

Research Study No.2011/2

# **Impact of Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme on Wage Rates, Food Security and Rural–Urban Migration in Haryana**

**D.S.Bhupal**



**Agricultural Economics Research Centre,  
University of Delhi,  
Delhi – 110 007  
August, 2011**

## **Acknowledgement**

This study is a part of All India study coordinated by the ADRT Bangalore. Major task of designing the study, sample size, methodology, usage of primary and secondary data and final shape of the report viz. tabulation chapter scheme etc. all are their contribution, deserving all the felicitations.

I am thankful to Mr. Sheokand, in charge NREGA for Haryana who helped me contact right persons at the selected districts and provided all the available data, contact numbers etc. in deciding the 5 sample districts.

I appreciate the cooperation and help rendered by the ADC Panipat, Mr. Bishnoi. In fact, all the 5 ADCs were kind enough to spare their valuable time and persons to provide us all the needed help and guidance at least twice when I visited them and many times through telephonic conversations.

At the centre, I am thankful to my colleagues Mr. Narinder Singh, Mrs. Perveen Taneja, and Mr. Debasis Manna for helping me in calculations, tabulation, scrutiny of schedules and literature searching to name a few assignments.

Support staff deserves special thanks to convey 100s of notes between the Acting Director and the project in charge during the process of the study. Mr. Gyan Chand along with handling the Library all alone in absence of recruitment of sanctioned staff, has to devote time for unproductive assignments such as to convince the Acting Director that district Mewat, was in fact, in Haryana. As my written notes were not enough, he succeeded only after producing her the Statistical Abstract.

I am wholeheartedly thankful to Prof. Kanchan Chopra, Chairperson of the GB of the Centre, for her patience and helping me in completing the field work, data entry etc.

Notwithstanding her general policy of non-intervention in day to day functioning of the centre, she has to intervene more than once and finally at the right time when getting fed up due to the delaying tactics of the Acting Director I was at the verge of relinquishing the project, by asking me to coordinate and the things could move smoothly afterwards.

In absence of requisite staff I personally have to do all the work- contacting the officials at Chandigarh, selected districts, villages, supervision of field work to typing of the report. Some mistakes in the draft report were pointed out by the reviewer section of the ADRT. Many may still be there, for which I alone stand responsible.

D.S.Bhupal

15<sup>th</sup> August, 2011

## Contents

S. N.	Chapter	Title	Page no.
1		Acknowledgement	i
2.		Executive Summary	ii-vi
2		Contents	vii
3		List of Tables	viii - ix
4	I	Introduction	1- 12
5	II	Employment generated under NREGA and its Socio-economic Characteristics	13 - 65
6	III	Household characteristics, income and Consumption pattern	66 - 84
7	IV	Work profile under NREGA and Wage structure	85 - 99
8	V	Functioning of NREGA–Qualitative aspects	100 - 121
9	VI	Impact of NREGA on village economy	122 - 138
10	VII	Summary and Concluding Remarks	139 - 157
		References	158
		Coordinator’s comments and action taken	159
		Coordinator’s letter	160 - 161

## List of tables

Table No.	Title of the table	Page
1.1	Details of Sample	10
2.1(a)	Percentage of households issued with job cards	15
2.1(b.1)	Growth in HH issued job cards in 2009- 10 over 2008-09	16
2.1 (b.2)	Growth in HH issued job cards in 2010-11 over 2009-10	17
2.1(b.3)	Growth in HH issued job cards in 2010-11 over 2008-09	17
2.1(c)	Households working under NREGA and % change	19
2.2(1)	Projects completed, % share in district (2008-09)	25
2.2(2)	Projects completed, % share in district (2009- 10)	25
2.2(3)	Projects completed, % share in district (2010- 11)	26
2.3 (a)	Projects completed, % share in state (2008-09)	27
2.3 (b)	Projects completed, % share in the state(2009-10)	28
2.3 (c)	Projects completed % share in the state (2010-11)	28
2.1	Employment generated under NREGA and socio-economic characteristics of households	41-45
2.2	District wise works completed/progress under NREGA	46-51
2.3	Amount spent on works completed under NREGA	52-57
2.4:	Social auditing and inspection of NREGA work	58-60
2.5:	The NREGA payment processed though banks/post office	61-63
2.6:	Unemployment allowance paid (2008-09 to 2010-11)	64
2.7:	Work projection under NREGA for 2010-11	65
3.1	Demographic Profile of the respondents (% or Households)	79
3.2	Main Occupation (% of total man-days per hh)	80
3.3	Household net income (Annual) (Rs. Per household)	80
3.4	Household consumption of food items (Per capita per month)	81
3.5	Monthly consumption expenditure of households	82
3.6	Variability in Income and Consumption	83
3.7a	Determinants of household participation in NREGA (OLS)	83
3.7b	Determinants of participation Members in NREGA (OLS)	84
3.7c	Determinants of participation in NREGA (Logit function)	84

Table No.	Title of the table	Page
4.1	Work profile under NREGA (Jan-Dec 2009)	95
4.2	Quality of assets created (Period Jan-Dec 2009) (% of hh)	97
4.3	Migration during Jan-Dec 2009	98
4.4	Wage differentials among activities	99
5.1	Assets Holdings (Rs. per household)	115
5.1b	Assets Holdings ( ratios per HH.)	115
5.2	Borrowing by Sample households (Rs. per household)	116
5.3	Household strength (borrowing and other assets % of HH)	116
5.4	Questions related to functioning of NREGA (%hh)	117- 119
5.5:	Quantitative questions related to NREGA functioning (% hh)	120
5.6:	Potential benefits of NREGA (% hh)	121
5.7	Quantitative questions related to food security (%hh)	121
6.1:	Infrastructure available within the village (%of villages)	133
6.2:	Occupational structure (% of households)	134
6.3:	Wage rates for different activities (avg. of all villages)	134
6.4	Labour charges for agricultural operations (avg. of all villages)	134
6.5.1	Qualitative changes in the villages (% of <i>Villages</i> )	135
6.5.2:	Qualitative questions about the functioning of NREGA	136
6.5.3	Quantitative questions about functioning of NREGA (% hh)	137
6.5.4	Details of potential benefits of NREGA (Percentage of hh)	138
6.5.5	Qualitative questions related to food security (% of hh)	138

# **Impact of Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme on Wage Rates, Food Security and Rural–Urban Migration in Haryana**

## **Executive Summary**

The National Rural Employment Guarantee Act ensuring 100 days per work household was implemented in Feb. 2006.

In Haryana districts Mahendergarh and Sirsa were selected in the first phase (2006) and Mewat and Ambala in the second phase (2007) and the remaining 17 districts in the third phase (2008).

**Objectives:** This study attempts to examine the outcome of the working of the scheme with following objectives

1. Identification of factors determining participation in NREGS
2. Impact of implementation of NREGA on employment, share of women in employment and change in their social status due to self earnings,
3. Impact on NREGA and non- NREGA wage differentials,
4. Impact of NREGA on rural- urban migration.
5. Impact of NREGA on assets creation and their sustainability
6. Impact of NREGA on rural food security, and ,
7. Overall assessment of the scheme and policy implications.

**Findings and Conclusions:** It is observed that household size, work available under non-NREGA activities and BPL card holding are significant factors for participation in the NREGA.

The progress of issuing job cards is significant during the three years. The percentage growth in the state as a whole in the three years was around 54%. The share of SC households in the issuance of job cards was more than 50%. The percentage of job seeking households among the job card holders was very low, but almost all those who demanded work were provided with, and the number of households working under NREGA increased from 73 thousand in 2008-09 to 98 thousand in 2010-11. There was 50% in women participation. Overall the share of women in generation of work days was more than 30%.

The share of rural connectivity in completed projects within the districts as well as in the state was more than 1/3<sup>rd</sup>. It was followed by water conservation and rain water harvesting measures with more than 20% share. Other important projects getting about 15-16% share in the state as well as in the selected districts were Drought Proofing and Micro Irrigation etc.

There was substantial increase in the amount spent on completed and ongoing projects during the three years which in 2010-11 was almost 95% more than the amount spent in 2008-09. The maximum amount has been spent on Land Development, Rural Connectivity and Water Harvesting.

Social audit of the works, verification of muster rolls, and, gram panchayats' and gram sabhas' meetings are key to the functioning of NREGA. During the three years more than 95% muster rolls were verified. But in district Sirsa about 33% less than due were verified. The situation related with verification/ completion of Panchayats was not even that good. In the state during the year 2010-11 about 40% verification of panchayats was not completed. In the year 2010-11 almost all the works are shown as inspected, though we find many districts lagging. In many districts meetings of the gram sabhas were not held.

We find number of individual and joint bank and post office accounts of NREGA workers increasing during the three years. But still a huge portion of wages is paid in cash and disbursal of wages through bank and post office accounts during the three years, as percentage of total amount spent on projects was merely 13.7%, 6.5% and 15.9%. No unemployment allowance was paid, though it has been reported as due for some considerable days during the year 2009-10.

The scope of NREGA has been enlarged, but some activities under Khadi and Village Industries can be brought under NREGA to strengthen both.

**Demographic profile of the respondents:** The average household size of the beneficiaries was larger (5.59) than non-beneficiaries (4.86) as well as the earning members (2.68) and (2.36) per household.

The percentage of females in the beneficiary households was a little higher, 45.4%, in comparison to 43.9% in the non-beneficiary households, which

translates into very disturbing gender ratio of 832 females per 1000 male members for beneficiary households and 783 for non-beneficiaries.

NREGA appears to provide more employment for proper working age people of <60 years as compared to the case of non-beneficiary households. Though a larger percentage of illiteracy, 39% as compared to 34% is observed in the case of beneficiary households, but percentage of primary school students is more by 1% as compared to non-beneficiary households.

For about 25% households work under NREGA was main occupation and 25% of their income came from working under NREGA activities.

No vivid pattern between beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries emerges from per capita monthly consumption. However, per capita per month consumption expenditure works out Rs. 487/- at current prices in aggregate for both the beneficiaries as well as non-beneficiaries which is not enough to save them from malnutrition, if not from hunger without NREGA. If food is not provided at subsidized rates even NREGA alone in the present form of providing 100 days' work at a fixed wage, will not address the issues of providing sufficient food. Because per capita consumption expenditure of Rs. 13 per day in the case of beneficiaries and Rs. 12.4 in the case of non-beneficiaries is not sufficient to provide two times food. Therefore, NREGA seems to have benefited the poor directly by delivering some money and indirectly to non-beneficiaries by increasing overall wage rates. Providing work under NREGA during lean period, therefore, makes sense. In Haryana as market wage rates are generally higher; therefore the option of adjusting wage rates to inflation (at least twice a year) may be more useful.

Effective PDS may be the best option to help the poor to meet both ends. More items in addition to wheat, rice, sugar etc. like milk products, edible oils, pulses, spices, poultry products etc. need to be brought under the PDS. To enhance real income of the workers, cloth, detergents, durable household items can also be provided without levying taxes as is the case with canteen stores department for armed forces. This will help increase the demand for industrial goods also.



**Impact on village economy:** Availability of credit to the resource-less households always remains problematic. Only in one case a small loan was reported for establishing a shop. Though cooperative credit societies were functioning in the villages and many respondents were members also, but loan facility probably was not available to them.

The common village assets like rural connectivity, land development, water harvesting, drought proofing and other infrastructure- roads, schools, electricity, panchayat's offices etc. were more or less available in most of the villages. But in none of the village bank branch was functioning, notwithstanding the RBI guidelines of opening a branch in villages with population of more than 2000. The fair price shop was also non-existent in 60% of the villages. These two are important from the point of view of providing economical credit and subsidized food to the poor.

The number of households with agricultural labour as main occupation has gone down by 3%, whereas number of cultivating households due to subdivision of holdings increased from 64% to 65%. Similarly there is increase in other occupations like transport, commerce/ business by 0.7- 0.8 %.

The increase in all type of wages from 30% to 50% both for male and female workers has been noticed all around. The increase in wages for different agricultural operations was also observed. For example, labour charges per day for ploughing have almost gone up by two times since 2005 and by 3 times since 2001. The cost of paddy transplantation has gone up by 50% to 200% since 2005 and 250% to 300% since 2001. No change in the position of attached labour is serious and needs attention.

Following suggestions may be considered:

1. Expansion of NREGA (200 days work per household or 100 days work per job seeker) should be the minimum.
2. For improvement in the implementation, toll free application registration, complaint registration call centre scheme be made compulsory.
3. For accounts in banks, payments, job cards etc related issues administrative camps (like administration to the villages in Rajasthan, where

- all the concerned officers camp in the village on specified day to settle all the issues) should be started.
4. Flow of Funds needs to be regular and not at the end of the year. For proper maintenance of records trained staff should be need based and recruited in a slightly liberal way instead of the present system of one project officer and one accounts assistant.
  5. For selection, monitoring of work etc. involvement of workers' association, along with some independent committee, may be of retired teachers/ government officials residing in the village, elected by the gram sabha, some senior officers of the district may be involved.

However, some other measures related with overall situation, other institutions also need to be considered.

1. Credit facility through financial institutions need to be improved to lift the poor above poverty. Post offices are based in each village therefore their infrastructure should be used for banking operations.
2. For enhancement in real income strengthening of PDS by inclusion of more edible as well as non-edible items at reasonable rates like CSD for the armed forces may be considered.
3. Immediate and effective steps for the welfare of the attached labour need to be taken.
4. More effective steps to strengthen the economy of the most backward sections of the society like artisans who have lost their traditional work under the new policies and development process like lohars, kumhars, carpenters, etc. need to be taken up on priority basis.
5. For all these and many more welfare activities, the already going on schemes, like RKVY, Khadi and Village Industries, Sarve shiksha abhiyan, mother- child care etc. need to be integrated and converged. For broad policy framework and effective resource utilization of funds, all the funds - MPLAD, Rural Development, KVIC, educational and health etc. should be put together and utilization thereof be planned on the basis RKVY under the total monitoring of the Gram Sabha.

# Impact of Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme on Wage Rates, Food Security and Rural–Urban Migration in Haryana

## Chapter – I Introduction

**1.1 Introduction:** “More than 1.1 million jobs may have been lost as a result of the south Asian earthquake that devastated parts of Pakistan, adding that productive and labour intensive job creation programmes are urgently needed to lift millions of people out of poverty that has been aggravated by quake damage”, the International Labour Organisation (ILO). The devastating earthquake caused loss of millions of livelihoods. “One aspect of the South Asian earthquake’s disaster was its effect on livelihoods. But employment and livelihoods are not the stuff of which headlines are made – unless, of course, it is in the context of the corporate world, or when it cannot be ignored such as a nation-wide strike.”<sup>1</sup>

The incident of earth quake was caused by the Mighty Nature and was an isolated one. More important was the exclusion of millions of people being devoid of benefits of high growth rates, which was impacting the life style of some haves and livelihood of millions of have-nots differently. The democratic polity cannot avoid huge disparity in receipt of economic benefits, particularly when it is caused due to policy intervention. Though to serve the interests of its peers the lead editorial of the TOI was meant to demean the left but timely will be its citation about the state of unorganized work force, on 28<sup>th</sup> October, it headlined “Labour Aristocrats,” and included some telling facts and interesting observations about the 500 million strong Indian workforce: “...a miniscule 5%, or 27 million, work in the organised sector. About 70% or 9 million, work for the central and state governments... Add a couple more million to that and you get a figure of between 20 and 22 million people who belong to the labour aristocracy. This 4% of workers militate against the interests of the other 96%.” The editorial also contained some advice for the communist parties: “The Left should stop fretting about 4% of the workforce” and

---

<sup>1</sup> A. Joseph. Is the media watching poverty enough, India Together,

should, instead, “look after the interests of non-organised, non-unionised people, who are the vast majority...This freedom also applies to employers who may choose to specify, in their contracts with employees, that strikes may lead to dismissal.”<sup>2</sup>

Almost in the entire South- East Asia situation of unemployment is similar. According to the 2003 edition of *Human Development in South Asia*, brought out by the Pakistan-based Mahbub ul Haq Human Development Centre, which focused on "The Employment Challenge," "South Asia's labour market is characterized by pervasive unemployment and underemployment, especially among the youth and the educated; working poor who do not get adequate wages to get out of poverty; working children; and women who face discrimination across the labour market."

Estimates of the total number of unemployed or underemployed people in India vary between 50 and 300 million. The Economic Survey of India has reported that the unemployment rate increased from 5.99 per cent in 1993-94 to 7.32 per cent in 1999-2000. To make matters worse, young people accounted for 53 per cent of the total unemployed in the country. But such official data are deceptive and reveal only a part of the story as these are based partly on information from employment exchanges across the country, which are used by a fraction of those seeking work, and partly on the Census conducted every ten years and National Sample Surveys in between. Another example of deception of data is related with poverty. The poverty estimates claiming poverty to be coming down to below 25% in the not so distant past has suddenly climbed above 40%, and above 70% if World Bank threshold of \$ 2 per capita income per day was applied notwithstanding the fact that there was no let up in the growth rate of the economy.

**1.2 Historical Background:** The country (the ministry of Rural Development specifically after it came into being) has been running a number of programmes since the days of famous slogan of “Garibi Hatao”. It started with 20 point programme. Some of the other programmes related with rural development, providing gainful employment, enhancing rural peoples’ skills thereby their income

---

<sup>2</sup> Times of India, Oct. 28, 2005

and thus envisaging their food security etc. like National Rural Employment Programme (NREP), Rural Landless Guarantee Programme (RLEGP), Jawahar Rozgar Yojna (JRY), Employment Assurance Scheme (EAS), Jawahar Gram Samridhi Yojna (JGSY), Sampoorn Grameen Rozgar Yojna (SGRY), National Food for Work Programme (NFWP), Training Rural Youth for Self Employment (TRYSEM) including the important programme Integrated Rural Development Programme (IRDP) were brought into being and a lot of money from time to time was spent.

This amount (both Plan and Non Plan) has increased from 10.46 per cent in 2003-04 to 19.46 per cent in 2009-10 (BE). Central support for social programmes has continued to expand in various forms although most social-sector subjects fall within the purview of the States. In Swarnjayanti Gram Swarozgar yojana (SGSY), up to December 2009, 36.78 lakh self help groups (SHGs) had been formed and 132.81 lakh swarozgaris have been assisted with a total investment of Rs.30896.08 crore. In Swarna Jayanti Shahari Rozgar Yojana (SJSRY), which the Government has recently revamped, during 2009-10 as reported by States/UTs, 28,613 urban poor have been assisted to set up individual enterprises, 13,453 urban poor women have been assisted in setting up group enterprises, 27,463 urban poor women have been assisted through a revolving fund for thrift and credit activities and 85,185 urban poor have been imparted skill training. In the National Rural Employment Guarantee scheme (NREGS), during the year 2009-10, 4.34 crore households have been provided employment. Out of the 182.88 crore person days created under the scheme during this period. 29 per cent and 22 per cent were for the SC and ST population respectively and 50 per cent for women<sup>3</sup>. But the results of the earlier programmes were not very encouraging, forcing even the then prime minister to admit that delivery of the system was gravely poor, resulting only 15% money to reach the poor.<sup>4</sup>

In the absence of viable and reliable social or economic security of any kind, the majority of Indians – male and female – have no option but to enslave themselves

---

<sup>3</sup> Economic Survey 2009-10

<sup>4</sup> The often quoted statement of the late Rajiv Gandhi, based upon the evaluation of poverty by Prof. CHH Hanumantha Rao and Dr. P. Rangaswamy.

under appalling conditions for less than decent wages, often from childhood to old age. The case of brick kiln workers in Rajasthan and also the efforts made by Swamy Agnivesh to get bonded labourers freed are telling. In North Rajasthan where the author has been involved, the brick kiln workers are not marked their attendance, not provided any tools to work with, they have to bring with their own, no place to rest, no child care facility, not even drinking water, no minimum wages, no paid leave/holiday, no compensation for accidents, no health check up, no insurance of any kind etc. In other words, no social security measure is applicable. Leave apart all these, they are not allowed even to leave the work, even when some of them have no debt.

In 18 out of the 32 states and union territories where legislation on minimum wages applies, the minimum permissible daily wage is less than Rs 50; the range of minimum wages rises above Rs.100 only in four states. It goes without saying that even such low minimum wages are not always paid. To make matters worse, there are seasonal variations in availability of work and calamities of various kinds – from drought to social conflict – adversely affecting employment and livelihoods on a regular basis.

Therefore, under the pressure of social groups and others, the congress party was forced to bring rural employment guarantee in its election manifesto, later on strong stand of the NAC and pressure of left parties on whose support the govt. was formed, it was made an essential aspect of National Common Minimum Programme of the UPA – I government. “The UPA government will immediately enact a **National Employment Guarantee Act**.<sup>5</sup> This will provide legal guarantee of at least 100 days of employment to begin with on asset-creating public works programmes every year at minimum wages for at least one-able bodied person in every rural, urban poor and lower middle class house-hold.”<sup>6</sup>

**It should be remembered that steps for almost the other half (the urban poor) are not yet considered, leave apart the needed action.**

---

<sup>5</sup> The NREGA has been renamed as Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Act, we have used both the terms interchangeably in this report

<sup>6</sup> National Common Minimum Programme

Under this background the NREGA was notified on 7<sup>th</sup> September 2005 and brought into implementation in Feb. 2006, initially in 200 most backward districts spread over 27 states, in other 130 districts in the following year (113 from 1<sup>st</sup> April and 17 districts of UP from 15<sup>th</sup> May); and the entire country was covered in the third year of its implementation, i.e., from 1<sup>st</sup> April, 2008. “The National Rural Employment Guarantee Act (NREGA) aims at enhancing the livelihood security of people in rural areas by guaranteeing hundred days of wage-employment in a financial year to a rural household whose members volunteer to do unskilled manual work”

It is to address the desperate need of millions of people struggling for basic livelihood that the NREGA was passed by Parliament on 23<sup>rd</sup> August, 2005. The Act, which became law in September, aims to provide large-scale employment to the rural poor through public works. It was expected to have the additional benefit of developing the infrastructure base in the countryside. The landmark legislation guarantees 100 days of wage employment in a year to adult members of a rural household who demand employment and volunteer to do unskilled manual work. Under the Act, any adult who is willing to undertake such labour is entitled to apply for employment and be assigned work within 15 days, subject to the current limit of 100 days per household per year. Further, and importantly, an unemployment allowance has to be paid if work is not provided for any reason.

The NREGA is a historic piece of legislation in the sense that it makes India the only country in the world wherein the local administration is liable to provide work within a fortnight to a rural jobseeker. It is significant that the law emerged through a bottom-up process, with a sustained popular campaign helping to coordinate the demand from below for the right to work. A draft Bill was prepared as part of this campaign. The fact that key people involved in the movement served on the National Advisory Council set up by the union government provided an added thrust to the effort, with the NAC coming up with a slightly different Bill. The NREGA was finally passed after many twists and turns, some dilution and at least one resignation, as well as a Rozgar Adhikar Yatra, a major effort at mobilizing mass awareness of and support for the employment guarantee law awaiting

Parliamentary approval. To reduce financial burden on the state governments the Central Government bears the costs on the following items:

The entire cost of wages of unskilled manual workers,

Seventy five percent of the cost of material and wages of skilled and semi-skilled workers,

Administrative expenses as may be determined by the central government, which will include inter- alia, the salary and the allowances of the Programme Officer and his supporting staff and work-site facilities and expenses of the National Employment Guarantee Council. Surprisingly, the council has been very recently constituted in June 2011.

**Implementation of NREGA in Haryana:** The act was implemented in 200 most backward districts of the country at the word go after the PM made the announcement that the Act would be implemented with effect from February, 2006. The Mahendergarh district of Haryana was one of those in the first phase. In its village Satnali, one Mr. Mahesh Kumar, 28 years of age, who used to get work for only 10 days a month started beating the drum to make announcement of the NREGA and asking people to get registered, claiming everybody who registers for job, subject to 100 days maximum per household per annum, would get employment at Rs. 90/- a day, became the first person in the entire country to get himself registered on February 2<sup>nd</sup>. Hundreds of miles away from the launch by Prime Minister Manmohan Singh and UPA chairperson Sonia Gandhi in Andhra Pradesh, 25 km from village Khudana where the local administration held its official launch, Satnali was the first real testing ground.<sup>7</sup>

Along with Kumar, at around the same time, all 132 panchayats in the district held their special Gram Sabhas to register “able-bodied men and women.” For them, this was the first time when work was a legal right.

On Day 1, attendance at the Satnali Gram Sabha was thin. All Panchayat members knew the details of the programme but this was the first time they had to explain it to the common people (aam aadmi). District Commissioner Fateh Singh Dagar has held four rounds of meetings with the local administration and the

---

<sup>7</sup> Sonu Jain: Feb 03, 2006 / Indian Express



sarpanchs to discuss implementation. “We are committed to this programme. Within the next 15 days, we will ensure that the scheme starts,” said Dagar. According to him, **Rs 3 crore was already there for him to start NREGS from Food for Work Programme before the next budget allocation.**

The National Rural Employment Guarantee Act (NREGA) may be able to divert the labour of traditionally backward states to the greener pastures but Haryana either does not have enough seekers for the employment programme or there is lack of enthusiasm on the part of those responsible for implementation that enough job seekers have neither been provided with job cards nor the sanctioned funds have been spent during at least in the initial years in the state as a whole and some parts even now.

According to the information from the Department of Rural Development, Haryana fell short of the target in utilising funds as the number of applicants was insufficient. The state could utilise only Rs 52.35 crore out of Rs 58.20 crore funds earmarked under NREGA in 2007-08. Similarly, out of Rs 160.12 crore available, the amount spent under NREGA was Rs 110.00 crore in 2008-09. Thus only 70 per cent utilisation of the available funds could take place.<sup>8</sup>

In the financial year 2007-08 161,000 households were issued job cards which increased to 217,000 households in 2008-09 and in the financial year of 2009-10, up to August 2009; 26,846 households were issued the cards. About 672 projects had been completed under NREGA since its inception.

The state has approved a labour budget of Rs 220 crore from the Union Ministry of Rural Development and this is for the first time that a labour budget has been sanctioned in advance, which is subject to revision, if required.

The scope of NREGA has been enlarged which may help the state to fully absorb the funds which include land development, irrigation facilities and horticulture plantation which has been permitted to small and marginal farmers.

In Haryana, out of 1.5 million farmers, 998,000 (almost 2/3<sup>rd</sup>) are small and marginal farmers. So, the expansion of the scheme is likely to trigger better reach out. The departments concerned have instructed the district administration to get

---

<sup>8</sup> Komal Gera, Business Standard, New Delhi, Sep.22, 2009

the work approved from the Gram Sabhas concerned and include it in their annual action plan.

The wage rate in Haryana is Rs 151 per day which was revised on July 2009 from Rs 148 per day.

An interesting report by the Secretary Rural development, GOI<sup>9</sup> who spent over night in village Kaluana of district Sirsa has been presented with sharp contrast of implementation of NREGA in two villages of the district, vigorously implementing village Kaluana and lagging village Govindpura, one surpassing the targets and the other even hesitating to start the project. The reason rightly pointed out was implementing spirit of the sarpanchs of both the villages. We shall include the finer points of the report at appropriate place.

In the light of the above we have taken up this study in the state to find out the status, achievements and reasons both positives and negatives of the implementation of the scheme.

