.11	-	-	2.86

Note: figures in brackets indicate absolute number of members migrated

Among the sample districts where some members of households have returned back to the village to work under NREGA, the destination of migrating members were mostly other states (cent percent in Jalpaiguri, 66.7 percent in Malda) to work in construction works, manufacturing and mining (84.62 percent in Jalpaiguri and 91.67 percent in Malda). The exception is Nadia district where out-migrating members migrated in nearby town (54.6 percent) to work as agriculture labourers in nearby villages surrounding the town. Out-migrating members mostly shifted to the village last year (86.67 percent in Jalpaiguri, 88.89 percent in Malda and 81.82 percent in Nadia) with the commencement of NREGA works. Majority of the shifting households reported that they are remaining better off now migrating back into the village compared to the previous occupation wherein they were engaged (cent percent in Jalpaiguri and Nadia and 88.89 percent in Malda) (table-4.4).

## Chapter–V

### The Functioning of NREGA–Qualitative Aspects

NREGA addressed many of the limitations and weaknesses of earlier wage-employment programmes through introducing several features in its design. The NREGA, being a demand-driven programme, if implemented properly, fund requirement of the programme while rising initially, will fall over time with the fall in demand for work on the part of labourers. Since its launch the programme has crossed a number of years and it is now high time to examine its performance. The present chapters deals with key issues of implementation and examine the performance of the programme based on the experiences of the participating households in the programme. In this chapter, after assessing households' asset position and borrowing, qualitative responses of the beneficiary households on some aspects of NREGA are presented and analyzed.

#### 5.1: Household assets holdings

The asset position of borrowing households is an important indicator of economic well-being of the household. Further, economic status of household is an important correlate of participation in NREGA. The value of assets owned by households is shown in table-5.1. It can be seen that category-wise as well as in the aggregate, assets per beneficiary household was substantially lower than that of non-beneficiary household. The total value of assets of non-beneficiary household is higher by 3 times than that of beneficiary households (Rs.89050.18 per household). This simply asserts that asset base and living standard of the non-beneficiary households is better than beneficiary households.

**Table 5.1: Assets holdings (Rs per household)**

Asset Category	Beneficiaries	Non-Beneficiaries	Aggregate
Land	40319.00	131000.00	58455.20
House Property	35645.00	112810.00	51078.00
Live stock	3322.50	4126.00	3483.20
Agricultural Impliments	590.00	3394.00	1150.80
Consumer Assets	3067.25	8698.00	4193.40
Business assets	1032.50	1700.00	1166.00
Ornaments	3882.50	13370.00	5780.00
Utensils	1168.43	1862.90	1307.32
Others	23.00	92.00	36.80
Total	89050.18	277052.90	126650.72

Among different types of assets, land property stood the highest for both beneficiary and non-beneficiary households. The value of land property per household was of the order of Rs.40319.00 and Rs.131000.00 for beneficiary and non-beneficiary households respectively. Thus non-beneficiary households possessed land 3.25 times higher than the corresponding figure of

beneficiary households. Obviously, owing to substantially higher land-base, non-beneficiary households are found to have invested more on house property, consumer assets and ornaments. Further, owing to larger sized land holdings, non-beneficiary households invested more in agricultural implements and livestock as compared to beneficiary households. Overall, the comparison reveals that the beneficiary households are poorer than non-beneficiary households.

## **5.2: Household status on borrowings and their financial vulnerability**

When income falls short of the requirement for meeting expenses like daily consumption need and certain other non-recurring expenses for social ceremony, purchase of land, livestock and other assets, consumer durables, construction of house, health treatment etc. households are compelled to borrow the required amount of money either from institutional or non-institutional sources.

### **Household status on borrowings**

The data relating to borrowing of sample households (source-wise and purpose-wise) are presented in table-5.2. The examination of borrowing data reveals that the average amount of loan availed by the beneficiary households (Rs.2399 per household) is higher than that of non-beneficiary households (Rs.1962 per household). It can be seen that for beneficiary households (table-5.2), the important source of loan is trader-cum-moneylender (32.95 per cent) followed by institutional sources (32.56 per cent). For those households, other important sources are friends and relatives (12.30 per cent). In case of non-beneficiaries, the main source of loan is friends and relatives (36.19 per cent) followed by traders-cum-moneylenders (31.29 per cent) and institutional source (25.48 per cent). It is however revealing that beneficiary households have better access to institutional loan but have used multiple sources of loan, institutional loan being one of them.

Purpose-wise examination of borrowing data reveals that beneficiary households borrowed 23.24 per cent of the total amount for the purpose of construction of house and 18.57 per cent for the purpose of meeting daily consumption expenditure. For such households, it was 15.53 per cent of total amount borrowed for the purpose of meeting the expenses of social ceremonies. The most important purpose for taking loan is 'others' (53.92 per cent) for the non-beneficiary households. The amount borrowed for the purpose of investment i.e. purchase of assets is relatively higher for beneficiary households (14.07 per cent) than the non-beneficiary households (11.21 per cent).

**Table – 5.2: Borrowings by sample households (Rs. Per household)**

Source and Purpose		Beneficiaries	Non beneficiaries	Aggregate
Source of loan	Institutional loan (banks)	781	500	724.8
	Traders-cum-Money Lenders	790.5	614	755.2
	Commission Agent	17.5	0	14
	Landlord/Employer	75	0	60
	Friends/Relatives	295	710	378
	Others	440	138	379.6
	Total	2399	1962	2311.6
Purpose of loan	Daily consumption	445.5	324	421.2
	Social ceremony	372.5	0	298
	Purchase of land, livestock or other assets	337.5	220	314
	Consumer durables	0	0	0
	Construction of house	557.5	30	452
	Health treatment	245	330	262
	Others	441	1058	564.4
	Total	2399	1962	2311.6
Rate of interest (percent per annum)		36.26	28.82	34.94

The rate of interest which the beneficiary households had to pay is 36.26 per cent. Non-beneficiary households had to pay relatively lower rate of interest which amounts to 28.82 per cent. As the beneficiary households availed loan in the main from traders-cum-moneylenders they had to pay higher rate of interest. In contrast as the non-beneficiary households, in major, obtained loans from friends and relatives, the interest rate charged is reasonable at low and hence they had to pay relatively lower interest rate.

### **Household strength on borrowing and other household assets**

The respondents were asked questions relating to availability of various formal and informal institutions including the existence of self-help-groups supplying credit to the respondent households. The respondents were also asked whether they are having account in bank/ post office, having ownership of bonds/ shares and having life insurance policy. The responses on these aspects are presented in table-5.3. Evidently, 40 per cent of households each in beneficiary and non-beneficiary groups have the facility of co-operative credit society in the village. The family members of 10.50 per cent beneficiary and 14.00 per cent of non-beneficiary households possess membership of the co-operative credit society. Majority of the beneficiary (90 per cent) and non-beneficiary (90 per cent) households reported the existence of informal credit society/ self-help-groups (SHGs) in the village for availing credit facility. However, family members of 42 per cent beneficiary and 32 per cent non-beneficiary households possessed membership such credit societies/ SHGs. Having ownership of account in bank/ post office is reported by all beneficiaries (100.00 per cent) and non-beneficiary (90 per cent) households.

**Table 5.3: Household strength on borrowing and other household assets (% of households)**

Occupation	Beneficiaries	Non-beneficiaries	Aggregate
Doing wage work to those whom they are indebted	8	1	9
%	4.00	2.00	3.60
Availability of co-operative credit society in village	80	20	100
%	40.00	40.00	40.00
Family member being member of such society	21	7	28
%	10.50	14.00	11.20
Availability of informal credit society/SHG in village	180	45	225
%	90.00	90.00	90.00
Family member being member of such society	84	16	100
%	42.00	32.00	40.00
Having account in a bank/post office/other institution	200	45	245
%	100.00	90.00	89.60
Having any stocks/bond/shares/other similar assets	7	0	7
%	3.50	0.00	2.80
Having life insurance policy	26	11	37
%	13.00	22.00	14.80
Total Households	200	50	250
%	100.00	100.00	100.00

A total of 22 per cent of non-beneficiary households has life insurance policy as against 13 per cent of beneficiary households. It is however, unpleasant to note that in case of 4 per cent of beneficiary households and 2 per cent of non-beneficiary households, loans are repaid through rendering labour services as wage labour by their family members. Under the system, the inherent form of exploitation cannot be ruled out.

### **5.3: Some qualitative aspects of NREGA**

Here in this section attempt has been made to assess the performance of NREGA based on the responses received from the participants on various aspects of NREGA. The qualitative questions asked to the sample beneficiaries covered various issues of NREGA which included issuance of job cards, work applications, payment of wages, worksite facilities, monitoring of work, quality of assets created, labour migration, respondents' awareness about NREGA implementation and impact of NREGA on food security. The answers to these questions are documented in table-5.4.

#### **5.3.1: Job card issues and work applications**

As per the guidelines, it is the duty of the Gram Panchayet to issue job card with photograph to every registered household free of cost. The job card ensures that workers are in possession of written record of the number of days they have worked, wages paid, unemployment allowances



received and so on. The job card is valid for a period of five years and it will be kept in the custody of the household to whom it is issued. In response to the questions related to the issuance of job cards, cent per cent of the households reported that they had not paid any fees or bribes for getting job card. Majority of the households reported no irregularity in the job card in entries of work done and in putting signature of the concerned authorities. Some of the households however informed that they are not sure about of the correctness of the entries made in the job card. It is worth-mentioning that cent per cent of the sample beneficiary households kept their job cards with the holder themselves (table-5.4).

**Table 5.4: Qualitative questions related to functioning of NREGA (Percentage of hh)**

Description		West Bengal		
		Yes	No	Not sure
Job card issuance	Paid any fees/charges or bribe to get a job card	-	200 (100.00)	-
	The amount paid for job card (exorbitant)	-	-	-
	The amount paid as bribe (exorbitant)	-	-	-
Irregularity in the job card	No entries were made, even though the job card holder(s) had worked on NREGA	-	192 (96.00)	8 (4.00)
	Some entries were incomplete or missing or fake information was entered	-	130 (65.00)	70 (35.00)
	Some entries had been over-written	-	190 (95.00)	10 (5.00)
	The signature column was blank or partly blank	-	190 (95.00)	10 (5.00)
Where was the card generally kept	With the card holders	200 (100.00)	-	-
	With Sarpanch or Sachiv	-	-	-
	With contractor	-	-	-
	With the gram rojgar sevak	-	-	-
	Elsewhere	-	-	-
Work application	Are you employed in response to an application for work	200 (100.00)	-	-
	If applied, did you get a dated receipt for the application	37 (18.50)	163 (81.50)	-
	If applied, did you get work within 15 days of application	145 (72.50)	55 (27.50)	-
	In case of failure to provide work within 15 days, is unemployment allowance paid	1 (5.00)	54 (95.00)	-
Payment of Wages	Are the wage rates same for men and women	167 (83.50)	-	-
	Wage rates higher for men	33 (16.50)	-	-
	Wage rates higher for women	-	-	-
	wages paid on "daily-wage" basis	-	-	-
	Wages paid on "piece-rate/task-wage" basis	200 (100.00)	-	-

Contd....

Contd.... **Table 5.4: Qualitative questions related to functioning of NREGA (Percentage of hh)**

Description		West Bengal		
		Yes	No	Not sure
Measurement of work	Work was measured by individual's work	20 (10.00)	-	-
	Work was measured by team measurement	160 (80.00)	-	-
	Work was measured by collective measurement	20 (10.00)	-	-
Period of wage payment	Wages were paid within a fortnight	99 (49.50)	-	1 (0.50)
	Wages were paid within a month	100 (50.00)	-	-
	Wages were paid more than a month	-	-	-
	Wages were paid after one year	-	-	-
Who made the wage payment	Sarpanch or Sachiv	-	-	-
	Post Office	93 (46.50)	-	-
	Bank	107 (53.50)	-	-
	Representative of line department	-	-	-
	Other government official or any other	-	-	-
In case wage payment made in the bank/Post Office	Bank account was on self's name	200 (100.00)	-	-
	Spouse's name	-	-	-
	Parent's name	-	-	-
	Children's name	-	-	-
	Others	-	-	-
	Individual account	200 (100.00)	-	-
	Joint account	-	-	-
In case wages were not paid through bank/Post Office	Did bank follow usual procedure of banking	200 (100.00)	-	-
	Wages paid in front of all labourers	-	-	-
	Wages paid on the worksite	-	-	-
	Wages paid in Panchayat Bhawan	-	-	-
	Wages paid on other public/private place	-	-	-
Complaints regarding wage payment	Wages paid on some one's private residence	-	-	-
	There were delays in wage payments	100 (50.00)	99 (49.50)	1 (0.50)
	Wage paid less than the minimum wage	-	200 (100.00)	-
	Wage paid less than asked for sign/thumb impression	-	200 (100.00)	-
	Task was too much compared to the wages paid	-	200 (100.00)	-
	Faced problems in accessing post office/bank accounts	45 (22.50)	155 (77.50)	-
	On what basis wages were calculated not clear	-	200 (100.00)	-
Others	-	-	-	

Contd.....

Contd.... **Table 5.4: Qualitative questions related to functioning of NREGA (Percentage of hh)**

Description		West Bengal		
		Yes	No	Not sure
Details of worksite facilities	A Board/GP member gave details of the sanctioned amount, work dimensions and other requisite details	113 (56.50)	36 (18.00)	51 (25.50)
	The worksite had drinking water facility	120 (60.00)	80 (40.00)	-
	Worksite had shade for periods of rest	120 (60.00)	80 (40.00)	-
	Worksite had child care facility	20 (10.00)	180 (90.00)	-
	Worksite had first aid kit/medicines	160 (80.00)	40 (20.00)	-
Monitoring	Was there any authority to monitor the functioning of the NREGA administration	200 (100.00)	-	-
	Any complaint lodged relating to worksite etc., to the Gram Panchayat, Programme Officer or other officials	-	200 (100.00)	-
	If yes, was any action taken on your complaint	-	-	-
Economic usefulness of the work	Work is very useful to the villagers	137 (68.50)	-	14 (7.00)
	Work is quite useful to the villagers	37 (18.50)	-	-
	Work is not particularly useful to the villagers	12 (6.00)	-	-
	Work is useless for the villagers	-	-	-
Nature of assets and their durability in which the interviewee involved	The structure created may last up to one year	-	-	-
	The structure created may last up to five year	62 (31.00)	-	-
	The structure created may last up to ten year	126 (63.00)	-	-
	The structure created may last more than ten year	12 (6.00)	-	-
	Is it worth creating the structure	143 (71.50)	-	57 (28.50)
	Was the structure created adequate	119 (59.50)	25 (12.50)	56 (28.00)
	No, structure needed more attention to be able to last long	11 (5.50)	160 (80.00)	29 (14.50)
How has NREGA has affected labour migration	Did any your family members migrated out for job after implementation of NAREGA (year 2005 onwards)	47 (23.50)	153 (76.50)	-
	If yes, only one member of the family migrated	42 (89.36)	-	-
	More than one member of the family migrated	5 (10.64)	-	-
	Are wages higher in city or other states than NREGA	28 (14.00)	85 (42.50)	87 (43.50)
	Any family members migrated back to village to work under NREGA	46 (23.00)	154 (77.00)	-
	If yes, only one member of the family migrated back	41 (89.13)	-	-
	More than one member of the family migrated back	5 (10.87)	-	-
	Any family member migrated as wage labourer with dissatisfaction from NREGA	1 (2.13)	46 (97.87)	-
	If yes, only one member of the family migrated	1 (100.00)	-	-
	More than one member of the family migrated	-	-	-

Contd.....