**Objectives of the Study:** As it is a National Flagship Programme of its only kind, having larger than life impact on national resources, livelihood of the people, poverty alleviation, food security, gender equity, children welfare etc., everybody from village Sarpanch to Parliament to World Bank and ILO are keeping a regular watch through their respective methods. Hence there are number of interested parties, including of course academics to corporate sector, (I was a little bit surprised pleasantly, when one friend of mine sent some of the recruits of his company to me to impart them basic information about the Act, its implementation and its impact on consumption pattern of fruits and vegetables in the rural households, his company's main area of business), planning commission, the ministries etc. evaluating its pros and cons. The Agro-Centres have been entrusted with the task to evaluate its overall functioning, impact it is making on rural livelihood, food security of the people and assets creation, in other words all the possible areas of its influence. The ADRT Bangalore, the coordinator of the All India Study has been entrusted to see a common approach to objectives,

---

<sup>9</sup> Tour Report on the visit of Sirsa(Haryana) by a Team of Officers headed by Shri B.K. Sinha, Secretary(RD) & Shri T. Vijay Kumar, JS(SGSY) and Shri N.K. Sinha, JD(NREGA), May 21, 2010

methodology and analysis. The present study based on Haryana experience in line with the coordinated report, attempts to look into the following objectives:

1. Identification of factors determining the participation of people in NREGA
2. Impact of implementation of NREGA on employment, share of women workforce in employment and change in their social status due to self earnings,
3. Impact on NREGA and non- NREGA wage differentials,
4. Impact of NREGA on rural- urban migration.
5. Impact of NREGA on assets creation and their sustainability
6. Impact of NREGA on rural food security, and ,
7. Overall assessment of the programme and policy implications for further strengthening the programme.

The endeavour will of course be to find out the successful cases and not so successful areas of NREGA in the state. Based upon the experience an attempt will also be made to make viable suggestions.

**1.4 Data and Methodology:** As stated above the present All India study is being coordinated by the ADRT Bangalore, hence a major work regarding finalization of objectives, methodology sample size, even chapter Scheme to tabulation Scheme etc. has been finalized by them so that the coordination becomes smooth and a common pattern of the final report becomes easy for presentation. We have mostly followed their design. For collection of data, five districts as suggested by the coordinator, one from almost extreme in each direction of the state and the fifth from the centre were to be selected for the study. However after discussion with the DRDA authorities of the state and the coordinator we altered one district Mahendergarh and replaced with the most backward district of the state, Mewat. The other districts selected for the study were, Ambala, Panipat, Sirsa and Rewari. These districts cover all the three phases of implementation of the NREGA in the state. From each district two villages – one within a radius of 5 kms and the other beyond 20 kms were to be selected. We have followed this pattern with some difference in distance (on the advice of the concerned district officials) for example the nearest villages in Sirsa, Mewat and Rewari were beyond 5 kms. as there was no work within that radius. And the other village in Rewari due to the same reason was less than 20 kms. From each village 25 respondents – 20 beneficiaries of NREGA and 5 non-

beneficiaries were to be selected for detailed enquiry. Despite the repeated requests from the ministry and the author, the vacant posts in the centre were not filled by the Acting Director on the silly ground that there was not enough money to pay salary to the existing staff; hence data were collected through a private agency on contract basis. Overall the study is based upon a sample size of 250 individual respondents and 10 villages represented by the respective sarpanches/ Panchayat secretaries/ village pardhans/ or village level workers of the state government. During the field visits for the process of data collection or after the field work was over, the author visited the villages, had discussions with all these officials/ village leaders/ actual beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries and list of enquiries was further expanded to incorporate information thus received. The questionnaires prepared by the coordinator for individual households as well for villages have been used to collect data from the respondents. We have mostly used the table formats prepared by the coordinator. The details of sample size have been presented in Table 1.1

Table 1.1  
Sample details

District	Block/ Tehsil	Villages	Distance Kms.)
Ambala	Ambala	Bhedon	22
	Shajadpur	Dangdheri	5
Panipat	Panipat	Ugrakhedi	3
	Ierana	Pardhana	25
Sirsa	Sirsa	Ranga	30
	Sirsa	Farawinkhurd	9
Mewat	Nuh	Kotla	14
	Feerozpur	Navli	26
Rewari	Bawal	Khandora	12
	Rewari	Budhpur	6

**1.5 An overview:** The state largely is well developed in overall agricultural process - production, yield, income of the farmers etc. thereby placing the agricultural labour force in a little bit advantageous position in comparison to agricultural workers in most of the other states of the country. This becomes

evident from the fact that a large number of farm workers immigrate from other states. The rush is heavy particularly during the peak agricultural seasons like, planting and harvesting of paddy, cotton picking, wheat harvesting, kinnu gathering etc. Also the average wage rate for farm workers has been found much higher in the state as compared to other parts of the nation. But in districts like Mewat and Mahendergarh, which lack irrigation facilities and also do not enjoy location advantage like Gurgaon, Faridabad or Rewari the situation for farm workers or for daily wage earners differs drastically. NREGA in fact, seems to make a tangible impact in such districts. Secondly and more importantly, the work done under NREGA seems to be long time beneficial in the sense that results of water harvesting activities, drought proofing etc. will be visible after some time. Overall the workforce, most deprived sections of the society for which the Act was enacted as a social security measure, should be the real beneficiaries. There are reports from various angles to suggest large scale bungling in the funds, creation of non-durable assets, wastage of taxpayers' money etc. But at grass root level they seem to be exaggerated. In sum at the beginning of the programme, we can say with some authenticity that NREGA seems to be much more beneficial in comparison to all other programmes listed above and practiced so far.

Independent India has to acknowledge the critical role the NREGA has played in providing a measure of inclusive growth. It has given people a right to work, to re-establish the dignity of labour, to ensure people's economic and democratic rights and entitlements, to create labour intensive infrastructure and assets, and to build the human resource base of our country. For the first time, the power elite recognises the people's right to fight endemic hunger and poverty with dignity, accepting that their labour will be the foundation for infrastructure and economic growth.<sup>10</sup>

In the light of the above we have presented the report as per the chapter scheme given below:

**Chapter Scheme:** The report has been divided into 7 chapters. In addition to introduction of the subject, a brief history of implementation in Haryana, data and

---

<sup>10</sup> Aruna Roy and N day NREGA: Breaking new ground, The Hindu

methodology and objectives are discussed in chapter I. We have given a brief description of employment generated under NREGA and the socio-economic characteristics based upon the data available on the web site of the state in chapter II. It also looks into the progress made in the state at district level, attempting to find out the reasons that some districts were not keeping pace with the others moving ahead. In chapter III, Household characteristics and income and consumption patterns have been discussed. The work profile under NREGA, wage structure and migration issues are subject matter of chapter IV. Qualitative aspects of the functioning of NREGA have been discussed in chapter V. Based upon the village schedules, impact of NREGA on village economy has been discussed in chapter VI and finally chapter VII concludes the findings along with the summary of the report and a few suggestions envisaging the improvement in the welfare of rural masses and the functioning of the programme.

**Limitations:** As stated earlier this report is part of the All India Study, hence, data, methodology, objectives etc are followed as per the common design. But the grass root situation in Haryana is slightly different in some aspects and drastically in some others, for example the minimum wages and prevailing wage rate, labour demand and supply for agricultural operations, workers' economic position due to various welfare schemes and food security and impact on cost of agricultural production. The focus of the study as per requirement in Haryana needed to be more about impact of NREGA on cost of production, which it lacks.

The other drawback is that NREGA is a village based programme depending largely upon the Sarpanch and Gram Sabha instead of district based. Hence a comprehensive village level intensive study about progress of implementation and impact might have been more useful to find out the impact in detail.

Thirdly, the real impact of the infrastructure and projects being taken up will be known after a few years.

Fourthly the social impact of NREGA (role of khaps and gender ratio) needs focus. Hence, these should be the focused areas for further research in Haryana.

## **CHAPTER – II**

### **Employment generated under NREGA and its socio-economic characteristics**

#### **2.1 The functioning of NREGA:**

Under the directions of the central government, the state governments are bound to upload the data related with NREGA implementation on the specified format. The data in most cases are available but in some cases is still lacking. In others there are discrepancies.<sup>11</sup>

This chapter is based upon the secondary data published and uploaded on the web site.. The purpose is to have a broad picture of the evolution of NREGA implementation in the state, starting from two districts, Mahendergarh and Sirsa in 2006 (phase I), followed by other two districts, Ambala and Mewat in 2007(phase II) and, along with the entire country, the remaining districts of the state coming under NREGA implementation in 2008 (final phase).

As would be seen from many reports of the state government, state agricultural university, state planning board etc. agricultural wages in Haryana have been ruling high as compared to other states, even to its immediate neighbour Rajasthan, in some cases more than minimum prescribed wages; labour has been immigrating into the state, particularly during the seasons, and surprisingly number of Scheduled tribes in the state have been far less as compared to other states due to two basic reasons, one- state traditionally had not been a tribes dominated state, and two, a few castes which generally should have been in the tribes category are included in the Scheduled castes. For example, nomadic (lohars) ironsmith (a hard working community) and bawri or bawria, sansi, spera, etc. are

---

<sup>11</sup> There are two links on the national web site for almost each category of data – one data entry distt. implementation tables, left side of the main web page) and the other on the right side for same set of data, same period, district, etc. As far as Haryana is concerned, there are huge discrepancies in data in both the links. Secondly, the data for the earlier period, that is for the year 2008-09 have also been removed and replaced by the latest year, i.e., 2011-12 and that is why we have to change the use of data for the revision of this chapter to include all the districts in place of only 5 selected districts, data for which were used in the draft report. Therefore, there are differences in the data used in draft report and this final report.

other castes which generally have been dependent on begging, forest produce, stealing, and other petty crimes and many of such communities are in the list of tribes in neighbouring Rajasthan and Punjab. But due to some good measures taken by the state many of such castes have been given land rights and are doing farming, therefore, status of Scheduled Tribes has been denied to them in Haryana.

This reflects upon their role in NREGA, for example, number of job cards issued, employment provided etc.

Table 2.1 covers households with socio-economic characteristics (Scheduled Castes, Scheduled Tribes and other backward castes as well as forward castes), which were issued job cards, households which demanded employment under NREGA and were provided with, which were working and finally the employment generated person days in the state during the three years, viz. 2008-09 to 2010-11. The data show that in 2008-09 more than 3.77 lakh households were issued job cards out of which about 2.11 lakh or nearly 56% were from the SC category. Only 56 households or less than 0.015% were from the ST category in the entire state and the rest, about 44% were from other castes. In the following year 2009-10 more other caste households in comparison to the SC were issued job cards. The increase was about 3% from 44 to about 47%, virtually no increase in ST and parallel reduction in the percentage of SC households, though about 3 lakh more SC households were added to the list. In the final year of comparison, i.e., in 2010-11, though more than 0.5 lakh SC households were added, but the percentage distribution among others and SC households almost equaled. In other words the progress in issuing job cards to other castes was more than that for SC households, because not a single ST household was added to the list.

However, district wise progress is further disparate. We can observe from table 2.1 (a) that only two first phase districts have been leading in the issuance of job cards with each having issued more than 10% job cards of the entire state and that too in both the SC and general category as well as during the three years under consideration. Another district is Mewat in which in first two years more than 10% job cards were issued to only general category households. It is followed by district



Hissar; wherein about 10% job cards were issued to SC households in the year 2010-11. Barring district Palwal which was formed on 15<sup>th</sup> August 2008, the most lagging district was Faridabad where in during the three years less than 1% of households in both the categories were issued job cards. The important point is that district Faridabad is also one of the most densely populated district in the state. So even per thousand population the number of job cards may also be far less. Similar is the case of Gurgaon. The only reason can be that due to other activities, particularly construction activities, the number of job cards seekers may not be very encouraging which we shall be looking into later. However, barring one or two districts like Ambala, Jind and Fatehabad in all the remaining districts the percentage of job cards was less than 5% of the state during the three years.

Table 2.1(a)  
Percentage of households issued with job cards

Distt.	2008-09			2009-10			2010-11		
	SC	others	total	SC	others	total	SC	others	total
MAHENDRAGARH	13.33	13.72	13.50	7.12	17.02	11.81	6.09	15.25	10.63
SIRSA	17.89	16.94	17.47	16.20	13.00	14.68	15.68	10.59	13.16
AMBALA	9.37	4.69	7.31	8.69	4.17	6.55	7.76	4.62	6.21
MEWAT	2.14	14.47	7.58	1.66	10.13	5.67	1.48	9.71	5.56
BHIWANI	5.59	5.27	5.46	6.47	7.48	6.96	8.19	9.31	8.74
FARIDABAD	0.50	0.37	0.44	0.29	0.20	0.24	0.61	0.54	0.57
FATEHABAD	4.99	2.55	3.91	6.54	3.28	4.99	7.06	3.66	5.38
GURGAON	0.59	0.28	0.45	0.77	0.37	0.58	0.85	0.56	0.71
HISSAR	5.24	1.46	3.57	7.15	1.98	4.70	10.19	3.90	7.07
JAJHJHAR	2.77	2.82	2.79	4.04	3.68	3.87	3.60	3.31	3.45
JIND	6.95	4.48	5.86	6.69	3.86	5.34	6.11	3.32	4.73
KAITHAL	5.18	4.20	4.75	4.67	3.75	4.23	3.14	4.15	3.64
KARNAL	3.74	4.15	3.92	4.05	3.91	3.98	4.24	3.80	4.02
KURUKSHETRA	3.70	4.88	4.22	3.08	4.51	3.76	3.14	4.19	3.66
PALWAL	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.58	2.15	1.85	1.86	3.03	2.44
PANCHKULA	1.46	3.10	2.18	1.16	2.90	1.98	1.10	2.60	1.84
PANIPAT	2.47	2.23	2.36	2.55	2.24	2.40	2.45	2.18	2.32
REWARI	3.26	4.14	3.65	5.33	4.53	4.95	5.09	4.44	4.77
ROHTAK	2.66	1.63	2.21	2.49	1.54	2.04	2.46	1.76	2.11
SONIPAT	4.51	3.65	4.13	5.37	4.79	5.09	5.06	4.88	4.97
YAMUNANAGAR	3.65	4.97	4.23	4.11	4.50	4.29	3.84	4.20	4.02
TOTAL	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

For further within the district distribution of job cards among Scheduled castes and other castes table 2.1 as per the requirement of the coordinator has been prepared which is self revealing.

To reach at meaningful conclusion at the progress of NREGA we have worked out % growth in the parameters over the preceding years and finally in the current year over the initial year as given in table 2.1 (b) below.

Two three points need to be emphasized in the beginning, one that district Palwal was carved out in 2008-09, therefore there is no data for the district in 2008-09 and subsequently for comparison, two, as stated above about very low strength of St households in Haryana, only 58 households belonging to St were issued job cards in district Bhiwani, 56 in 2008-09 and 2 more were added in 2009-10, three, data for the year 2009-10 are cumulative, i.e., all households having job cards issued in 2008-09 and 2009-10.

Table 2.1 (b.1)  
Percentage growth in hh issued job cards in 2009- 10 over 2008-09

District	SC	St	others	total
MAHENDRAGARH	-38.8		62.2	6.5
SIRSA	3.7		0.3	2.2
AMBALA	6.3		16.2	9.1
MEWAT	-11.3		-8.5	-9.0
BHIWANI	32.7	3.6	85.7	55.1
FARIDABAD	-34.7		-29.7	-32.9
FATEHABAD	50.1		68.1	55.2
GURGAON	49.7		76.5	57.0
HISSAR	56.4		76.8	60.1
JAJHJHAR	66.8		70.8	68.6
JIND	10.2		12.4	10.9
KAITHAL	3.3		16.5	8.4
KARNAL	23.8		23.3	23.6
KURUKSHETRA	-4.6		21.0	8.4
PALWAL	na	na	na	na
PANCHKULA	-9.2		22.4	10.6
PANIPAT	18.3		31.2	23.7
REWARI	87.1		42.9	65.0
ROHTAK	7.4		23.6	12.7
SONIPAT	36.3		71.6	50.0
YAMUNANAGAR	28.9		18.3	23.4
State	14.6	3.6	30.7	21.7

Table 2.1 (b.2)  
Percentage growth in HH issued job cards in 2010-11 over 2009-10

districts	SC	St	others	total
MAHENDRAGARH	3.9		18.9	14.2
SIRSA	17.7		8.1	13.7
AMBALA	8.6		46.9	20.2
MEWAT	8.8		27.2	24.4
BHIWANI	53.8		65.1	59.3
FARIDABAD	160.0		258.7	197.9
FATEHABAD	31.2		48.4	36.6
GURGAON	34.0		98.5	53.6
HISSAR	73.3		161.1	90.8
JAJHJHAR	8.3		19.3	13.3
JIND	11.1		14.4	12.2
KAITHAL	-18.3		46.9	9.1
KARNAL	27.4		28.9	28.1
KURUKSHETRA	24.0		23.1	23.5
PALWAL	43.2		87.4	67.5
PANCHKULA	15.9		18.8	17.9
PANIPAT	16.9		29.4	22.5
REWARI	16.1		30.2	22.2
ROHTAK	19.8		50.8	30.9
SONIPAT	14.7		35.3	23.9
YAMUNANAGAR	13.9		23.7	18.8
State	21.6		32.7	26.9

Table 2.1(b.3)  
Percentage growth in hh issued job cards in 2010-11 over 2008-09

District	SC	St	others	total
MAHENDRAGARH	-36.4		92.9	21.5
SIRSA	22.1		8.4	16.3
AMBALA	15.4		70.7	31.1
MEWAT	-3.5		16.4	13.3
BHIWANI	104.1		206.5	147.1
FARIDABAD	69.7		152.2	99.9
FATEHABAD	96.9		149.5	112.0
GURGAON	100.6		250.4	141.1
HISSAR	171.0		361.7	205.5
JAJHJHAR	80.7		103.9	91.0
JIND	22.5		28.5	24.5
KAITHAL	-15.6		71.1	18.3
KARNAL	57.8		58.9	58.3
KURUKSHETRA	18.3		48.9	33.9
PALWAL	na	na	na	na
PANCHKULA	5.3		45.5	30.4
PANIPAT	38.3		69.8	51.4
REWARI	117.2		86.0	101.6
ROHTAK	28.6		86.4	47.5
SONIPAT	56.3		132.2	85.8
YAMUNANAGAR	46.8		46.4	46.6
State	39.3		73.4	54.3

The tables 2.1(b.1-3) show progress of job cards issued during the years under reference. In the state, 22% increase was achieved in 2009-10 over 08-09, followed by 27% in the succeeding year and thus 54% increase over the first year in total job cards, with in the caste groups 73% increase is noticed for the other castes and 40% for the Scheduled castes. However, among the districts, district Hissar is leading with more than 205% increase followed by Bhiwani and Gurgaon. In the third year however, district Mewat lagged wherein only 13% more job cards were issued.

But this progress depends upon the previous year mostly. If in the year 2009-10 or in 2008-09 more job cards were issued the percentage growth will be less in the third year, for example in district Mewat we see even negative increase in second and third years over the previous years. This raises even the question about data also. How come that the cumulative number of job cards of Scheduled caste households came down in the district from 4520 in 2008-09 to 4007 in 2009-10 and 4361 in 2010-11, which showed negative increase in 2009-10 over 2008-09 and in 2010-11 over 2008-09 also or the cumulative totals were only for the months and not through the years.

In the year 2010-11 percentage growth in the issuance of job cards in district Rewari, one of our sample districts has gone up tremendously over 2008-09 because, in actuality the work under NREGA was started seriously in this year in the district.

Table 2.1 contains many columns and information. Next is about those who demanded employment and were provided with. It is not that all those who were issued job cards put up applications for jobs. That is why in the year their percentage was less than even half of those issued job cards, 45.5% in 2008-09 which was the highest in the three years, 34% in 2009-10 the lowest and a less than 41% in the 2010-11. The percentage growth in the state as a whole was around 54% in 2010-11 over 2008-09.

Among the districts, district Jajhjar tops with 100% job card holders seeking jobs in 2008-09 as compared to the lowest about 19.5% in district Kurukshetra, whereas in the year 2009-10, in district Faridabad about 92.7% job card holders

sought work as compared to only 11% in Rewari. In 2010-11 in district Gurgaon, about 88%, the highest of job card holders demanded work whereas in district Sonipat the lowest percentages of job seekers was about 18.4%.

The positive point is that almost all those seeking jobs were provided with work during the three years in all the districts with very miniscule variation. For example, in the state as a whole, during the year 2008-09, the lowest percentage among the three years was about 95%, in 2009-10 100% job seekers were provided with work and 2010-11 their percentage was about 99%. Among the districts, in the year 2008-09 it was in Jajhjar that only 19.4% employment seekers were provided with work, otherwise it was above 95% in most of the districts and in some 100%. In the year 2009-10, it is almost perfect 100% barring district Karnal only where 99.9%, were provided with employment. In the year 2010-11, it was in Gurgaon where less than 49% job seekers were given employment. Incidentally, it was Gurgaon where percentage of job card holders seeking work was the highest.

Table 2.1 (c)  
No. of households working under NREGA at the end of financial year, & % change

District	2010-11		2009-10		2008-09		% 9-10 Over 8-9	%10-11 Over 9-10	%10-11 Over 8-9
	hh	%	hh	%	hh	%			
Mahendergarh	5195	5.30	10764	12.21	1500	2.05	617.6	-51.74	246.33
Sirsa	18384	18.75	4566	5.18	8663	11.81	-47.29	302.63	112.21
Ambala	8010	8.17	9232	10.47	13126	17.90	-29.67	-13.24	-38.98
Mewat	5958	6.08	1687	1.91	2452	3.34	-31.20	253.17	142.99
Bhiwani	9081	9.26	13580	15.40	6101	8.32	122.59	-33.13	48.84
Faridabad	245	0.25	532	0.60	1384	1.89	-61.56	-53.95	-82.30
Fatehabad	21714	22.14	3239	3.67	10396	14.18	-68.84	570.39	108.87
Gurgaon	239	0.24	200	0.23	330	0.45	-39.39	19.50	-27.58
Hissar	11108	11.33	2390	2.71	777	1.06	207.59	364.77	1329.6
Jajhjar	733	0.75	453	0.51	2043	2.79	-77.83	61.81	-64.12
Jind	3074	3.13	5410	6.14	1169	1.59	362.79	-43.18	162.96
Kaithal	747	0.76	4437	5.03	6474	8.83	-31.46	-83.16	-88.46
Karnal	2454	2.50	742	0.84	1289	1.76	-42.44	230.73	90.38
Kurukshetra	2069	2.11	4078	4.62	844	1.15	383.18	-49.26	145.14
Palwal	1272	1.30	3164	3.59	0	0.00	-	-59.80	-
Panchkula	1162	1.19	3358	3.81	376	0.51	793.09	-65.40	209.04
Panipat	662	0.68	5551	6.30	5656	7.71	-1.86	-88.07	-88.30
Rewari	1737	1.77	2498	2.83	2885	3.93	-13.41	-30.46	-39.79
Rohtak	1042	1.06	444	0.50	3174	4.33	-86.01	134.68	-67.17
Sonipat	816	0.83	4454	5.05	4685	6.39	-4.93	-81.68	-82.58
Yamunanagar	2355	2.40	7398	8.39	0	0.00	-	-68.17	-
TOTAL	98057	100	88177	100	73324	100	20.26	11.20	33.73
CV%	434.6	-	424.8	-	408.4	-	-	-	-

As far as working households were concerned, the following need to be considered, one, in the year 2008-09, the highest number of working households was in Ambala, where almost 18% households of the state were working under NREGA, followed by about 12% in Sirsa and the lowest number was in Yamunanagar where not a single household was working. In 2009-10 the highest number about 12% was in Mahendergarh followed by 10% in Ambala and the lowest number was 0.5% in district Rohtak and Jajhjar each. However, in 2010-11 district Fatehabad topped with about 22%, followed by Sirsa with about 19% and Hissar with 11%. Among the lowest working households were in districts Gurgaon and Faridabad with about 0.25% each. Secondly, the coefficient of variation among the three years in districts moves between 408% and 434%, i.e., the variation among the districts is on the increase and substantial also.

Thirdly, though we find consistent increase in the number of working households during the three years increasing by about 20% in 2009-10 and about 11% in 2010-11 and thus by about 34% in 2010-11 over 2008-09, but there is huge variation among districts, for example, - 86% in Rohtak to a huge increase 1329% in Hissar. The reasons may be many, including the interest or keenness of the project in charge officer or of the Sarpanchs in the district along with others. This variation needs to be addressed by administrative and policy measures.

The number of households which demanded work and were provided with is almost equally matching. Almost all the households demanding work were provided in both the years. In fact, the condition by the centre government that it will bear the cost of the work provided and not of the unemployment allowance, probably forces the state government to see that work to the maximum is generated and provided to those seekers. The concerned officers have been issued strict instructions accordingly.

However, it would be interesting to know how much quantum of work was generated and provided during these years. In Table 2.2 we have tried to provide this information.

## **2.2 Employment generated and socio-economic characteristics:**

Provisions have been made for the creation of employment for different groups, mostly deprived ones like women, scheduled castes and tribes. In fact, the Act makes provision for everybody willing to do manual work subject to 100 days limitation per household per year. But some provisions for most backward sections of the society such as artisans like potters, carpenters, ironsmiths broom makers, barbers, clothes washers and many more need to be made as they are the persons whose traditional livelihood had been endangered by advancement of technology and also because they did not have the necessary resources to move forward with the society. Mostly these are the sections of the society who lack material resources, be it land, not for agriculture but even to collect soil for pottery, wood and logs to prepare wooden articles due to environmental degradation caused by unscrupulous contractors, forest officials and large saw mills, or cheap iron to prepare and repair small tools, or even water to wash clothes, adequate and cheap finance to procure materials, or technical skill to shift to other professions. The Mandal Commission's recommendation of providing them adequate material resources and to equip them with necessary skill/training etc. has been limited to provide reservation in government jobs alone, where they cannot enter due to lack of necessary skills and education. Only class IV manual services in government/public sector were available to such sections, which the 6<sup>th</sup> pay commission has eliminated. Therefore, in absence of any social, political and economic strength, NREGA provides hope and only chance for them to survive by doing manual unskilled work, not in any way linked to their traditional skills.

There are no rules as to how much employment should be earmarked for particular group except, women who have been reserved 1/3<sup>rd</sup> share of employment generation. This target has almost been achieved in Haryana, varying between 30.6% employment in 2008-09, 34.81% in 2009-10 and 35.6% in 2010-11. The point is that share of women in total employment generated is increasing in the state. But in the sample districts, barring the case of Rewari, Sirsa and Mewat in 2008-09 when only 21%, 26% and 27% employment was generated, the employment generation for women has surpassed the minimum requirement of

33% in the sample districts in all the years under reference (Table 2.1). However, among the other districts, in 2008-09 in districts Rohtak and Ambala women got more than 40% share in person days employment created. The actual figures were 47.8% in Rohtak and 42.7% in Ambala, whereas in Panchkula less than 1% work was created for women during the year. In 2009-10 many more districts entered the range of creating more than 40% work for women. For example, in district Faridabad it was 45%, Gurgaon 43.8%, Kurukshetra 43.7%, Mewat 42.5%, Karnal 42% and Ambala 41.9%, while the lowest number of person days, 9.4% for women were generated in district Panchkula. In the year 2010-11 in Faridabad a huge share of work more than 338% was for women and other districts like Karnal and Mewat crossed the 40% mark. District Panchkula however again failed to create reasonable work for women. Only 6.7% share of work came to them.

Similarly, other target group, scheduled castes have also largely benefited in almost all the sample districts as well as in the state. In 2008-09 more than 53% of work was shared among the scheduled caste households, in 2009-10 it was around 54% and in 2010-11, it was around 49%.

As far as inter district variation is concerned, we find that in more than 50% districts, 13 out of 20 in 2008-09, more than 62% employment was for scheduled caste households, and district Hissar leading with providing more than 84% employment to SC households. The lowest employment generating district for SC households during the year was Mewat where only 17% employment was created for SC households. In the following year however, in 7 districts more than 64% employment was for SC households, while Mewat again was at the bottom with only 15% employment for SC households. The number of districts creating more than 60% work came down but more districts joined the table by creating more work, say more than 40% for them in the year 2010-11. Why in district Mewat sufficient work was not created for SC households is understandable by the composition of Muslim domination in population where SC households are not found in that proportion.

The serious concern would have been with regard to no employment or very little employment generated for scheduled tribes. For a small number of such



households employment opportunities for the first time were created during the year 2010-11. One reason for such dismal growth of employment of scheduled tribes, as pointed out earlier, was lack of scheduled tribes people in the state. Most of the tribes have been categorized as scheduled castes in the state, which are in neighbouring states of Uttar Pradesh, Punjab and Rajasthan under the scheduled tribes category. However, other deprived category, scheduled castes have got a fair representation in the employment generation. More than half of its beneficiaries at all India level belong to Scheduled Castes and Tribes, and more than half are women<sup>12</sup> What was even more remarkable was the coverage of SC/STs and women under the scheme. The share of SC/ST families in the work provided under MGNREGA in the past four years ranged between 51-56%, while that of women was 41-50% during the corresponding period.<sup>13</sup>

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

The NREGA has been designed basically as a social security measure to protect the deprived sections of the society from destitute and to provide them with useful economic activity so that along with meeting their emergency requirements society could also benefit with the projects they take up and complete. The list of activities which can be taken up under the NREGA has been provided down the line to Panchayats through the state government machinery. The major activities listed are creating infrastructure for connecting villages with towns, other villages and cities, flood control measures, water conservation and rain water harvesting measures, drought proofing, micro irrigation, renovation of traditional water bodies, land development etc. A majority of these activities require maximum human labour and minimal involvement of machinery and lesser amount of materials. The purpose was to spare resources (by spending less on material and machinery) to create more job opportunities. Since the beginning of the project in 2006 a number of such projects have been completed and a good number of them are in progress. Table 2.2 has been provided with absolute numbers of the projects completed

---

<sup>12</sup> IFPRI discussion Paper 00963, 2010

<sup>13</sup> ET Bureau, 26.3.2010

during the last three years in the state. However, their percentage share within the districts and within the state has been given in tables 2.2 (1 -3) and 2.2 (a - c)

Table 2.2(1)  
Projects completed, % share in district (2008-09)

District	RC	FC	WC	DP	MI	PIL	RTW	LD	AAA	RGSK	total
Mahendergarh	37.29	0.00	30.58	1.72	17.00	0.00	11.54	1.87	0.00	0.00	100
Sirsa	26.48	4.54	19.21	0.76	17.10	0.91	4.39	26.63	0.00	0.00	100
Ambala	26.76	3.01	9.36	54.29	0.00	0.00	2.56	4.01	0.00	0.00	100
Mewat	52.03	1.01	13.51	0.68	0.68	0.00	31.08	1.01	0.00	0.00	100
Bhiwani	44.44	0.00	11.11	0.00	11.11	0.00	29.63	0.00	3.70	0.00	100
Faridabad	16.67	16.67	50.00	0.00	16.67	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	100
Fatehabad	39.24	0.00	45.57	0.00	0.00	0.00	7.59	7.59	0.00	0.00	100
Gurgaon	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Hissar	70.83	2.08	20.83	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.08	2.08	2.08	0.00	100
Jajhjar	8.75	16.25	28.75	0.00	0.00	5.00	25.00	16.25	0.00	0.00	100
Jind	14.04	1.75	59.65	17.54	0.00	0.00	0.00	7.02	0.00	0.00	100
Kaithal	12.98	3.85	8.65	0.48	39.90	0.00	30.29	3.85	0.00	0.00	100
Karnal	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Kurukshetra	40.00	0.00	5.71	2.86	11.43	0.00	25.71	14.29	0.00	0.00	100
Palwal	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na
Panchkula	38.39	3.32	50.24	1.42	0.00	2.84	1.42	2.37	0.00	0.00	100
Panipat	34.00	20.00	6.00	10.00	10.00	0.00	2.00	18.00	0.00	0.00	100
Rewari	63.49	4.76	15.87	1.59	0.00	0.00	0.00	14.29	0.00	0.00	100
Rohtak	31.54	0.00	20.77	4.62	20.00	0.00	2.31	20.77	0.00	0.00	100
Sonipat	0.00	0.00	42.86	0.00	0.00	0.00	57.14	0.00	0.00	0.00	100
Yamunanagar	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	31.87	2.96	20.87	15.13	9.84	0.45	9.89	8.93	0.06	0.00	100

Note: RC= rural connectivity; FC=flood control; WC=water conservation; DP= Drought proofing; MI= micro irrigation; PIL= provision for irrigation to land; RTW= renovation of traditional water bodies; LD= land development; AAA= any other activity; RGSK= Rajeev Gandhi Gram seva Kendra

Table 2.2(2)  
Projects completed, % share in district (2009- 10)

District	RC	FC	WC	DP	MI	PIL	RTW	LD	AAA	RGSK	total
Mahendergarh	42.86	0.00	35.63	1.76	6.00	0.00	5.82	7.94	0.00	0.00	100
Sirsa	26.70	6.54	13.08	3.20	18.69	0.40	5.74	25.63	0.00	0.00	100
Ambala	37.37	12.53	11.09	26.49	0.00	0.00	6.16	6.37	0.00	0.00	100
Mewat	47.25	1.65	26.37	0.55	3.30	0.00	17.86	3.02	0.00	0.00	100
Bhiwani	43.86	1.75	22.81	0.00	7.02	0.00	15.79	8.77	0.00	0.00	100
Faridabad	85.00	0.00	15.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	100
Fatehabad	21.81	1.23	41.98	0.00	16.87	0.00	11.11	7.00	0.00	0.00	100
Gurgaon	0.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	100
Hissar	44.93	2.64	38.33	0.00	6.61	0.00	2.64	4.85	0.00	0.00	100
Jajhjar	14.67	2.67	25.33	0.00	0.00	0.00	12.00	29.33	16.00	0.00	100
Jind	23.72	2.56	51.28	7.69	4.49	0.00	6.41	3.85	0.00	0.00	100
Kaithal	43.16	3.16	29.47	0.00	7.37	0.00	7.37	9.47	0.00	0.00	100
Karnal	38.30	4.26	29.79	4.26	0.00	0.00	6.38	6.38	10.64	0.00	100
Kurukshetra	23.64	5.45	20.00	4.55	7.27	0.00	23.64	15.45	0.00	0.00	100
Palwal	51.04	11.46	23.96	0.00	5.21	0.00	6.25	2.08	0.00	0.00	100
Panchkula	32.05	0.32	43.27	0.00	2.24	1.28	16.03	4.81	0.00	0.00	100
Panipat	74.29	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.86	0.00	11.43	11.43	0.00	0.00	100
Rewari	32.81	0.00	46.88	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.56	18.75	0.00	0.00	100
Rohtak	24.17	3.33	60.83	0.83	6.67	0.00	1.67	2.50	0.00	0.00	100
Sonipat	0.00	2.21	38.24	0.00	0.00	0.00	41.91	0.00	17.65	0.00	100
Yamunanagar	21.98	1.10	45.05	0.00	0.00	0.00	30.77	1.10	0.00	0.00	100
TOTAL	33.77	4.01	29.14	4.55	7.11	0.17	10.24	9.99	1.01	0.00	100

Table 2.2(3)  
Projects completed, % share in district (2010- 11)

District	RC	FC	WC	DP	MI	PIL	RTW	LD	AAA	RGSK	total
Mahendergarh	47.97	0.00	21.82	5.52	5.16	0.00	10.68	8.84	0.00	0.00	100
Sirsa	23.76	3.82	5.40	4.05	39.88	0.45	6.15	16.49	0.00	0.00	100
Ambala	52.92	8.76	10.58	12.41	0.00	0.00	0.36	9.49	0.00	5.47	100
Mewat	52.28	1.10	15.70	6.12	5.97	0.00	2.67	15.07	0.00	1.10	100
Bhiwani	46.36	2.68	2.68	0.00	33.72	0.00	9.20	4.98	0.38	0.00	100
Faridabad	54.55	0.00	9.09	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	36.36	0.00	0.00	100
Fatehabad	26.18	0.53	11.58	0.00	31.97	0.00	10.53	19.21	0.00	0.00	100
Gurgaon	17.86	0.00	46.43	14.29	0.00	0.00	7.14	10.71	3.57	0.00	100
Hissar	56.68	0.28	25.88	0.56	4.64	0.00	1.41	10.55	0.00	0.00	100
Jajhjar	37.11	5.15	13.40	1.03	1.03	0.00	2.06	39.18	0.00	1.03	100
Jind	46.76	1.08	17.63	0.00	29.86	0.00	0.36	4.32	0.00	0.00	100
Kaithal	18.93	1.79	6.43	0.00	62.14	0.00	7.50	2.14	0.00	1.07	100
Karnal	42.86	5.59	25.47	0.62	4.35	0.00	8.07	8.07	0.00	4.97	100
Kurukshetra	28.77	2.83	16.51	23.58	6.13	0.47	8.49	13.21	0.00	0.00	100
Palwal	61.54	5.98	5.13	5.13	1.71	0.00	2.56	17.09	0.00	0.85	100
Panchkula	50.00	10.31	17.27	0.00	2.32	0.00	6.70	13.40	0.00	0.00	100
Panipat	46.89	15.31	1.44	0.96	9.57	0.48	9.09	16.27	0.00	0.00	100
Rewari	48.03	3.95	13.82	1.32	0.00	0.00	6.58	26.32	0.00	0.00	100
Rohtak	27.34	0.72	20.14	5.04	21.58	0.00	12.95	12.23	0.00	0.00	100
Sonipat	0.00	2.54	19.49	5.08	46.61	0.00	10.17	11.86	0.00	4.24	100
Yamunanagar	37.81	2.50	33.75	0.31	0.31	0.00	22.19	3.13	0.00	0.00	100
TOTAL	39.55	2.91	15.09	3.58	18.29	0.11	7.21	12.72	0.03	0.53	100

Two three things are highlighted in the tables below – one, share of Rural Connectivity projects within the districts as well as in the state is more than 1/3<sup>rd</sup> of all projects during the last three years and it is continuously increasing from 32% in 2008-09 to about 40% in 2010-11. It is followed by Water Conservation and Rain Water Harvesting measures with more than 20% share during the two years and more than 15% in 2010-11 In the country in 2008-09, the percentage share of Water Conservation projects was 45, Irrigation Facilities 21%, Rural Connectivity 18%, Land Development 15% and other activities 0.8%<sup>14</sup> Other important projects getting about 15-16% share in the state as well as in the selected districts are Drought Proofing and Micro Irrigation etc. In other words, major tasks taken up with NREGA funds are related in one way or the other with water, land, meeting challenges of drought etc. However, a very attractive activity, though stated to be not equally useful was to create Rajiv Gandhi Gram Seva Kendra. This has gained importance recently, particularly during 2010-11 and 2011-12 In many villages two-three rooms are being built on public land with NREGA funds. The utility of such

<sup>14</sup> Sapna kedia: Sustainable Development through Inter-sectoral Convergence

Kendras is being questioned by the officials, village leaders and even by the conscientious NREGA workers. Two reasons are cited for that – one, at places where there already exists some public building, RGSKs do not serve any extra purpose, two – they are being built without making provisions for their upkeep in future. Already other such structures are suffering from upkeep due to lack of funds. We ourselves could see the condition of a dharamshala built for scheduled caste families in one village in Ambala district and the other building known as baratghar in similar condition in another village of district Sirsa. Such buildings, viz. Baratghar, Dharma shalas, public utilities, which exist in most villages were created earlier under some other programmes and do not reflect good on maintenance. Therefore, the funds being spent on RGSKs need reconsideration.

In completion of projects district Sirsa has been leading all through with completing 661 projects in 2008-09, 749 in 2009-10 and 1334 in 2010-11, whereas district Mahendergarh with second place was far behind in completion of projects in 2010-11, though a large number of projects were completed during earlier years, particularly in the year 2008-09. The respective numbers for three years were, 1086, 567 and 641. District Faridabad was at the bottom with just completing 11 projects in 2010-11, 20 in 2009-10 and only 6 in 2008-09. In 2010-11, in district Mewat, 637 projects were completed (table 2.2).

However, in the state as a whole (tables 2.3 (a-c), in 2008-09 about 92% of the state's Drought Proofing projects were completed in Ambala alone and share of district Rewari was less than 0.2%. Similarly more than 56% Land Development projects were completed in Sirsa alone. In 2009-10 the trend continued. Both the districts covered projects related with above cited two activities. However, in Sirsa Micro Irrigation projects also attracted attention as flood control measures in Ambala. This trend got reversed in 2010-11. Other non-sample districts might have led the completion of projects as none of the selected districts crossed 50% share and that too one district Sirsa completing 75% projects related with providing irrigation facilities. Most important was that district Mewat completed about 14% projects related with Drought Proofing.

Table 2.3 (a)  
Projects completed, % share in state (2008-09)

District	RC	FC	WC	DP	MI	PIL	RTW	LD	AAA	RGSK	Total
Mahendergarh	21.32	0.00	26.70	2.07	31.50	0.00	21.26	3.82	0.00	0	18.23
Sirsa	15.61	28.85	17.30	0.94	32.66	37.50	8.33	56.05	0.00	0	18.79
Ambala	21.41	25.96	11.44	91.54	0.00	0.00	6.61	11.46	0.00	0	25.50
Mewat	13.74	2.88	5.45	0.38	0.58	0.00	26.44	0.96	0.00	0	8.42
Bhiwani	1.07	0.00	0.41	0.00	0.87	0.00	2.30	0.00	50.00	0	0.77
Faridabad	0.09	0.96	0.41	0.00	0.29	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0	0.17
Fatehabad	2.77	0.00	4.90	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.72	1.91	0.00	0	2.25
Gurgaon	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0	0.00
Hissar	3.03	0.96	1.36	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.29	0.32	50.00	0	1.36
Jajhjar	0.62	12.50	3.13	0.00	0.00	25.00	5.75	4.14	0.00	0	2.27
Jind	0.71	0.96	4.63	1.88	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.27	0.00	0	1.62
Kaithal	2.41	7.69	2.45	0.19	23.99	0.00	18.10	2.55	0.00	0	5.91
Karnal	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0	0.00
Kurukshetra	1.25	0.00	0.27	0.19	1.16	0.00	2.59	1.59	0.00	0	1.00
Palwal	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na
Panchkula	7.23	6.73	14.44	0.56	0.00	37.50	0.86	1.59	0.00	0	6.00
Panipat	1.52	9.62	0.41	0.94	1.45	0.00	0.29	2.87	0.00	0	1.42
Rewari	3.57	2.88	1.36	0.19	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.87	0.00	0	1.79
Rohtak	3.66	0.00	3.68	1.13	7.51	0.00	0.86	8.60	0.00	0	3.70
Sonipat	0.00	0.00	1.63	0.00	0.00	0.00	4.60	0.00	0.00	0	0.80
Yamunanagar	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0	0.00
TOTAL	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	0	100.00

Table 2.3 (b)  
Projects completed, % share in the state(2009-10)

District	RC	FC	WC	DP	MI	PIL	RTW	LD	AAA	RGSK	Total
Mahendergarh	17.71	0.00	17.06	5.41	11.76	0.00	7.93	11.08	0.00	0	13.96
Sirsa	14.58	30.06	8.28	12.97	48.44	42.86	10.34	47.29	0.00	0	18.43
Ambala	13.27	37.42	4.56	69.73	0.00	0.00	7.21	7.64	0.00	0	11.99
Mewat	12.54	3.68	8.11	1.08	4.15	0.00	15.63	2.71	0.00	0	8.96
Bhiwani	1.82	0.61	1.10	0.00	1.38	0.00	2.16	1.23	0.00	0	1.40
Faridabad	1.24	0.00	0.25	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0	0.49
Fatehabad	3.86	1.84	8.61	0.00	14.19	0.00	6.49	4.19	0.00	0	5.98
Gurgaon	0.00	0.00	1.01	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0	0.30
Hissar	7.43	3.68	7.35	0.00	5.19	0.00	1.44	2.71	0.00	0	5.59
Jajhjar	0.80	1.23	1.60	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.16	5.42	29.27	0	1.85
Jind	2.70	2.45	6.76	6.49	2.42	0.00	2.40	1.48	0.00	0	3.84
Kaithal	2.99	1.84	2.36	0.00	2.42	0.00	1.68	2.22	0.00	0	2.34
Karnal	1.31	1.23	1.18	1.08	0.00	0.00	0.72	0.74	12.20	0	1.16
Kurukshetra	1.90	3.68	1.86	2.70	2.77	0.00	6.25	4.19	0.00	0	2.71
Palwal	3.57	6.75	1.94	0.00	1.73	0.00	1.44	0.49	0.00	0	2.36
Panchkula	7.29	0.61	11.40	0.00	2.42	57.14	12.02	3.69	0.00	0	7.68
Panipat	1.90	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.35	0.00	0.96	0.99	0.00	0	0.86
Rewari	1.53	0.00	2.53	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.24	2.96	0.00	0	1.58
Rohtak	2.11	2.45	6.17	0.54	2.77	0.00	0.48	0.74	0.00	0	2.95
Sonipat	0.00	1.84	4.39	0.00	0.00	0.00	13.70	0.00	58.54	0	3.35
Yamunanagar	1.46	0.61	3.46	0.00	0.00	0.00	6.73	0.25	0.00	0	2.24
TOTAL	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	0	100.00

Table 2.3 (c)  
Projects completed % share in the state(2010-11)

District	RC	FC	WC	DP	MI	PIL	RTW	LD	AAA	RGSK	Total
Mahendergarh	17.40	0.00	20.73	22.14	4.04	0.00	21.25	9.97	0.00	0.00	14.34
Sirsa	10.58	23.18	6.30	19.93	38.41	75.00	15.02	22.85	0.00	0.00	17.62
Ambala	4.84	10.91	2.54	12.55	0.00	0.00	0.18	2.70	0.00	37.50	3.62
Mewat	11.12	3.18	8.75	14.39	2.74	0.00	3.11	9.97	0.00	17.50	8.41
Bhiwani	4.04	3.18	0.61	0.00	6.35	0.00	4.40	1.35	50.00	0.00	3.45
Faridabad	0.20	0.00	0.09	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.42	0.00	0.00	0.15
Fatehabad	6.64	1.82	7.70	0.00	17.55	0.00	14.65	15.16	0.00	0.00	10.04
Gurgaon	0.17	0.00	1.14	1.48	0.00	0.00	0.37	0.31	50.00	0.00	0.37
Hissar	13.46	0.91	16.10	1.48	2.38	0.00	1.83	7.79	0.00	0.00	9.39
Jajhjar	1.20	2.27	1.14	0.37	0.07	0.00	0.37	3.95	0.00	2.50	1.28
Jind	4.34	1.36	4.29	0.00	5.99	0.00	0.18	1.25	0.00	0.00	3.67
Kaithal	1.77	2.27	1.57	0.00	12.56	0.00	3.85	0.62	0.00	7.50	3.70
Karnal	2.30	4.09	3.59	0.37	0.51	0.00	2.38	1.35	0.00	20.00	2.13
Kurukshetra	2.04	2.73	3.06	18.45	0.94	12.50	3.30	2.91	0.00	0.00	2.80
Palwal	2.40	3.18	0.52	2.21	0.14	0.00	0.55	2.08	0.00	2.50	1.54
Panchkula	6.48	18.18	5.86	0.00	0.65	0.00	4.76	5.40	0.00	0.00	5.12
Panipat	3.27	14.55	0.26	0.74	1.44	12.50	3.48	3.53	0.00	0.00	2.76
Rewari	2.44	2.73	1.84	0.74	0.00	0.00	1.83	4.15	0.00	0.00	2.01
Rohtak	1.27	0.45	2.45	2.58	2.17	0.00	3.30	1.77	0.00	0.00	1.84
Sonipat	0.00	1.36	2.01	2.21	3.97	0.00	2.20	1.45	0.00	12.50	1.56
Yamunanagar	4.04	3.64	9.45	0.37	0.07	0.00	13.00	1.04	0.00	0.00	4.23
TOTAL	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100.00

In addition to the projects and works completed, many works remain incomplete or spill over to next financial year. Some of these might have been suspended due to one or the other reason and these are shown as in progress or ongoing.

In 2008-09, district Sirsa was at top with 634 projects in progress, followed by district Ambala where the number of ongoing projects was 423 and most of them about 54%, were linked with Rural Connectivity, whereas smallest number of ongoing projects was in district Jajhjar. In Rewari ongoing projects related with Rural Connectivity were 49. In 2009-10, again district Sirsa with ongoing 627 projects was at the top, followed by district Bhiwani with 406 projects in progress. The largest number of ongoing projects was related with Land Development followed by Micro Irrigation projects in Sirsa,

However, in 2010-11 the works under NREGA got a boost. More than 5000 projects were in progress in district Sirsa, mostly related with Rural Connectivity followed by Land Development. Hissar was at the top with 841 projects in

progress, with 404 related with Rural Connectivity. In Sonipat also about 360 projects were in progress, about half of them related with RGSK.

Thus in Haryana work on Rural Connectivity and irrigation projects has started at very large scale in the current year. Therefore, it would be worthwhile to see how these huge projects, in number and quantum of work, succeed.

Physical form of projects is one aspect and financial, the equally important is another. **The NREGA probably is the first scheme of its kind that along with amount spent, physical evaluation, usefulness and viability of the completed projects have been earmarked for comprehensive evaluation and that too by the civil society.**

### **Amount spent on completed projects:**

As stated above data on the web site is problematic. For example, in the year 2010-11 in district Ambala only two projects were shown completed and the amount spent was shown Rs. 0.2005 lakh. The projects were related with rural connectivity. And at other places the figures are different.

'Many of the links are not working, quite a few tables are blank, and essential facts that ought to be available at a glance tend to be oddly scattered through the site. More importantly, much of the site is a rather puzzling mix of valuable data and dubious statistics. It is hard to understand why a Ministry that spends more than Rs. 10,000 crores a year on NREGA is unable to ensure that this crucial resource is up to the mark'.<sup>15</sup>

That apart, we are looking at the data as was available at the end of the financial year, which shows that a sum of Rs. 207 crore was spent on completion and ongoing projects in the state during the year 2010-11 which was Rs. 136.14 crore in 2009-10 and merely 106 crores in the year 2008-09. The sum spent on completion of projects in the state in 2009-10 was about 19% higher than that in 2008-09, but it was drastically more in 2010-11 over 2009-10 by 61% and the highest by about 91% than that in 2008-09. District wise, we find huge variation in amount spent on completion of projects during the last two years. It was less by

---

<sup>15</sup> Jean Drèze and Christian Oldiges, 'How is NREGA Doing?'

about 51% in 2009-10 over 2008-09 in Ambala and more than 356% in Hissar during the same period Similarly we find huge variation activity wise also, for example, an increase by 15244% (from Rs. 09 lakh to 13. 81 lack) in Faridabad on Rural Connectivity to zero spending in the same district on Micro Irrigation and many more such cases are visible.

Similarly we find huge variation in the amount spent district wise as well as activity wise in 2010-11 over 2009-10, for example, in district Karnal the amount spent increased by more than 583% followed by district Panipat with an increase of about 438% whereas in district Ambala about 59% less amount was spent which was followed by Kurukshetra by spending about 41% less amount. It was not that per project money was spent more or less but variation in number of projects completed also moves in the same direction in all the districts and in all the years. We find huge variation in the amount spent activity wise as well, for example an increase of more than 2959% in district Bhiwani on Micro Irrigation (from Rs. 1.13 lakh to Rs.34.57 lakh) and huge decrease in district Jind on drought proofing from 4.77 lakh to zero.

On comparison of the amount spent in 2010-11 over 2008-09, we find that in the state overall the amount spent increased by about 91% but with huge inter-district variation, such as an increase of 1102% in Hissar to 80% less spending in Ambala and drastic variation in activity wise spending, such as an increase of 34522% (from Rs. 0.09 lakh to Rs. 31.16 lakh) on rural connectivity in Faridabad to zero spending on drought proofing from 1.13 lakh in Jind.

In sum, there seems no planning in the inter-district projects to be taken up and on their completion. Each district plans its own priorities as per the requirement of work to be provided.

**Consultation and coordination, therefore, with RKVY authorities (ministry of agriculture) and local members of parliament and legislatures (for MP LAD funds) and ministry of Rural development appears to be more relevant for the proper execution of projects and for proper utilization of funds.**



### **Amount Spent on ongoing/ suspended works:**

A sum of more than Rs. 45/- crores was spent upon ongoing /suspended projects in 2008-09 in the state as whole. About 25% of that was spent in district Sirsa alone followed by Mewat among the selected districts. Among the activities about Rs. 5.5 crores were spent on renovation of traditional water bodies. In the following year, 2009-10 the amount spent on ongoing/ suspended works increased by about 42% and in the year 2010-11 over 2009-10 by similar margin 42%. However, in the same year 2010-11 the amount spent increased by about 101% over 2008-09. Like 2008-09 district Sirsa topped the amount spent in the following two years as well, in 2009-10 by spending about 17% and in the year 2010-11 by spending about 19% of the total amount spent in the state. Activity wise Rural Connectivity attracted maximum of the amount spent. It was more than 38% of the total amount spent in the state in the year 2009-10 and also in the year 2010-11. Water Conservation and Rain Water Harvesting followed the Rural Connectivity, wherein about 16% of the total amount was spent.

Among the selected districts during the year 2010-11, however, the highest amount was spent on Rajiv Gandhi Sewa Kendra in Ambala which was about 31% of the entire amount spent by the district followed by about 30% on Flood Control and 14% on Rural Connectivity. In district Mewat a massive sum, more than 48%, was spent on RGSK followed by 41% on Rural Connectivity. In Sirsa 43% was spent on Rural Connectivity, 22% on Land Development and 14% on Micro Irrigation. In district Rewari 44 % was spent on Rural Connectivity, 23% on Land Development and 22% on Water Harvesting (table 2.3)

In sum maximum amount has been spent on Land Development, Rural Connectivity and Water Harvesting related works on both, completed projects as well as on ongoing projects and all of them will have long term economies for the communities associated with. In the country also maximum amount has been spent on such type projects, in some states like Pudduchery and Uttrakhand, almost 100% funds were spent in 2008-09 on water conservation and irrigation.<sup>16</sup>

---

<sup>16</sup> Sapna Kedia op.cit

## **2.4 Performance of NREGA:**

### **Social auditing:**

Despite all the regulations and various audit organisations, a steel frame neutral and efficient bureaucracy, a democratic set up and highly independent judiciary, the governance in India has developed not better than those in banana republics. All the programmes, be it plan projects, welfare schemes, disposal of disputes etc, everything gets choked under corruption and the poor and innocent hard workers remain deprived of the potential benefits. Findings of a well researched study by Prof. CHH Hanumantha Rao and Dr. P. Rangaswamy often quoted by many starting from late Rajiv Gandhi that only paisa 15 of a Re reach the poor is an example. Many welfare and employment schemes quoted earlier either have to be given up or did not yield expected results. In fact, this was one of the arguments of vested interests against NREGA also, along with fear of some well wishers and genuine critics. For example, 'Of course, it is also important to ensure that the reported expenditure levels actually correspond to "real" work and wages'<sup>17</sup> But the provision of transparency (RTI included) and that of handing over the responsibility to civil society through social audit should be the most wanted and necessary measure for the success of this most important scheme.

In table 2.4 all the details of total muster rolls used, audited/ verified, Gram panchayats due for verification and actually verified etc. are given. It is noted that for the purpose of social audit all the tasks are not performed within the financial year itself and the pending work is carried over to next year and undertaken accordingly. Total number of muster rolls used in the year 2008-09 for the state as a whole was 25985 but 24382 muster rolls or 93.8% were verified during the year. Similarly about 99% muster rolls were verified during the year 2009-10. But during the year 2010-11 about 98% muster rolls in the state were verified. However, in all the districts selected for the sample, the muster rolls due and verified mostly match; minor variations are noted during the year 2010-11 in districts Ambala and a major variation, about 33% less than due verified in district Sirsa.