Contd.... **Table 5.4: Qualitative questions related to functioning of NREGA (Percentage of hh)**

Description		West Bengal		
		Yes	No	Not sure
Respondents' awareness about NREGA implementation	Are respondent aware about NREGA implementation	127 (63.50)	20 (10.00)	53 (26.50)
	Right to apply for work and get employed within 15 days	15 (7.50)	99 (49.50)	86 (43.00)
	The work application procedure	112 (56.00)	2 (1.00)	86 (43.00)
	Right to minimum wages	58 (29.00)	7 (3.50)	135 (67.50)
	The level of minimum wages	91 (45.50)	2 (1.00)	107 (53.50)
	The wage calculation method	34 (17.00)	117 (58.50)	49 (24.50)
	Right to the unemployment allowance	29 (14.50)	29 (14.50)	142 (71.00)
	Minimum worksite facilities (drinking water, first aid,)	78 (39.00)	61 (30.50)	61 (30.50)
	Mandatory availability of muster rolls at the worksite	13 (6.50)	35 (17.50)	152 (76.00)
	The list of permissible works under the NREGA	12 (6.00)	32 (16.00)	156 (78.00)
Potential benefits of NREGA	NREGA enhanced food security	146 (73.00)	15 (7.50)	39 (19.50)
	NREGA provided protection against extreme poverty	136 (68.00)	20 (10.00)	44 (22.00)
	NREGA helped to reduce distress migration	117 (58.50)	11 (5.50)	72 (36.00)
	NREGA helped to reduce indebtedness	120 (60.00)	30 (15.00)	50 (25.00)
	NREGA gave greater economic independence to women	98 (49.00)	45 (22.50)	57 (28.50)
	NREGA generated purchasing power at local economy	149 (74.50)	14 (7.00)	37 (18.50)
Questions related to food security	Did your family get full two meals throughout year 2009	141 (70.50)	59 (29.50)	-
	Family did not get sufficient food for one month	7 (11.86)	-	-
	Family did not get sufficient food for two months	37 (62.71)	-	-
	Family did not get sufficient food for above two month	15 (25.43)	-	-
	How did you cope with the situation – take loan	41 (69.49)	-	-
	Catch fish/rat/crab etc	-	-	-
	Near/sometime starvation/take meal only once	17 (28.81)	-	-
	Begging	1 (1.70)	-	-
	Any other	-	-	-

Under the Act, there is a provision to submit written application demanding employment generally to the Gram Panchayet stating the registration number of job card, the date from which employment is required and the number of days of employment required. The concerned authority will issue a dated receipt for the application for work. Employment is supposed to be provided within 15 days of application; otherwise, daily unemployment allowance is to be paid by the concerned authority at the rate prescribed in the Act. In response to the questions related to work application, cent per cent of the respondents reported that they got employed in response to

application for work. Out of those who applied, only 18 per cent got a dated receipt for the application and 72.50 per cent got employment under NREGA within the stipulated time period of 15 days of application. Thus as per provision in the Act, unemployment allowance became due for payment to 27.50 per cent of households. Notably, out of these 27.50 per cent of households, 95 per cent did not get any unemployment allowance.

### **5.3.2: Payment of wages and related issues**

In respect of payment of wages under NREGA, men and women are entitled to receive the same wages. In fact, any form of gender discrimination is prohibited under the NREGA. Based on the information received from the sample participant households, no gender bias is noted in the responses of majority of households (83.50 per cent). Only 16.50 per cent of households reported payment of wages in favour of men. With regard to the mode of wage payment, cent per cent of the sample households reported that wages were paid on 'piece rate/ task wage' basis (table-5.4).

The measurement of works carried out under NREGA is done on individual, team and collective basis. In the state of West Bengal, 80 per cent of the households reported that the parameter for measurement of work was group of workers (team). Nearly 10 per cent of households said that their works were collectively measured and another 10 per cent of households reported that their works were measured on the basis of work done by the individual. The Act provides that wages are to be paid on time; disbursement of wages to workers has to be done on weekly basis and not beyond fortnight from the date on which work was done. In our survey data, 49.50 per cent of the total sample beneficiary households received wage payment within the stipulated time – within a fortnight and 50 per cent were paid wages within a month. As an effective check against the embezzlement of NREGA wages and to prevent defrauding of workers, the government has shifted from cash to bank/ post office payments of wages. In our survey data, the responses of households show that the NREGA wage payments have been made either through banks (53.50 per cent) or through post office (46.50 per cent). In case of wage payment made in the bank/ post office, cent per cent of the accounts were on self's name and the accounts opened are entirely 'individual account' (for each NREGA labourer). All households unanimously reported that banks/ post office followed the usual banking procedure. There was no complaints regarding wage payments except the delay in wage payments (50.00 per cent) and facing difficulties in accessing the bank or post office accounts (22.50 per cent).

### **5.3.3: Worksite facilities and economic usefulness of the work**

As per the NREGA, it is mandatory to provide the basic facilities at the worksite inclusive of safe drinking water, shade for children and for periods of rest, first-aid box with medicines for emergency treatment. In case of facilities at the worksite, majority reported drinking water facility. Shade for periods of rest and first-aid kit/ medicines were the facilities available. The availability of

child care facility was reported by 10 per cent of sample households. Notably, 80 per cent of the households reported that first-aid kits with medicines were made available at the worksite.

In respect of economic usefulness of the works executed under NREGA, the majority of the responses showed that work is very useful to the villagers. The majority of households constituting 68.50 per cent believed that works were very useful to the villagers. Another 18.50 per cent of households considered works quite useful. In sum, majority expressed satisfaction about usefulness of works, although some of the households (6 per cent) questioned about the usefulness of works.

Many of the respondents (56.50 per cent) reported that Gram Panchayet member gave details of the sanctioned amount, work dimensions and other details about the works. Some others (18 per cent) said that such details were not provided.

#### **5.3.4: Monitoring of the work**

In response to the questions relating to monitoring of NREGA works, the sample households unanimously (cent per cent) reported that the concerned officials made frequent visits at the worksite and monitored the execution of works. No one lodged complaint relating to implementation and functioning of NREGA.

#### **5.3.5: Nature of assets created and their durability**

Majority of the households (63 per cent) reported that the quality of structures created was good and these would last up to 10 years. About 6 per cent of households perceived that the quality of created structures was so good that they could last more than 10 years. About 31 per cent of households were of the view that assets created under NREGA could last up to 5 years. Hence, these structures require timely repairs and maintenance to be capable of lasting more and generating expected benefits.

#### **5.3.6: Labour migration and NREGA**

One of the objectives of NREGA is to arrest out-migration of rural labour households who go outside villages in search of employment. In order to know the impact of NREGA on rural labour migration, related data were collected from the sample beneficiary households. It was revealed from the responses that after implementation of NREGA, 23.50 per cent of sample beneficiary households were found to be involved in out-migration. In 89.36 per cent of out-migrated households, only one family member migrated to other places which in the rest 10.64 per cent more than one member migrated. This shows that out-migration has taken place even after NREGA was implemented. Similarly, some households who migrated earlier to other places in search of employment returned back to village to work under NREGA. The proportion of such in-migrated households accounted for 23 per cent and among them in 89.13 per cent of households only one member of the family migrated back to the village while in the rest 10.87 per cent of households, more than one member of the family migrated back to the village. There was only one

member of one single household (2.13 per cent) who migrated to outside places to work as wage labour due to dissatisfaction from NREGA. Overall, the impact of NREGA on labour migration is positive in the sense that NREGA has succeeded in bringing migrated households back to village, although at the same time, there are more instances of out-migration. The incidence of out-migration might have been arrested on providing 100 days of employment to each adult worker within a family during a financial year.

### **5.3.7: Respondents' awareness about NREGA implementation**

Awareness about NREGA among people in all its aspects is an important ingredient for success of NREGA. However the responses received from the sample households in the sample villages show that although, the people were aware about the implementation of NREGA (63.50 per cent), majority were not aware about the specific aspects of NREGA, specifically right based aspects such as right to apply for work and get employed within 15 days, minimum wages, wages calculation method, unemployment allowance, minimum worksite facilities, mandatory availability of muster rolls at the worksite and the list of permissible works under NREGA. About 56 per cent of the households had knowledge about work application procedure while only 7.50 per cent of households were aware that they should be provided employment within 15 days and in rest of the cases they were either totally unaware or unsure about their legal right to get employment within 15 days. Only 29 per cent of beneficiary households reported that they had knowledge about right to minimum wages. Only 14.50 per cent of the households were aware about the provision of unemployment allowance. About 61 per cent of households were found unaware about the provision of minimum worksite facilities. Reportedly, about 94 per cent of households were either unaware or unsure about mandatory availability of muster rolls at the worksite and the list of permissible works under the NREGA.

### **5.3.8: Potential benefits of NREGA**

The implementation of NREGA is expected to bring many changes in various aspects such as enhancement of food security, providing protection against extreme poverty, reducing distress migration, reducing indebtedness, providing greater economic independence to women and above all, creating purchasing power at local economy. Beneficiaries were asked to put their observations on these aspects. The responses in major, show that the implementation NREGA has enhanced food security (73 per cent), provided protection against extreme poverty (68 percent), helped to reduce indebtedness (60 percent), created purchasing power of local economy (74.50 per cent) and reduced the incidence of distress migration (58.50 per cent).

### **5.3.9: NREGA and food security**

NREGA through generating incremental income is expected to bring about changes in the food security situation at least making available the minimum quantity of food for the entire members of the family. Evidently, 70.50 per cent of households reported that they got full two

meals throughout the year 2009 while the rest 29.50 per cent of households did not get full two meals throughout the same year. Out of the households who are not having full two meals, 11.86 per cent did not get sufficient food for one month, 62.71 per cent for two months and the rest 25.43 percent for period of more than two months. To cope with the worsening situation of food security, majority of households (69.49 per cent) suffering from food security took loans from different sources whereas some of the households (28.81 per cent) reduced food consumption taking meal only once a day. However, although some of the households reported worsening situation of food security even after the introduction of NREGA, the overall impact NREGA on food security is positive as it has improved the food security for majority of households. In the context of ensuring food security, the potential benefit of NREGA might have been greater if households are provided with full one hundred days of employment during the financial year.

#### **5.4: Quantitative information related to NREGA functioning**

In implementing National Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme, the implementing agency must follow the procedures laid down in the National Rural Employment Guarantee Act. In the scheme, there is a provision to issue job card affixed photograph thereon free of cost. Further, job card must be in the custody of the job-card holder. Apart from planning, the programme officer is supposed to monitor the implementation of works sanctioned, ensure that wages are paid on time, deal with any complaints that may arise, enforce all the transparency provision and so on. Table-5.5 brings out some details about the functioning of NREGA. In response to questions regarding payment of fees and bribes for getting job card, all sample households unanimously (100 per cent) reported that they got job card free of cost and not paid any amount either as fees or bribes. Asked whether the job card is with the card holder, all households reported that they have kept job card with them. In respect of monitoring of the functioning of NREGA, all the sample households reported that Supervisor/ Nirman Sahayak monitored the NREGA activity (table-5.5).

The Act includes grievance redressal mechanism for ensuring responsive implementation process. The programme officer is the Grievance Redressal officer at the block level and the District Programme Coordinator at the district level. The Act provides that person registering the grievance is to be given a receipt with number and date. However, as per the opinions of the surveyed households, no written complaint is lodged regarding any aspect of the implementation of the scheme (table-5.5).

As far as the type of work undertaken is concerned, digging of ponds singly constituted the major (50 per cent) activity among all works undertaken under the scheme. Among other works, road connectivity is the major (46 per cent) followed by land reclamation (4 per cent) (table-5.5).



**Table 5.5: Quantitative questions related to NREGA functioning (Percentage of hh)**

<b>Q1.</b>	If you paid some amount to get job card: how much for job card and how much bribe.
<b>Answer</b>	(no fees/bribe paid for job card) - 100%
<b>Q.2</b>	If the job card is not kept with you, what is the reason for that?
<b>Answer</b>	(Job card kept with the card holder) - 100%
<b>Q.3</b>	If there is any authority who monitors the functioning of NREGA then describe the details?
<b>Answer</b>	(Supervisor/ Nirman Sahayak) - 100%
<b>Q.4</b>	If you lodged any complaints give details and also provide details of what action was taken
<b>Answer</b>	(No complaint lodged) - 100%
<b>Q.5</b>	Provide description of the work and its starting date?
<b>Answer</b>	(Road connectivity started on April, 2009 - September, 2009) - 46%, (digging of ponds started on May, 2009 - November, 2009) - 50% , (land reclamation - January, 2010) - 4%
<b>Q.6</b>	Provide details of family members migrated to city after implementation of NREGA and why?
<b>Answer</b>	(only one member of family migrated) - 21%, (more than one family member migrated) - 2.50%, (no members of family migrated) - 76.50% reason: (lack of sufficient works) 75%, (higher wages in the city) - 25%
<b>Q.7</b>	Provide details of family members migrated back to village to work in NREGA and why?
<b>Answer</b>	(only one member of family migrated back) - 20.50, ( more than one member of family migrated back) - 2.50%, reason: (sufficient work in the village) - 82.00%, (to look after family) – 18.00%
<b>Q.8</b>	Provide details of family members migrated to city with dissatisfaction of NREGA and why?
<b>Answer</b>	(only one member of family migrated) - 0.50%, (low wage rate ) - 100%

**Table 5.6: Quantitative questions related to food security (percentage of hh)**

<b>Q1.</b>	Do you feel that your family does not have sufficient food for the whole of year give reasons
<b>Answer</b>	(yes) - 29.50%, (No) - 70.50%, reasons: (lack of work/job) - 80%, (lack of purchasing power) - 20%
<b>Q.2</b>	Have you faced any deprivations other than food insufficiency? If yes, explain
<b>Answer</b>	(yes) - 8%, (not availing of Government assistance) - 80%, (lack of infra-structure facilities) - 20%
<b>Q.3</b>	What were the main difficulties you and your family faced during the last year?
<b>Answer</b>	(expenditure greater than income due to price rise of food item)-80%, ( expenditure incurred due to illness) - 20%
<b>Q.4</b>	What is the most important thing your household lacks
<b>Answer</b>	(sufficient Job/Work) - 75% , (sufficient food) - 25%
<b>Q.5</b>	What is the suggestion for amelioration
<b>Answer</b>	(Creation of Job opportunity) - 60%, (increased food supply) - 20%, (to reduce price of food) - 20%
<b>Q.6</b>	Any suggestions to improve NREGA functioning
<b>Answer</b>	(proper planning) - 15%, (proper monitoring) - 20%, (create more job opportunity) - 40%, (wage payment immediately)- 25%

As regards starting dates of works (table-5.5) the majority of the households (96 percent) reported that NREGA works were undertaken during April to November; 2009 which includes

agriculturally busy and slack seasons. As per the opinion of only 4 per cent of households, works started entirely during the lean period i.e. in the month of January. Thus the responses in major show that the work plan designed under the programme coincides with both busy and lean seasons of agriculture. This has resulted in excess demand for labour during busy seasons and accordingly exerted upward pressure on agricultural wages in the rural wage-labour market.

After implementation of NREGA, those who migrated to city, cited reasons for migration. Majority (75 per cent) reported that they have migrated owing to lack of sufficient works in the village, hoping to get work in the city. Also there were cases (25 per cent) where family member migrated to city due to higher wages in the city. Among those who migrated back to village, 82.00 per cent reported that their family member migrated back to village on account of work availability in the village with the introduction of NREGA and the rest 18.00 per cent reported that they came back to village to look after family. The responses show that out of 200 households, only one member of one single household migrated to city owing to dissatisfaction arising from comparatively lower wage rate of NREGA.

### **5.5: Some qualitative questions related to food security**

The implementation of NREGA is expected to protect rural households from poverty and hunger. It is a great privilege particularly for those who live on the margin of subsistence. However, despite implementation of NREGA there were a number of beneficiaries who continue to face difficulties in the form of food insecurity. Table – 5.6 presents responses relating to the issue of food security. As regards food insufficiency, 29.50 per cent of responding households reported that they do not have sufficient food in their families for the whole of the year. Reportedly, lack of work/ job opportunity (80 per cent) coupled with low income/ low purchasing power (20 per cent) were the primary reasons for food insufficiency. In respect of deprivations faced other than food insufficiency, 8 per cent of households reported that they were facing deprivations in the form of non-availability of government assistance (80 per cent) and lack of basic infra-structure facilities (20 per cent) at home like safe drinking water, sanitation etc. When they were asked about the main difficulties which they and their families faced during last year (2009), 80 per cent of the respondents replied that mismatch between expenditure and earned income owing to rise in food price posed a major problem in the previous year. The rest 20 per cent of beneficiary households replied that unaffordable medical treatment expenditure due to illness was the main difficulty which they faced during the last year (table-5.6).

The beneficiary households were asked about the most important thing which they lacked. A total of 75 per cent households reported that they lacked adequate job/ work. In response to the question, 25 per cent households replied that they did not have sufficient food. Suggestions were invited from the respondents for amelioration. The respondents suggested that their difficulties could be eased if the job opportunity is created/ increased (60 per cent) and food supply is increased (20 per cent). Another 20 per cent of households feel that price of food has to be reduced.

Suggestions were invited from the beneficiary households for improving functioning of NREGA. Nearly, 40 per cent of households suggested the need for creating more work opportunities under NREGA (table-5.6). About 25 per cent of households suggested for making arrangement for timely wage payment. About 15 per cent of households emphasized the need for proper planning of works to be undertaken under the scheme and another 20 per cent of households urged the need for proper monitoring of the execution of works in the context of improving functioning of NREGA.

## Chapter–VI

### NREGA Impact on Village Economy

One of the objectives of the NREGA is to enhance livelihood security of households living in the villages. The act also seeks to strengthen the natural resource base of rural livelihood and create durable assets in rural areas. Overall NREGA has the potential to transform the geography of poverty in the villages. In the present study, in addition to household questionnaire, a village schedule is canvassed in order to capture the general changes that have taken place in the village during the last decade and to take note of increase in labour wages for agricultural operations after the implementation of NREGA. The village schedule also contained qualitative questions related to change in life style of the villagers taking place particularly after the implementation on NREGA. Based on village-level data collected from 10 villages this chapter intends to document the changes in the status of village economy including the livelihood status of the villages. It studies the infrastructure available in the villages, changing occupational structure in the village, changes in wage rates for agricultural operations and other changes in the villages including the living standard of the villagers.

#### **6.1: Infrastructure available in the village**

Infrastructure plays the key role in the development process. In an agrarian economy, it promotes agricultural development which in turn exert influence on the growth of agricultural activities creating the avenues for employment. Good infrastructural facilities not only ensure smooth flow of inputs and outputs but also facilitates higher accessibilities to knowledge. Within the group of infrastructures, accessibility to all weather roads is crucial which link rural with urban areas. We now pass on to examine the infrastructural facilities available in the sample villages.

Infrastructurally, all the sample villages have a fairly accessible road connection either kutchra road or morum bound roads or the motorable road. Majority of the villages (90 percent) are however not having railway connectivity within the village but connected by the same at a distance of about 14 kms from the village. All the villages enjoy landline or mobile connectivity facility. In about 50 percent of the sample villages post office exists within the village while for another 50 percent of the villages post office is located at a distance of 2.5 kms. There are no co-operative credit societies within the village in about 80 percent of villages studied, the average distance is about 4 kms from the Co-operative Society where it is located (table-6.1).

**Table-6.1: Infrastructure available within the village (percentage of villages)**

Item	West Bengal (all districts combined)			
	No of villages reporting within village	No of villages reporting nearest village	If nearest village, average distance (kms)	Total no of villages
Road connectivity	10 (100.00)	0 (0.00)	0	10 (100.00)
Railway connectivity	1 (10.00)	9 (90.00)	14	10 (100.00)
Landline or mobile connectivity	10 (100.00)	0 0.00	0	10 (100.00)
Post Office	5 (50.00)	5 (50.00)	2.4	10 (100.00)
Co-operative credit society	2 (20.00)	8 (80.00)	4.1	10 (100.00)
Regional Rural Bank	1 (10.00)	9 (90.00)	5.9	10 (100.00)
Commercial Bank	2 (20.00)	8 (80.00)	5.5	10 (100.00)
Agricultural Produce Market	1 (10.00)	9 (90.00)	3.1	10 (100.00)
Self Help Group Centre	7 (70.00)	3 (30.00)	2.8	10 (100.00)
School Primary	10 (100.00)	0 0.00	0	10 (100.00)
School Secondary	3 (30.00)	7 (70.00)	3.6	10 (100.00)
School Higher Secondary	1 (10.00)	9 (90.00)	5.1	10 (100.00)
Primary Health Centre	5 (50.00)	5 (50.00)	4.5	10 (100.00)
Hospital/Dispensary	1 (10.00)	9 (90.00)	7.8	10 (100.00)
Gram Panchayat Office	3 (30.00)	7 (70.00)	4	10 (100.00)
Fair Price Shop	5 (50.00)	5 (50.00)	1.6	10 (100.00)
Any other	0 (0.00)	0 0.00	0 0.00	10 0.00

Note: Figures in brackets indicate percentages

The existence of banking service facilities available in the sample villages shows marked variation across the villages. In spite of having a wide network of rural financial institutions in India, only 10 percent of the sample villages are in a advantageous position covered by Regional Rural Bank network enjoying facilities within the village. For the majority of 90 percent of villages, RRB's network is located at an average distance of 5.9 kms. Commercial banking network facilities are available within the village in 20 percent of sample villages while for the other villages the average distance works out 5.5 kms from the location of the institution. Other important infrastructure includes marketing facilities of agricultural produce which would strengthen the foundation of agriculture and thus influences generating employment avenues in rural areas. Education is the crucial indicator of village infrastructure. Regarding the institutional basis of education in the village, there is one primary school in every village among the sample villages

studied while secondary schools are located within the village in 30 percent of the villages. In 10 percent of the villages, higher secondary schools are located within the village and for other villages (90 percent), the average distance from the location of Higher Secondary School is 5.1 kms.

In the field of health centre facilities, primary health centre existed within the village in 50 percent of sample villages while for another 50 percent of villages, primary health centre is located of a distance of 4.5 kms. Hospital is located at relatively larger distance of about 8 kms from the villages in case of 90 percent of sample villages. Under the Panchayati Raj System of administration, gram panchayat office is situated within the village in 30 percent of villages while for other villages, the distance of villages from the gram panchayat office works out to 4 kms. Fair price shop/ration shop existed within the village in 50 percent of villages and for other 50 percent of villages the nearest fair price shop is at the average distance of 1.6 kms.

## **6.2: Changes in occupational structure in the selected villages**

This section will devote itself to the discussion of the changes in occupational structure that have taken place between two counts, one in 2001 and another in 2009. Notably, between two counts, the number of households had increased from 4371 to 5053. It is clear that during the period households had broken up into separate units because of family partitioning and thus resulted in the increase in the number of households during the period. An occupation group-wise study shows that occupational structure has undergone changes during the period. Changes have occurred at many points, though few of them are significant.

An important aspect of occupational shift has been the decline in the proportion of households engaged in cultivation of land. It has got reduced from 20.38 percent in 2001 to 19.55 percent in 2009. There is a definite tendency among them to move on to non-agricultural occupations viz household small industry, transport & communications and other services. The pattern of distribution also changed in favour of agricultural labour. The proportion in this occupation increased from 45.71 in 2001 to 46.13 percent in 2009. The outflow from manufacturing other than household small industry group was to lower its proportion from 8.03 percent to 7.90 percent. The outflow from trade, commerce and business causing to lower its proportion from 6.43 percent in 2001 to 6.31 percent in 2009 is also noteworthy. Neither influx nor outflow is noted in respect of households engaged in construction (Table-6.2). The observed changes in the occupational structure in the sample villages owing to introduction of NREGA have been broadly similar to the one arrived at based on NSS or population census data (Sundarm, 2007) except increased dependence of rural households on agricultural labour. As one would expect, we have a continuation of the long term trend of a decline in the share of ‘agriculture’ as observed from the evidence of decline in the share of cultivators in the occupational groups. The secondary sector covering household manufacturing raises its share with construction retaining its share as earlier. Overall, the share of services viz. transport and other services went up albeit small reduction in the share of services viz. trade, commerce and business.

**Table-6.2: Occupational structure (% of households)**

Occupation	West Bengal (all districts combined)	
	Reference period	
	2009	2001
1. Cultivators	988 (19.55)	891 (20.38)
2. Agricultural Labour	2331 (46.13)	1998 (45.71)
3. Household Small Industry	87 (1.72)	67 (1.53)
4. Other Manufacturing./mining	399 (7.90)	351 (8.03)
5. Construction	545 (10.79)	471 (10.78)
6. Trade, Commerce and Business	319 (6.31)	281 (6.43)
7. Transport and Communication	92 (1.82)	78 (1.78)
8. Other Services	292 (5.78)	234 (5.35)
9. Total Households	5053 (100.00)	4371 (100.00)

Note: Figures in brackets indicate percentages

### 6.3: How has NREGA affected wage rates in the selected villages?

Due to the implementation of NREGA there has been sharp increase in the wage rates during our reference periods pertaining to the years 2005 and 2009. The year 2005 refers to the period before the implementation of NREGA while the year 2009 relates the period after the implementation of NREGA. Work provision under NREGA enhances the purchasing power of households through the wage channel. This could affect rural wages in general and agricultural operations in particular. In the present study we find that both male and female wages have gone up after the implementation of NREGA (table-6.3). Across sexes, the percentage increase in female wages was higher than the percentage increase in male wages. The wage disparity between male and female persisted both in agricultural and non-agricultural works, even after the introduction of NREGA. The prevailing wage received by male agricultural workers prior to the introduction of NREGA was Rs.62/- which increased to 83.5 after the introduction of NREGA implying that wage rate increased by 34.68 percent during the reference period. The rate of increase of wages for female agricultural workers was of the order of 42.16 percent from Rs. 51/- to Rs. 72.5/- during the same period. In general non-agricultural wages was higher albeit small than agricultural wages both

for males and females. Here again, there have been noticeable increase in wage rates both for males and females during the reference period. As compared to the minimum wage fixed by the government, the level of nominal daily wage of male agricultural workers in 2009 was above the minimum wage. For male agricultural workers it was Rs. 83.5/- as against the minimum wage of Rs. 80.98/- stipulated for unskilled agricultural workers as on 2008-09. In the case of wages of female agricultural workers, the situation was more dismal. The daily wages of female agricultural workers were below the minimum wage in 2009. For females it was Rs. 72.5 per day as against the stipulated minimum wage of Rs. 80.98/-

**Table-6.3: Wage rates for different activities (average of all villages) Rs.**

Activity		West Bengal (all districts combined)					
		Reference period (2009)		Before NREGA (2005)		Percentage increase/decrease in 2009 over 2005	
		Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
Prevailing	Agricultural	83.50	72.50	62.00	51.00	34.68	42.16
Prevailing	Non Agricultural	85.00	72.00	63.00	51.50	34.92	39.81
Construction		113.50	84.50	85.50	59.50	32.75	42.02
Mining		130.00	100.00	100.00	75.00	30.00	33.33
Other skilled work	Electrician	130.00	0.00	92.50	0.00	40.54	-
	Plumber	141.20	0.00	104.00	0.00	35.77	-
	Pump-set boring	145.70	0.00	104.50	0.00	39.43	-

#### **6.4: How has NREGA affected changes in wage rates for agricultural operations?**

In the earlier paragraphs the level of agricultural and non-agricultural wages across sexes both before and after the introduction of NREGA are analyzed. In this section, we intend to examine the changes in agricultural wages in various agricultural operations occurred during the period between pre and post introduction of NREGA. Agricultural operation-wise wage rates for the select years, viz. 2001, 2005 and 2009 are presented in table – 6.4. The comparative time periods before the implementation of NREGA pertaining to the years 2001 and 2005 while the year 2009 refers to the time period after the introduction of NREGA. Evidently, in general, there was a rising trend in the wage rates for all the agricultural operations with varying degrees between 2001 and 2005, that is, during the pre-introduction period of NREGA. After the introduction of NREGA, there was a sharp increase in the wage rates for all the agricultural operations of principal crops viz. paddy and wheat. Notably, the gap in the wages in the post NREGA period between 2005 and 2009 appeared to have widened as compared to the pre NREGA period between 2001 and 2005. The rate of increase in wages was highest (67.14 percent) in ploughing operation from Rs. 318.00 per acre in



2005 to Rs. 531.50 per acre in 2009 followed by levelling (57.69 percent) and weeding (39.66 percent). For transplantation, harvesting and threshing operations, paddy the principal crop in West Bengal experienced increase in wage rate by 37.80 percent between 2005 and 2009 from Rs. 63.5 per day to Rs. 87.5 per day. In the case of wheat there was 39.66 percent increase in wage rates for harvesting operation from Rs. 58 per day in 2005 to Rs. 81 per day in 2009 while for threshing operation wage rate enhanced by 37.80 percent during the same period from Rs. 63.5 per day to Rs. 87.5 per day. The changes in wages for harvesting operation of pulses uniformly recorded an increase of 39.66 percent. In short, using the comparable years 2005 and 2009, with the implementation of NREGAs wages in various agricultural operations have gone up stretching from an increase of 37.80 percent to 67.14 percent. Obviously, higher agricultural wages rates with the commencement of NREGA works have adversely affected cost of cultivation of crops to the extent of rise in wages in various agricultural operations. The escalation in the cost of cultivation could partly be compensated if a portion of enhanced income earned through NREGA is invested in agriculture in the form purchasing of yield increasing inputs for the purpose of raising yield of crops.

#### **6.5: Various changes in the village economy after implementation of NREGA**

Implementation of NREGA is expected to bring about various changes in the village economy. The Act provides strong social safety net for the vulnerable group through the process of providing a legal guarantee of 100 days wage employment on works that address causes of chronic poverty such as draught, deforestation and soil erosion. The Act thus seeks to enhance livelihood security in rural areas through strengthening the natural resource base of rural livelihood and creating durable assets. The Act is also likely to lead to a substantial reduction of rural-urban migration. NREGA thus if effectively implemented has the potential to transform the geography of poverty. The present section deals with qualitative information on changes in various aspects of village economy as experienced by the village households after the introduction of NREGA. These are produced in tables-6.5 and 6.6.