---

<sup>17</sup> Jean Drèze and Christian Oldiges, *ibid.*

This requires strict regularity and punctuality, at least in the beginning for a few years. Laxity may lead to misuse of funds and may become a bad example to control in future, which may endanger the scheme itself. Already those who want more money for their projects be it industry, builders, exporters, or corrupt politicians are hell bent for the stoppage of funds being spent for the poor. The social audit therefore needs to be strictly enforced with regularity and punctuality.

The situation related with verification/ completion of Panchayats was no better than verification of muster rolls. In the state as whole, during the year 2010-11 about 40% verification of panchayats was not completed, whereas in the previous two years figure were about 29% and 40% less than the total due. However, in the selected districts, Ambala, Panipat and Rewari lagged behind. It was only in districts Sirsa and Mewat that during the three years all the panchayats were verified in time. The situation in some other districts was not as good as in the sample districts, for example, in Gurgaon verification of only 7% was completed.

As far as total number of works and their 10% verification at district level was concerned, in districts Karnal, Panchkula and Sonipat no verification was undertaken in the year 2008-09, whereas in district Mahendergarh more than 30% works were inspected at district level. In the selected districts barring Sirsa verification was undertaken during the year 2010-11. In Sirsa not even a single work was verified at district level. At block level also in district Sirsa near about 54% works were inspected and the other district was Sonipat where together at district and at block levels less than 90% works were completed/ inspected.

In the state about 81 % and 78% works were inspected. During the first two years, whereas in the year 2010-11 almost all the works are shown as inspected, though at district level we find many lagging.

In many districts of the state meetings of the gram sabhas were not held, which as per the act were mandatory. It was in the year 2010-11 that in two districts, Ambala and Sirsa all the gram sabhas met. The records for the previous two years were not uploaded. Similarly the disposal of complaints was not satisfactory. First not all the complaints are lodged. Secondly, many of them were pending. Though we find the percentage of disposal of complaints increasing from 78% in the year 2008-09

to 81% in 2009-10 to 89% during the year 2010-11, at district level the situation is not as good. For example, in Ambala 18 % complaints were not settled in the year 2010-11 and in many districts there is no complaint received at all.

The assignment of social auditing is yet to mature. Though the beginning can be stated as good but much work needs to be done, which should be urgently taken up to carry out inspection of works, calling the gram sabhas meetings etc.

### **Bank/ Post office accounts:**

There are some important points related with opening of bank accounts for making payment under NREGA: one, it is considered that chances of under payment get reduced if payment is made through bank/ post office accounts, two, the workers will develop habit of savings, three, the female workers will be able to save some hard cash for emergency, even keeping safe from their 'spendthrift' spouses. This may not apply in the case of joint accounts. But due to their own reasons, may be to keep banking safe from money laundering, black money, NPA etc., the banks have been advised by the regulator (RBI) to be strict in 'know your customer' (KYC), hence more restrictions and more documentation like PAN, photo, residence proof etc. are enforced in opening and operating the accounts. Secondly, the interest rates on deposits had been reduced, and after recent small increases do not still match the higher inflation. At least such accounts (savings) need to be offered higher rate of interest, something like higher rates for senior citizens. Thirdly, restriction of keeping certain minimum amount are being imposed which in such cases needs to be done away with. The regulatory measures, though may be important for the banks but create problems for the rural poor to open and operate such accounts. Still many people prefer and need to be encouraged to get payment through bank or post office accounts. The payment should also be brought under the purview of social audit with some penal action in the case of failure on the part of the village leaders/ officials for not making payment through bank / Post office accounts

In the state as a whole, we find about 7.7% increase in opening of individual bank accounts during the year 2009-10 over 2008-9, but more than 91% increase in the succeeding year and finally about 105% increase in 2010-11 over 2008-09. The

respective figures in the case of joint accounts are as follows, increase by about 42%, 108% and 194% respectively, almost on the same pattern as was in the case of individual accounts. Thus we find about 37% increase in disbursement of wages through bank accounts in the year 2009-10 over 2008-09, about 60% increase in the succeeding year and about 119% increase in the year 2010-11 over 2008-09 (table 2.5).

Because banks' branches are not operating in all the villages, not even in those villages where they should invariably under the guidelines of the regulator be, for example the author's own village,<sup>18</sup> the amount could be disbursed through post offices, which are functioning in almost all the villages. Rather to strengthen postal department banking operation may be permitted through them. The progress of post office accounts was as follows:

Individual accounts opened in the year 2009-10 were more by 18% than in 2008-09, increased by more than 26% in the next year and by 48 % in the year 2010-11 over 2008-09. The figures for the joint accounts were as follows: 59%, 229% and 422% respectively. The disbursement of wages through accounts in post offices increased by 56%, 130% and 258% during the periods under consideration.

Thus we find increase in individual bank and post office accounts by about 9%, 85% and 101% in the years 2009-10 over 2008-09, in 2010-11 over 2009-10 and 2008-09 respectively. The respective figure for joint accounts were 42%, 114% and 205%, leading total increase in individual and joint accounts by 20%, 96% and 135% and in disbursement of wages through post office and bank accounts by 37%, 64% and 125% during the periods.

In sum we can say that increase in joint accounts, both in post offices and banks is more in comparison to individual accounts, hence the purpose of saving by women away from the spouses may not be successful. The joint accounts were opened under the influence of husbands mostly and too much paper work was another reason for opening joint bank accounts.

---

<sup>18</sup> This village in Rajasthan at the border of Haryana is very large with more than 6,000 voters and economically very rich on the main 4 lane high way. As per the RBI guidelines branch should have been working there since long back in the village itself. The license was obtained Bank of Rajasthan and the branch was started and is still functioning in the nearby town (5kms away) instead of in the village.

Second and more important is the point that how much money as percentage of total amount spent on completed and ongoing projects has been disbursed as wages and through bank and post office accounts. Because the respective figures of disbursement of wages through accounts (individual and joint accounts in post offices and banks) for the three years, 2008-09, 2009-10 and 2010-11 are 13.7%, 6.5% and 15.9%

It raises a serious question, if total amount on materials and other administrative expenses is around 40% and on wages around 60%, and half of the wages are paid in cash, then at least 30% of total amount spent on projects should have been disbursed as wages through accounts. Keeping in mind the level of misappropriation of public funds, the disbursement of innocent workers' wages in cash is neither recommended and nor desired. The social audit has to take care of it seriously.

### **Unemployment allowance:**

As far as payment of unemployment allowance in lieu of providing work was concerned, as stated earlier, because in such cases the state government has to bear the entire cost on unemployment allowance and the concerned officers are cautioned, therefore, no case of unemployment allowance in the selected sample households was reported, not even in the entire state up to 2009-10. The NREGA states that if work is not provided within 15 days of an application being made, the applicants are entitled to an unemployment allowance at the rate of one-fourth of the minimum wage for the first 30 days, and one half thereafter. We do not know if the state has been following any tricks to save on unemployment allowance.

In 2005, while conducting a field survey in Dahanu (Maharashtra) I learnt of cases where work was provided for as little as two days in order to evade the unemployment allowance<sup>19</sup>.

In Haryana, however, in the year 2009-10 total allowance for 1549 days has been reported by the state government as due but not a single Rupee was paid as unemployment allowance. Similarly, in the year 2010-11 only 28 days

---

<sup>19</sup> Reetika Khera Economic & Political Weekly, august 30, 2008

unemployment allowance has been reported due in district Palwal (20) and Fatehabad (8) in the entire state, but not a single Re. was paid. (table 2.6).

The lesser number of days for unemployment, almost negligible for the state as whole leads to conclude that with strict action things can be got done. The bureaucracy can deliver if there is no political intervention, with encouragement for performing honestly and severe punishment for delinquency. Perhaps the financial implication seems to be the strongest measure. Secondly non-payment of unemployment allowance which was reported due raises another question for social audit and implementation of the ACT.

### **Work projection:**

As far as work projection was concerned, more than 1/3<sup>rd</sup> of projects to be taken up during the year would be spilled over from the previous year. The huge number of spill over projects, about 65% of the total in the state was reported from district Rewari alone. Contrarily, Panipat and 6 more districts would have zero projects pending in the preceding year. Thus in the state total number of projects on which work was to continue would be about 11,470, 3164 from the last year and the rest were fresh to start. The projection at the end was that about 3753 projects would spill over for the following year. Along with these spillover projects, 24723 new proposed projects would be expected to start in the forthcoming financial year. With such a huge number of projects in the state, a total about 7.9 million person days work was expected to be created. More than 17% person days work will be expected to be created in Sirsa alone and more than 8% person days work would be expected to be created in district Mewat, Bhiwani and Mahendergarh districts. Thus about 50% workdays are expected to be generated in 5 districts of the state. As far as cost was concerned, it was expected that about 182 crores of Rupees will be spent on wages for the unskilled and skilled workers. Out of which about Rs. 129 crores will be for unskilled workers alone Thus generation of about 7.8 million work days for unskilled workers would mean that 78, 000 workers were projected to get 100 days work during the year (table 2.6). A similar act for the urban poor will help lift the state out of hunger and poverty and many poverty linked evils.

## **2.5 Sum Up:**

The work on NREGA in the state was started with two districts, Sirsa and Mahendergarh in the beginning, followed by other two, Mewat and Ambala districts in 2007 and in the remaining 17 districts in the third year. District Palwal was created in 2009-10. The progress of issuing job cards is significant during the three years. The share of SC households in the issuance of job cards was more than 50% during the three years, coming down from 55% to nearly 50% in the latest year, because the number of non-SC households increased phenomenally to 116% as compared to 51% in the case of SC households. The percentage growth of households issued job cards in the state as a whole was around 54% in 2010-11 over 2008-09.

As far as generation of person days of work was concerned, there was almost 41% increase in women participation in 2010-11 over 2009-10 and 50% increase in 2010-11 over 2008-09. Overall the share of women in generation of work days was more than 30% in the three years.

Among the districts, Mewat and Jind created more than 41% work for women in the year 2010-11, while in Karnal about 44% work was created for women. The state and some districts have achieved magnificent growth in employment generation for scheduled castes.

So far as completion of works was concerned, share of Rural Connectivity projects within the districts as well as in the state was almost 1/3<sup>rd</sup> during the last three years and it was continuously increasing from 32% in 2008-09 to about 42% in 2010-11. It was followed by Water Conservation and Rain Water Harvesting measures with more than 20% share during the three years. Other important projects getting about 15-16% share in the state as well as in the selected districts were Drought Proofing, Micro Irrigation etc. However, a very attractive activity, though not equally useful was to create Rajiv Gandhi Gram Seva Kendra. In almost all the village two- three rooms are being built on public land with NREGA funds. The utility of such Kendras is being questioned by the officials, village leaders and even by the conscientious NREGA workers



As far as amount spent was concerned, about 25% of that was spent in district Sirsa alone followed by Mewat among the selected districts in 2008-09. Among the activities about Rs. 5.5 crores were spent on renovation of traditional water bodies. In the following year the amount spent on ongoing/ suspended works increased by about 42% and in the year 2010-11 over 2009-10. However, in the same year 2010-11, the amount spent increased by about 101% over 2008-09. Like 2008-09 district Sirsa topped the amount spent in the following two years as well, in 2009-10 by spending about 17% and in the year 2010-11 by spending about 19% of the total amount spent in the state. Activity wise Rural Connectivity attracted maximum of the amount spent. It was more than 38% of the total amount spent in the state in the year 2009-10 and also in the year 2010-11. Water Conservation and Water Harvesting followed the Rural Connectivity, wherein about 16% of the total amount was spent.

In sum maximum amount has been spent on Land Development, Rural Connectivity and Water Harvesting related works on completed as well as ongoing projects and all of them will have long term economies for the communities associated with.

Social audit of the works, verification of muster rolls, and, gram panchayats' and gram sabhas' meetings are key to the functioning of NREGA.

Total number of muster rolls used in the year 2008-09 for the state as a whole was 25985 but 24382 muster rolls or 93.8% were verified during the year. Similarly during the year 2010-11 about 98% muster rolls in the state were verified. However, among the districts selected for the sample, the muster rolls due and verified match mostly, except in Sirsa where only 67% muster rolls were verified.

The situation related with verification/ completion of Panchayats was no better than verification of muster rolls. In the state as whole, during the year 2010-11 about 40% verification of panchayats was not completed, whereas in the previous two years figure were about 29% and 40% less number than the total due.

In the state about 81 % and 78% works were inspected. During the first two years, whereas in the year 2010-11 almost all the works are shown as inspected, though at district level we find many lagging.

In many districts of the state meetings of the gram sabhas were not held, which as per the act was mandatory. It was in the year 2010-11 that in two districts, Ambala and Sirsa all the gram sabhas met. The assignment of social auditing is yet to mature.

We find number of individual and joint bank and post office accounts of NREGA workers increasing during the three years. But still a huge portion of wages is paid in cash. Second money as percentage of total amount spent on completed and ongoing projects disbursed as wages and through bank and post office accounts during the three years, 2008-09, 2009-10 and 2010-11 were merely 13.7%, 6.5% and 15.9. Keeping in mind the level of misappropriation of public funds, the disbursal of innocent workers' wages in cash is neither recommended and nor desired. The social audit has to take care of it seriously.

No unemployment allowance was paid, even it has been reported as due for some considerable days during the year 2009-10 and for miniscule days in 2010-11.

As far as work projection is concerned, about 7.8 million work days for unskilled workers were projected to be generated which would mean that 78, 000 workers getting 100 days work during the year. A similar act for the urban poor will lift the entire state out of hunger and poverty and many more evils.

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

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 generate (in Lakhs)(Till the reporting month)				
	SC	ST	Others	Total				SC	ST	Others	Total	Women
<b>2010-11</b>												
MAHENDRAGARH	17890	0	44050	61940	23150	23150	5195	2.57	0	7.2	9.77	2.42
(%)	28.88	0.00	71.12	100.00	37.37	100.00		26.31	0.00	73.69	100.00	24.77
SIRSA	46105	0	30573	76678	34490	34385	18384	7.39	0	4.12	11.51	4.17
(%)	60.13	0.00	39.87	100.00	44.98	99.70		64.21	0.00	35.79	100.00	36.23
AMBALA	22820	0	13339	36159	8497	8453	8010	1.52	0	1.16	2.68	0.86
(%)	63.11	0.00	36.89	100.00	23.50	99.48		56.72	0.00	43.28	100.00	32.09
MEWAT	4361	0	28046	32407	12448	12443	5958	1.16	0	6.64	7.8	3.27
(%)	13.46	0.00	86.54	100.00	38.41	99.96		14.87	0.00	85.13	100.00	41.92
BHIWANI	24073	0	26871	50944	29118	29068	9081	4.23	0	4.81	9.04	3.24
(%)	47.25	0.00	52.75	100.00	57.16	99.83		46.79	0.00	53.21	100.00	35.84
FARIDABAD	1799	0	1546	3345	831	831	245	0.14	0	0.12	0.26	0.88
(%)	53.78	0.00	46.22	100.00	24.84	100.00		53.85	0.00	46.15	100.00	338.46
FATEHABAD	20742	0	10583	31325	21714	21714	21714	4.43	0	2.14	6.57	2.26
(%)	66.22	0.00	33.78	100.00	69.32	100.00		67.43	0.00	32.57	100.00	34.40
GURGAON	2498	0	1612	4110	3611	1764	239	0.26	0	0.26	0.52	0.17
(%)	60.78	0.00	39.22	100.00	87.86	48.85		50.00	0.00	50.00	100.00	32.69
HISSAR	29960	0	11260	41220	29826	29787	11108	8.56	0	2.96	11.52	4.28
(%)	72.68	0.00	27.32	100.00	72.36	99.87		74.31	0.00	25.69	100.00	37.15
JAJHJHAR	10570	0	9561	20131	3021	3021	733	0.57	0	0.79	1.36	0.56
(%)	52.51	0.00	47.49	100.00	15.01	100.00		41.91	0.00	58.09	100.00	41.18
JIND	17958	0	9598	27556	7082	7076	3074	1.37	0	0.55	1.92	0.7
(%)	65.17	0.00	34.83	100.00	25.70	99.92		71.35	0.00	28.65	100.00	36.46
KAITHAL	9224	0	11977	21201	8365	8363	747	1.25	0	1.26	2.51	0.84
(%)	43.51	0.00	56.49	100.00	39.46	99.98		49.80	0.00	50.20	100.00	33.47
KARNAL	12469	0	10970	23439	8357	8337	2454	1.41	0	1.2	2.61	1.14
(%)	53.20	0.00	46.80	100.00	35.65	99.76		54.02	0.00	45.98	100.00	43.68
KURUKSHETRA	9236	0	12092	21328	7237	7204	2069	0.82	0	1.12	1.94	0.76
(%)	43.30	0.00	56.70	100.00	33.93	99.54		42.27	0.00	57.73	100.00	39.18

..... contd

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

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 generate (in Lakhs)(Till the reporting month)				
	SC	ST	Others	Total				SC	ST	Others	Total	Women
PALWAL	5464	0	8756	14220	5470	5465	1272	0.63	0	1.8	2.43	0.78
(%)	38.42	0.00	61.58	100.00	38.47	99.91		25.93	0.00	74.07	100.00	32.10
PANCHKULA	3244	0	7500	10744	4891	4878	1162	0.39	0	1.54	1.93	0.13
(%)	30.19	0.00	69.81	100.00	45.52	99.73		20.21	0.00	79.79	100.00	6.74
PANIPAT	7195	0	6309	13504	5219	5219	662	0.86	0	0.78	1.64	0.63
(%)	53.28	0.00	46.72	100.00	38.65	100.00		52.44	0.00	47.56	100.00	38.41
REWARI	14955	0	12828	27783	6332	6332	1737	0.99	0	1.15	2.14	0.8
(%)	53.83	0.00	46.17	100.00	22.79	100.00		46.26	0.00	53.74	100.00	37.38
ROHTAK	7226	0	5070	12296	4536	4530	1042	0.8	0	0.81	1.61	0.57
(%)	58.77	0.00	41.23	100.00	36.89	99.87		49.69	0.00	50.31	100.00	35.40
SONIPAT	14883	0	14099	28982	5333	5332	816	0.71	0	0.83	1.54	0.55
(%)	51.35	0.00	48.65	100.00	18.40	99.98		46.10	0.00	53.90	100.00	35.71
YAMUNANAGAR	11303	0	12122	23425	7952	7929	2355	1.14	0	1.76	2.9	0.98
(%)	48.25	0.00	51.75	100.00	33.95	99.71		39.31	0.00	60.69	100.00	33.79
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>293975</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>288762</b>	<b>582737</b>	<b>237480</b>	<b>235281</b>	<b>98057</b>	<b>41.2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>84.2</b>	<b>29.99</b>
(%)	50.45	0.00	49.55	100.00	40.75	99.07		48.93	0.00	51.07	100.00	35.62
<b>2009-10</b>												
MAHENDRAGARH	17223	0	37038	54261	12390	12390	10764	2.19	0	3.65	5.84	1.29
(%)	31.74	0.00	68.26	100.00	22.83	100.00		37.50	0.00	62.50	100.00	22.09
SIRSA	39164	0	28276	67440	28726	28726	4566	8.16	0	3.76	11.92	4.04
(%)	58.07	0.00	41.93	100.00	42.59	100.00		68.46	0.00	31.54	100.00	33.89
AMBALA	21009	0	9083	30092	9232	9232	9232	2.99	0	1.33	4.32	1.81
(%)	69.82	0.00	30.18	100.00	30.68	100.00		69.21	0.00	30.79	100.00	41.90
MEWAT	4007	0	22043	26050	9751	9751	1687	0.9	0	5.2	6.1	2.59
(%)	15.38	0.00	84.62	100.00	37.43	100.00		14.75	0.00	85.25	100.00	42.46
BHIWANI	15650	58	16275	31983	13580	13580	13580	2.26	0	2.66	4.92	1.93
(%)	48.93	0.18	50.89	100.00	42.46	100.00		45.93	0.00	54.07	100.00	39.23
FARIDABAD	692	0	431	1123	1030	1030	532	0.1	0	0.1	0.2	0.09
(%)	61.62	0.00	38.38	100.00	91.72	100.00		50.00	0.00	50.00	100.00	45.00

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

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 generate (in Lakhs)(Till the reporting month)				
	SC	ST	Others	Total				SC	ST	Others	Total	Women
FATEHABAD	15809	0	7130	22939	13691	13691	3239	3.05	0	1.28	4.33	1.44
(%)	68.92	0.00	31.08	100.00	59.68	100.00		70.44	0.00	29.56	100.00	33.26
GURGAON	1864	0	812	2676	443	443	200	0.1	0	0.06	0.16	0.07
(%)	69.66	0.00	30.34	100.00	16.55	100.00		62.50	0.00	37.50	100.00	43.75
HISSAR	17291	0	4313	21604	12474	12474	2390	3.42	0	0.87	4.29	1.67
(%)	80.04	0.00	19.96	100.00	57.74	100.00		79.72	0.00	20.28	100.00	38.93
JAJHJHAR	9758	0	8011	17769	2935	2935	453	0.59	0	0.66	1.25	0.4
(%)	54.92	0.00	45.08	100.00	16.52	100.00		47.20	0.00	52.80	100.00	32.00
JIND	16160	0	8391	24551	5410	5410	5410	0.94	0	0.52	1.46	0.55
(%)	65.82	0.00	34.18	100.00	22.04	100.00		64.38	0.00	35.62	100.00	37.67
KAITHAL	11287	0	8153	19440	4437	4437	4437	0.65	0	0.56	1.21	0.38
(%)	58.06	0.00	41.94	100.00	22.82	100.00		53.72	0.00	46.28	100.00	31.40
KARNAL	9784	0	8513	18297	5777	5773	742	0.95	0	0.78	1.73	0.73
(%)	53.47	0.00	46.53	100.00	31.57	99.93		54.91	0.00	45.09	100.00	42.20
KURUKSHETRA	7447	0	9820	17267	4078	4078	4078	0.43	0	0.6	1.03	0.45
(%)	43.13	0.00	56.87	100.00	23.62	100.00		41.75	0.00	58.25	100.00	43.69
PALWAL	3815	0	4673	8488	6565	6565	3164	0.6	0	0.91	1.51	0.38
(%)	44.95	0.00	55.05	100.00	77.34	100.00		39.74	0.00	60.26	100.00	25.17
PANCHKULA	2798	0	6313	9111	3358	3358	3358	0.38	0	1.01	1.39	0.13
(%)	30.71	0.00	69.29	100.00	36.86	100.00		27.34	0.00	72.66	100.00	9.35
PANIPAT	6153	0	4874	11027	5551	5551	5551	0.83	0	0.78	1.61	0.6
(%)	55.80	0.00	44.20	100.00	50.34	100.00		51.55	0.00	48.45	100.00	37.27
REWARI	12884	0	9852	22736	2498	2498	2498	0.41	0	0.42	0.83	0.31
(%)	56.67	0.00	43.33	100.00	10.99	100.00		49.40	0.00	50.60	100.00	37.35
ROHTAK	6031	0	3361	9392	2632	2632	444	0.61	0	0.49	1.1	0.43
(%)	64.21	0.00	35.79	100.00	28.02	100.00		55.45	0.00	44.55	100.00	39.09
SONIPAT	12978	0	10420	23398	4454	4454	4454	1.01	0	0.55	1.56	0.5
(%)	55.47	0.00	44.53	100.00	19.04	100.00		64.74	0.00	35.26	100.00	32.05
YAMUNANAGAR	9925	0	9798	19723	7398	7398	7398	1.08	0	1.2	2.28	0.76
(%)	50.32	0.00	49.68	100.00	37.51	100.00		47.37	0.00	52.63	100.00	33.33

..... contd.

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

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 generate (in Lakhs)(Till the reporting month)				
	SC	ST	Others	Total				SC	ST	Others	Total	Women
TOTAL	241729	58	217580	459367	156410	156406	88177	31.65	0	27.39	59.04	20.55
(%)	52.62	0.01	47.37	100.00	34.05	100.00		53.61	0.00	46.39	100.00	34.81
<b>2008-09</b>												
MAHENDRAGARH	28125	0	22841	50966	13100	13100	1500	3.61	0	2.57	6.18	2.29
(%)	55.18	0.00	44.82	100.00	25.70	100.00		58.41	0.00	41.59	100.00	37.06
SIRSA	37754	0	28202	65956	38870	38870	8663	11.5	0	4.16	15.66	4.2
(%)	57.24	0.00	42.76	100.00	58.93	100.00		73.44	0.00	26.56	100.00	26.82
AMBALA	19772	0	7816	27588	13126	13126	13126	6.24	0	3.59	9.83	4.2
(%)	71.67	0.00	28.33	100.00	47.58	100.00		63.48	0.00	36.52	100.00	42.73
MEWAT	4520	0	24092	28612	21372	21372	2452	2.68	0	13.29	15.97	4.19
(%)	15.80	0.00	84.20	100.00	74.70	100.00		16.78	0.00	83.22	100.00	26.24
BHIWANI	11797	56	8766	20619	6150	6149	6101	1.18	0	0.7	1.88	0.66
(%)	57.21	0.27	42.51	100.00	29.83	99.98		62.77	0.00	37.23	100.00	35.11
FARIDABAD	1060	0	613	1673	1536	1467	1384	0.2	0	0.12	0.32	0.1
(%)	63.36	0.00	36.64	100.00	91.81	95.51		62.50	0.00	37.50	100.00	31.25
FATEHABAD	10535	0	4241	14776	10396	10396	10396	1.38	0	0.8	2.18	0.57
(%)	71.30	0.00	28.70	100.00	70.36	100.00		63.30	0.00	36.70	100.00	26.15
GURGAON	1245	0	460	1705	1615	1615	330	0.38	0	0.29	0.67	0.11
(%)	73.02	0.00	26.98	100.00	94.72	100.00		56.72	0.00	43.28	100.00	16.42
HISSAR	11054	0	2439	13493	6732	6732	777	1.89	0	0.35	2.24	0.72
(%)	81.92	0.00	18.08	100.00	49.89	100.00		84.38	0.00	15.63	100.00	32.14
JAJHJHAR	5849	0	4690	10539	10539	2043	2043	0.43	0	0.48	0.91	0.23
(%)	55.50	0.00	44.50	100.00	100.00	19.39		47.25	0.00	52.75	100.00	25.27
JIND	14663	0	7467	22130	6749	6749	1169	1.31	0	0.62	1.93	0.72
(%)	66.26	0.00	33.74	100.00	30.50	100.00		67.88	0.00	32.12	100.00	37.31
KAITHAL	10927	0	6999	17926	6503	6474	6474	0.99	0	0.5	1.49	0.37
(%)	60.96	0.00	39.04	100.00	36.28	99.55		66.44	0.00	33.56	100.00	24.83
KARNAL	7901	0	6904	14805	5281	5162	1289	0.65	0	0.73	1.38	0.52
(%)	53.37	0.00	46.63	100.00	35.67	97.75		47.10	0.00	52.90	100.00	37.68

.....contd.

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

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 generate (in Lakhs)(Till the reporting month)				
	SC	ST	Others	Total				SC	ST	Others	Total	Women
KURUKSHETRA	7809	0	8119	15928	3108	3108	844	0.47	0	0.66	1.13	0.29
(%)	49.03	0.00	50.97	100.00	19.51	100.00		41.59	0.00	58.41	100.00	25.66
PANCHKULA	3081	0	5156	8237	2467	2467	376	0.29	0	0.76	1.05	0.01
(%)	37.40	0.00	62.60	100.00	29.95	100.00		27.62	0.00	72.38	100.00	0.95
PANIPAT	5202	0	3715	8917	5656	5656	5656	0.8	0	0.65	1.45	0.46
(%)	58.34	0.00	41.66	100.00	63.43	100.00		55.17	0.00	44.83	100.00	31.72
REWARI	6886	0	6895	13781	3208	3208	2885	0.4	0	0.29	0.69	0.14
(%)	49.97	0.00	50.03	100.00	23.28	100.00		57.97	0.00	42.03	100.00	20.29
ROHTAK	5617	0	2720	8337	3174	3174	3174	0.83	0	0.32	1.15	0.55
(%)	67.37	0.00	32.63	100.00	38.07	100.00		72.17	0.00	27.83	100.00	47.83
SONIPAT	9524	0	6073	15597	4685	4685	4685	0.41	0	0.25	0.66	0.15
(%)	61.06	0.00	38.94	100.00	30.04	100.00		62.12	0.00	37.88	100.00	22.73
YAMUNANAGAR	7702	0	8281	15983	7527	7379	0	1.02	0	1.32	2.34	0.68
(%)	48.19	0.00	51.81	100.00	47.09	98.03		43.59	0.00	56.41	100.00	29.06
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>211023</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>166489</b>	<b>377568</b>	<b>171794</b>	<b>162932</b>	<b>73324</b>	<b>36.66</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>32.45</b>	<b>69.11</b>	<b>21.16</b>
(%)	55.89	0.01	44.10	100.00	45.50	94.84		53.05	0.00	46.95	100.00	30.62

**Table 2.2 District wise works completed/progress under NREGA (no. of projects)**

Districts	Works/Activities										Total
	Rural Connectivity	Flood Control and Protection	Water Conservation and Water Harvesting	Drought Proofing	Micro Irrigation Works	Provision of Irrigation facility to Land Owned by	Renovation of Traditional Water bodies	Land Development	Any Other activity Approved by MRD	Bharat Nirman Rajeev Gandhi Sewa Kendra	
<b>Completed 2010-11</b>											
MAHENDRAGARH	521	0	237	60	56	0	116	96	0	0	1086
SIRSA	317	51	72	54	532	6	82	220	0	0	1334
AMBALA	145	24	29	34	0	0	1	26	0	15	274
MEWAT	333	7	100	39	38	0	17	96	0	7	637
BHIWANI	121	7	7	0	88	0	24	13	1	0	261
FARIDABAD	6	0	1	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	11
FATEHABAD	199	4	88	0	243	0	80	146	0	0	760
GURGAON	5	0	13	4	0	0	2	3	1	0	28
HISSAR	403	2	184	4	33	0	10	75	0	0	711
JAJHJHAR	36	5	13	1	1	0	2	38	0	1	97
JIND	130	3	49	0	83	0	1	12	0	0	278
KAITHAL	53	5	18	0	174	0	21	6	0	3	280
KARNAL	69	9	41	1	7	0	13	13	0	8	161
KURUKSHETRA	61	6	35	50	13	1	18	28	0	0	212
PALWAL	72	7	6	6	2	0	3	20	0	1	117
PANCHKULA	194	40	67	0	9	0	26	52	0	0	388
PANIPAT	98	32	3	2	20	1	19	34	0	0	209
REWARI	73	6	21	2	0	0	10	40	0	0	152
ROHTAK	38	1	28	7	30	0	18	17	0	0	139
SONIPAT	0	3	23	6	55	0	12	14	0	5	118
YAMUNANAGAR	121	8	108	1	1	0	71	10	0	0	320
Total	2995	220	1143	271	1385	8	546	963	2	40	7573



..... contd

**Table 2.2 District wise works completed/progress under NREGA (no. of projects)**

Districts	Works/Activities										Total
	Rural Connectivity	Flood Control and Protection	Water Conservation and Water Harvesting	Drought Proofing	Micro Irrigation Works	Provision of Irrigation facility to Land Owned by	Renovation of Traditional Water bodies	Land Development	Any Other activity Approved by MRD	Bharat Nirman Rajeev Gandhi Sewa Kendra	
<b>Ongoing 2010-11</b>											
MAHENDRAGARH	40	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	48
SIRSA	249	29	65	13	93	3	30	180	0	5	667
AMBALA	77	34	60	0	0	0	12	31	0	43	257
MEWAT	22	0	6	0	1	0	0	0	0	22	51
BHIWANI	423	10	87	3	32	0	124	94	39	0	812
FARIDABAD	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	2	19
FATEHABAD	43	11	65	0	58	0	29	69	0	44	319
GURGAON	11	0	13	39	1	0	2	3	0	3	72
HISSAR	404	1	254	1	66	0	3	67	0	45	841
JAJHJHAR	3	5	3	0	0	0	0	11	0	8	30
JIND	106	1	63	2	14	0	1	12	0	9	208
KAITHAL	29	18	52	2	54	0	2	9	0	22	188
KARNAL	81	5	27	0	2	0	7	17	0	21	160
KURUKSHETRA	79	13	43	20	2	1	52	36	13	0	259
PALWAL	45	4	2	3	1	0	5	16	0	5	81
PANCHKULA	36	4	26	0	0	0	0	15	0	15	96
PANIPAT	98	25	5	4	1	0	26	19	0	13	191
REWARI	106	2	57	5	3	0	20	122	0	4	319
ROHTAK	24	2	12	0	1	0	7	9	0	21	76
SONIPAT	22	3	51	4	40	0	86	37	0	116	359
YAMUNANAGAR	85	38	46	0	1	0	19	18	0	57	264
Total	1995	205	940	96	370	4	425	770	57	455	5317

.....contd

**Table 2.2 District wise works completed/progress under NREGA (no. of projects)**

Districts	Works/Activities										Total
	Rural Connectivity	Flood Control and Protection	Water Conservation and Water Harvesting	Drought Proofing	Micro Irrigation Works	Provision of Irrigation facility to Land Owned by	Renovation of Traditional Water bodies	Land Development	Any Other activity Approved by MRD	Bharat Nirman Rajeev Gandhi Sewa Kendra	
<b>Completed 2009-10</b>											
MAHENDRAGARH	243	0	202	10	34	0	33	45	0	0	567
SIRSA	200	49	98	24	140	3	43	192	0	0	749
AMBALA	182	61	54	129	0	0	30	31	0	0	487
MEWAT	172	6	96	2	12	0	65	11	0	0	364
BHIWANI	25	1	13	0	4	0	9	5	0	0	57
FARIDABAD	17	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
FATEHABAD	53	3	102	0	41	0	27	17	0	0	243
GURGAON	0	0	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
HISSAR	102	6	87	0	15	0	6	11	0	0	227
JAJHJHAR	11	2	19	0	0	0	9	22	12	0	75
JIND	37	4	80	12	7	0	10	6	0	0	156
KAITHAL	41	3	28	0	7	0	7	9	0	0	95
KARNAL	18	2	14	2	0	0	3	3	5	0	47
KURUKSHETRA	26	6	22	5	8	0	26	17	0	0	110
PALWAL	49	11	23	0	5	0	6	2	0	0	96
PANCHKULA	100	1	135	0	7	4	50	15	0	0	312
PANIPAT	26	0	0	0	1	0	4	4	0	0	35
REWARI	21	0	30	0	0	0	1	12	0	0	64
ROHTAK	29	4	73	1	8	0	2	3	0	0	120
SONIPAT	0	3	52	0	0	0	57	0	24	0	136
YAMUNANAGAR	20	1	41	0	0	0	28	1	0	0	91
Total	1372	163	1184	185	289	7	416	406	41	0	4063

.....contd

**Table 2.2 District wise works completed/progress under NREGA (no. of projects)**

Districts	Works/Activities										Total
	Rural Connectivity	Flood Control and Protection	Water Conservation and Water Harvesting	Drought Proofing	Micro Irrigation Works	Provision of Irrigation facility to Land Owned by	Renovation of Traditional Water bodies	Land Development	Any Other activity Approved by MRD	Bharat Nirman Rajeev Gandhi Sewa Kendra	
<b>Ongoing 2009-10</b>											
MAHENDRAGARH	97	0	11	0	7	0	2	11	5	0	133
SIRSA	133	22	70	9	152	5	65	169	2	0	627
AMBALA	121	27	48	1	0	0	6	10	18	0	231
MEWAT	79	2	33	1	3	0	0	3	22	0	143
BHIWANI	153	11	65	0	69	0	83	22	3	0	406
FARIDABAD	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	15
FATEHABAD	17	7	76	0	6	0	3	16	0	0	125
GURGAON	0	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
HISSAR	107	2	131	0	2	0	0	6	8	0	256
JAJHJHAR	10	1	10	1	0	0	2	10	5	0	39
JIND	26	3	53	4	1	0	1	4	1	0	93
KAITHAL	44	10	49	0	1	0	2	6	0	0	112
KARNAL	85	9	85	7	0	0	26	18	15	0	245
KURUKSHETRA	31	7	48	8	6	1	37	16	13	0	167
PALWAL	24	0	7	0	0	0	0	1	5	0	37
PANCHKULA	18	0	19	11	0	0	0	7	0	0	55
PANIPAT	131	24	9	1	5	0	36	27	3	0	236
REWARI	58	2	22	0	1	0	20	80	1	0	184
ROHTAK	5	0	13	0	1	0	1	0	2	0	22
SONIPAT	3	3	67	0	0	0	41	0	99	0	213
YAMUNANAGAR	76	5	116	0	0	0	84	9	6	0	296
Total	1229	135	939	43	254	6	409	417	210	0	3642

.....contd

**Table 2.2 District wise works completed/progress under NREGA (no. of projects)**

Districts	Works/Activities										Total
	Rural Connectivity	Flood Control and Protection	Water Conservation and Water Harvesting	Drought Proofing	Micro Irrigation Works	Provision of Irrigation facility to Land Owned by	Renovation of Traditional Water bodies	Land Development	Any Other activity Approved by MRD	Bharat Nirman Rajeev Gandhi Sewa Kendra	
<b>Completed 2008-09</b>											
MAHENDRAGARH	239	0	196	11	109	0	74	12	0	0	641
SIRSA	175	30	127	5	113	6	29	176	0	0	661
AMBALA	240	27	84	487	0	0	23	36	0	0	897
MEWAT	154	3	40	2	2	0	92	3	0	0	296
BHIWANI	12	0	3	0	3	0	8	0	1	0	27
FARIDABAD	1	1	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	6
FATEHABAD	31	0	36	0	0	0	6	6	0	0	79
GURGAON	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
HISSAR	34	1	10	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	48
JAJHJHAR	7	13	23	0	0	4	20	13	0	0	80
JIND	8	1	34	10	0	0	0	4	0	0	57
KAITHAL	27	8	18	1	83	0	63	8	0	0	208
KARNAL	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
KURUKSHETRA	14	0	2	1	4	0	9	5	0	0	35
PANCHKULA	81	7	106	3	0	6	3	5	0	0	211
PANIPAT	17	10	3	5	5	0	1	9	0	0	50
REWARI	40	3	10	1	0	0	0	9	0	0	63
ROHTAK	41	0	27	6	26	0	3	27	0	0	130
SONIPAT	0	0	12	0	0	0	16	0	0	0	28
YAMUNANAGAR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	1121	104	734	532	346	16	348	314	2	0	3517

.....contd

**Table 2.2 District wise works completed/progress under NREGA (no. of projects)**

Districts	Works/Activities										Total
	Rural Connectivity	Flood Control and Protection	Water Conservation and Water Harvesting	Drought Proofing	Micro Irrigation Works	Provision of Irrigation facility to Land Owned by	Renovation of Traditional Water bodies	Land Development	Any Other activity Approved by MRD	Bharat Nirman Rajeev Gandhi Sewa Kendra	
<b>Ongoing 2008-09</b>											
MAHENDRAGARH	4	0	3	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	9
SIRSA	125	47	81	15	111	2	55	198	0	0	634
AMBALA	242	31	92	22	0	0	14	22	0	0	423
MEWAT	112	1	31	4	3	0	39	1	0	0	191
BHIWANI	30	1	40	0	0	0	31	0	0	0	102
FARIDABAD	25	0	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	40
FATEHABAD	13	21	38	0	0	0	30	4	0	0	106
GURGAON	0	0	42	0	1	0	0	5	0	0	48
HISSAR	53	4	54	0	6	0	2	5	0	0	124
JAJHJHAR	2	0	3	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	8
JIND	17	6	88	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	112
KAITHAL	35	7	35	5	1	0	2	4	0	0	89
KARNAL	36	8	70	21	0	0	11	19	9	0	174
KURUKSHETRA	13	0	36	0	0	0	5	3	0	0	57
PANCHKULA	13	1	32	2	0	0	1	6	0	0	55
PANIPAT	101	23	2	0	14	0	35	16	0	0	191
REWARI	49	3	27	2	0	0	7	10	0	0	98
ROHTAK	8	0	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41
SONIPAT	0	4	45	0	0	0	40	0	0	0	89
YAMUNANAGAR	30	0	84	0	0	0	89	3	0	0	206
Total	908	157	850	72	136	4	362	299	9	0	2797

**Table 2.3: District wise works completed/progress under NREGA (amount spent) (Rs in lacs)**

Districts	Rural Connectivity	Flood Control and Protection	Water Conservation and Water Harvesting	Drought Proofing	Micro Irrigation Works	Provision of Irrigation facility to Land Owned by	Renovation of Traditional Water bodies	Land Development	Any Other activity Approved by MRD	Bharat Nirman Rajeev Gandhi Sewa Kendra	Total
<b>Completed 2010-11</b>											
Mahendragarh	1198.82	0	759.75	60.9	70.64	0	180.55	140.25	0	0	2410.91
Sirsa	595.47	122.89	178.41	60.66	491.86	10	82.86	441.06	0	0	1983.21
Ambala	64.17	18.09	33.18	87.84	0	0	0.51	24.74	0	74.11	302.64
Mewat	1105.89	15.45	215.36	31.23	109.69	0	38.89	191.29	0	47.29	1755.09
Bhiwani	221.77	1.89	11.86	0	34.57	0	63.22	21.41	1.37	0	356.09
Faridabad	31.16	0	0.74	0	0	0	0	3.04	0	0	34.94
Fatehabad	155.8	15.03	136.23	0	243.09	0	80.59	117.35	0	0	748.09
Gurgaon	3.97	0	8.53	2.15	0	0	4.74	3.98	2.26	0	25.63
Hissar	679.99	0.13	379.8	1.82	28.28	0	10.14	77.47	0	0	1177.63
Jajhjar	70.96	16.42	38.92	0.2	0.1	0	8.51	87.6	0	2.27	224.98
Jind	128.41	5.66	64.34	0	76.76	0	0.1	19.35	0	0	294.62
Kaithal	41.35	3.23	8.7	0	228.74	0	19.16	6.3	0	50.98	358.46
Karnal	85.84	4.29	147.19	0	5.74	0	16.83	22.1	0	2.1	284.09
Kurukshetra	19.75	1	0	0.62	2.38	0	12.65	6.6	0	0	43
Palwal	195.92	4.83	13.84	3	1.12	0	12.62	79.63	0	5.61	316.57
Panchkula	166.31	25.36	69.13	0	3.04	0	12.75	43.79	0	0	320.38
Panipat	85.42	15.92	2.8	0.22	8.85	0.17	22.04	43.74	0	0	179.16
Rewari	124.23	3.85	25.51	0.86	0	0	6.44	28.46	0	0	189.35
Rohtak	64.5	0.22	51.77	2.12	47.43	0	12.22	38.36	0	0	216.62
Sonipat	0	4.25	32.96	2.35	64.2	0	16.34	7.71	0	9.66	137.47
Yamunanagar	110.91	13.06	145.8	1.49	0.04	0	55.58	9.05	0	0	335.93
Total	5150.64	271.57	2324.82	255.46	1416.53	10.17	656.74	1413.28	3.63	192.02	11694.86

....contd

**Table 2.3: District wise works completed/progress under NREGA****(amount spent)** (Rs in lacs)

Districts	Rural Connectivity	Flood Control and Protection	Water Conservation and Water Harvesting	Drought Proofing	Micro Irrigation Works	Provision of Irrigation facility to Land Owned by	Renovation of Traditional Water bodies	Land Development	Any Other activity Approved by MRD	Bharat Nirman Rajeev Gandhi Sewa Kendra	Total
<b>Ongoing 2010-11</b>											
Mahendragarh	66.25	0	5.3	0	0	0	0	0	103.93	0	175.48
Sirsa	488.99	42.24	68.3	23.45	162.01	1.55	21.24	248.4	0	77.83	1134.01
Ambala	60.62	126.01	56.62	0	0	0	9.31	40.55	0	133.9	427.01
Mewat	54.67	0	13.9	0	0.16	0	0	0	0	63.92	132.65
Bhiwani	764.36	0.36	79.07	8.2	12.04	0	173.48	165.04	148.11	0	1350.66
Faridabad	14.95	0	0	0	0	0	0	13.7	0	4.9	33.55
Fatehabad	38.39	2.2	106.7	0	68.07	0	45.37	83.07	0	177.27	521.07
Gurgaon	33.05	0	22.39	41.89	0.09	0	1.5	4.96	0	5.5	109.38
Hissar	811.27	0	638.98	0.47	74.16	0	0.61	118.29	0	207.19	1850.97
Jajhjar	2.19	14.16	12.93	0	0	0	0	48.59	0	39.25	117.12
Jind	60.88	0.04	78.2	1.36	0	0	0	16.3	0	66.04	222.82
Kaithal	32.34	14.44	26.02	0	107.61	0	0	7.78	0	82.16	270.35
Karnal	105.1	6.07	79.91	0	2.07	0	16.46	41.1	0	62.18	312.89
Kurukshetra	124.13	33.42	120.87	5.7	15.41	0	76.63	38.99	50.87	0	466.02
Palwal	87.85	0.17	1.45	0.24	0	0	7.7	42.21	0	22.03	161.65
Panchkula	54.05	3.11	29.11	0	0	0	0	11.65	0	74.48	172.4
Panipat	84.65	9.44	38.66	3.02	0.46	0	40.5	14.71	0	33.09	224.53
Rewari	172.92	3.14	84.41	0.4	2.91	0	15.8	89.37	0	24.54	393.49
Rohtak	39.14	1.37	22.23	0	0.13	0	14.26	19.34	0	124.25	220.72
Sonipat	24.32	4.33	14.64	0.98	22.86	0	71.49	25.4	0	81.25	245.27
Yamunanagar	119.82	50.23	65.03	0	0.04	0	43.88	29.88	0	153.85	462.73
Total	3239.94	310.73	1564.72	85.71	468.02	1.55	538.23	1059.33	302.91	1433.63	9004.77

....contd

**Table 2.3: District wise works completed/progress under NREGA****(amount spent)** (Rs in lacs)

Districts	Rural Connectivity	Flood Control and Protection	Water Conservation and Water Harvesting	Drought Proofing	Micro Irrigation Works	Provision of Irrigation facility to Land Owned by	Renovation of Traditional Water bodies	Land Development	Any Other activity Approved by MRD	Bharat Nirman Rajeev Gandhi Sewa Kendra	Total
<b>Completed 2009-10</b>											
Mahendragarh	512.27	0	437.9	21.01	62.58	0	67.08	66.93	0	0	1167.77
Sirsa	643.72	107.79	245.32	24.07	166.09	5.06	47.63	523.2	0	0	1762.88
Ambala	162.12	37.87	34.91	451.45	0	0	26.43	31.52	0	0	744.3
Mewat	423.23	16.22	314.64	4.85	30.15	0	106.06	16.62	0	0	911.77
Bhiwani	106.27	0.45	25.44	0	1.13	0	20.31	21	0	0	174.6
Faridabad	13.81	0	2.79	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16.6
Fatehabad	57.01	9.5	234.86	0	55.82	0	42.3	24.06	0	0	423.55
Gurgaon	0	0	26.94	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26.94
Hissar	207.65	5.41	196.89	0	17.43	0	5.23	14.48	0	0	447.09
Jajhjar	11.9	0.99	36.75	0	0	0	23.21	39.49	39.6	0	151.94
Jind	82.1	6.42	94.69	4.77	3.24	0	7.9	3.96	0	0	203.08
Kaithal	42.49	1.2	68.65	0	2.52	0	4.15	4.26	0	0	123.27
Karnal	8.78	0.65	20.75	0	0	0	1.18	10.04	0.16	0	41.56
Kurukshetra	10.56	1.73	28.28	0.88	2	0	20.92	9.19	0	0	73.56
Palwal	81.59	25.65	82.36	0	5.67	0	14.7	11.82	0	0	221.79
Panchkula	113.81	5	91.67	0	7.71	2.81	8.98	9.9	0	0	239.88
Panipat	25.74	0	0	0	0.35	0	6.66	0.5	0	0	33.25
Rewari	18.38	0	28.43	0	0	0	3.16	13.39	0	0	63.36
Rohtak	65.16	8.81	99.85	0.89	6.92	0	4.62	3	0	0	189.25
Sonipat	0	4.17	88.32	0	0	0	81.84	0	11.31	0	185.64
Yamunanagar	26.41	2.8	23.1	0	0	0	11.08	0.02	0	0	63.41
<b>Total</b>	<b>2613</b>	<b>234.66</b>	<b>2182.54</b>	<b>507.92</b>	<b>361.61</b>	<b>7.87</b>	<b>503.44</b>	<b>803.38</b>	<b>51.07</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>7265.49</b>



....contd

**Table 2.3: District wise works completed/progress under NREGA****(amount spent)** (Rs in lacs)

Districts	Rural Connectivity	Flood Control and Protection	Water Conservation and Water Harvesting	Drought Proofing	Micro Irrigation Works	Provision of Irrigation facility to Land Owned by	Renovation of Traditional Water bodies	Land Development	Any Other activity Approved by MRD	Bharat Nirman Rajeev Gandhi Sewa Kendra	Total
<b>Ongoing 2009-10</b>											
Mahendragarh	256.92	0	13.55	0	13.88	0	1	34.17	5.13	0	324.65
Sirsa	301.67	97.02	80.04	4.75	190.74	20.89	131.55	296.25	13.35	0	1136.26
Ambala	77.29	92.83	39.92	0	0	0	9.42	11.48	41.87	0	272.81
Mewat	202.22	0	90.67	1.71	12.15	0	0	0	122.77	0	429.52
Bhiwani	482.89	23.77	130.68	0	51.11	0	204.34	40.06	34.4	0	967.25
Faridabad	28.67	0	0	0	0	0	0	1.21	2.18	0	32.06
Fatehabad	11.48	13.43	181.55	0	18.8	0	11.98	22.88	0	0	260.12
Gurgaon	0	0	14.8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14.8
Hissar	248.69	3.52	286.26	0	2.21	0	0	12.02	61.45	0	614.15
Jajhjar	33.32	1.46	40.71	8.75	0	0	8.1	15.05	9.66	0	117.05
Jind	41.16	1.53	80.03	1.69	2.36	0	0.13	8.59	0.96	0	136.45
Kaithal	16.17	3.22	79.97	0	4.54	0	1.65	35.14	0	0	140.69
Karnal	58.77	8.2	97.68	0	0	0	42.13	20.11	1.16	0	228.05
Kurukshetra	32.49	6.61	59.81	0.9	8.18	0.2	22.44	9.22	40.68	0	180.53
Palwal	69.79	0	5.04	0	0	0	0	2	20.3	0	97.13
Panchkula	20.4	0	27.47	25.89	0	0	0	36.64	0	0	110.4
Panipat	211.37	10.74	29.56	0.14	1.79	0	37.51	55.55	9.9	0	356.56
Rewari	47.32	0	42.04	0	3.37	0	11.83	25.44	14.47	0	144.47
Rohtak	20.2	0	27.69	0	3.49	0	0.65	0	18.72	0	70.75
Sonipat	0	1.99	103.32	0	0	0	77.82	0	29.04	0	212.17
Yamunanagar	188.39	5.56	168.95	0	0	0	119.64	7.85	12.24	0	502.63
<b>Total</b>	<b>2349.21</b>	<b>269.88</b>	<b>1599.74</b>	<b>43.83</b>	<b>312.62</b>	<b>21.09</b>	<b>680.19</b>	<b>633.66</b>	<b>438.28</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>6348.5</b>

....contd **Table 2.3: District wise works completed/progress under NREGA** (amount spent) (Rs in lacs)

Districts	Rural Connectivity	Flood Control and Protection	Water Conservation and Water Harvesting	Drought Proofing	Micro Irrigation Works	Provision of Irrigation facility to Land Owned by	Renovation of Traditional Water bodies	Land Development	Any Other activity Approved by MRD	Bharat Nirman Rajeev Gandhi Sewa Kendra	Total
<b>Completed 2008-09</b>											
Mahendragarh	304.5	0	446.41	9.52	387.91	0	110.14	21.88	0	0	1280.36
Sirsa	376.56	100.1	289.51	10.16	122.03	7.76	69.41	445.66	0	0	1421.19
Ambala	586.85	24.14	124.31	734.09	0	0	12.86	48.94	0	0	1531.19
Mewat	386.49	3.55	127.23	2	1.12	0	232.57	4.77	0	0	757.73
Bhiwani	57.11	0	5.55	0	0.93	0	23.93	0	3.52	0	91.04
Faridabad	0.09	2	7.01	0	7.21	0	0	0	0	0	16.31
Fatehabad	28.73	0	85.26	0	0	0	16.74	11.34	0	0	142.07
Gurgaon	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Hissar	69	1.73	24.29	0	0	0	0.77	1.74	0.47	0	98
Jajhjar	23.31	11.42	45.08	0	0	6	21.98	16.98	0	0	124.77
Jind	12.62	2.12	81.23	1.13	0	0	0	6.8	0	0	103.9
Kaithal	27.34	2.12	15.93	0.1	21.14	0	30.88	2.84	0	0	100.35
Karnal	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Kurukshetra	10.94	0	5.43	0.24	6	0	14.42	5	0	0	42.03
Panchkula	84.91	5.34	55.05	0.71	0	2.36	3.37	1.43	0	0	153.17
Panipat	11.97	3.1	3.43	0.45	2.88	0	0.48	4.45	0	0	26.76
Rewari	27.14	1	8.3	0.5	0	0	0	4.03	0	0	40.97
Rohtak	34.65	0	56.2	1.21	19.97	0	2.52	26.7	0	0	141.25
Sonipat	0	0	13.43	0	0	0	34.94	0	0	0	48.37
Yamunanagar	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>2042.21</b>	<b>156.62</b>	<b>1393.65</b>	<b>760.11</b>	<b>569.19</b>	<b>16.12</b>	<b>575.01</b>	<b>602.56</b>	<b>3.99</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>6119.46</b>

....contd

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

(Rs in lacs)

Districts	Rural Connectivity	Flood Control and Protection	Water Conservation and Water Harvesting	Drought Proofing	Micro Irrigation Works	Provision of Irrigation facility to Land Owned by	Renovation of Traditional Water bodies	Land Development	Any Other activity Approved by MRD	Bharat Nirman Rajeev Gandhi Sewa Kendra	Total
<b>Ongoing 2008-09</b>											
Mahendragarh	4.15	0	4.37	1.1	0	0	1.5	0	0	0	11.12
Sirsa	225.53	135.07	172.04	31.09	158.88	1.11	88.04	370.33	0	0	1182.09
Ambala	222.79	31.63	97.47	96.8	0	0	8.33	16.89	0	0	473.91
Mewat	298.71	3.5	103.13	8.68	7.06	0	58.14	4.51	0	0	483.73
Bhiwani	59.78	1.15	70.42	0	0	0	59.48	0	0	0	190.83
Faridabad	15.94	0	20.76	0	0	0	0	0.38	0	0	37.08
Fatehabad	14.69	12.27	60.36	0	0	0	30.17	6.84	0	0	124.33
Gurgaon	0	0	94.34	0	0.11	0	0	2.42	0	0	96.87
Hissar	99.69	7.7	101.06	0	6.04	0	3.13	15.82	0	0	233.44
Jajhjar	3.5	0	8.98	0	0	4.65	0	2.46	0	0	19.59
Jind	14.71	11.39	127.33	0	0	0	0	0.56	0	0	153.99
Kaithal	31.93	11.86	73.1	2.96	0.39	0	1.45	9.56	0	0	131.25
Karnal	19.34	8.21	123.98	3.31	0	0	23.96	15.44	2.15	0	196.39
Kurukshetra	19.95	0	107.39	0	0	0	4.64	12.39	0	0	144.37
Panchkula	4.95	1.5	26.69	39.73	0	0	1.6	7.04	0	0	81.51
Panipat	130.11	27.05	4.97	0	5.79	0	54.85	12.66	0	0	235.43
Rewari	22.57	0.64	22.71	0	0	0	4.34	2.24	0	0	52.5
Rohtak	21.64	0	79.25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	100.89
Sonipat	0	6.17	24.23	0	0	0	56.5	0	0	0	86.9
Yamunanagar	107.13	0	177.51	0	0	0	158.55	0.38	0	0	443.57
Total	1317.11	258.14	1500.09	183.67	178.27	5.76	554.68	479.92	2.15	0	4479.79