**Table-6.4: Prevailing labour charges for agricultural operations (average of all villages)**

(Rs./acre or Rs./day)

Activity	West Bengal (all districts combined)					
	Reference period	Before NREGA		Percentage increase/decrease in wages		
	2009	2005	2001	2005 over 2001	2009 over 2005	
Ploughing(per acre)	531.50	318.00	234.00	35.90	67.14	
Levelling(acre)	143.50	91.00	59.50	52.94	57.69	
Weeding(Per day)	81.00	58.00	41.00	41.46	39.66	
Paddy transplanting(Per day)	87.50	63.50	47.00	35.11	37.80	
Harvesting of wheat(Per day)	81.00	58.00	41.00	41.46	39.66	
Harvesting of paddy(Per day)	87.50	63.50	47.00	35.11	37.80	
Harvesting of grams(Per day)	81.00	58.00	41.00	41.46	39.66	
Harvesting of pigeon pea(Per day)	81.00	58.00	41.00	41.46	39.66	
Harvesting of ragi	0.00	0.00	0.00	-	-	
Harvesting of jowar	0.00	0.00	0.00	-	-	
Harvesting of maize	81.00	58.00	41.00	41.46	39.66	
Cane-cutting(Per day)	87.50	63.50	47.00	35.11	37.80	
Harvesting other crops	Oil seed (Per day)	87.50	63.50	47.00	35.11	37.80
	Summer Paddy (Per day)	87.50	63.50	47.00	35.11	37.80
Digging of potatoes(Per day)	87.50	63.50	47.00	35.11	37.80	
Threshing of paddy(Per day)	87.50	63.50	47.00	35.11	37.80	
Threshing of wheat(Per day)	87.50	63.50	47.00	35.11	37.80	
Winnowing of wheat/paddy(Per day)	87.50	63.50	47.00	35.11	37.80	

As revealed from table-6.5, a good majority of households (91.09 per cent) reported that there has been shortage of agricultural wage labour at some point of time during last year. The shortage of agricultural wage labour varied over the months of the year (table-6.6). Last year the shortage of wage labour was mostly felt at sowing period in the months of June and July as reported by 53.12 per cent and 43.38 per cent of households respectively. Nearly 38.23 per cent of households reported labour shortage during inter culture period in the month of August and 36.49 per cent of households experienced shortage of agricultural wage labour during harvesting in the month of November.

After implementation of NREGA, a greater proportion of households (93.92 per cent) reported that there has been a shortage of agricultural labour. Responses show varying degrees of shortage of agricultural labour over the months (table-6.6). Notably after implementation of NREGA, shortage of agricultural labour is largely confined in the months of June, July, Aug and November representing sowing, inter culture and harvesting periods.

Labour cost being the important component of cost of production, all households unanimously (cent per cent) reported that cost of production in agriculture increased because of

scarcity of labour. Regarding the magnitude of increase in cost of production, majority of households (66.42 per cent) believed that cost of production increased by 20 per cent while 27.75 per cent households reported that cost of production recorded an increase of 10 per cent. The remaining 5.83 per cent replied that cost of production increased in the range of 20-50 per cent (table-6.5).

**Table-6.5:Qualitative questions on changes in the villages during last one year (% of hh)**

Description	Yes	No	Not sure
Was there a shortage of agricultural wage labour at some point during last year.	91.09	8.91	-
After implementation of NREGA has there been a shortage of agriculture labour	93.92	6.08	-
After implementation of NREGA the cost of production in agriculture increased because of scarcity of labour	100.00	-	-
Cost increased by 10 percent	27.75	-	-
Cost increased by 20 percent	66.42	-	-
Cost increased by 20-50 percent	5.83	-	-
Cost increased by 50-75 percent	-	-	-
Cost increased by 100 percent	-	-	-
Cost increased by more than 100 percent	-	-	-
After implementation of NREGA have the labour migration trends affected (yes/No)?	88.09	11.91	-
After implementation of NREGA labour who migrated earlier to town /city are coming back to work in the village	56.88	-	-
More labours is migrating from the village as wage rate in the town is higher than wage rate under NREGA or other activities in the village	5.15	-	-
Some labour has come back to work in NREGA but others are moving to the town/city because of wage differential	26.06	-	-
There is no change in labour migration by NREGA activities	0.00	-	-
After NREGA change in wages of casual labourers has increased	100.00	-	-
After NREGA change in wages of casual labourers has decreased	0.00	100.00	-
After NREGA change in wages of casual labourers remained same	0.00	100.00	-
The trend of people living in village and going to work outside daily has increased	0.00	100.00	-
The trend of people living in village and going to work outside daily for longer period has increased	6.08	93.92	-
Has living standard improved in your village since the introduction of NREGA	100.00	0.00	-
After NREGA have you witnessed increase in household consumption in village	100.00	0.00	-
After NREGA have you witnessed more children are now going to the school	100.00	0.00	-
After NREGA, have you witnessed change in trend of attached labour in agriculture	94.16	5.84	-
After NREGA have villagers' awareness towards Government Schemes increased	100.00	0.00	-

**Table-6.6: Quantitative questions about the functioning of NREGA**

	Description	Percentage of households reporting yes
Q1	Was there a shortage of agricultural wage labour at some point during last year. If so in which months?	91.09
Answer	Shortage of wage labour during the month of	
1	April	11.93
2	May	35.78
3	June	53.12
4	July	43.38
5	August	38.23
6	September	35.78
7	October	24.46
8	November	36.49
9	December	13.06
Q2	After implementation of NREGA has there been a shortage of agriculture labour? if yes in which years /months?	
Answer	Shortage of wage labour during the month of	
1	January	8.91
2	April	5.84
3	May	39.20
4	June	59.21
5	July	79.18
6	August	48.62
7	September	5.15
8	October	24.46
9	November	43.48
10	December	19.97
Q3	Give details of change in wages of casual labour during the last 5 years after NREGA	
Answer	Wages of casual labour increased	100.00
1	Due to shortage of labour	17.34
2	Due to higher wage rate in NREGA activities	46.27
3	Increased job opportunity among the casual labourers in different sectors	24.46
4	Labour movement for higher wages	31.90
Q4	In what way the standard of living improved in your village since the introduction of NREGA?	
Answer:1	Food, Clothing and Housing condition improved due to extra earning through NREGA activities	50.31
2	Education condition improved due to extra earning from NREGA	32.97
3	Increased daily consumption due to extra income from NREGA	11.93
4	Health treatment condition improved and expenses of Social ceremony increased	8.91
5	Now people are using consumer goods	12.74
Q5	In what way the household consumption improved in your village since the introduction of NREGA	
Answer:1	People are getting full two meals	28.66
2	Protein intake increased	60.14
3	Fooding, Clothing, Health treatment and housing condition improved	34.71

Contd.....

Contd.... **Table-6.6: Quantitative questions about the functioning of NREGA**

	Description	Percentage of households reporting yes
Q6	In what way NREGA has impacted the children education	
Answer:1	Now families are able to spend more money on education due to extra earning from NREGA	100.00
2	Awareness towards education has increased	6.08
Q7	In what way NREGA has impacted the trends of attached labour in agriculture	100
Answer:1	More employment opportunity in NREGA activities	86.46
2	Due to higher wage rate in NREGA	13.54
Q8	In what way NREGA has improved villagers' awareness towards Government Schemes	
Answer:1	Through Gram Panchayet members	54.23
2	Campaign of Gram Panchayet	74.51
3	Through awareness camp organised by block officers	51.00
4	Through Gram Sansad Meeting	22.20
Q9	Your suggestions to improve the implementation of NREGA for the benefits of both labourers as well as cultivators?	
Answer:1	NREGA work should start in the lean season	34.49
2	NREGA work should take up for agricultural development	35.78
3	Individual Benefit scheme should be given more importance	18.82
4	The work of irrigation , Forest Deptt. And Operation Flood Control Scheme should be included under NREGA Scheme	6.08
5	Simplification of administrative procedure for successful implementation of NREGA	19.97
6	100 days limit should be increased and require continuous work of NREGA through out the year	21.97
7	To take up proper planning for short term and long term benefit for the villagers and proper supervision is required for successful implementation of NREGA activities	6.10
8	Opinion of GP and Block level technical staff should be considered at the time of preparation of district level annual action plan	12.74
9	Land levelling programme and water conservation programme should be given more importance	12.74
10	Infrastructural development of GP office for smooth functioning of NREGA and payment of NREGA should be done entirely through banks	8.91

One of the important goals of NREGA is to reduce rural-urban migration. On the questions relating to migration, 88.09 per cent of households believed that the implementation of NREGA has affected the trends of labour migration. With regard to migration however mixed responses of both out-migration and in-migration were noticed. Out of the households who believed that NREGA has affected labour migration trend, nearly 56.88 per cent reported labourers who migrated earlier to town/ city are coming back to their own villages after implementation of NREGA. According to some households (26.06 per cent), some labourers has come back to work in the village but others are moving to the town/city. The remaining 5.15 per cent households reported otherwise who replied that more labourers are migrating from the village and moving to the town. In both the cases

of out-migration higher wage rates at migrated places tempted the labourers to migrate from the villages to the towns.

All households unanimously reported that wages of casual labourers have increased after implementation of NREGA (table-6.5). As shown in table-6.6, the reasons cited are shortage of labour availability caused by NREGA (17.34 per cent), higher wage rate in NREGA activities compared to other activities in the village (46.27 per cent), increased job opportunities due to the introduction of NREGA (24.46 per cent) and labour movement for higher wages (31.90 per cent).

All households unanimously pointed out that after introduction of NREGA the trend of people living in village and going to work outside daily has decreased (table-6.5). Majority of the respondents (93.92 per cent) also feel that the trend of people going to work outside daily for longer period has decreased.

NREGA is expected to bring about changes in the standard of living of village people. In this regard, all respondents feel that living standard in general improved after the introduction of NREGA. The responses show that due to incremental income obtained from NREGA activities, households were able to spend more on food, clothing, housing and education and thus improvement in the living standard since the introduction of NREGA is noticed specifically in terms of these aspects. After introduction of NREGA, household daily consumption is increased as reported by 11.93 per cent of households. About 8.91 per cent of households reported improvement in health treatment condition. Households able to spend more on consumer goods and social ceremony are also noticed.

All households held the view that after the introduction of NREGA, they have witnessed increase in household consumption (table-6.5). The good impact is also noticed in the education front where cent per cent of households experienced schooling of more children after introduction of NREGA. As shown in table-6.6, improvement in household consumption was recorded in terms of access to full two meals (28.66 per cent), increased protein intake (60.14 per cent) and improved condition of food, clothing and health treatment (34.17 per cent). In the education front, all households reported that they are investing more money on children's education due to extra income earned from NREGA. Reportedly, awareness about education is also improved after the introduction of NREGA (6.08 per cent). Villagers were asked whether the incidence of attached labour in agriculture had increased. Majority of the respondents (94.16 per cent) reported changing situation of the incidence of attached labour in agriculture (table-6.5). According to them, work opportunities created under NREGA (86.46 per cent) and higher wage rate in NREGA activities (13.54 per cent) induced the labourers to work under NREGA rather than working as attached labour (table-6.6). Accordingly the incidence of the practice of attached labour in the villages had decreased after the introduction of NREGA.

The beneficial impact of NREGA is largely noticed in creating awareness about government schemes among the villagers. All the respondents (cent per cent) unanimously reported that after the introduction of NREGA, villagers' awareness towards government schemes have increased (table-6.5). Nearly 74.51 per cent of households reported that campaigning by Gram Panchayat have created interest and awareness about different government schemes (table-6.6). Awareness camp organized by Block-level officers also enhanced the level of awareness among people in villages about government schemes as reported by 51.00 per cent of households. Discussions among participants in the Gram Samsad meeting played important role in making the villagers well informed about the government schemes.

Village households were asked to offer suggestions for improvement of NREGA implementation in the interest of benefits accruable to both labourers as well as cultivators. Village households offered their suggestions mainly in three important aspects of NREGA for improvement of NREGA functioning. Firstly, as reported by 34.49 per cent of households NREGA works should be taken up in the lean season of agriculture when labourers mostly remain out of work in the village due to season-bound character of agriculture. Secondly, 35.78 per cent of households reported that agriculture related activities should be taken up under NREGA for the improvement of agricultural productivity as well as overall agricultural development. Thirdly, according to the opinion of 21.97 per cent households NREGA works should be made available throughout the year and thus 100 days limit should be increased. If the work is continuously available in the villages for longer periods, the labourers can afford the delay in wage payment depending on lump sum amount of wages which they receive after every few days. It is also likely to lead to arrest out-migration of family members of households. Among others, some of the village respondents (19.97 per cent) suggested simplification of administrative procedure for successful implementation of NREGA, while some others (12.74 per cent) suggested the presence of Block-level technicians at the time of preparation of district-level annual action plan.

## Chapter–VII

### Concluding Remarks and Policy Suggestions

#### 7.1: Background

Since Independence the country's strength is derived from the achievements of planning. The policies and programmes have been designed with the aim of alleviation of rural poverty which has been one of the primary objectives of planned development in India. The frontal attack on poverty was pursued in three successive phases. In the first phase, lasting from the beginning of the 1950s till the end of the 1960s, the major emphasis was on land reforms viz. abolition of functionless intermediaries; tenancy reforms culminating in the principle of 'land to the tiller'; imposition of ceilings on large holdings and re-distribution of ceiling surplus land among the landless agricultural labourers and marginal farmers. By the late 1960s the second phase of the Poverty Alleviation Programme (PAP) started with measures that promised to address directly and exclusively the poor in rural areas. This target group oriented approach started with the programme for backward regions graduated to the programme for the development of small and marginal farmers, land less labourers, etc and finally culminated in the Integrated Rural Development Programme and National Rural Employment Programme. Serious efforts for poverty alleviation were initiated only during this phase. The distinguishing feature of the poverty alleviation programme during this phase was the emphasis on creating employment opportunities and distributing renewable assets among the poor. This was in sharp contrast to the intentions in the earlier phase i.e. redistributing existing, non-renewable assets. In the third - the latest phase starting from the beginning of the 1990s, emphasis has shifted to measures aimed at accelerating economic growth and on creating an environment for ensuring a 'spread effect'. The dominant thought is to create more wealth and to enable the poor to benefit from the secondary effects of growth which it is presumed will percolate down and reach the poor. Thus the relative emphasis placed on poverty alleviation programmes has shifted from structural interventions to a target - group oriented approach, to market oriented policies. All the states in India more or less have acted in all these phases.

Unemployment, a perennial problem of the Indian economy has become sharply accentuated in the recent years. But employment programmes were not perceived as major instrument of poverty alleviation until the beginning of the 1980s in most states of the country. They were expanded in the sixth plan period with the introduction of the National Rural Employment Programme (NREP) and the Rural Landless Employment Guarantee Programme (RLEGP). Subsequently, some other public employment programmes were adopted viz. Jawahar Rozgar Yojana (JRY), Employment Assurance Scheme (EAS), Sampoorna Grameen Rozgar Yojana (SGRY), National Food For Work Programme (NFFWP). The programmes were targeted at the



poor and were generally identified with poverty alleviation programmes. Such programmes were treated as schemes which did not involve any legal entitlements. For the first time, the National Rural Employment Guarantee Act, 2005 provides employment opportunities of rural labourers as a matter of right.

National Rural Employment Guarantee Act (NREGA) was passed in the year 2005. The ongoing programmes of Sampoorna Grameen Rozgar Yojana and National Food for Work Programme were subsumed within this programme in the 200 of the most backward districts of the country. The act was enacted to enhance livelihood security in rural areas by providing 100 days of guaranteed wage employment in a financial year to every household whose adult members volunteer to do unskilled manual work. In the past, wage employment programmes targeted at the poor are generally identified with poverty alleviation programmes. Such programmes treated as schemes have failed to bring any security in people's lives. Often people were not even aware of them. The NREGA goes beyond poverty alleviation and recognizes employment as a legal right. It is a step towards legal enforcement of the right to work, as an aspect of the fundamental right to live with dignity.

The work guarantee under NREGA is limited to 100 days per household per year. One hundred days of guaranteed employment is not a great privilege but it would matter for those who live on the margin of subsistence. Among the potential benefits of NREGA, firstly, the Act would help to protect rural households from poverty and hunger. Secondly, the Act is likely to lead to a substantial reduction of rural-urban migration. That is, if work is available in the village, many families will stay in the village instead of heading for the towns or cities. Thirdly, the employment guarantee Act is an opportunity to create useful durable assets in rural areas which would strengthen the livelihood resource base of the rural poor. Fourthly, guaranteed employment can be a major source of empowerment for women through providing them economic independence. Lastly, but not the least, guaranteed employment is likely to act as a means of strengthening the bargaining power of un-organized workers resulting in a change of power equations in the rural society.

In India, NREGA was implemented in three phases:

I Phase – notified 200 districts with effect from February 2<sup>nd</sup> 2006.

II Phase – extended to 130 districts in the financial year 2007-08 (113 districts from April 1<sup>st</sup> 2007 and 17 districts of UP were notified with effect from May 15<sup>th</sup> 2007).

III Phase – remaining districts in all the States/UTs were notified from April 1<sup>st</sup> 2008.

In West Bengal, NREGA became operational from February 2006 with the notification by the Government of West Bengal as West Bengal Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme, 2006. In the state, the NREGA scheme had been introduced in phases, the latest addition being the Howrah district. Initially, in the first phase, the scheme was introduced in ten districts, namely, Jalpaiguri, Uttar Dinajpur, Dakshin Dinajpur, Malda, Murshidabad, Purulia, Birbhum, Bankura, Paschim

Midnapore and South 24-Parganas. In the second phase, from 1<sup>st</sup> April 2007 seven more districts namely, Coochbehar, Darjeeling, Burdwan, Nadia, North 24-Parganas, Hooghly, Purba Midnapore were brought under its coverage. One more district viz. Howrah was added in the third phase from 1<sup>st</sup> April 2008. Thus the scheme is operational in all districts of the state w.e.f. 1<sup>st</sup> April 2008.

There have been a dearth of studies designed to assess the performance of National Rural Employment Scheme ever since the Act came into force in the country (Ambasta,P,et.al,2008,Gopal,2009, Jha,et.al.2008, Mehrotra,2008, Chakraborty,2007). While some studies have drawn attention to huge leakage in the implementation of the scheme, namely inflated or fake muster roll entries, embezzlement of funds, non-payment of minimum wages, delayed wage payments beyond the stipulated period of 15 days, non-payment of unemployment allowance, irregularities in conduct of social audit etc., others are not that critical, rather have been hopeful recognizing that the programme effectiveness will increase with experience. With the guarantee of demand-driven fund allocation, NREGA scheme opens up tremendous possibilities of creating a livelihood resource base of the rural poor. The scheme has high expectations in terms of employment generation, alleviation of poverty, food security, halting migration and overall rural development. As the scheme is in its initial stages, there is a need for the study to evaluate the performance of the scheme for its impact on rural poor. Based on this background, the study is conceptualized and is undertaken in West Bengal with the following objectives:

## **7.2: Main Objectives of the Study**

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

## **7.3: Data Base and Methodology**

The study is based on both primary and secondary data. Primary data is collected from five districts of the state of West Bengal namely Jalpaiguri, Malda, Purulia, Nadia and Howrah. From each district, two villages are selected keeping into account their distance from the main city/town. One village is selected from the nearby periphery of around 5 kilometers of the district/city head-

quarters and the second village is selected from a farthest location of 20 kilometers or more than that. From each selected village, primary survey is carried out on 20 participants in NREGA and 5 non-participants working as wage employed. In this fashion, from the state 10 villages are selected and total number of 250 households are surveyed in detail with the help of structured household questionnaire. For selecting participant households, a list of all beneficiaries (participants) in the village is obtained from the Gram Panchayat in the village along with the information of caste factor of the workers. After getting the list, a Stratified Random Sampling Method is adopted for selection of the participant households giving proportionate representation to the Caste, i.e. (i) Schedule Caste (ii) Schedule Tribe (iii) Other Backward Caste (iv) Forward Castes (others). A due representation is also given to the gender factor. For the selection of non-participants, no such list is available. Therefore, criterion for selecting non-participant households is that these households are not participating in NREGA but constitute the similar caste and gender characteristics as that of selected participant households. In selecting the districts utmost care is given to the fact how many districts implemented NREGA in the first Phase and how many did in the second and third Phase in order to give proper representation to all the three Phases of the NREGA implementation. While the data is collected through questionnaires, the collected data is analyzed through performing tabular analysis. Suitable statistical techniques are also used in analyzing data.

In addition to household questionnaire, a Village Schedule is canvassed in order to capture the general changes that have taken place in the village during the last decade and to take note of increase in labour charges for agricultural operations after the implementation of NREGA. The village schedule also contained qualitative questions related to change in life style of the villagers taking place during the last one decade. One village schedule in each village is filled up with the help of a Group Discussion with the Panchayat Members, Officials, educated and other well informed people available in the village being surveyed.

#### **7.4: Major findings**

##### **Analysis based on secondary data**

##### **7.4.1: Total Employment Generated - Their Socio-Economic Characteristics:**

In order to examine the functioning of NREGA, secondary data is obtained from the official website of NREGA ([www.nrega.nic.in](http://www.nrega.nic.in)). Data used in the study relate to the years 2008-09, 2009-10 and 2010-11 (till Dec' 2010).

Primarily the implementation of NREGA can be evaluated in terms of jobs demanded and provided. The official data in this connection shows that during the financial year 2010-11 (till December 2010) a cumulative total of 44.21 lakhs households demanded employment and among them 43.80 lakhs households (99.1 percent), were provided wage employment under the scheme in the state. The performance shown in terms of Jobs demanded and provided has been more or less uniform across the phase 1, phase 2 and phase 3 districts. Phase 1 and phase 2 districts which have

more experience, of running the programme do not show any variation over the years viz. 2008-09, 2009-10 and 2010-11 in respect of providing jobs in relation to demand.

In terms of person days of employment generated under the scheme, the state of West Bengal generated a cumulative total of 910.65 lakhs person days during the financial year 2010-11 (till Dec' 2010) under NREGA out of which 328.35 lakhs person days (36.1 percent) has been for scheduled caste, 98.85 lakhs days (10.9 percent) for schedule tribe and the rest 910.65 lakhs days (53.1 percent) for people belonging to other castes.

The act mandates that at least one-third of the workers should be women. Notably, in the state, 284.08 lakhs days of employment were generated for women which imply that women obtained 31.2 percent of the wage opportunities with their male counterpart getting the remaining 68.8 percent. The Act places no restriction on how each household's quota of 100 days is shared within the household, means that there is ample scope for women's participation in NREGA works. In fact while the women workers participation rate (2001) is barely 3.19 percent in rural West Bengal, women workers shared 31.2 percent of total person days generated under NREGA during the year 2010-11. While the share of Scheduled Castes (SCs) in West Bengal population is 23.02 percent, their share in NREGA employment is 36.1 percent as recorded in the financial year 2010-11. Again, while the share of Scheduled Tribes (STs) in the total population is only 5.50 percent, they constituted 10.9 percent of the total employment days generated under the NREGA.

Importantly, during the study period between 2008-09 and 2010-11, all the districts in phase 1, 2 and 3 respectively showed highest employment generation during 2009-10. There is a consistent decline in total person days generated in all the districts in 2010-11 compared to the year 2009-10 while almost all the districts have generated much less employment in 2008-09 as compared to 2009-10.

The primary objective of the scheme is to provide 100 days of guaranteed wage employment in a financial year to every household whose adult members volunteer to do unskilled manual work. The quota of 100 days per household per year can be shared between adult members of the household provided their combined days of employment do not exceed 100 days in the financial year. However, despite making provision of 100 days of employment in a financial year, there has been wide deviation in term of actual employment generation in all the districts of West Bengal. Among various districts, Bankura and Purulia in phase I districts, Burdwan in phase II district provided largest number of households with full 100 days of employment in the year 2010-11 (till Dec. 2010). During the study period 2008-09 to 2010-11, households completing 100 days of work in the state was highest in 2009-10 when the figure was 72123 (2.1 percent of households who got employment) as against the figures of 23050 (0.8 percent of households who got employment) in 2008-09 and 42142 (1.00 percent of households who got employment) in 2010-11. That the actual employment generation is much below than 100 days in a year has been experienced by all the districts in the state.

#### **7.4.2: Number of projects completed and total amount spent**

The works carried out under the scheme suggested that a total of 65,673 work in different work categories have been accomplished during the financial year 2010-11 (till December, 2010) in the state. The corresponding figure was much higher for the year 2009-10, which stood at 1, 21,858 followed by the figure of 54526 in 2008-09. The works undertaken and completed during the financial year 2010-11 indicated that agricultural development related activities accorded top priority which accounted for the maximum share in total number works completed during the year. As evidenced by secondary data, water conservation (27.72 percent), renovation of traditional water bodies (14.92 percent), land development (9.58 percent) minor irrigation (4.69 percent), drought proofing (4.63 percent) flood control (4.23 percent) and provision of irrigation facility to land development (4.09 percent) together constituted 69.86 percent of total works undertaken and completed. The next in importance was the emphasis on rural connectivity which alone constituted 28.98 percent of total works accomplished during the year. Across the districts, works relating to the development agriculture were given utmost priority, during the year 2010-11. Agriculture development related activities accounted for 73.43 percent in total works in phase 1 districts, 66.41 percent in phase 2 districts and 61.36 percent in phase 3 districts. In phase 1 and phase 2 districts, water conservation and water harvesting followed by renovation of traditional water bodies and land development were the major work categories among the agricultural development related activities. In phase 3 districts, drought-proofing followed by minor irrigation and renovation of traditional water bodies constituted the major share of works undertaken among agriculture related activities. Rural connectivity works singly constituted the major activity among all the works undertaken and completed in phase 1, phase 2 and phase 3 districts. Thus in the state of West Bengal works under NREGA mainly concentrated on agriculture related activities designed to ensure future growth in agricultural sector followed by rural connectivity works providing access to all weather roads. Notably, the works undertaken in the NREGA were consistent with the eight categories of works listed under NREGA.

As can be seen an amount of Rs. 48662.8 lakhs was spent for completed works under NREGA during 2010-11 (till December 2010) in the state which was in fact a decrease of 65.90 percent from the figure of 142685.27 lakhs in the previous year 2009-10. Further amount spent during the year 2008-09 was only 70211.07 lakh which rose by 103.22 percent in 2009-10. Thus during the period 2008-11, the year 2009-10 recorded the largest amount of rupees spent for carrying out the activity. Notably, in all the years under study, major emphasis has been placed on the development of agriculture related activities with the objective of ensuring sustainable growth in agriculture. The emphasis on building water harvesting structures through labour intensive methods under NREGA indicates that under the Act, useful durable assets are created designed to strengthen the livelihood resource base of the poor.

### **7.4.3: Performance of NREGA- some quantitative indicators**

#### **Social Auditing**

An innovative feature of the National Rural Employment Guarantee Act is that it gives a central role to 'social audits' as a means of continuous public vigilance. Under the Act, gram sabhas are given the power to conduct regular social audits of all works carried out in the panchayat and to verify that all relevant norms are being observed. Social audits thus can be seen as a means of promoting some basic norms in public works namely, transparency, participation and accountability.

In respect of conducting social audits, it is seen that a total of 3604 social audits of NREGA have been conducted in 2008-09 as against 8275 in 2009-10 and 6136 in 2010-11. However, social audits have not been done in all the districts uniformly. In conducting social audits, phase 3 district viz. Howrah, the phase 3 districts is the leader followed by phase 2 and phases 1 districts in 2008-09. In the year 2009-10 phase 1 districts came next to phase 3 districts where social audits have taken place, while in the year 2010-11 phase 2 districts performed better and occupied the position after phase 3 districts.

In the matter of muster roll verification, out of the total of 1084133 muster rolls for the year 2010-11, a total of 706863 (65.20 percent) muster rolls are verified in the state as a whole. The corresponding figures for verified muster roll for the year 2009-10 and 2008-09 were 1111032 (53.89 percent) and 378759 (54.74 percent) respectively. Across the districts phase 3 district viz. Howrah has gone much ahead compared to phase 2 and phase 1 district in respect of muster roll verification. As between phase 1 and phase 2 districts, the latter districts have progressed much in muster roll verification in all the years under study.

In the state as a whole, it was found that about 41.29 percent of works in 2010-11 were inspected by district level and block level officers together as against the figure of 46.54 percent in 2009-10 and 51.91 percent in 2008-09. However, there exists considerable variation across the districts. Here again, phase 3 district viz. Howrah has gone much ahead than phase 1 and phase 2 districts and as between phase 1 and phase 2 districts the latter districts performed better than the former districts.

Social audits and vigilance works must be institutionalized in the sense that they must be regularly carried out by Gram Sabhas through the participatory process. Gram Sabha meetings organized by Gram panchayat are held twice in a year every 6 months interval. It is seen that as against a total number of Gram Panchayats 3239 in West Bengal, Gram Sabha meeting held numbered 2222 in 2010-11, 10675 in 2009-10 and 8436 in 2008-09. Thus so far official data is concerned, the incidence of holding Gram Sabha meeting in ensuring transparency in planning and implementation of scheme is considerably less in 2010-11 as compared to the previous years. Across the districts there exists wide variation in this respect. During the year 2010-11 phase 2 district lead in holding gram sabha meeting numbering 1607 as against the figures of 469 for phase 1 districts

and 146 for phase 2 districts. More importantly, during the year 2010-11 the mandatory gram sabha meeting has not taken place in some of the district viz. Dinajpur (north), Jalpaiguri in phase 1 districts. Nadia in phase 2 districts while no information is received in the districts of Bankura, Murshidabad and Midnapore (west) in phase 1 districts and Coachbeher in phase 2 districts.

Another critical finding relates to conduct of VMC meetings (gram unnayan samiti or beneficiary committee meetings) in running the programme of NREGA. As per the provision of NREGA, VMC meeting needs to be conducted for the participation of all affected persons in the process of decision making and validation. Evidently however, in the state, the participatory process, the main route to insuring transparency has not been taken seriously by the implementing authority. During the year 2010-11, only a total of 191 VMC meetings were held as against the corresponding figures of 6472 and 6216 in 2009-10 and 2008-09 respectively. In many of the districts, VMC (beneficiary committee) meetings were not held at all during the year 2010-11.

### **Bank accounts**

The NREGA introduced bank payments or post office payments as safeguards against corruption in wage payments to the labourers. Ideally there should be a separate account for each person listed on the job card and in the case of joint accounts, all members including women should be included, otherwise women workers might be deprived of the opportunity to collect and keep their own wages. Official data for the year 2010-11 shows that post office accounts constituted the major which accounted for 52.44 percent of total accounts opened. Further a larger majority of the accounts are individual accounts either at banks (78.97 percent) or of post office (85.06 percent) and the rest are joint accounts (21.03 percent for banks and 14.94 percent for post offices) which of course included the names of female members of the household. Disbursal of wages through the banking system was to the tune of 52.65 percent of total wage payments during the year 2010-11 although in terms of number of accounts opened, post office accounts accounted for the major. Across the districts, payments through post offices took the lead in phase 1 districts (51.73 percent) followed by phase 3 (48.24 percent) and phase 2 (42.34 percent) districts.

### **Unemployment allowance**

It has been specified in the Act that if an applicant is not provided employment within 15 days of his application seeking employment, he/she shall be entitled to a daily unemployment allowance which will be paid by the state government. However, official data in this regard shows the reluctance of the State Government to disburse unemployment allowance. In the state, where unemployment allowances were due for payment to the tune by 3679 days in 2010-11 it was paid for 6 days only in the district of Coachbeher costing Rs. 273.00. In other districts unemployment allowance were not paid at all.