**Table 2.4: Social auditing and inspection of NREGA work**

Name Of The District	Must Roll Verified		Social Audit		Inspections Conducted			Gram Sabha Held			Complaints	
	USED/DUE	VERIFIED/COMPLETED	Total Gram Panchayats	COMPLETE D	NO –Total Works Taken up	10% NO. of Works Inspected at District Level	100% NO. of Works Inspected at Block Level	Total Gram Panchayats	No. of Gram Sabhas held	No. of VMC meetings held	No. of Complaints disposed PO	No of Complaints Disposed DPCS
<b>2010-11</b>												
MAHENDRAGARH	3294	3294	344	344	1134	150	1134	344	0	1086	0	0
SIRSA	4500	3009	333	333	2001	5	1078	333	333	333	0	0
AMBALA	531	502	409	173	531	53	502	409	409	409	50	44
MEWAT	3889	3889	308	308	688	102	688	308	308	90	0	0
BHIWANI	10272	10272	461	461	1075	108	1075	461	461	28	0	0
FARIDABAD	295	295	111	27	30	4	30	111	245	13	0	0
FATEHABAD	8612	8612	245	245	1079	108	1079	245	245	97	2	2
GURGAON	638	638	210	14	100	12	100	210	56	1	0	0
HISSAR	12721	12721	310	310	1552	164	1552	310	310	0	4	4
JAJHJHAR	727	727	249	59	122	15	122	249	59	59	0	0
JIND	2430	2430	299	121	486	50	486	299	299	299	0	0
KAITHAL	2757	2757	263	115	484	123	260	263	115	0	0	0
KARNAL	2441	2441	372	85	169	17	169	372	379	85	5	4
KURUKSHETRA	1218	1218	382	42	467	22	467	382	314	3	4	4
PALWAL	1592	1519	239	64	190	20	190	239	64	0	0	0
PANCHKULA	2517	2517	162	95	484	48	484	162	162	162	4	3
PANIPAT	828	828	167	109	398	54	398	167	109	0	2	2
REWARI	1561	1561	324	149	471	66	471	324	351	17	0	0
ROHTAK	2180	2180	141	67	215	29	215	67	67	0	1	1
SONIPAT	1247	1247	321	321	486	33	399	321	321	0	0	0
YAMUNANAGAR	2644	2644	441	186	585	59	585	186	0	0	2	2
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>66894</b>	<b>65301</b>	<b>6091</b>	<b>3628</b>	<b>12747</b>	<b>1242</b>	<b>11484</b>	<b>5762</b>	<b>4607</b>	<b>2682</b>	<b>74</b>	<b>66</b>

.....contd **Table 2.4: Social auditing and inspection of NREGA work**

Name Of The District	Must Roll Verified		Social Audit		Inspections Conducted			Gram Sabha Held			Complaints	
	USED/DUE	VERIFIED/COMPLETED	Total Gram Panchayats	COMPLETE	NO –Total Works Taken up	10% NO. of Works Inspected at District Level	100% NO. of Works Inspected at Block Level	Total Gram Panchayats	No. of Gram Sabhas held	No. of VMC meetings held	No. of Complaints disposed PO	No of Complaints Disposed DPCS
<b>2009-10</b>												
MAHENDRAGARH	1792	1792	339	339	2619	588	1446	339	4686	2976	35	27
SIRSA	2408	2160	333	333	1344	28	140	333	333	0	0	0
AMBALA	700	636	430	355	718	71	636	430	430	430	49	31
MEWAT	2777	2777	297	217	507	55	507	297	278	219	0	0
BHIWANI	5361	5361	461	461	468	44	468	461	461	0	3	3
FARIDABAD	169	169	110	22	35	7	35	110	35	0	4	3
FATEHABAD	4379	4379	240	240	368	28	393	240	366	240	4	4
GURGAON	130	130	207	44	19	2	19	207	19	0	0	0
HISSAR	4298	4298	310	310	483	5	40	310	310	310	30	29
JAJHJHAR	276	276	248	94	30	9	30	248	248	0	0	0
JIND	1610	1610	299	299	249	31	249	299	299	0	0	0
KAITHAL	1100	1100	263	172	205	93	205	263	172	6	3	3
KARNAL	1607	1607	379	137	245	24	241	379	379	0	0	0
KURUKSHETRA	993	993	100	100	277	19	261	378	791	24	5	5
PALWAL	1297	1270	76	76	132	39	132	237	76	0	0	0
PANCHKULA	972	972	162	162	367	39	367	162	162	162	8	8
PANIPAT	924	924	170	105	271	29	271	170	10	2	2	2
REWARI	278	278	91	91	249	19	139	348	117	0	0	0
ROHTAK	1177	1177	150	150	142	16	142	150	150	21	0	0
SONIPAT	1106	1106	321	0	321	0	105	321	321	0	0	0
YAMUNANAGAR	2265	2265	469	160	386	39	386	280	160	2345	3	3
TOTAL	35619	35280	5455	3867	9435	1185	6212	5962	9803	6735	146	118

.....contd

**Table 2.4: Social auditing and inspection of NREGA work**

Name Of The District	Must Roll Verified		Social Audit		Inspections Conducted			Gram Sabha Held			Complaints	
	USED/DUE	VERIFIED/COMPLETED	Total Gram Panchayats	COMPLETE D	NO –Total Works Taken up	10% NO. of Works Inspected at District Level	100% NO. of Works Inspected at Block Level	Total Gram Panchayats	No. of Gram Sabhas held	No. of VMC meetings held	No. of Complaints disposed PO	No of Complaints Disposed DPCS
<b>2008-09</b>												
MAHENDRAGARH	137	137	339	339	1915	588	1248	339	4407	2976	35	26
SIRSA	2981	2795	333	333	1295	13	26	333	333	333	0	0
AMBALA	1320	865	430	416	1320	132	865	430	430	430	33	27
MEWAT	3257	3257	369	306	487	76	487	369	369	210	0	0
BHIWANI	2171	2171	461	461	135	17	128	461	461	10	10	10
FARIDABAD	236	217	279	4	46	6	14	279	46	0	1	1
FATEHABAD	379	379	240	185	185	105	185	240	240	240	1	1
GURGAON	295	295	207	35	38	7	37	207	36	0	0	0
HISSAR	2521	2100	310	59	172	55	172	310	310	77	29	18
JAJHJHAR	864	864	53	53	88	18	88	248	248	0	0	0
JIND	2027	2027	299	299	169	52	169	299	299	0	0	0
KAITHAL	1500	1428	263	132	250	16	190	263	526	263	13	8
KARNAL	1527	1527	379	24	0	0	0	379	379	1	4	4
KURUKSHETRA	914	912	378	0	43	5	43	378	1184	0	7	7
PANCHKULA	196	196	162	20	266	0	266	162	162	0	0	0
PANIPAT	963	963	170	170	241	27	241	170	20	5	10	10
REWARI	795	795	90	65	161	29	161	348	694	0	0	0
ROHTAK	932	867	148	147	168	18	168	148	300	187	0	0
SONIPAT	481	98	321	71	117	0	36	321	321	276	0	0
YAMUNANAGAR	2489	2489	0	0	206	21	206	469	12	12	1	1
TOTAL	25985	24382	5231	3119	7302	1185	4730	6153	10777	5020	144	113

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

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	
<b>2010-11</b>										
MAHENDRAGARH	31968	240	1642.59	371	0	0	32339	240	32579	1643
SIRSA	0	42481	1936.129	0	4574	29.17	0	47055	47055	1965
AMBALA	5029	206	467.68	314	18	25.78	5343	224	5567	494
MEWAT	19591	8198	939.62	1552	6159	374.92	21143	14357	35500	1315
BHIWANI	20789	6186	1205.677	943	602	311.205	21732	6788	28520	1517
FARIDABAD	2680	647	43.417	0	0	0	2680	647	3327	43
FATEHABAD	10365	20542	1077.045	10	408	18.8	10375	20950	31325	1096
GURGAON	5742	0	87.044	0	0	0	5742	0	5742	87
HISSAR	0	29826	1989.51	0	0	0	0	29826	29826	1990
JAJHJHAR	2718	0	224.77	3030	0	12.02	5748	0	5748	237
JIND	28742	0	333.791	0	0	0	28742	0	28742	334
KAITHAL	13453	1846	307.84	2517	339	114.04	15970	2185	18155	422
KARNAL	4014	5875	448.7	7	6	0.425	4021	5881	9902	449
KURUKSHETRA	13908	4511	312.98	1117	602	55.02	15025	5113	20138	368
PALWAL	5865	4377	350.45	199	0	0	6064	4377	10441	350
PANCHKULA	6947	0	271.29	1060	0	60.12	8007	0	8007	331
PANIPAT	9678	0	287.08	210	0	3.05	9888	0	9888	290
REWARI	18993	0	337.776	0	0	0	18993	0	18993	338
ROHTAK	0	9411	272.64	0	95	0	0	9506	9506	273
SONIPAT	15332	60	213.98	2707	756	53.87	18039	816	18855	268
YAMUNANAGAR	0	22901	483.66	0	81	0	0	22982	22982	484
TOTAL	215814	157307	13233.67	14037	13640	1058.42	229851	170947	400798	14294

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

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	
<b>2009-10</b>										
MAHENDRAGARH	15972	240	872.97	371	0	5.98	16343	240	16583	879
SIRSA	2802	26349	1619.794	0	2256	175.53	2802	28605	31407	1796
AMBALA	8715	1082	532.57	2550	37	121.08	11265	1119	12384	654
MEWAT	10924	2292	887.17	605	150	14.59	11529	2442	13971	902
BHIWANI	5565	3123	526.239	903	602	20.774	6468	3725	10193	547
FARIDABAD	616	41	28.6	0	0	0	616	41	657	29
FATEHABAD	2928	5825	641.37	0	41	11.89	2928	5866	8794	653
GURGAON	2445	0	28.15	0	0	0	2445	0	2445	28
HISSAR	0	12474	640.48	0	0	0	0	12474	12474	640
JAJHJHAR	2460	0	187.63	2860	0	0	5320	0	5320	188
JIND	21859	0	244.757	0	0	0	21859	0	21859	245
KAITHAL	7448	903	171.68	1964	316	25.65	9412	1219	10631	198
KARNAL	6471	0	259.21	0	0	0	6471	0	6471	259
KURUKSHETRA	5735	3107	121.16	656	566	31.88	6391	3673	10064	153
PALWAL	2848	742	228.78	199	0	0	3047	742	3789	229
PANCHKULA	1083	0	187.46	131	0	22.88	1214	0	1214	210
PANIPAT	8367	0	241.87	210	0	0	8577	0	8577	242
REWARI	4247	0	126.749	0	0	0	4247	0	4247	127
ROHTAK	0	7533	162.48	0	95	0	0	7628	7628	162
SONIPAT	2597	60	205.68	670	0	30.19	3267	60	3327	236
YAMUNANAGAR	0	11881	340.6397	0	81	0	0	11962	11962	341
TOTAL	113082	75652	8255.44	11119	4144	460.44	124201	79796	203997	8718



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

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	
<b>2008-09</b>										
MAHENDRAGARH	13440	240	960	198	0	2.75	13638	240	13878	963
SIRSA	1298	18315	534.504	0	1015	32.25	1298	19330	20628	567
AMBALA	5010	963	625.52	1008	22	104.93	6018	985	7003	731
MEWAT	11272	2160	922.39	804	150	11.5	12076	2310	14386	934
BHIWANI	6126	1046	245.056	883	642	17.12	7009	1688	8697	262
FARIDABAD	1038	356	43.14	0	0	0	1038	356	1394	43
FATEHABAD	929	13582	252.39	10	245	7.55	939	13827	14766	260
GURGAON	1174	0	93.96	0	0	0	1174	0	1174	94
HISSAR	7803	0	315.22	0	0	0	7803	0	7803	315
JAJHJHAR	2460	0	137.64	2860	0	0.15	5320	0	5320	138
JIND	14556	0	257.906	0	0	0	14556	0	14556	258
KAITHAL	3936	943	184.01	1575	23	36	5511	966	6477	220
KARNAL	5281	0	193.84	0	0	0	5281	0	5281	194
KURUKSHETRA	3066	957	121.03	795	331	33.57	3861	1288	5149	155
PANCHKULA	2453	42	151.74	536	10	31.55	2989	52	3041	184
PANIPAT	6917	0	201.03	210	0	5.05	7127	0	7127	206
REWARI	8730	0	95.66	0	0	0	8730	0	8730	96
ROHTAK	0	7423	157.12	0	95	4.79	0	7518	7518	162
SONIPAT	9500	60	105.11	580	0	8.26	10080	60	10140	113
YAMUNANAGAR	0	7379	448.86185	0	81	0	0	7460	7460	449
TOTAL	104989	53466	6046.13	9459	2614	295.47	114448	56080	170528	6344

**Table 2.6: Unemployment allowance paid in lieu of not providing employment  
(2010-11 & 2009-10)**

	Unemployment Allowance Due No. of days		Unemployment Allowance Paid (No. of days)		Unemployment Allowance Paid (Amount)	
	2010-11	2009-10	2010-11	2009-10	2010-11	2009-10
<u>AMBALA</u>	0	358	0	0	0	0
<u>BHIWANI</u>	0	0	0	0	0	0
<u>FARIDABAD</u>	0	22	0	0	0	0
<u>FATEHABAD</u>	8	30	0	0	0	0
<u>GURGAON</u>	0	0	0	0	0	0
<u>HISAR</u>	0	29	0	0	0	0
<u>JAJHJHAR</u>	0	0	0	0	0	0
<u>JIND</u>	0	0	0	0	0	0
<u>KAITHAL</u>	0	0	0	0	0	0
<u>KARNAL</u>	0	0	0	0	0	0
<u>KURUKSHETRA</u>	0	0	0	0	0	0
<u>MAHENDRAGARH</u>	0	0	0	0	0	0
<u>MEWAT</u>	0	0	0	0	0	0
<u>PALWAL</u>	20	0	0	0	0	0
<u>PANCHKULA</u>	0	0	0	0	0	0
<u>PANIPAT</u>	0	54	0	0	0	0
<u>REWARI</u>	0	14	0	0	0	0
<u>ROHTAK</u>	0	0	0	0	0	0
<u>SIRSA</u>	0	992	0	0	0	0
<b>SONIPAT</b>	0	50	0	0	0	0
<b>YAMUNANAGAR</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total>>>>	28	1549	0	0	0	0

**Table 2.7: Work projection under NREGA for 2010-11**

Name of District	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	Person days To be Generated	Estimated Cost (In Lakhs)		
							On Unskilled Wage	including skilled and semiskilled wages	Total
AMBALA	Total	310	815	211	2303	557800	842.27	456.76	1299.03
MEWAT	Total	81	691	305	803	648921	1078.17	435.39	1513.56
PANIPAT	Total	0	558	0	837	259101	455.53	139.98	595.5
REWARI	Total	2058	997	1145	431	153016	215.41	119.04	334.45
SIRSA	Total	72	562	132	2217	1379700	2520.5	615.47	3135.97
BHIWANI	Total	58	641	127	5036	651866	1048.49	457.46	1505.95
GURGAON	Total	0	2	0	303	52125	87.86	19.14	107
JAJHJAR	Total	0	418	0	387	294688	446.84	235.05	681.89
KURUKSHETRA	Total	0	1086	1	1191	176652	276.36	126.89	403.25
PALWAL	Total	0	0	0	314	183164	345.04	94.85	439.89
YAMUNANAGAR	Total	144	865	998	2179	415277	628.78	416.46	1045.24
FATEHABAD	Total	101	283	153	780	423394	809.12	171.94	981.06
HISSAR	Total	151	255	194	1270	588944	919.02	424.1	1343.12
KAITHAL	Total	70	89	74	474	258001	491.08	113.71	604.79
MAHINDRAGARH	Total	0	155	0	889	650924	952.95	562.54	1515.49
ROHTAK	Total	2	240	8	1359	176787	301.51	106.34	407.85
FARIDABAD	Total	0	0	21	156	29893	45.17	10.3	55.47
JIND	Total	17	265	76	314	214928	298.36	198.46	496.82
KARNAL	Total	17	1	20	942	261413	439.23	169.94	609.17
PANCHKULA	Total	1	41	56	754	211895	341.34	159.56	500.9
SONEPAT	Total	82	342	232	1784	284202	435.49	194.28	629.77
HARYANA	Total	3164	8306	3753	24723	7872691	12978.52	5227.66	18206.17

## Chapter – III

### Household characteristics, income and consumption pattern

#### 3.1 Demographic profile of the respondents:

In this chapter we discuss the household characteristics of the respondents. Out of a sample size of 250 respondents, 200 were the beneficiaries of NREGA or they were the people who got employment under NREGA and the 50 were those who were labourers or small/ marginal size land holders but either they were not given any benefit under the NREGA or they did not ask for that. The information in this regard has been given in table 3.1

The average size of the households of the beneficiaries is significantly larger (5.59) than those of the non-beneficiaries (4.86) members. Also the earning members were more (2.68) in NREGA families than (2.36) in non- NREGA families. In other words, the large size households are more keen to demand work under the provisions of NREGA. As would be seen later the household size is one of the significant variables to determine the participation in NREGA.

Secondly, the difference in sample size of respondents in NREGA v/s non-NREGA respondents is 4:1, or 80% and 20% respectively. However, we find ratio of workers about 82% under the NREGA category as compared to just 18% under non- NREGA category, in other words, under NREGA more members are working in comparison to non-NREGA work vis-à-vis their percentage share in the sample. Similarly the ratio of female workers in NREGA households is more in comparison to non- NREGA households. Overall the percentage of females in the beneficiary households is higher, 45.4% in comparison to 43.9% in the non-beneficiary households (table 3.1). This has some vital implications for the society at large. Though we cannot conclude that NREGA has impacted the gender ratio, rather it would be more appropriate to infer that more the females in the households, the more is their participation in NREGA. But surely in the long run possibility of such outcome cannot be ruled out.

Thirdly, in the working age groups of less than 60, more percentage of workers is found under beneficiary category of households as compared to non- beneficiaries. That should be a positive indicator. Whereas in the age group of more than 60

years, which is not considered suitable for physical labour, i. e., a negative aspect, more people are found working under non-NREGA activities as compared to those under NREGA scheme. This is in contrast to the number of people of working age in the sample households. Their percentage in the non-beneficiary households is more, more than 65% as compared to less than 63% in the case of beneficiary households. But percentage of children in the age group of less than 16 is more in the case of beneficiary households.

Fourthly, looking at the education level (6+ years of age) of both beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries, we find more percentage of educated people at primary level of education under the beneficiary category. It is more than 28% and equal to beneficiaries at graduate level. But we see a huge proportion of beneficiary households, about 39% illiterate, whereas their percentage in the non-beneficiary households is about 34%. More people in the case of non-beneficiary households are having education up to middle, secondary and above graduation level. It may be due to the fact that their economic position is slightly better than beneficiary households

Fifthly, under the social category groupings, it is the workers of the tribal castes which are found more in the case of beneficiary by 2% than under the NREGA activities. Forward castes have equal share in both the beneficiary as well as non-beneficiary households.

Sixthly, as far as card holding pattern is concerned, we did not find any worker holding AAY card being given benefits under NREGA. Workers below poverty line were also more than 83%, even those without any card were about 8.5% in beneficiary households. None of the beneficiary households possessed AAY card in comparison to 2% (in absolute numbers it was only one household) households possessing such cards in the non-beneficiary category. Absence of any type of cards in the case of non-beneficiary households is surprising, maybe it is due to the fact that non-beneficiary households being immigrants may not be entitled to work under NREGA. Also some others in this category, about 2.5% were from the salaried/ pensioners class. But a huge majority in both the categories was of wage earners. Only two members of two households, one in each were noted to be

involved in migration in the year 2009, which work out less than 1% of the sample households. One of these members Mr. Raghuvir 40, Agricultural labourer, from village Pardhana, district Panipat, went for less than a week to Panipat for greener pastures but due to not getting work there came back within a week. He got work for Land Development under NREGA for 30days @ Rs.150 pd, and earned Rs. 4500. He also worked as agrl labour for 150 days @ Rs. 200 pd (Rs. 30,000). Also he was doing work for rearing animals. The other person Mr. Sarbjeet Singh, of village Bhedon, 43, agricultural labourer, district Ambala, came back to the village from Ambala to work under NREGA, got work for 40 days on Land Development at the rate of Rs 151 pd and earned Rs. 6040. These two persons make less than 0.15% of the total members of the sample, hence can be ignored.

Thus looking at the overall profile of the respondents, it appears that NREGA has been more relevant on all the above mentioned parameters vis-à-vis non-NREGA work in the state, particularly to the target groups, Scheduled castes, Scheduled tribes and women.

### 3.2 Main Occupation:

The rural workers, if they are without land or have marginal holdings either have very small number of livestock or do not have any, generally earn their livelihood by doing wage labour. In absence of major industrial development they get employment as casual agricultural workers, non- agricultural casual work, in some cases on public works programmes other than NREGA or some sort of self employment in non-farming activities, such as running a small shop, or vending daily food items like vegetables, milk etc. self employment in agricultural activities either working with land holders or doing other associated activities like repairing agricultural implements, rearing small number of livestock like goat/ sheep or cow and in some cases even buffaloes also; some may be even employed on regular bases in semi- govt. cooperative bodies, local bodies, krishi upaj mandi samiti, Schools, dispensaries etc. and in some cases they might be migrating and after introduction of NREGA finding work under NREGA activities.

Also there may be cases of working on in more than one areas, for example, in some cases people rear livestock along with other activities, i.e., along with main

occupation doing some subsidiary work as well. In fact, for economic survival they have to try their hands in many fields, turn by turn if not simultaneously.

In Table 3.2 we have presented the percentage of total man days of work per household from both the beneficiary and non-beneficiary respondents. The highest percentage was recorded under agricultural casual work, 35.8% for beneficiaries and 34.7% in the case of non-beneficiaries, thus around 35.6% in aggregate. Non-agricultural casual work follows next with 32% in aggregate, but in a very disparate manner in the case of beneficiaries (27.8%) to 53 % in the case of non-beneficiaries. Self employment in rearing livestock in both the categories of respondents – beneficiaries (11%) as well as non-beneficiaries (12%) is the third largest sector if work under NREGA is excluded. However, for the beneficiaries NREGA provides work up to 24.6% of the total employment. In other words, up to that extent of total direct employment in rural areas is due to NREGA activities. Moreover, the extra employment generated through NREGA will create extra income which will push up demand for other consumable items like fruit and vegetables resulting in more employment and income to the vendors with its own forward and backward linkages and non-consumable items with similar potential.

### 3.3 household income:

Explained in terms per household (table 3.3) for the NREGA beneficiaries, about 25% income was received from NREGA activities, about 37% from agricultural wages, 32% from other than agricultural wages and about 4% income came from livestock. Income from public works and salary etc. is about 1/4<sup>th</sup> of 1 % each. In fact, because of change in numerator there is change in percentage distribution of income from what we worked out earlier in the draft report. Earlier the average was worked out on the basis of within the groups instead of the total. For example, if income from salary was to be divided by 1 or 2 households instead of the entire sample of 200 households, certainly the result will be drastically different and that will affect other figures as well. Similarly figures for the non-beneficiary households have differed from those in the draft report. In the case of non-beneficiary sample households, the largest share of household income (about 60%) came from non-

agricultural wages, followed by (34%) wages received by doing casual agricultural work and about 5% income was generated by rearing livestock.

Across households the variation in income has been measured by Coefficient of variation. As stated above there is a variety of non-agricultural works, therefore the income generated through these works also differs hugely. The CV in this case is the highest for beneficiaries, followed by income from agricultural wages. However, in the case of non-beneficiary households the highest variation was found in the case of income from agricultural wages then followed by non-agricultural wages. The variation in agricultural wages in the case of non-beneficiary households may be taking place due to some operations being undertaken on contract basis, per unit of area for example.

The smallest variation measured as coefficient of variation of income, on expected lines from salary/ pension etc. is easy to understand and natural, because there is not much difference in such type of income across sections and workers.

### **3.4 Household consumption:**

As far as per capita monthly consumption of different edible items between beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries is concerned (table 3.4), no vivid pattern seems to emerge, except that overall food consumption seems to be slightly favouring the beneficiaries. However, this should be natural and nothing surprising, because: one, there is not much difference in the basic characteristics of the beneficiary and non-beneficiary households' income, working conditions and overall status, two, at the lowest level of income more money is spent on consumption and three, there is not much difference in food habits of both groups, except that some of the non-beneficiaries might be immigrants from let us say Bihar other such states, where the consumption patterns differs substantially.

The rice consumption in north India which is not a regular diet and is considered to be a symbol of prosperity is more as compared to consumption of wheat in the case of beneficiaries. The consumption of other cereals may be rich in nutrition is also more. Though the consumption of rice and other cereals is more in the case of beneficiary households as compared to non-beneficiaries, but due to more consumption of wheat, total consumption of cereals is more in the case of non-



beneficiary households than the beneficiaries. But consumption of pulses, which is now not a poor man's diet, is significantly more, more than twice the per capita per month, in the case of beneficiary households. If the consumption of liquid milk in beneficiary households is less, consumption of milk products is more. As far as consumption of poultry products is concerned, it is more in the case of beneficiaries, but consumption, fruits and vegetables is significantly more in the case of non-beneficiary households. Consumption pattern can be more meaningful if it is analysed in terms of nutritional value.

We have tabulated NSS data on consumption for three rounds, 1993-94, 1999 - 2000 and 2004-05 for rural Haryana. Strictly the data are not comparable with the primary data we have collected, because, first there is huge time gap. With the passage of time income, consumption pattern etc. change, second, we do not know wherefrom the sample households were selected by the NSS, third, at what time of the year data were collected and fourth, we have taken NSS data for all the classes (income groups) as tabulated by the NSS whereas primary data pertain to mostly landless, poor group of daily wage earners. All these issues matter for comparison of consumption data. But some important facts do emerge from the NSS data as well. For example, there is continuous decline in consumption of all the items, cereals, pulses, milk and milk products, edible oils, fruits and vegetables, despite the fact that overall growth in the country as well as in the state was increasing and India was shining in the year 2004 -05 round as compared to earlier round/s. In some items consumption was less than even the 1993-94 round (table 3.4). However, there is considerable increase in the consumption of beverages, may be aerated drinks. The level of consumption is not adequate to meet the nutrition requirement of the people, and puts a question mark on the assertion of some who say that increase in income has resulted in change in consumption pattern in rural India, leading to more consumption of animal products, bakery, confectionery and beverages, fruits and vegetables; and all leading to food inflation. At least the NSS data do not support that hypothesis.