## **Analysis based on primary data**

### **7.4.4: Household characteristics and their income and consumption pattern**

Among beneficiary households, across castes 37.50 percent beneficiary households belong to scheduled castes, 6.50 percent of the households belong to scheduled tribes, 4.50 percent belong to other backward castes whereas the balance 51.50 percent of the households goes to general castes. Caste composition of non-beneficiary households is not exactly similar to those of beneficiary households.

Beneficiary households holding BPL and AAY card accounted for 42.50 percent and 5.50 percent respectively. Among beneficiary households, APL card holding households constituted the major accounting for 50 percent of total beneficiary households. The rest of the households hold neither BPL nor AAY card. Among the non-beneficiaries, BPL and AAY card holding households together constituted 44 percent of total non-beneficiary households. On the other hand a total of 50 percent of non-beneficiary households are APL card holders, the remaining 6.00 percent being without holding any card in the identified group.

The scheme of NREGA has the transformative potential for women in enhancing economic and social security and thus the scheme can alter the balance of power in the rural family. However, empowerment of women would be easier for the families where the decision maker in the family is the female member. In our sample households, in case of both beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries male members are the decision makers in majority of the families (76.50 percent for beneficiary families and 82.00 percent for non-beneficiary families).

Judging by the primary occupation of the head of the households, our survey data showed that among the beneficiary households, 69.50 percent of households belong to the class of wage earner, 19.50 percent have the main occupation farming, 2.50 percent are engaged in self-business and the rest belonged to the category 'others'. Within the group of non-beneficiary households, majority accounting for 52 percent are wage earners, 20 percent are engaged in farming, 8 percent are employed in self-business, another 8 percent are salaried persons and the rest 12 percent belong to the category of 'others'.

Out-migration has been the result of lack of employment opportunities within the village. With the commencement of NREGA works, which has ensured employment in their native places, the incidence of outmigration is expected to come down. In our survey data among the sample beneficiary families, 43 families (21.50 percent) have out-migrated while 7 families (14.00 percent) among non-beneficiaries have out-migrated in the year 2009.

### **Household net income**

Across the beneficiary and non-beneficiary households, income per non-beneficiary households is higher by 34.11 percent from Rs. 36904.24 for beneficiary households to 49493.22



for non- beneficiary households. For beneficiary households wage income from non-agricultural pursuits accounted for the major (36.99 percent) share in total household income. Importantly, net income from works under NREGA accounted for 14.23 percent of the total household income and the remaining receipts are from wage income in agriculture (21.65 percent), income from agriculture (13.44 percent), income from wages as migrant workers (7.38 percent), income from self-employed in non-farming (2.97 percent) and income from regular job (2.01 percent) in order of importance.

In case of non-beneficiary households, income per household obtained from self-employment in non-farm activity accounted to Rs. 12,227.20 and constituted the major accounting for 24.70 percent of total household income followed by income from regular job (20.53 percent), wage income from non-agricultural pursuits (19.98 percent), income from agriculture (19.17 percent), wage income from agriculture activity (9.63 percent) and income from wages as migrant workers (6.72 percent) in order.

As measured by the coefficient of variation, income derived from each pursuit exhibited higher degree of variation across the households both for beneficiary and non-beneficiary households. Further it is interesting to note that occupationally low income per household is associated with high variance in income across the households. This holds true particularly for the beneficiary households.

### **Household consumption**

The item-wise distribution of expenditure shows that cereal intake of the household population is the largest component of expenditure on food items both for beneficiary and non-beneficiary households, rice being the major among cereals followed by wheat. This pattern does not vary across the beneficiary and non-beneficiary households in terms of the level of monthly consumption per capita. However, there are large differences when the comparison is made by specific non-cereal food items viz. liquid milk, poultry meat & egg, fruits, vegetables and confectionery or beverages. The monthly per capita expenditure on these food items is significantly higher for non-beneficiary households, the difference ranging from 28.57 percent in vegetables to 70.97 percent in liquid milk. In case of poultry meat & egg it is higher by 56.41 percent in case of non-beneficiary households. In terms of cereals consumption per capita per month, NSS data (2004-05) gives relatively higher figure by about 20.85 percent. As a whole NSS estimates of food-grains consumption is 20.60 percent higher than implied in our survey estimate. In most other food items, viz. sugar, oils, spices and meat NSS shows lower level of consumption than our survey estimates, the difference ranging from 8.33 percent in edible oils to 33.74 percent in spices. NSS estimates of liquid milk consumption is 42.45 percent higher than implied in our estimate while NSS estimate of poultry meat and egg consumption is lower than our estimate by 30.30 percent.

To carry this analysis a bit further we have compared the monthly per capita consumption expenditure of households by broad commodity items groups under food and non-food. First of all, it is observable that the average level of monthly per capita consumption expenditure (food and non-food) is higher for non-beneficiary households which are of the order of Rs. 539.68 for beneficiary households and Rs. 651.23 for non-beneficiary counterpart. In terms of food intake, the pattern of expenditure shows again higher value figure of monthly per capita consumption expenditure for non-beneficiary (434.94) as compared to beneficiary (376.50). The pattern of expenditure distribution by broad commodity groups as food and non-food appear somewhat different across the beneficiary and non-beneficiary households. Although, the pattern shows a larger share of expenditure on food items in case of both beneficiary and non-beneficiary households, the observed behavioural tendency of non-beneficiary households has been to expend more on non-food items as compared those of beneficiary households. In case of non-beneficiary households, more consumption on non-food consumer goods involves greater sacrifice in food consumption as compared to beneficiary households.

Evidently, NSS data on consumption expenditure are broadly in close agreement with our survey data in respect of total monthly per capita consumption expenditure of households. The NSS figure of per capita monthly consumption expenditure is estimated at Rs. 562.11 (food and non-food) as against our estimate of Rs. 561.99 combining beneficiary and non-beneficiary households together. As opposed to general belief, NSS estimate for cereal consumption is on the lower side by nearly 5.14 percent than the figure derived from our estimate. Both the beneficiary and non-beneficiary households ranked ahead of NSS estimate in respect of per capita cereals consumption of households.

Data furnished above may be used for drawing a statistical picture of the level of living of the sample households. In fact what is regarded a minimum level of living in rural India? The official poverty lines for India and its states are based on a calorie norm of 2400 calories per capita per day for rural areas. If one regards the level of per capita monthly consumption expenditure of Rs. 382.82 (official poverty line for 2004-05 for the state of West Bengal based on expert group method, 1993) as the bare minimum, then beneficiary households lie below the poverty line even after their participation in NREGA scheme, whose monthly per capita food consumption expenditure estimate to be Rs. 376.50.

### **Variability (CV) and gini ratios of income and consumption**

Broadly the average household consumption expenditure is lower than household income both for beneficiary and non-beneficiary households. There are however variations in income and consumption across the households as captured by the co-efficient of variation, the extent of variation being greater for non-beneficiary households both in income and consumption. The striking conclusion emerging from the study is that higher household income/ consumption is associated with higher degree of variance as happened in the case of non-beneficiary households. In

contrast, beneficiary households with comparatively lower level of income and consumption are accompanied by lower variance showing low level of variation in income and consumption. As between household income and consumption, the extent of variation tended to be lower in consumption than in income both in the case of beneficiary and non-beneficiary households.

The Gini ratio as a measure of inequality does not vary between income and consumption. In fact, there are no major instances of savings or dis-savings (transfer of income through loans) that could cause the measures of inequality for consumption and income to diverge. However, the degree of inequality both in income and consumption is high and this does not vary much across the beneficiary and non-beneficiary households, although, comparatively it is a little bit smaller for non-beneficiary households. Thus talking from the angle of poverty, measured in terms of both per capita income/expenditure and the degree of inequality, creation of employment opportunities under NREGA has failed to provide any impact on both absolute and relative poverty, either through increase in mean income above the poverty line or through reducing income/consumption inequality. Cross section data across beneficiary and non-beneficiary households does not provide adequate basis for talking about the dynamics of change taking place in rural areas from the situation of a high to a low incidence of poverty on account of the implementation of NREGA.

#### **Determinants of participation in NREGA—functional analysis**

The Logit probit analysis conducted at both household and member levels suggest that a set of household specific characteristics such as caste (whether a member of SC, ST or ‘others’), educational attainment, number of members in the household (household size), household asset holding explain the household’s participation status (whether participating in NREGA or not). Our econometric exercise confirms one thing that the targeting of the NREGA programme was not unsatisfactory. The disadvantaged groups proxied by the SC and ST had significantly high probabilities of participation in NREGA. This does not however imply that relatively affluent households were excluded. In fact, the probability of participation was higher in case of SC and ST households

OLS estimates at the household level reveals that although some of the explanatory variables have positive coefficients, none of the coefficients are found to be statistically significant. At the individual member level only one variable i.e. dummy for the SC was found to statistically influence the NREGA employment. Here again, SC dummy is negatively related to NREGA employment days.

#### **7.4.5: Work Profile under NREGA, Wage Structure and Migration Issues How successful has been NREGA providing 100 days employment (to the registered families at their door steps)**

On an average, 2 persons per household are working under NREGA at the aggregate level in the state. Across the districts the number of workers per household employed in the NREGA works

varied from 1 to 2. Households employing only one worker are observed in the districts of Nadia and Howrah belonging to phase 2 and phase 3 districts respectively. Across the caste categories, greater size of worker employed under NREGA is located in case of scheduled caste households followed by general caste and schedule tribe households respectively.

Evidently, despite making provision of 100 days of employment in a financial year, it is seen that there have been wide deviation in terms of actual employment generation. Among the selected districts, households completing 100 days of employment are experienced by Purulia district and the figure stood at 5 per cent of households who got employment. In all, for all the sample districts together, the proportion of households completing 100 days of work constituted 1.00 per cent of total sample beneficiary households, similar to the estimate obtained from secondary level macro-data for the year 2010-11.

In terms of person days employed under NREGA works, the average number of person days employed per household was of the order of 54 days in the state which is far away from the envisaged 100 days. Person days employed per household was highest for general caste households (59 days) followed by schedule caste (50days), scheduled tribe (47 days) and OBC (45 days). The number of person days employed per household for women was about 24 days which remained well below their male counterpart in all the categories of households.

The district wise figures for person days of employment per household show considerable variation across the districts. Among the selected districts, Purulia the phase 1 district is showing the highest number of person days of employment (79 days per household) followed by another phase 1 district called Jalpaiguri (76 days per household). For other selected districts, employment per household varied in between 33 days to 43 days. Caste-wise general caste households among the selected districts, received highest employment in Purulia (92 days) and lowest employment (22 days) in Malda, both are phase 1 districts. For scheduled caste households, the district of Jalpaiguri recorded highest employment days (79 days per household) followed by the Purulia district (54 days per household), while the district of Nadia, phase 2 district showed lowest employment days (21 days). Scheduled tribe households received highest employment (79 days per household) in Jalpaiguri followed by Howrah (65 days per household) and Purulia (48 days per household). Other backward classes (OBCs) obtained highest employment in Jalpaiguri district (65 days per household) followed by Malda (42days per household) and Nadia (42 days per household). Thus given the fact that majority of the poor in our country are either SCs,STs, or OBCs, the coverage in terms of employment provided per household is rather poor for SC, ST and OBC in the selected districts, the exception being the district of Jalpaiguri which belongs to phase 1 district.

### **Nature of assets created and their durability**

Eight types of works are permitted to be carried out under the NREGA. Evidently, the works undertaken in the sample districts are consistent with the eight special types of works listed in the NREGA. As observed in the study, overall in the state, the works undertaken mainly related to rural

connectivity followed by renovation of traditional water bodies and water conservation and water harvesting. However, there existed variation across the sample districts in respect of works undertaken under NREGA. As is evident, works under NREGA in the state of West Bengal were mainly concentrated on irrigational development and water conservation related activities apart from the major emphasis on rural connectivity to provide all weather access road.

As far as quality of assets is concerned, the majority of households reported that the quality assets created under NREGA is good. Evidently, the incidence of non-reporting households regarding the quality of assets is quite large in Howrah, the phase 3 district.

With regard to unemployment allowance, the present study noticed that the unemployment allowance was paid only to a few workers in Malda district. This shows the reluctance of the state government to pay unemployment allowance in West Bengal.

### **Wage differentials under NREGA and its comparison with minimum wage Act**

According to NREGA Act, persons working under the scheme are entitled to receive the statutory minimum wage fixed by the state government applicable to agricultural workers in the state. The primary data collected from the sample districts reveals that the average per day wages obtained by the sample beneficiaries under the scheme varied from Rs. 82.38 to Rs. 84.85 across castes of households. At the aggregate level, for the state as a whole, the average wage rate received by households stood at Rs. 84.42. Across the districts, wage rates received in aggregate are higher in Howrah and Jalpaiguri districts as compared to State average whereas those in Malda, Nadia and Purulia are lower. Noticeably, the women workers received the same wages as those of males at the rate of Rs. 84.47 per day.

In all the sample districts, wages received under NREGA were found to be less than the stipulated minimum wage of Rs. 96.00. This is basically due to the fact that persons working under NREGA are mostly given piece rate. Hence wages received under NREGA varied from person to person depending on quantum of work done. Obviously, the underperformance of workers caused them to receive wages less than the stipulated minimum wage. However, NREGA wages were higher than market wages for agricultural workers in the state and this has led to distort the wage labour market by exerting upward pressure on market wages.

The average distance of the work places from the residences of workers was found to be within 5 km. as provided under the Act. The average distance of work place from residence is on an average 0.80 km. The distance is relatively higher in Purulia district (1.23 km.)

### **Wage differentials in different activities, among beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries**

Evidently, non-agricultural casual labour wage rates compares unfavourably to agricultural wage rates for males, while the wage gap between the non-agricultural and agricultural activities for females is showing close to each other. The ratio of non-agricultural to agricultural wage rates of

males works out to 1.17 while for females the ratio is close to 1.0. Across the category of households, the ratio stood at 1.19 for male beneficiary and 1.10 for male non-beneficiary counterpart. In case of females, non-agriculture agriculture wage ratio varied prominently across beneficiary and non-beneficiary households, the ratio being 1.02 for beneficiary and 0.84 for non-beneficiary households.

The gender issue has figured prominently in respect of receiving wage rate both in agricultural and non-agricultural activities. For agricultural operations, on an average, female wage rate formed 85.00 percent of male wage rate while for non-agricultural activities, female wage rates fell behind male wage rate by 72.55 percent. In receiving agricultural wage rates, male-female differences are sharp for non-beneficiary households as compared to beneficiary households. Migrant workers received relatively higher wage rate. Here again, wage received by an average female worker was lower than the wage received by a male worker. Under the NREGA females are paid the same wage rates as males which stood at Rs. 84.38. It is noticeable that NREGA wage rates are significantly higher than market wage rates for agricultural casual labour. This is especially noticeable in the case of females who are paid markedly lower market wage rates as compared to males in agricultural activities working as casual labourer. As a whole female–male wage ratio for agricultural wages showed lower gender disparity compared to non-agricultural wages while under NREGA wage payments, gender disparity is totally removed.

#### **How has NREGA affected labour migration?**

One major concern particularly, in rain-fed areas is distress-induced seasonal migration. NREGA scheme provides local opportunities for employment and thus workers do not need to migrate to other areas. Manual works provided under NREGA are thus expected to bring down the level of out-migration. Evidently, it is however seen that among the five surveyed districts, out-migration has taken place mainly in three districts viz. Jalpaiguri, Malda and Nadia and marginally in Purulia district. Of course such migration has been the result of lack of employment opportunities within the village.

The number of family members (per beneficiary household) who migrated due to non-availability of work in the village under NREGA was seen to be very low (below 1). Among the four districts where out-migration has taken place, the number per household was comparatively higher in Jalpaiguri district (0.13) followed by Malda (0.07), Nadia (0.06) and Purulia (0.005). At the same time, with the commencement of NREGA works which has ensured employment in the native places, in-migration also has taken place in the same districts where out-migration occurred. The degree of in-migration was also seen to be lower similar to that of out-migration measured in terms of number of family members per household migrated. The net effect in respect of migration has thus been negligible even if NREGA ensured employment within the village.

Among the sample districts where some members of households have returned back to the village to work under NREGA, the destination of migrating members were mostly other states (cent percent in Jalpaiguri, 66.7 percent in Malda) to work in construction works, manufacturing and mining (84.62 percent in Jalpaiguri and 91.67 percent in Malda). The exception is Nadia district where out-migrating members migrated in nearby town (54.6 percent) to work as agriculture labourers in nearby villages surrounding the town. Out-migrating members mostly shifted to the village last year (86.67 percent in Jalpaiguri, 88.89 percent in Malda and 81.82 percent in Nadia) with the commencement of NREGA works. Majority of the shifting households reported that they are remaining better off now migrating back into the village compared to the previous occupation wherein they were engaged (cent percent in Jalpaiguri and Nadia and 88.89 percent in Malda).

#### **7.4.6: The functioning of NREGA—qualitative aspects**

##### **Job card issues and work applications**

In response to the questions related to the issuance of job cards, cent per cent of the households reported that they had not paid any fees or bribes for getting job card. Majority of the households reported no irregularity in the job card in entries of work done and in putting signature of the concerned authorities. Some of the households however informed that they are not sure about of the correctness of the entries made in the job card. It is worth-mentioning that cent per cent of the sample beneficiary households kept their job cards with the holder themselves.

In response to the questions related to work application, cent per cent of the respondents reported that they got employed in response to application for work. Out of those who applied, only 18 per cent got a dated receipt for the application and 72.50 per cent got employment under NREGA within the stipulated time period of 15 days of application. Thus as per provision in the Act, unemployment allowance became due for payment to 27.50 per cent of households. Notably, out of these 27.50 per cent of households, 95 per cent did not get any unemployment allowance.

##### **Payment of wages and related issues**

In respect of payment of wages under NREGA, men and women are entitled to receive the same wages. In fact, any form of gender discrimination is prohibited under the NREGA. Based on the information received from the sample participant households, no gender bias is noted in the responses of majority of households (83.50 per cent). Only 16.50 per cent of households reported payment of wages in favour of men. With regard to the mode of wage payment, cent per cent of the sample households reported that wages were paid on ‘piece rate/ task wage’ basis.

The Act provides that wages are to be paid on time; disbursement of wages to workers has to be done on weekly basis and not beyond fortnight from the date on which work was done. In our survey data, 49.50 per cent of the total sample beneficiary households received wage payment within the stipulated time – within a fortnight and 50 per cent were paid wages within a month.

As an effective check against the embezzlement of NREGA wages and to prevent defrauding of workers, the government has shifted from cash to bank/ post office payments of wages. In our survey data, the responses of households show that the NREGA wage payments have been made either through banks (53.50 per cent) or through post office (46.50 per cent). In case of wage payment made in the bank/ post office, cent per cent of the accounts were on self's name and the accounts opened is entirely 'individual account' (for each NREGA labourer). All households unanimously reported that banks/ post office followed the usual banking procedure. There was no complaints regarding wage payments except the delay in wage payments (50.00 per cent) and facing difficulties in accessing the bank or post office accounts (22.50 per cent). However, as per the opinions of the surveyed households, no written complaint is logged regarding any aspects of the implementation of the scheme.

### **Worksite facilities and economic usefulness of the work**

As per the NREGA, it is mandatory to provide the basic facilities at the worksite inclusive of safe drinking water, shade for children and for periods of rest, first-aid box with medicines for emergency treatment. In case of facilities at the worksite, majority reported drinking water facility. Shade for periods of rest and first-aid kit/ medicines were the facilities available. The availability of child care facility was reported by 10 per cent of sample households. Notably, 80 per cent of the households reported that first-aid kits with medicines were made available at the worksite. Majority expressed satisfaction about usefulness of works, although some of the households (6 per cent) questioned about the usefulness of works.

### **Monitoring of the work**

In response to the questions relating to monitoring of NREGA works, the sample households unanimously (cent per cent) reported that the concerned officials (Supervisor/Nirman Sahayak) made frequent visits at the worksite and monitored the execution of works. No one lodged complaint relating to implementation and functioning of NREGA.

### **Nature of assets created and their durability**

Majority of the households (63 per cent) reported that the quality of structures created was good and these would last up to 10 years. About 6 per cent of households perceived that the quality of created structures was so good that they could last more than 10 years. About 31 per cent of households were of the view that assets created under NREGA could last up to 5 years. These structures require timely repairs and maintenance to be capable of lasting more and generating expected benefits.

### **Labour migration and NREGA**

One of the objectives of NREGA is to arrest out-migration of rural labour households who go outside villages in search of employment. In order to know the impact of NREGA on rural



labour migration, related data were collected from the sample beneficiary households. It was revealed from the responses that after implementation of NREGA, 23.50 per cent of sample beneficiary households were found to be involved in out-migration. In 89.36 per cent of out-migrated households, only one family member migrated to other places while in the rest 10.64 per cent more than one member migrated. This shows that out-migration has taken place even after NREGA was implemented. Similarly, some households who migrated earlier to other places in search of employment returned back to village to work under NREGA. The proportion of such in-migrated households accounted for 23 per cent and among them in 89.13 per cent of households only one member of the family migrated back to the village while in the rest 10.87 per cent of households, more than one member of the family migrated back to the village. There was only one member of one single household (2.13 per cent) who migrated to outside places to work as wage labour due to dissatisfaction from NREGA. Overall, the impact of NREGA on labour migration is positive but negligible. NREGA has succeeded in bringing migrated households back to village, although at the same time, there are more instances of out-migration. The incidence of out-migration might have been arrested on providing 100 days of employment to each adult worker within a family during a financial year.

As far as reasons for migration is concerned, majority (75 per cent) reported that they have migrated owing to lack of sufficient works in the village, hoping to get work in the city. Also there were cases (25 per cent) where family member migrated to city due to higher wages in the city. Among those who migrated back to village, 82.00 per cent reported that their family member migrated back to village on account of work availability in the village with the introduction of NREGA and the rest 18.00 per cent reported that they came back to village to look after family. The responses show that out of 200 households, only one member of one single household migrated to city owing to dissatisfaction arising from comparatively lower wage rate of NREGA.

### **Respondents' awareness about NREGA implementation**

Awareness about NREGA among people in all its aspects is an important ingredient for success of NREGA. However the responses received from the sample households in the sample villages show that although, the people were aware about the implementation of NREGA (63.50 per cent), majority were not aware about the specific aspects of NREGA, specifically right based aspects such as right to apply for work and get employed within 15 days, minimum wages, wages calculation method, unemployment allowance, minimum worksite facilities, mandatory availability of muster rolls at the worksite and the list of permissible works under NREGA. About 56 per cent of the households had knowledge about work application procedure while only 7.50 per cent of households were aware that they should be provided employment within 15 days and in rest of the cases they were either totally unaware or unsure about their legal right to get employment within 15 days. Only 29 per cent of beneficiary households reported that they had knowledge about right to minimum wages. Only 14.50 per cent of the households were aware about the provision of

unemployment allowance. About 61 per cent of households were found unaware about the provision of minimum worksite facilities. Reportedly, about 94 per cent of households were either unaware or unsure about mandatory availability of muster rolls at the worksite and the list of permissible works under the NREGA.

### **NREGA and food security**

NREGA through generating incremental income is expected to bring about changes in the food security situation. Evidently, 70.50 per cent of households reported that they got full two meals throughout the year 2009 while the rest 29.50 per cent of households did not get full two meals throughout the same year. Out of the households who are not having full two meals, 11.86 per cent did not get sufficient food for one month, 62.71 per cent for two months and the rest 25.43 percent for period of more than two months. To cope with the worsening situation of food security, majority of households (69.49 per cent) suffering from food security took loans from different sources whereas some of the households (28.81 per cent) reduced food consumption taking meal only once a day. However, although some of the households reported worsening situation of food security even after the introduction of NREGA, the overall impact NREGA on food security is positive as it has improved the food security for majority of households. In the context of ensuring food security, the potential benefit of NREGA might have been greater if households are provided with full one hundred days of employment during the financial year.

### **Suggestions for improving the functioning of NREGA**

Suggestions were invited from the beneficiary households for improving functioning of NREGA. Nearly, 40 per cent of households suggested the need for creating more work opportunities under NREGA. About 25 per cent of households suggested for making arrangement for timely wage payment. About 15 per cent of households emphasized the need for proper planning of works to be undertaken under the scheme and another 20 per cent of households urged the need for proper monitoring of the execution of works in the context of improving functioning of NREGA.

### **7.4.7: NREGA impact on village economy**

#### **Changes in occupational structure in the selected villages**

The occupational structure has undergone changes during the period between two counts, one in 2001 and another in 2009. An important aspect of occupational change has been the decline in the proportion of households engaged in cultivation of land. It has got reduced from 20.38 percent in 2001 to 19.55 percent in 2009. There is a definite tendency among them to move on to non-agricultural occupations viz., household small industry, transport & communications and other services. The pattern of distribution also changed in favour of agricultural labour. The proportion in this occupation increased from 45.71 in 2001 to 46.13 percent in 2009.

### **How has NREGA affected wage rates in the selected villages?**

Due to the implementation of NREGA there has been sharp increase in the wage rates during our reference periods pertaining to the years 2005 and 2009. The present study finds that both male and female wages have gone up after the implementation of NREGA. Across sexes, the percentage increase in female wages was higher than the percentage increase in male wages. The wage disparity between male and female persisted both in agricultural and non-agricultural works, even after the introduction of NREGA. The prevailing wage received by male agricultural workers prior to the introduction of NREGA was Rs.62/- which increased to 83.5 after the introduction of NREGA implying that wage rate increased by 34.68 percent during the reference period. The rate of increase of wages for female agricultural workers was of the order of 42.16 percent from Rs. 51/- to Rs. 72.5/- during the same period. In general non-agricultural wages was higher albeit small than agricultural wages both for males and females. Here again, there have been noticeable increase in wage rates both for males and females during the reference period. As compared to the minimum wage fixed by the government, the level of nominal daily wage of male agricultural workers in 2009 was above the minimum wage. For male agricultural workers it was Rs. 83.5/- as against the minimum wage of Rs. 80.98/- stipulated for unskilled agricultural workers as on 2008-09. In the case of wages of female agricultural workers, the situation was more dismal. The daily wages of female agricultural workers were below the minimum wage in 2009. For females it was Rs. 72.5 per day as against the stipulated minimum wage of Rs. 80.98/-

### **How has NREGA affected changes in wage rates for agricultural operations?**

Evidently, in general, there was a rising trend in the wage rates for all the agricultural operations with varying degrees between 2001 and 2005, that is, during the pre-introduction period of NREGA. After the introduction of NREGA, there was a sharp increase in the wage rates for all the agricultural operations of principal crops viz. paddy and wheat. Notably, the gap in the wages in the post NREGA period between 2005 and 2009 appeared to have widened as compared to the pre NREGA period between 2001 and 2005. The rate of increase in wages was highest (67.14 percent) in ploughing operation from Rs. 318.00 per acre in 2005 to Rs. 531.50 per acre in 2009 followed by levelling (57.69 percent) and weeding (39.66 percent). For transplantation, harvesting and threshing operations, paddy the principal crop in West Bengal experienced increase in wage rate by 37.80 percent between 2005 and 2009 from Rs. 63.5 per day to Rs. 87.5 per day.

### **Various changes in the village economy after implementation of NREGA**

Implementation of NREGA is expected to bring about various changes in the village economy.

As revealed from the qualitative information, a good majority of households (91.09 per cent) reported that there has been shortage of agricultural wage labour at some point of time during last year. After implementation of NREGA, a greater proportion of households (93.92 per cent) reported

that there has been a shortage of agricultural labour. Responses show varying degrees of shortage of agricultural labour over the months (table-6.6). Notably after implementation of NREGA, shortage of agricultural labour is largely confined in the months of June, July, Aug and November representing sowing, inter culture and harvesting periods.

Labour cost being the important component of cost of production, all households unanimously (cent per cent) reported that cost of production in agriculture increased because of scarcity of labour. Regarding the magnitude of increase in cost of production, majority of households (66.42 per cent) believed that cost of production increased by 20 per cent while 27.75 per cent households reported that cost of production recorded an increase of 10 per cent. The remaining 5.83 per cent replied that cost of production increased in the range of 20-50 per cent.

One of the important goals of NREGA is to reduce rural-urban migration. On the questions relating to migration, 88.09 per cent of households believed that the implementation of NREGA has affected the trends of labour migration. With regard to migration however mixed responses of both out-migration and in-migration were noticed. Out of the households who believed that NREGA has affected labour migration trend, nearly 56.88 per cent reported labourers who migrated earlier to town/ city are coming back to their own villages after implementation of NREGA. According to some households (26.06 per cent), some labourers has come back to work in the village but others are moving to the town/city. The remaining 5.15 per cent households reported otherwise who replied that more labourers are migrating from the village and moving to the town. In both the cases of out-migration higher wage rates at migrated places tempted the labourers to migrate from the villages to the towns.

All households unanimously reported that wages of casual labourers have increased after implementation of NREGA. The reasons cited are shortage of labour availability caused by NREGA (17.34 per cent), higher wage rate in NREGA activities compared to other activities in the village (46.27 per cent), increased job opportunities due to the introduction of NREGA (24.46 per cent) and labour movement for higher wages (31.90 per cent).

All households unanimously pointed out that after introduction of NREGA the trend of people living in village and going to work outside daily has decreased. Majority of the respondents (93.92 per cent) also feel that the trend of people going to work outside daily for longer period has decreased.

NREGA is expected to bring about changes in the standard of living of village people. In this regard, all respondents feel that living standard in general improved after the introduction of NREGA. The responses show that due to incremental income obtained from NREGA activities, households were able to spend more on food, clothing, housing and education and thus improvement in the living standard since the introduction of NREGA is noticed specifically in terms of these aspects. After introduction of NREGA, household daily consumption is increased as

reported by 11.93 per cent of households. About 8.91 per cent of households reported improvement in health treatment condition. Households able to spend more on consumer goods and social ceremony are also noticed.

In the education front, all households reported that they are investing more money on children's education due to extra income earned from NREGA. Reportedly, awareness about education is also improved after the introduction of NREGA (6.08 per cent).

Village households were asked to offer suggestions for improvement of NREGA implementation in the interest of benefits accruable to both labourers as well as cultivators. Village households offered their suggestions mainly in three important aspects of NREGA for improvement of NREGA functioning. Firstly, as reported by 34.49 per cent of households NREGA works should be taken up in the lean season of agriculture when labourers mostly remain out of work in the village due to season-bound character of agriculture. Secondly, 35.78 per cent of households reported that agriculture related activities should be taken up under NREGA for the improvement of agricultural productivity as well as overall agricultural development. Thirdly, according to the opinion of 21.97 per cent households NREGA works should be made available throughout the year and thus 100 days limit should be increased. If the work is continuously available in the villages for longer periods, the labourers can afford the delay in wage payment depending on lump sum amount of wages which they receive after every few days. It is also likely to lead to arrest out-migration of family members of households. Among others, some of the village respondents (19.97 per cent) suggested simplification of administrative procedure for successful implementation of NREGA, while some others (12.74 per cent) suggested the presence of Block-level technicians at the time of preparation of district-level annual action plan.