### **3.5 Monthly consumption expenditure:**

However, in terms of total monthly per capita consumption expenditure (table 3.5) some pattern of difference between beneficiary and non-beneficiary households does emerge and may be useful for the purpose of comparison as well as for overall analysis to reach at some meaningful conclusions. Many important issues get highlighted. Most important being, the planning commission uses Rs. 356 (2004 prices level) consumption expenditure as threshold for measuring poverty line. Can total per capita per month consumption expenditure of less than Rupees 500/- (Rs. 487/- to be exact) in both the cases of beneficiaries as well as non-beneficiaries and total expenditure on food and non-food items of less than Rs. 600 be enough to save poor workers suffering from malnutrition, if not from hunger without NREGA, probably not. Even NREGA alone in the present form of providing 100 days' work at a fixed wage, will not address the issues of providing sufficient food, if the food is not provided at subsidized rates, mostly through the PDS. Because, per day per capita consumption expenditure of Rs. 13 per day in the case of beneficiaries and Rs. 12.4 in the case of non-beneficiaries, is not sufficient to provide two times food to satisfy one's hunger. Therefore, NREGA seems to have benefited the poor directly by delivering some money and indirectly to non-beneficiaries by increasing overall wage rates, particularly during peak seasons. Providing work under NREGA during lean period therefore makes sense. Secondly, wage rates need to be kept in tune with rising food inflation either through indexing minimum wages or fixing them according to minimum wages Act. In Haryana fixation of wages under NREGA as per the minimum wages ACT, may not serve any meaningful purpose as market wage rates are generally higher. Therefore the second option of adjusting wage rates to inflation (at least twice a year) with a rider that the wages will not be less than minimum wages as per the minimum wages act, may be more useful. The governments, both central and states, probably due to some pressing financial problems have not agreed to apply minimum wages Act and instead have recently linked the wages under NREGA with price index. For the time being that may provide some relief, but for longer times, the measure may not be powerful enough to mitigate poverty – because,

one, price index does not present the real picture Even the data made available and used to measure price inflation are mostly based on quick estimates subjected to adjustment after a considerable gap, which always is found to be more than the quick estimates. The regular employees with the govt. and public sector undertakings get DA arrears, but the poor casual wage earners are never paid retrospectively. Hence, some arrangement is needed to mitigate the workers' wage losses. Two, price index always does not present the virtual situation. Price index uses certain weights, which are mostly not in tune with items consumed by the workers. Thirdly, without effective PDS nothing can help the poor to meet both ends. Many more items (food as well as non-food) need to be put under the PDS, may be in addition to wheat, rice, sugar etc. items like milk products, edible oils, pulses, spices, poultry products etc. need to be provided through the PDS. To enhance real income of the workers, cloth, detergents, durable household consumer items can be provided without levying taxes as is the case with canteen stores department for armed forces. This will not only improve the quality of life of the workers but also enhance overall demand for the industry with Keynesian accelerator and multiplier effects to achieve targeted growth rates of 8-9%.

Coming to the issues of overall benefits to beneficiaries vis-à-vis non-beneficiaries, and also in comparison to other programmes, persons benefiting from NREGA seem to be slightly better off, spending Rs. 490 per month per capita vis-à-vis Rs. Rs.474 in the case of non-beneficiaries, otherwise ' benefits for the poor end up being poor benefits'<sup>20</sup>. That further strengthens the arguments favouring NREGA.

In sum up one can say that even though the progress of NREGA is below targets, it has resulted in improvement of food consumption in the state particularly in sections dependent mostly on wage labour. Total per capita expenditure on food and non-food items works out Rs. 585 and 614 respectively for beneficiary and non-beneficiary households. Important aspect is that non-food expenditure on other items which includes repair of items is more in the case of non-beneficiary households obviously they have some items which the beneficiary households may

---

<sup>20</sup> Drèze and Sen: Hunger and public action, oxford 1989

be lacking. But the difference in total food and non-food expenditure in both groups is very clear, the beneficiary households spending about 84 % on food and 16% on non-food items whereas the non-beneficiary households spent in the ratio of 77% and 23%.

It further confirms that the major share of beneficiary households, even after increase in employment and income due to NREGA is still goes on food items which as per Engel's law shows that these households still need assured employment and enhanced income to shift the consumption expenditure.

### **3.6 Variability in income and expenditure:**

Haryana is considered a well developed state. We have the impression that agricultural wages are far above the minimum wages in the country. We have seen some good houses and good living conditions of some wage earning families, having milk animals, may be goats and in a few cases cows and buffaloes, children going to school, may be in the hope of getting mid day free meals, girl children going to school even in SC, ST and MBC (Most backward families like potters, carpenters, ironsmiths, barbers etc, i.e., mostly artisans or manual workers) either to get benefits from the governments welfare schemes announced from time to time or for the better future of the generation by getting education and monetary benefits, either way it should be overall good move. But in reality that seems to be far from truth. A large section of the society, mostly labourers, were getting less than Rs. 54000/- per household income for the reference period (Jan- Dec.2009) (table 3.6), which works out Rs. 4500/ - pm per household. If it is divided by the average size of the family to work out per member per month income it is Rs. 805 and per day it should be Rs. 26.83. Therefore, the overall rural economic situation needs further improvement through various measures.

There are limitations of getting the total annual picture as the data are not for the financial year. Even agricultural land transactions leasing in/out, selling buying of land, hiring of annual workers etc. take place after the end of Rabi season, which generally matches with financial year. Secondly, we did not have enough data on consumption of other than food items so we have not included in total consumption and that is why there seems to be less consumption as compared to income.

Along with very low annual per household income of the rural workers, two three things are striking: one the annual per household income of the NREGA beneficiaries though overall not as much as it is presumed, still it is more than those non- NREGA beneficiaries. Also we know that due to NREGA average wage rate in general has gone up. One can imagine that without NREGA per household income should have been still lesser. The consumption expenditure including non-food items is far less than required to maintain basic nutrition level. At current prices, when food inflation is in double digits, per annum per household expenditure of about Rs.32748 in the case of beneficiaries and about Rs. 28376 in the case of non-beneficiaries cannot be considered sufficient. Secondly, consumption expenditure due to income effect is more in the beneficiary households vis-à-vis non-beneficiary households.

Because other options of work for the beneficiary households are available, therefore there is more variation in income across households as compared to non-beneficiary households. The values of Gini coefficient both for income and consumption are more in the case of beneficiary households as compared to non-beneficiary households. It signifies more variation in income and consumption in the case of beneficiary households. Also, the variation in income is more as compared to variation in consumption.

**3.7 Determinants of participation in NREGA:** As per the directions of the coordinator we have tried to work out the determinants of participation in NREGA. We tried both the OLS regression taking actual number of NREGA days as dependent variable and independent variables like land value, asset value, number of BPL, SC, ST and OBC card holders, size of households and income etc. The results were not very encouraging. The values of R squared was not much. Only values of coefficients of households size, BPL card and work available under non-NREGA activities were significant as per the standard levels of significance, i.e., within 10% level of significance. Results of household participation in NREGA based upon independent variables like non- NREGA work days per household, non NREGA income per hh, household size, BPL, SC, ST and OBC cards ( all cards dummy) NREGA wage rate and land value (table 3.7 a) show that BPL, SC

and OBC are significant determinants. However, if we take members participation and use NREGA wage rate, age factor, education level, hh size, castes, gender and BPL (caste, gender and BPL dummy), (table 3.7 b), we find that along with BPL, OBC, SC, gender and age factor also play significant role. All the five show significance below 10% level.

We tried some other combinations for determination of both the household and members participation in NREGA activities, but all proved that value of R squared in all the cases was very low and secondly no other variable proved to be significant determinant.

However, after taking the values of 0 and 1 for these dependent and independent variables we tried logit and probit regression. Different combinations of independent variables were tried to find out the more sensible reasons for participation under NREGA. Finally we settled for the independent variables shown in (table .3.7.c). Of course the value of R squared is not much in this regression as well. But we find values of household size, BPL card holding and work provided under non-NREGA days as significant under 5% level of significance.

The values of SC and ST category surprisingly are not found significant. The reason is obvious, though maximum persons under these categories apply for NREGA work, but applicants under other two categories viz. OBC and forward castes also apply for work in quite substantial numbers.

### **3.7 Sum Up:**

In this chapter we have discussed household characteristics and income and consumption pattern of the respondents.

The average size of the households of the beneficiaries was noted significantly large (5.59) than those non-beneficiaries (4.86) members per household. Also the earning members were more (2.68) in NREGA families than (2.36) in non- NREGA families. The ratio of male and female workers was about 55% and 45% under the NREGA category as compared to 56 and 44% under non- NREGA category. Also in the beneficiary households percentage of female is higher, 45.4% in comparison to 43.9% in the non-beneficiary households. In the working age groups of less than 60 more percentage of workers is found under beneficiary category as compared

to non- beneficiaries. Whereas in the age group of more than 60 years, which is not considered suitable for physical labour. A negative indicator is that more people above 60 work under non-NREGA activities as compared to those under NREGA. Looking at the education level of both beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries, we find more percentage of people educated at primary in the case of beneficiary households. But in the case of illiterate persons, the major difference of about 5% exists as more people are illiterate in the case of beneficiary households.

As far as card holding pattern is concerned, we did not find any worker holding AAY card holder being given benefits under NREGA. Workers below poverty line were more than 80% in aggregate and 80% in the case of beneficiaries.

As far as migration is concerned, a very small number of persons (only 2 out of 1356) migrated during the reference year 2009 and that can be ignored as an exception.

We have found that percentage of total man days per household was highest under agricultural casual work for the beneficiaries and non- agricultural casual work for the non-beneficiary category. But non- agricultural casual work provides significant work for the beneficiary households also. Nonetheless the beneficiaries got work under NREGA to the extent of about 25%. Moreover, the extra employment generated through NREGA will create extra income which will push up demand for other items like fruit and vegetables, resulting in more employment and income to the vendors with its own forward and backward linkages.

For the NREGA beneficiaries, about 25% per household income was received from NREGA activities, about 37% from agricultural labour, 33% from working on other than agricultural operations, and about 4% income came from livestock. In the case of non-beneficiary sample households, the largest share of household income (60%) came from non-agricultural wages, followed by (34%) wages received by doing casual agricultural work and about 5% income was generated by rearing livestock.

Across households the variation in income has been measured by Coefficient of variation. The CV in this case is the highest for beneficiaries, followed by income from agricultural wages. However, in the case of non-beneficiary households the

highest variation was found in the case of income from agricultural wages then followed by non-agricultural wages.

As far as per capita monthly consumption of different edible items between beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries is concerned, no significant pattern seems to emerge, except that overall food consumption seems to be favouring the beneficiaries.

However, in terms of total monthly per capita consumption expenditure many important issues get highlighted. For example, monthly per capita consumption expenditure on food items works out to Rs, 487/- This small expenditure in both the cases of beneficiaries as well as non- beneficiaries may not be enough to save poor workers suffering from malnutrition, if not from hunger without NREGA. Even NREGA alone in the present form of providing 100 days' work at a fixed wage, will not address the issues of providing sufficient food, if the food is not provided at subsidized rates, mostly through the PDS. Because, per day per capita consumption expenditure of Rs. 13 per day in the case of beneficiaries and Rs. 12.4 in the case of non-beneficiaries, is not sufficient to provide two times food to satisfy one's hunger. Though NREGA seems to have benefited the poor directly by delivering some money and indirectly to non-beneficiaries by increasing overall wage rates, particularly during peak season, but to alleviate poverty and hunger some other steps need to be taken or improved. Wage rates therefore need to be inflation neutral. Without effective PDS nothing will be effectively helpful to the poor to meet both ends. Many more items (food as well as non-food) need to be put under the PDS to increase their real income. Coming to the issues of beneficiaries vis-à-vis non-beneficiaries, overall persons benefiting from NREGA seem to be slightly better off, which further strengthens the arguments favouring NREGA.

In sum one can say that even though the progress of NREGA seems to be below targets to address the issues of gender equality, social and other issues, it has resulted in improvement of food consumption in the state particularly in sections dependent mostly on wage labour.



**Table 3.1 Demographic Profile of the respondents (% or Households)**

<b>Characteristics</b>	<b>Beneficiaries</b>	<b>Non-Beneficiaries</b>	<b>Aggregate</b>
No. of HH	200	50	250
Household size (no.)	5.59	4.86	5.44
Average no. of earners	2.68	2.36	2.612
Gender Male	54.6	56.1	54.9
Female	45.4	43.9	45.1
Age Group <16	33.1	28.3	32.2
16-60	62.7	65.2	63.1
>60	4.2	6.6	4.6
Identity of respondent			
Head	65.5	60.0	64.4
Others	34.5	40.0	35.6
Education status			
Illiterate	38.8	34.2	38.0
Up to primary	28.1	27.5	28.0
Up to Middle	20.0	21.2	20.2
Up to secondary	12.1	15.8	12.6
Up to graduate	0.9	0.9	0.9
Above graduate	0.1	0.5	0.2
Caste			
SC	61.0	62.0	61.2
ST	6.0	4.0	5.6
OBC	31.0	32.0	31.2
General	2.0	2.0	2.0
Card holding			
AAY	0.0	2.0	0.4
BPL	83.0	72.0	80.8
APL	8.5	8.0	8.4
None	8.5	18.0	10.4
Decision Maker			
Male	84.5	92.0	86.0
Female	15.5	8.0	14.0
Main Occupation			
Farming	0.0	0.0	0.0
Self business	0.6	0.0	0.5
Salaried/pensioner	0.8	2.5	1.1
Wage Earners	98.7	97.5	98.5
Involved in migration during 2009(%)	1.0	0	0.8

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

Occupation	Beneficiaries	Non-Beneficiaries	Aggregate
Agricultural casual labour	35.8	34.7	35.6
Non-agricultural casual labour	27.8	53.1	32.1
Work for public work programmes other than NREGA	0.2	0.6	0.3
Self employed in non farming	00	00	00
Self employed in agriculture	00	00	00
Self employed in livestock	11.1	11.6	11.2
Regular/salary jobs	0.48	00	0.4
Worked as migrant worker	0.1	00	0.1
Worked under NREGA	24.6	00	20.4
Any other work	00	00	00
Total	100	100	100

**Table 3.3 Household net income (Annual) (Rs. Per household)**

	Average Income	CV (across HH)	Average Income	CV (across HH)	Average Income	CV (across HH)
	Beneficiaries		Non-beneficiaries		Aggregate	
Income from work under NREGA	14086	70	0	0	11269	70
%	25.05				21.05	
Income from wages in agriculture	20954	80	14629	71	19689	79
%	37.26		34.29		36.79	
Income from wages in non-agriculture	18439	153	25464	67	19844	136
%	32.79		59.69		37.08	
Income from wages in PWP	150	-	288	-	177.6	-
%	0.27		0.67		0.33	
Income from wages as migrant workers	0	0	0	0	0	0
%						
Income from self employed in non-farming	0	0	0	0	0	0
%						
Income from agriculture/ livestock	2430	41	2280	41	2400	41
%	4.32		5.34		4.48	
Income from regular job/salary/pension	180	-	0	-	144	-
%	0.32				0.27	
Income from sale of assets/rent/transfer etc.	0	0	0	0	0	0
%						
Total	56239		42461		53524	
%	100		100		100	

**Table 3.4**  
**Household consumption of food items (kgs. Per capita per month)**

	<b>Beneficiaries</b>	<b>Non-Beneficiaries</b>	<b>Aggregate</b>	<b>NSS 1993-94</b>	<b>NSS 1999-00</b>	<b>NSS 2004-05</b>
Rice	2.241	1.967	2.113	0.73	0.99	0.678
Wheat	8.406	9.000	8.683	11.9	9.90	9.515
Other cereals	0.645	0.424	0.542	0.3	0.48	0.463
Total cereals	11.293	11.391	11.338	12.2	11.37	10.656
Total pulses	1.415	0.667	1.067	0.53	1.01	0.589
Sugar	1.904	1.745	1.830	1.82	2.01	1.556
Edible oils#	0.612	0.572	0.593	0.36	0.39	0.378
Liquid milk#	3.888	4.016	3.948	13.82	13.88	13.126
Milk Products	0.120	0.082	0.102	0.09	0.15	0.15
Spices\$	114	107	111	144.72	208.97	118.67
Poultry meat	0.222*	0.000*	0.119*	Egg 0.08a	0.24a	0.662a
meat				0.06	0.03	0.06
Fruits	0.264	0.506	0.377	0.15+3.1b	0.28+3.43b	0.625+2.7b
Vegetables	0.111	0.639	0.357	2.92	5.23	4.781
Beverages@					22.78	39.78

*Source NSS reports: 404,461 & 509, Vol.I, hh consumption of goods and services in India*

# Edible oils and liquid milk in liters

Edible oil includes coconut oil, g.nut oil, mustard oil, sunflower oil, refined oil etc

\$ Spices in gms.

\* Includes meat

Sugar includes gur & khandsari

Ghee is included in Milk Prod.

@ Rs. Per capita per month.

a. eggs in number.

b. banana in no., other fruits in kgs.

**Table 3.5**  
**Monthly consumption expenditure of households**

Food/ Non-food Items	Monthly per capita (Rs)	Coefficient of variation	Monthly per capita (Rs)	Coefficient of variation	Monthly per capita (Rs)	Coefficient of variation
	Beneficiaries		Non - Beneficiaries		Aggregate	
<b>Food Items</b>						
Rice	39.32 (6.72)	74.18	34.99 (5.70)	53.20	38.55 (6.53)	72.43
Wheat	72.19 (12.34)	65.19	75.74 (12.34)	63.34	72.83 (12.34)	64.90
Other Cereals	8.25 (1.41)	221.06	6.21 (1.01)	241.53	7.89 (1.34)	225.74
Total cereals	119.77 (20.48)	51.59	116.95 (19.06)	48.26	119.26 (20.21)	51.49
Pulses	38.44 (6.57)	70.40	34.79 (5.67)	65.76	37.79 (6.40)	70.53
Sugar etc	59.11 (10.11)	60.51	56.73 (9.24)	66.12	58.69 (9.95)	61.78
Cooking Oil	41.00 (7.01)	59.60	41.34 (6.74)	71.86	41.06 (6.96)	61.89
Spices	14.70 (2.51)	60.89	13.54 (2.21)	51.84	14.49 (2.46)	60.41
Milk & Prod	20.57 (3.52)	197.07	15.43 (2.51)	203.34	19.65 (3.33)	200.18
Poultry-meat	15.13 (2.59)	432.85	0.00 0.00	-	12.43 (2.11)	486.28
Fruits	7.85 (1.34)	224.90	14.03 (2.29)	177.90	8.96 (1.52)	212.96
Vegetables	53.70 (9.18)	47.79	64.12 (10.45)	46.23	55.56 (9.42)	47.40
Confectionery	0.0	-	0	-	0	-
Total Food	490.04 (83.78)	44.13	473.87 (77.22)	34.71	487.15 (42.76)	43.21
<b>Non-Food items</b>						
Education	0	-	0	-	0	-
Clothing	26.77 (4.58)	124.72	39.55 (6.44)	99.81	29.05 (4.92)	118.19
Footwear	11.42 (1.95)	63.80	15.84 (2.58)	77.00	12.21 (2.07)	66.44
Other items	56.71 (9.70)	113.29	84.40 (13.75)	87.59	61.66 (10.45)	107.37
Fuel	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total Non-food	94.90 (16.22)	113.35	139.79 (22.78)	87.69	102.92 (17.44)	107.44
Gross Total	584.94 (100.00)	40.35	613.67 (100.00)	28.04	590.07 (100.00)	38.53

*Information on non-food expenditure was not available from all the sample households*

**Table 3.6**  
**Variability in Income and Consumption**

<b>Description</b>	<b>Beneficiaries</b>	<b>Non-Beneficiaries</b>	<b>Total</b>
Average household Income during the reference year(Rs)	56239	42661	53524
Average household consumption during the reference year(Rs)	32748	28376	31873
Coefficient of Variation in income across households	75.88	51.68	74.29
Coefficient of Variation in consumption across households	40.35	28.04	38.53
Ginni coefficient of income	0.318	0.290	0.317
Ginni coefficient of consumption	0.215	0.154	0.205

**Table 3.7a determinants of participation in NREGA (OLS)**  
(Dependent variable : No. of days worked under NREGA, Household)

<b>Variable Name</b>	<b>Coefficient</b>	<b>Signi.</b>
(Constant)	81.812	0.428
Non-Nrega days per HH	0.022	0.453
Non-Nrega Income per HH.Rs	0.000	0.284
HH.Size	3.815	0.132
BPL.Card.Dummy	33.354	<b>0.008</b>
SC.Dummy	-60.781	<b>0.091</b>
ST.Dummy	-1.175	0.976
OBC.Dummy	-62.724	<b>0.081</b>
Nrega.Wage.Rate	0.131	0.839
Land.Value	-1.370E-5	0.508
No. of observations	200	
F	2.537	
R <sup>2</sup>	0.107	

**Table 3.7b determinants of participation in NREGA (OLS)**

(Dependent variable : No. of days worked under NREGA, members)

Variable Name	Coefficient	Signi.
(Constant)	48.986	0.250
Nrega.Wage.rate	0.053	0.845
Age	0.243	<b>0.086</b>
Education	0.130	0.944
HH.Size	-0.614	0.341
BPL.Card	9.519	<b>0.056</b>
Male.Dummy	11.482	<b>0.003</b>
SC.Dummy	-24.578	<b>0.047</b>
ST.Dummy	-15.506	0.249
OBC.Dummy	-26.587	<b>0.034</b>
No. of observations	345	
F	2.550	
R <sup>2</sup>	0.064	

**Table 3.7c****Determinants of participation in NREGA (Logit function)**

Variable Name	Coefficient	Signi.
Constant	-.853	.246
Non.Nrega.days.per.HH	-.002	.058
HH.Size	.326	.002
BPL.Card.Dummy	1.042	.010
Land.Value	.000	.325
SC.ST.dummy	.228	.520
Cox & Snell R <sup>2</sup>	.060	
Log likelihood	234.617	
No.of observations	250	

## Chapter – IV

### Work profile under NREGA and wage structure

#### 4 Introduction:

The National Rural Employment Guarantee Act (NREGA), now termed as Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Act (MGNREGA) was the result of countless efforts of civil society members, NGOs, academicians, some retired or still working well wisher bureaucrats, left and left of the centre political parties etc. The purpose as mentioned in chapter –I was to create work opportunities at the door steps of the rural resource-less population and thus to evolve an economically fruitful exercise which should be equally a social security measure at the first place. It has its own added advantages, like restriction on rural –urban migration to help ease the pressure of immigrant population in all types of cities from metros like Delhi, NCR townships to other towns, may be Panchkula, Ambala or Mandi Dabwali in Haryana to name a few. Because it was a social security measure, therefore the amount to be spent on NREGA was to be divided in such a way that a greater proportion was spent on wage labour and a very small on materials, almost nil on use of machines or official wherewithal. That is the reason that at every office of the Additional District Commissioner, necessarily in charge of the programme at the district level in Haryana, (the rules provide the activities to be directly under the control of the District Commissioner), we found only one programme officer, one assistant to deal with files, computer, accounts etc. with one or two cupboards. Besides, the assets or infrastructure to be created have has to be tangible, productive and economically useful. 'We look upon the programme to create durable assets and strengthen Panchayati Raj Institutions since at least 50% of work will be routed through Panchayats. Three watchwords should be followed: outlays must be matched by outcomes, productive assets must be created and guarantee must be implemented in true spirit. The Act is a blessing and a challenge. Let us hope it brings smiles on the faces of our poor people. We

can also share his hopes and fulfill our commitment to make such a realistic change in future.<sup>21</sup>

That is with regard to implementation. The nature of work permitted to be carried out was also specified, which of course is being renewed from time to time and all possible useful activities are being added like plantation of trees in schools and other such premises as well as on vacant panchayat lands.

However, finer details of nature of work, place of work and distance from the residence of the workers, wage rates and other issues like migration etc. need to be focused, which are discussed in this chapter.

#### **4.1 Work profile under NREGA:**

We start with the basics of background of the workers such as what type of work they were doing. Were the NREGA activities their main work or was it a side job for vacant periods when they were workless due to off agricultural seasons. As stated earlier, about 25% wage earners found work under NREGA as their main occupation. However, if we look at the number of average workers per household finding work under NREGA activities, the numbers varied from 1.35 to 1.98 in the selected districts with 1.73 persons per household being employed in aggregate. In three selected districts, Ambala, Rewari and Panipat, no general category household was found working during the year January -December 2009. May be, these districts were on top of development activities and people with little, economic, social and political sources could find livelihood opportunities outside NREGA more easily as compared to those without such support. However, calculated on the basis of intera group in the state as a whole, 1.75 members per household from the general category, 1.66 from scheduled Caste households, 2.33 from schedules tribe households and 1.74 from the OBC households could find work under NREGA during the year.

The number of females per household 0.62 working under NREGA activities was the lowest. (table 4.1).

The district Mewat is the most backward in the state where highest number of people per household was in need of NREGA and was rightly provided too. Thus it

---

<sup>21</sup> Prime Minister, Dr. Manmohan Singh



appears that two main target groups in the social set up scheduled tribes and in regional framework district Mewat were the biggest beneficiaries of NREGA activities. If the females could also be involved in a little more aggressive way, ensuring 50% work for them, which was mandatory also, the objective of NREGA as far as involvement of different social and targeted groups, regional consideration was concerned, could have been perfectly met. While on visit for field work we tried to find out the reason for such shortcoming. The reasons were mixed, like compulsion of other household activities for the women, more attention for school going children (we have seen more school going children in the NREGA families), in a few cases females still finding working useful, convenient and comfortable and obligatory in traditional village elders' (socially, politically and economically influential) homes. But certainly they were more comfortable if work under NREGA was provided rather than working in the fields of land owners.

#### **4.2 Number of days work provided:**

During the period under reference in aggregate 94 days' work pr household in total was provided, in two districts, Sirsa and Mewat, even exceeding the annual target of minimum 100 days work. Mahendergarh (not in our sample) is the other backward district where NREGA was started in the first phase and reports of it doing well have come. In the state as a whole more than 94 days' work per household fell short of mandatory 100 days. Among different social groups ST households in districts Sirsa and Mewat were the largest beneficiaries getting more than 160 days' work per household during the period. In district Sirsa general category households got maximum work of 160 days. Most of the general category people from this district belong to one caste which is politically dominant here due to it being the area of former powerful chief ministers. Along with the backwardness of the district, political dominance of the social group cannot be ruled out in this area. Though agriculture in district Rewari is not that developed due mainly to lack of surface irrigation facilities, but it being in the NCR region other than agriculture overall development in the recent past is overwhelming. Still the work for largest number of woman days was created. Per household 41 days' work was provided to women in the district. Overall in the state women got about

30 days' work per household in the state during the period. "With regard to the impact of NREGA on women folk, all the Panchayats in district Sirsa, more than 87% of Sirmaur and about three-fourths of district Hoshiarpur reported that women belonging to poor strata of the villages are getting jobs and their wages are same as of men, which otherwise are getting very less. 37 percent Panchayats in district Sirsa reported that in migration has decreased due to NREGA work at their native place. It was reported that out migration from their villages in district Sirsa has decreased."<sup>22</sup>

However, per member work provided in aggregate during the period varies drastically inter districts as well as inter social groups. In aggregate inter district variation is recorded from 44days (lowest) in district Rewari to 62 days in district Ambala. Similarly among the SC members lowest number of days was 29.34 in district Sirsa to highest being 113 days in district Mewat. The lowest variation among all the groups is found in OBC members, varying from 47.42 per member in district Ambala to 58 the highest in district Sirsa. Among women, the variation is found between 37 days to about 52 days.