#### **7.4.8: Policy implications**

Although there has been a debate about the effectiveness of NREGA, the experience of West Bengal show a mixed picture. The scheme is successful in terms of coverage of weaker sections of society including coverage of women, asset creation and reduction in the incidence of large scale out-migration. The major problem however relates to the employment generation as the man-days generated and the number of households provided 100 days of employment were quite low in almost all the districts of West Bengal. In our survey data, average number of person days generated per household was of the order of 54 days in the state. For women households it was 24 days, well below their male counterpart. However, the NREGA is much better scheme than any other employment programmes undertaken in the past. Obviously NREGA works should be made available throughout the year. The implementing agency should take up proper planning of work for both short-term and long-term benefits for the villagers. Further, 100days limit of guaranteed wage employment under the Act should be increased. This has been suggested by 21.97 per cent of village households in the surveyed villages. There is thus a lot to do for better functioning of the

**NREGA. (attn: Department of Panchayat and Rural Development, Government of West Bengal).**

The act provides that gram sabha would monitor the execution of works and conduct regular social audits of all works carried out under the NREGA. The study however observes that in many cases the mandatory social audits are not taking place. As evidenced by official level secondary data, social audits have not been done in all the districts uniformly in the state. The findings thus lend support to demand that the social audit process must be taken more seriously by the administration for ensuring transparency, participation and accountability. **(attn: Department of Panchayat and Rural Development, Government of West Bengal).**

The participatory process, the main route to ensuring transparency has not been taken seriously by the implementing authority in the state. As is evident, during the year 2010-11 only a total 191 VMC meetings (gram unnayan samiti or beneficiary committee meeting) were held as against the corresponding figures of 6472 and 6216 in 2009-10 and 2008-09 respectively. Notably, in many of the districts VMC meetings were not held at all during the year 2010-11. **(attn: Department of Panchayat and Rural Development, Government of West Bengal).**

The projects/works undertaken in the NREGA were consistent with the eight categories of works listed under NREGA. However, for the fulfilment of the quota of 100 days of employment per household per year, the state government should be empowered to expand the list of permissible works in the light of local conditions. New innovative works need to be found out to bring down the level of out-migration of rural labour force as also to provide productive employment. **(attn: Ministry of Rural Development, Department of Rural Development, Government of India, New Delhi).**

Regarding the quality of assets created under NREGA, about 31 per cent of households were of the view that assets created under NREGA could last only up to five years. Hence, these structures would require timely repairs and maintenance to be capable of lasting more and generating expected benefits. Thus quality and maintenance of assets need more attention in future so that investments made would not go futile. In fact, employment guarantee and durable assets creation have to be seen as two sides of the same coin. **(attn: Department of Panchayat and Rural Development, Government of West Bengal).**

According to the Act, persons working under the scheme are entitled to receive the statutory minimum wage fixed by the State Government applicable to agricultural workers in the state. The primary data however reveals that in all the sample districts NREGA wages obtained by the beneficiaries were less than the stipulated minimum wage. Persons working under NREGA were given wages on piece rate basis. Hence, wages received under NREGA varied from person to person depending upon the quantum of work done. However, even if wages are paid on a piece rate basis, the schedule of rates has to be such that a person working for seven hours would earn the

minimum wage (**attn: Ministry of Rural Development, Department of Rural Development, Government of India, New Delhi**).

In our survey data, irregularity in wage payments is noticed. About 50 percent of sample beneficiary households were paid wages beyond fortnight and accordingly they are entitled to receive compensation as per the provision of the act. However, no compensation is paid to labourers in the state in respect of delayed payment of wages beyond the stipulated period of 15 days. Obviously, in the long run, much more sustained effort will have to be put in to ensure continued compliance with norms laid down in the NREGA Act. (**attn: Department of Panchayat and Rural Development, Government of West Bengal**).

The reluctance of state government to disburse unemployment allowances is noted in the study. Official level secondary data shows that unemployment allowances due for payment were for 3679 days in 2010-11 but it was paid only for 6 days in a single district. Further the primary data shows that the unemployment allowance is paid only in one district called Malda but to a few workers spending a small amount of money. In this context, it is suggestive that the central government should pay a part of the unemployment allowance after amendment of NREGA rules so that workers could draw unemployment allowance as per the provisions of the Act in the event of failure to provide unemployment allowance by the state government (**attn: Ministry of Rural Development, Department of Rural Development, Government of India, New Delhi**).

Shifting from cash payment of wages under the scheme to bank payment has been done in order to prevent embezzlement of funds and also to give workers greater control over their wages. The direct transfer of wages into workers' bank/post office account has given substantial protection against embezzlement. However, the distance from the place of residence to the nearest bank or post office has caused hardship to the NREGA workers. This would require opening of new branches of banks in rural areas (**attn: Reserve Bank of India, Government of India**).

The rural labour markets have been influenced by the introduction of NREGA and have had a decisive impact on agriculture. Nearly 66.42 per cent of village households in the surveyed villages believed that cost of production in agriculture is increased by 20 per cent due to scarcity labour caused by the introduction of NREGA leading to rise in wages. In fact wage rise caused by NREGA could only be maintained if productivity rises too in agriculture. NREGA works must be such as to contribute to raising agricultural productivity. This has to be taken seriously by the administration which calls for innovative thinking and action. (**attn: Ministry of Rural Development, Department of Rural Development, Government of India, New Delhi**).

The NREGA ranks among the most powerful initiatives ever undertaken for transformation of rural livelihoods in India. However for NREGA, to realize its full potential, it must focus on raising the productivity of agriculture. In our survey data about 35.78 per cent of village households reported that agriculture related activities should be taken up more under NREGA for the

improvement of agricultural productivity as well as overall agricultural development leading to the creation of allied livelihoods of the rural people. **(attn: Department of Panchayat and Rural Development, Government of West Bengal).**

The NREGA holds the powerful prospect of bringing major changes in the social and economic well-being of women. This of course happens to be true in a state like West Bengal where women shared a sizeable proportion of working days generated under NREGA. As is evident from secondary data, women workers shared 31.20 per cent of total person days generated under NREGA. What is however frustrating is that the issue of child care is overlooked. Under the NREGA, it is clearly stated that in the event where there are at least five children under the age of six years at the worksite, one of the female workers should be deputed to look after them and she should be paid the same wage as other NREGA workers receive. Yet in our survey data only 10 per cent of the sample households reported the availability of child care facility at the worksite. Disturbingly many of the respondents were unaware of this basic entitlement. Thus the provision of effective child care facilities at NREGA worksites is an important issue that calls for creative thinking and action. **(attn: Department of Panchayat and Rural Development, Government of West Bengal).**

NREGA provides an important opportunity for improving gender relations. However, for the longer term goal of gender equality to be realized, attention needs to be paid in ensuring greater participation of women in procedural aspects viz. participation in the planning process through participation in gram sabhas, social audits. These measures would simultaneously improve gender relations and ensures effective implementation of NREGA. **(attn: Department of Panchayat and Rural Development, Government of West Bengal).**

Agriculture provides employment for the vast majority of the workforce. The agricultural activities dominate twice in a year during the sowing/ transplanting and harvesting seasons. Once these seasons are over, the households sink into a state of unemployment. During the period of seasonal unemployment, the NREGA scheme can be efficiently used to fill the void created in the period of seasonal unemployment. In our surveyed villages, 34.49 per cent of village households were of the view that NREGA works should be taken up in the lean season of agriculture when labourers mostly remain out of work. The implementing agency is thus required to schedule the NREGA works accordingly. **(attn: Department of Panchayat and Rural Development, Government of West Bengal).**

The government must recognize the enormous diversity of tasks involved in NREGA and the skills required to execute the same with speed and quality. In this context, there is need to continuously upgrade the capacities of the personnel involved in NREGA implementation, most crucially block-level personnel which is at the cutting-edge of implementation. Capacity building also ought to take place at the gram panchayat level. It is therefore suggestive that efforts can be made by the government in conducting one year diploma course on administering government



schemes including NREGA. (attn: **Ministry of Rural Development, Department of Rural Development, Government of India, New Delhi**).

**Conclusion:**

Overall, the scheme of NREGA has the great potential in enhancing income and livelihood security of the rural poor. The present study, in an attempt to evaluate the impact of NREGA has identified the key areas of progress as well as the shortcomings of the programme. Notably, NREGA has not been able to provide the employment that one would have expected. Despite making provision of 100 days of employment in a year, actual employment generation has been much below than 100 days in a year. In the matter of wage payment, in many cases, delay in wage payment is noticed. Procedural irregularities are also noticed at the stage of implementation of the scheme such as irregularities in conducting social audits and gram sabhas. True that NREGA addressed many of the weaknesses of the earlier wage employment programmes through introducing several features in its design. However, as evidenced by the present study, NREGA is also not free from limitations despite having its positive impact on income generation, asset creation and above all improving standard of living. Obviously, if the remedial measures are taken to address the limitations, the effectiveness of NREGA would increase with experience and would go a long way in ensuring livelihood security to the rural poor in a sustainable manner and in altering the balance of power in rural society. The key lies in proper implementation and planning of the scheme as per the guidelines laid down in the Act.

## Selected Bibliography

1. Adhikari, Anindita and Kartika Bhatia (2010), “NREGA wage payments: can we bank on the banks?”, *Economic and Political Weekly*, January 2.
2. Ambasta, P., P.S.V, Shankar and Mihir Shah (2008), “Two years of NREGA: The Road Ahead”, *Economic and Political Weekly*, Vol. 43, No. 8 February,
3. Banerjee, Kaustav and Partha Saha (2010), “The NREGA, the Maoists and the developmental woes of the Indian state”, *Economic and Political Weekly*, July 10.
4. Chakraborty, Pinaki (2007), “Implementation of employment guarantee: A preliminary appraisal”, *Economic and Political Weekly*, February 17.
5. Chavan, Pallavi and Rajshree Bedamatta (2006), “Trends in agricultural wages in India: 1964-65 to 1999-2000”, *Economic and Political Weekly*, September 23.
6. Deaton, A and J Dreze (2002): “Poverty and Inequality in India: A Re-examination”, *Economic and Political weekly*, 7 September.
7. Datta, K L (2008), “An estimate of poverty reduction between 2004-05 and 2005-06”, *Economic and Political Weekly*, November 22.
8. Gopal, K.S (2009), “NREGA Social Audit: Myths and Reality”, *Economic and Political Weekly*, Vol. 44, No. 3, January.
9. Jha, R., R. Gaiha, and S. Shankar (2008), “Reviewing the National Rural Employment Guarantee Programme”, *Economic and Political Weekly*, Vol. 43, No. 10, March.
10. Kareemulla, K Shalander Kumar, K.S. Reddy, C.A. Rama Rao and B. Venkateswarlu, “Impact of NREGS on rural livelihoods and agricultural capital formation”, *Indian Journal of Agricultural Economics*, Vol 65, No.3, July– Sept, 2010.
11. Mehrotra, S. (2008), “NREG Two years on: Where Do We Go from Here?”, *Economic and Political Weekly*, Vol. 43, No. 31, August.
12. Sen, A and Himanshu (2004): “poverty and inequality – I and II, widening disparities during the 1990s”, *Economic and Political weekly*, 18 and 25 September.
13. Sundaram, K and SD Tendulkar (2003): “Poverty in India in the 1990s – An analysis of changes in 15 major states”, *Economic and Political weekly*, 5 April.
14. Himanshu (2007), “Recent trends in poverty and inequality: some preliminary results”, *Economic and Political Weekly*, February 10. Patnaik, Prabhat (2005), “On the need for providing employment guarantee”, *Economic and Political Weekly*, January 15.

15. Murgal, Rinku and Martin Ravallion (2005), "Employment guarantee in rural India: what would it cost and how much would it reduce poverty?" *Economic and Political Weekly*, July 30.
16. Mehrotra, Santosh (2008), "NREG two years on: where do we go from here?" *Economic and Political Weekly*, August 2
17. Reetika, Khera (2008), "Access to the targeted public distribution system: A case study in Rajasthan", *Economic and Political Weekly*, November 1, 2008.
18. Sundarum, K (2007), "Employment and poverty in India, 2000-2005", *Economic and Political Weekly*, July 28.
19. Siddhartha, Anish Vanaik (2008), "CAG report on NREGA: fact and fiction", *Economic and Political Weekly*, June 21.
20. Shah, Deepak and Sovna Mohanty (2010), "Implementation of NREGA during eleventh plan in Maharashtra: Experiences, challenges and ways forward", *Indian Journal of Agricultural Economics*, Vol.65, No.3, July – Sept.
21. Vanaik, A and Siddhartha (2008), "Bank payments: End of corruption in NREGA?", *Economic and Political Weekly*, April 26.

## ANNEXURE - I

### Coordinator's Comments on the Draft Report

Impact of NREGA on Wage Rates, Food Security and Rural Urban Migration in West Bengal

Jiban Kumar Ghosh  
Agro-Economic Research Centre  
Visva-Bharati  
Santiniketan – 731235

1. Table 2.1, Page 25: Cumulative person days generated during 2009-10 presented in Column 7 and for 2008-09 presented in page 26 must be in Lakh, kindly check and mention the same.
2. Chapter 3, Table 3.1: Please recheck the number of male and female members in the gender, it does not realistic with male member ratio of 78 and female members of only 22. There is some calculation error as male and female ratio approximately should be near to 50/50. Similarly age group with children (less than 16) cannot be 0 and working age people exceeding 90 percent does not look realistic.
3. Chapter 4, Table 4.1: while providing information on numbers of members and no of days per hh employed during the year include another category of men as that of women and sum total of men + women should supposedly be equal to aggregate. Also in this table provide another row with details of percentage of HH employed 100 or more days, selected district wise.
4. Chapter 4, Table 4.5: The information asked in the first two rows is no of members migrated or out-migrated per household. Per household migrated members = The total numbers of members migrated each district/ total numbers of members in the district. Kindly make the correction.
5. Table 4.4: Migration incidents, while presenting No of members per household migrated from the village and migrated back to the village, also provide absolute number of members migrated in each district in parentheses.

SD/-  
Parmod Kumar  
Professor & Head, ADRTC  
Institute for Social and Economic Change  
Bangalore

## **ANNEXURE - II**

### **Action Taken Report**

Impact of NREGA on Wage Rates, Food Security and Rural Urban Migration in West Bengal

1. Table 2.1 checked. Figures of cumulative person days generated for the years 2008-09 and 2009-10 are in lakhs and corrections are made.
2. Chapter 3, Table 3.1, figures are checked. It may be noted that as per requirement of the table design, figures relate to the beneficiary and non-beneficiary respondents.
3. Chapter 4, Table 4.1 checked. The table has been prepared as per the table design sent by the co-ordinator. However as suggested the table includes category of men while providing information on number of members and number of days per household employed during the year. Besides percentage of households employed 100 or more days for the selected districts are provided in another row of the table.
4. Chapter 4, Table 4.4 and Table 4.5:

There is no such table as 4.5 in the chapter as per table format given by the co-ordinator. The information asked relating to migration incidents are available in table 4.4. As suggested, necessary correction is made in table 4.4. Further as suggested, absolute number of members migrated in each sample district is provided in parentheses.

AER Centre, Visva-Bharati  
Santiniketan  
October, 2011

Debashis Sarkar  
Director