The NREGA mandates 100 or more days' work per household, but we find in districts Mewat and Panipat only 55 % and 50% households could get 100 days or more days' work during the year. In rest of the districts even 50% households could not get 100 days work (table 4.1)

As far as wage rate is concerned, in Haryana the wage rate has been quite high as compared to some other poor states of the country. But during the period the average wage rate was about Rs. 150 per day, varying across sections of society marginally, among ST and women workers for example. The ST workers received lowest wages (Rs. 147) among all. Two reasons are largely attributed to the differentiation in wages, One the ignorance and innocence on the part of uneducated workers and the tribal people are mainly the victims in such cases and two, due to piece rate of wages, where efficiency of the workers to type (various

---

<sup>22</sup> Appraisal of Impact assessment of NREGS in selected districts of Himachal Pradesh, Punjab, Haryana. Districts Hoshiarpur, Sirsa, Sirmaur, period July-August 2009 India Centre for Research in Rural and Industrial Development, (CRRID)

kinds) and nature (difference in difficulty for performing the assigned task) of work to honesty and dishonesty of the mates (work in-charge) and others like sarpanch etc. who matter. Though the difference in minimum prescribed wage (Rs. 148) at that time (now revised to Rs. 151) and the lowest paid (Rs. 147) was marginal but considering the prevalent higher rate of wages in the state at that time, it was not that small too. For example, per day wage rate for agricultural operations was around Rs. 200 per day at that time. Specific examples of persons involved in migration from district Panipat and Ambala, discussed elsewhere in this report can be cited where they got work @Rs. 200 per day back in their village outside NREGA.

The average distance of work place from the residence in the state is about 2.23 Kms, varying from 1.28 kms in district Ambala to 2.7 kms in district Rewari. Now the question arises what distance can be treated as normal. If easy and cheap transport is available, the distance of few more Kms. may be normal, but in absence of such facility even traveling a 2 to 2 and half kms. one way and then doing tedious work for the whole day, in addition to daily household work for the females cannot be considered the work provided at door step. Here the work provided under the Khadi and Village Industries (KVIC) seems to be more at home. In fact, the Act (NREGA) permitting, some of the KVIC works may be considered for inclusion in the NREGA activities.

#### **4.3 Activities under NREGA - Nature of assets created and their durability:**

In the act certain types of activities were specified and some more added recently also, work on which can be undertaken under NREGA. Data on such activities were collected and have been tabulated (table 4.2). In the state between Jan. and Dec. 2009 about 6% households were employed to work on rural connectivity projects. In two districts, Ambala and Panipat, there was no work on this activity whereas in the remaining three percentage of households employed varied between 12.5 (Mewat and Sirsa) the maximum to 5% the minimum in Rewari. In fact, in these two districts all the work was done on land development, rural connectivity therefore got no importance in that. Moreover the selected villages

were already well connected with roads. In the remaining three districts maximum work was on land development, varying from 72.5% in Sirsa and Mewat to 77.5% in Rewari. In Ambala and Panipat too the work was carried out on development of land. Overall in the state about 85% households got employment on projects related with land development. Surprisingly In none of the selected districts work on water conservation was being undertaken. We have seen work going on to use Ghaghar Flood water for agricultural purposes during the rainy season in village Bhedon in district Ambala but probably that was marked under the land development category or maybe they will include in the relevant year. Similarly work in district Rewari was going on plantation at public land as well as in schools and other offices. But that was not under the reference period.

As far as quality of these works was concerned, maximum respondents, 79%, reported it to be very good, and about 22% reported it to be of good quality. None of the respondents stated it of bad quality, and that is very significant response. Generally people, who are deeply involved, are never satisfied with the quality of the work because always there is scope for improvement for amount spent and time and resources consumed. Overall the quality of assets, as per the respondents cannot be considered below standard. The general perception that like earlier schemes no good quality work would be carried out under NREGA also finds no support at the ground level.

As providing employment allowance in lieu of work is state's responsibility, without any bearing on the central govt. in the entire state efforts were made to see that not a single paisa is provided for allowance, and work to avoid stress on the state's resources is created as per demand. The introduction of more activities, such as developing horticulture, plantation, etc. will further reduce the pressure of finding and providing work to the needy in the village. As stated above to my mind there is great scope to include some of the Khadi and village industry's activities in the list of NREGA activities. The activities provided under the KVIC are not only at the door steps and serve the very weakest targeted groups, they can be easily provided at the door steps, in fact in the houses of the workers. Moreover, they are economically as useful as any other viable economic activity, be it agricultural or

industrial. It (KVIC) has also been helpful in checking migration of workers to urban centres.

### **4.3 Issues of Migration:**

In Haryana, Punjab and adjoining North Rajasthan maximum agricultural labour employed in paddy transplantation, cotton picking and other highly labour absorbing agricultural activities like harvesting of wheat prior to large scale introduction of harvesters and combines, used to be from other states. But of late there is drastic reduction in labour immigration. Even in Delhi, we used to have maximum manual workers, plumbers, masons, woodworkers, car cleaners, watchmen etc. from Bihar, Odisha, Rajasthan and other poor Indian states. But after implementation of NREGA, we, in Delhi,<sup>23</sup> know how difficult it is to find workers for security and other activities. The reason being people are going back to their home states, sometime on the occasion of festivals and sometimes due to agricultural crop operations, mostly when work under NREGA starts there and not coming back on schedule from the states of their origin. In Haryana and Punjab also, there are reports, and having family relations, mostly doing agriculture, we have personal knowledge that labour immigration into the states has scaled down drastically. The problems were faced at times earlier also.<sup>24</sup> The data also show that only 2 persons from the sample of 1356 were involved in migration for a very short period. Only two members of two households, one in each were noted to be involved in migration in the year 2009. One of these members Mr. Raghuvir 40, Agricultural labourer, from village Pardhana, district Panipat, went for less than a week to Panipat for greener pastures but due to not getting work there came back within a week. Back in the village he got work for Land Development under

---

<sup>23</sup> Being the president of a residential group housing society, the author is personally well aware of the issues of labour shortage, when the contracting agency will along with changing the security guards of and on insist to increase the hiring rates.

<sup>24</sup> we have family relations in District Sirsa, known for growing cotton. At the time of picking, there was huge labour shortage. Farmers have to arrange the cotton pickers from every source, even making arrangements at the time of end of the season for the next crop to avoid future difficulty. On one such occasion, the workers from other state arrived at the Dabwali station, from where they were picked up in tractor trolley and taken to the village. They were put in a out of village plot of owned land used generally to store animal fodder, fuel wood etc. and provided necessary wheat flour, pulses, water for the night. They were supposed to stay there till the entire crop was picked up in the following 2-3 weeks. But in the night a farmer from the neighbouring village came and took all of them on the promise of higher payment. In the morning finding none of them relatives following the tractor tracks found them and brought back with an apology from the hijacker farmer.

NREGA for 30 days @ Rs.150 per day, and earned Rs. 4500. He also worked as agricultural labourer for 150 days @ Rs. 200 per day (Rs. 30,000). Also he was doing work for live stock. The other person Mr. Sarbjeet Singh, 43, agricultural labourer of village Bhedon, district Ambala, came back to the village from Ambala to work under NREGA; got work for 40 days on Land Development at the rate of Rs 151 per day and earned Rs. 6040. These two cases make less than 0.15% of the total members of the sample, hence can be ignored (table 4.3).

#### **4.4 Wage differential across activities:**

The differences in wages across activities have been shown in table 4.4. The highest average wage was noted under public works programmes. In fact, these programmes include in addition to food for work etc. hiring of casual workers for official works as well which include daily wage earners hired as per government rules for daily wage earners and also some other activities carried out on piece rates which translate into more earnings in some cases. But in the case of earth development works under NREGA sometimes the poor are deprived of their dues for which otherwise they should have been entitled as daily wage earners, because the work was done on piece rate basis. Because of piece rate work, as reported by some respondents the wages did not measure accurately the work done by them and paid less amount. Had the work been done on daily wages, they could have got more money. In fact, wage rates in rural areas of Haryana, Punjab and adjoining north Rajasthan, particularly districts Sri Ganganagar and Hanumangarh due to developed agriculture have generally been more than the prescribed minimum wages. The average wage during the reference period (Jan. - Dec. 2009) was mostly Rs. 150 per day, whereas the minimum wages has recently, later part of 2010 were increased to Rs.151. The minimum market wage goes occasionally up due to operational/ seasonal needs of specific tasks. NREGA, i.e., assured minimum work for around 90 days in Haryana has also helped increase the bargaining strength of the workers not only in peak seasons but also during the lean season when due to NREGA activities they are assured of work for certain days. Employment guarantees have also been credited for their potential to induce

positive labour market responses by improving the bargaining strength of workers<sup>25</sup>

In general, the wage differential across genders is also not observed in Haryana. But that does not mean that wage differential across gender does not exist. Additionally, if the work is done on contract basis or on piece rate basis particularly agricultural activities like harvesting of wheat or uprooting of cotton stacks etc. on per acre basis, the earnings differ significantly. On wage rate basis marginal difference is noted, across activities as well as across genders. The coefficient of variation varies between 23 and 27 under agricultural casual work between genders, whereas there is insignificant variation under NREGA activities. However, the variation in the case of non- beneficiaries is slightly less than in the case of beneficiaries.

#### **4.5 Sum Up:**

Overall work profile of the respondents has been discussed in this section. The focus being on what type of work the respondents were doing? What was their main profession – NREGA or something else? Was there any difference in per household members getting employment across activities, across districts and across genders? Was there any wage differential across activities, and across genders? What were the issues related with migration of workers? Where (what distance from their residence) they were being provided employment? These are some of the issues discussed in this chapter. The results show a positive trend with regard to employment, for example, work is mostly needed and provided during lean season. More people per household are getting employment under NREGA in relatively backward district like Mewat, 1.98 as compared other districts, 1.35 the minimum. Overall 94 days' work per household during the year was provided, reasonably better in the state as compared to many other states, and also in the sample districts as compared to the entire state, but still less than the minimum mandatory 100 days' work. But it is quite satisfying that in district Mewat, where it is most needed, more people per household and per member could get

---

<sup>25</sup> Dr`eze and Sen 1991, Dev 1995 "Strategies of Entitlement Protection". In Hunger and Public Action, pp. 104 - 121

employment. Similarly among the social groups also the needy scheduled tribes got relatively more employment than others. But on the gender disparity, the situation may be considered dismal. Only 30 woman days' work was provided during the year as compared to 94 days' for all.

The wage rate differential does exist across districts and across genders but wages are generally equal to or more than minimum prescribed wages by the state under the minimum wages ACT. In fact, rate of minimum wages remains generally higher in the state as compared to the country and many individual states.

The work sites were generally at a reasonable distance, around 2 kms. from the residence. However, it is far away as compared to work provided under the KVIC, where actually it is at the door step. Therefore, some of the activities of the KVIC need to be considered for the provision of NREGA.

Most of the work being undertaken in the state, in sample districts particularly, was related with land development. The assets created were rated very highly by the respondents, very good in most of the cases and good in the remaining. Not a single respondent categorizing them of bad quality.

Migration was not reported, barring one or two random cases which can be ignored as exception.

**In sum, work done under NREGA seems to be making positive impact, of course, not to the extent it is mandated, for example, 50% work for women, 100 days' work per household, no wage differential etc.**



**Table 4.1**  
**The work profile under NREGA (reference Period Jan-Dec 2009)**

<b>Characteristics</b>		<b>Ambala</b>	<b>Panipat</b>	<b>Sirsa</b>	<b>Mewat</b>	<b>Rewari</b>	<b>State</b>
<b>No. of members per hh employed during the year</b>	Aggregate	1.50	1.35	1.88	1.98	1.93	1.73
	General	-	-	2.00	1.67	-	1.75
	SC	1.04	1.44	3.14	1.03	1.97	1.66
	ST	-	2.00	2.80	2.33	1.67	2.33
	OBC	1.94	1.45	1.67	1.75	1.83	1.74
	Women	0.45	0.50	0.58	0.78	0.80	0.62
	Men	1.05	0.85	1.30	1.20	1.13	1.11
<b>No. of days per hh employed during the year</b>	Aggregate	92.3	79.7	104.3	109.5	85.2	94.2
	General	-	-	160.0	115.0	-	126.3
	SC	92.5	80.7	92.2	116.4	81.5	89.7
	ST	-	60.0	167.0	163.3	120.0	145.4
	OBC	91.9	78.8	96.7	95.8	87.0	91.0
	Women	20.0	18.5	27.4	40.3	41.0	29.4
<b>Wage rate obtained (Rs.)</b>	Aggregate	149.2	150.8	146.1	149.4	153.2	149.6
	General	-	-	141.0	151.0	-	147.8
	SC	149.0	150.9	146.0	148.7	154.1	149.9
	ST	-	151.0	142.9	151.0	150.4	147.0
	OBC	149.4	150.4	150.4	149.4	151.0	149.9
	Women	149.1	151.0	143.3	149.9	153.3	149.6
<b>No. of days per member during the year</b>	Aggregate	61.50	59.02	55.60	55.44	44.27	54.60
	General	-	-	80.00	69.00	-	72.14
	SC	89.31	56.05	29.34	112.79	41.43	54.17
	ST	-	30.00	59.64	70.00	72.00	62.32
	OBC	47.42	54.19	58.00	54.71	47.45	52.26
	Women	44.44	37.05	47.61	51.94	51.22	47.46
Avg.distance from residence where employed(Kms)		1.290	2.648	2.333	2.076	2.721	2.229
% hh worked =>100 days/year		47.5	50	45	55	45	48.5

**Table 4.2**

**The activity in which employed under NREGA and the quality of assets created (reference Period Jan-Dec 2009) (% of hh)**

Characteristics		Ambala	Panipat	Sirsa	Mewat	Rewari	State
Name of the activity under which employed	Rural connectivity	0	0	12.5	12.5	5	6.00
	Flood control and protection	0	0	7.5	15	17.5	8.00
	water conservation and water harvesting	0	0	0	0	0	0.00
	Drought proofing	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Micro irrigation works	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Provision of irrigation facility to land owned by Panchayat	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Renovation of traditional water bodies	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Land development	100	100	72.5	72.5	77.5	84.50
	Any other activity approved by the Min.of Rural Development	0	0	7.5	0	0	1.50
Quality of the assets created through NREGA activities	Very Good	80.0	67.5	85.0	87.5	72.5	78.5
	Good	20.0	32.5	15.0	12.5	27.5	21.5
	Bad	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	Worst	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Average employment allowance received by the household for not getting work under NREGA after registration (Rs. Per hh)		0	0	0	0	0	0

**Table 4.3**  
**The migration incidents recorded during the Reference Period Jan-Dec 2009**

Characteristics		Ambala	Panipat	Sirsa	Mewat	Rewari	State
No. of members migrated from the village because of not getting work under NREGA even after registration (per household)		0	1	0	0	0	0
No. of out migrated members returned back to village because of getting work in NREGA (per household)		1	0	0	0	0	0
In case of some members returned back to the village to work under NREGA where were they earlier working (% of returned members)	Nearby village	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Nearby town	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Same district	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Same state	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Other State	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Other country	-	-	-	-	-	-
In case of some members returned back to the village to work under NREGA which activity earlier working in (% of returned members)	Const./Manufacturing/mining	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Trading/Services and transport	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Private works/ self business	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Other government work	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Agriculture labour	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Any other	-	-	-	-	-	-
Year in which shifted (% of shifted hh)	Shifted last year	2009	2009	-	-	-	-
	Shifted before last year	-	-	-	-	-	-
Is your family better off now compared to previous occupation(% of shifted hh)		-	-	-	-	-	-

**Table 4.4**  
**Wage differentials among activities**

Occupation		Beneficiaries		Non-Beneficiaries		Aggregate	
		Average	CV	Average	CV	Average	CV
Wage rate in agricultural casual labour (Rs.)	Male	171	23	156	26	169	23
	Female	160	27	151	28	159	27
Wage rate in non-agricultural casual labour (Rs.)	Male	161	29	168	23	163	28
	Female	162	29	178	23	166	27
Wage rate in public work programmes (Rs.)	Male	200	-	-	-	200	-
	Female	-	-	-	-	-	-
Wage rate earned by migrant workers (Rs.)	Male	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Female	-	-	-	-	-	-
Wage rate under NREGA (Rs.)	Male	150	4	144	-	150	4
	Female	150	5	-	-	150	5
Any other work (Rs.)	Male	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Female	-	-	-	-	-	-

## Chapter – V

### The functioning of NREGA – Qualitative aspects

#### 5.1 Household assets holdings:

The data collected from household respondents belong to the period from January to December 2009. The NREGA project was implemented three years before that in Mahendergarh and Sirsa districts in the first phase. In the second year or phase – II, districts Ambala and Mewat were added and finally in the third year (2008) or phase- III, all the districts of the state along with the entire country were covered. In fact, barring district Rewari, where practically it started in 2009, the respondents were benefiting directly for the last two - three years in the state in the form of ensured employment and extra income during the lean periods through manual labour. Also we cannot rule out that those with resources might not have taken advantage of the scheme at the cost of some other genuinely needy. The assets holding pattern of the respondents confirms that. Barring consumer assets, utensils and other unspecified small items per household all major assets like land, house property, livestock, even a few ornaments of very little value were more valued in the case of beneficiary households vis-à-vis non-beneficiary households. If we total the value of all assets the difference is significant. The aggregate value of all assets per household was Rs. 89 thousand and Rs.68 thousand respectively of beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries. The major difference came from land and house property. Surprisingly the beneficiaries also had some small business assets in the form of small items to run a petty shop (one respondent in a sample of 250 households). For the purpose of comparison we have converted the assets into ratios, taking the value of beneficiary assets equal to one we find that land in the case of non-beneficiary households is just 0.63, house property 0.88, live stock 0.91, ornaments 0.64 and some other assets 0.92, vis-à-vis the value of 1 each in the case of beneficiary households. However, value of consumer assets was found slightly more than one, i.e. 1.18, and utensils 1.15 in the case of non-beneficiary households. Because the data collected pertain to the period between January – December, 2009, i.e., more than 3 years of implementation of NREGA, **contribution in the**

**enhancement of value of household assets of NREGA beneficiaries cannot be ruled out, and if that is so, then it is not a minor achievement of NREGA.**

In fact, along with contribution in the creation of common public assets like, water harvesting, land development, plantation, infrastructure etc. contribution in enhancement of personal assets of the NREGA workers is also important and NREGA seems to succeed in that area too. Compared with Keynesian magical formula of digging the pits and then refilling them for the sake of creating jobs to lift the economy from depression, NREGA seems to be more effective way of doing many things simultaneously – removing poverty, ensuring food and nutrition for the most targeted sections, enhancing gender equality, productively utilizing the unused valuable human labour, saving the society from turning chaotic or criminal (empty mind is the workshop of crime), most importantly, creating demand for the industry and the like.

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

Barring one case of a loan of Rs. 50,000/- @ 13% rate of interest from the SBI for establishing a shop by one beneficiary household, not a single case was reported by any household, neither by beneficiaries nor non-beneficiary households (Table 5.2). In fact, for getting a loan one has to provide some assets as collateral, which for the households dependent on wage labour if not impossible is difficult to provide. Therefore they get no credit, neither from the public sector financial institutions nor from private money lenders easily. Even in case of emergency, for example, serious sickness they have to seek help from family, friends and relatives, and, from private lenders by mortgaging whatever asset they have. But the households both beneficiaries as well as non-beneficiaries did borrow from the private money lenders. The amount and terms of loan might not have been revealed by the respondents. The following table (5.3) does provide an indication of the strict terms of loan from private sources. For example, 22% respondents in aggregate (23% beneficiary households and 18% non-beneficiary households) did work for the lenders, they were indebted.

Even though 18% reported that cooperative credit society was in existence in the village, 5% and 10% households respectively from beneficiary and non-beneficiary households were members of such a society, additionally, for the 12% respondents facility from informal credit society or Self Help Group was also available. About 7% family members were holding the membership of such a society or SHG, as much as 51% were also having live accounts in bank branch or post office, still no formal substantial credit line was opened to them.

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

Not only providing some material asset for collateral is essential to get loan from private sources, but also terms of repayment of loan in such cases are harsher ones. For example, rate of interest is quite high, installments are large so that loan is recovered quickly and some other conditions, like retention of some amount (may be one installment) even before making payment etc. are imposed to get back the loan amount quickly and safe from default. In absence of sufficient resources, the lender knows the difficulty in realizing the loan, so terms like doing wage labour in lieu of loan installment are also imposed. That is what 23% beneficiary households and 18% non-beneficiary households reported doing wage labour for the lender.

As per the Act and rules there under the payment of wages to the NREGA workers has to be made either through the bank or through the post office. But only 53% beneficiaries and 44% non-beneficiaries reported having bank or post office accounts. 8% respondents from both the categories were also having some type of shares or other such stocks. Most of these stocks were bought during the early nineties boom in the share market, and unfortunately many people did not get expected returns. Only 11% households (10% and 14% respectively from beneficiary and non-beneficiary category) were having some sort of insurance policy.

A few things, need to be considered seriously: one – to ensure economic welfare of these groups, credit facility with convenient terms and easy availability has to be provided, two – to protect their health some strong medical/ health arrangement, through strengthening of public health care system, medical

insurance cover such as provided to bidi workers, etc. need to be put in place so that these groups if due to NREGA come above poverty line do not fall back due to any such reason, poor health conditions particularly.

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

“There is no remedy if the Panchayat Office is always closed, and the Panchayat Secretary, and the Sarpanch missing or absent most of the time. Even if they are present, there is no way the card holder can get them to sign on the receipt tag. On the other hand, every application has to be made on a form. Forms are of course willfully not made available to the card holders. On the other hand, if the card holder brings a petition on paper it is rejected, as it is not in due format”<sup>26</sup>

Job cards as per the act and rules are to be issued to the applicants desirous of work without any fee and normally should be handed over to the applicant for retention. No fee is prescribed for such cards. However, 1% respondents reported that they were charged fee for that.

It was reported by 2.5% respondents that no entry was made in their cards, while 18.5 % were not sure whether any entry was made or not. This happened because job cards were not with the applicants. About the fake entries or incomplete entries in the job cards, 0.5 % agreed to that while 6.5% were not sure. However, a large majority 93% said no to fake entries in their cards. About over writing of entries only 0.5 % stated yes while a huge majority declined any over writing in the job cards. Only 6% were not sure about such entries. 4.5% said that signatures were not put on the job cards.

As far as retention of the cards was concerned, about half of the respondents said it was with them, in 40% cases cards were retained by the sarpanch, in 5% cases they were with the contractor and in rest about 5% cases elsewhere, without any specific identification. Not only job cards, the author was told by the workers in village Ugrakhedi that even the bank pass books were taken away by the sarpanch for the sake of getting them completed and they were yet to get back.

---

<sup>26</sup> Vidhya Das: NREGA – Orissa Experience, ceva



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

The act provides a common wage rate for all the workers, fixed by state governments as per their norms. However, there were agitations all along for application of the minimum wages Act to fix the wages for NREGA workers. But the govt. felt constrained to do that, notwithstanding pressure from the public as well higher ups like the NAC. The only modification to the act is that the wage rates have been indexed with the price indices, to neutralize the inflation effect. In Haryana market wages for the agricultural labourers were more than the minimum wages in many states. But there was always a marginal difference in the wages on the basis of genders. We have seen that happening in the case of construction workers and brick kiln workers working on wage rates. The question was asked from the respondents. To which 71% responded in the affirmative while 29% told the existence of gender based wage differential. Out of 29%, a few were of the view that wage rates for women were higher and the rest saying that wage rates were lower for women. On the question of timely payment, about 20% agreed to timely payment of wages while 80% told about the delay in payment. In the rules 15 days time for payment of wages has been provided. It means if the wages are paid within 15 days, then there was no delay. However, beyond that 81% said it took about a month to get wages, while 19% said it was more than a month. As far as the mode of payment was concerned, 13% were paid by the sarpanch, 78% got the wages transferred to their bank accounts, while for the remaining the payment was through the post office. In 1% cases it was through their representatives. The bank accounts in the case of 92% were in their own names, while in the case of 7.5% women it was in their spouses' names and in the remaining cases in their children's name. It was interesting to know how the children got their bank accounts and not the workers themselves. It was found that in the case of girl child, there were some schemes of the state government to provide, rather deposit some money in the name of girl child so bank accounts were opened and now were being used by their parents. The reasons why the new accounts of their own were not opened were quite a few, first, it was cumbersome to open a bank account more documents and photos

were needed, and in about 82% cases the banks followed their normal procedures. Secondly, some money has always to be kept in the account to avoid it becoming closed, and thirdly, always there have to be some transactions to avoid it being dormant. 86% were individual accounts and in 14% cases joint accounts.

In those cases where wages were not paid through bank account, 76% said the payment was made in front of other labourers, 14% declined such payment and 10 % were not sure. In 59% cases wages were paid at work site, in 30% cases at panchayat bhawan, in 10.5% cases at some private/public place and in 0.5% cases at some private residence. For the solution of wage related problems more measures like reported by Roy and Day need to be seriously considered.

“Students and Academics, working together with workers’ organisations in Khunti District in Jharkhand, have operationalised the entitlement in the NREGA to get Rs. 2,000/- per worker paid to over 300 workers as compensation for delayed payment under the provisions of the Payment of Wages Act. The Khunti payment, made last month, has once again demonstrated that the solution to the vexatious issue of late payments lies in the entitlement framework”<sup>27</sup>.

As far as lodging of complaints in the sample households was concerned, in 21% cases the complaints were lodged about delay in wage payments, 65% did not lodge any complaint about this and the rest were not sure. In 8% cases of less payment of wages complaints were filed, 83% did not lodge complaint, while the remaining 9% were not sure about that. In about 8% cases respondents were asked to sign/ put thumb impression for less payment of wages while in 82% cases there was no such incident. 11% respondents lodged complaints about more work as compared to wage payment. About 8% respondents filed complaints for problems in accessing the bank accounts. Overall about 8 to 10% respondents have filed complaints while the remaining did not take any action in what so ever be the cases. Most of the work was being done on piece rates instead of on the basis of daily wages and a huge majority of respondents 78% confirmed that, while in rest of the cases it was on wage rate basis. Further how

---

<sup>27</sup> Aruna Roy and N day, ibid

the work done was measured - about 24% said it was measured by individual's work, 69% were of the view that it was measured by team's work and the remaining 6% said it was collective.

Solution to issues like lodging of complaints, pursuing them to conclusion and ensuring the workers' rights can be possible if some help groups as was the Khunti case, are readied. Once the workers start getting success, then they themselves will be able to fight for their rights.

### **5.3.3 Work-site facilities and economic usefulness of the work:**

Two types of work sites facilities are most important: one- regarding the work details, manpower needed, expected remuneration related issues and two, about the physical and material facilities for the benefit of the workers. As far as first question was concerned, about 38% respondents said that they were given the details of worksite dimensions, amount sanctioned and other details, about 43% declined to have been provided such details, while the remaining were not sure about that. About the second type of facilities 97% said they were provided with drinking water, but child care facility for working women was available to only about 10%, first aid kit or other medical aid was made available to only 17% respondents. Another very important aspect was about providing of work tools, equipment like spade, fork (gaintee), basket etc., which to our mind should be the priority. Unfortunately in none of the cases, which we personally enquired, such tools or equipment was provided. The workers have to bring in their own spade, basket, gaintee etc. to work with.

The importance of this question will be clear only if all the babus and executives are asked to bring their own table, desk, air conditioners, etc. to work with in govt. offices. Secondly, about on site facilities we could observe at almost all the work sites in the selected districts, no where except drinking water, no facility was to women, children, male workers was created and no where we could see any signboard stating the details of the project except in the case village Bhedon, Ambala, and that too was old board.

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

On the question of monitoring of NREGA work, a huge majority, 96%, said there was no such arrangement, while only 4% said the monitoring was done. In fact, it appears that by monitoring these 4% might have understood the monitoring of their own performance and not the NREGA work. This aspect of NREGA should be most important. It is not that the quality of the work being done needs to be monitored, but also the entire process, starting from issuance of job cards, their maintenance, measurement of work done, payment of wages, display of work site plans, expenditure etc. to even the regular checking of accounts, cash etc. everything needs to be strictly monitored/ checked. Like RKVY, the monitoring of NREGA work should be in the hands of people of the village through an empowered body to recommend penal action for any fraud whether, related to issuance of job cards, measurement or work, payment of wages, quality of work etc. Only 1.5% respondents said that complaints in such cases were filed and 15 also said that some sort of action was taken upon the complaints.

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

A major criticism of the programme is that the assets created are worthless, and the other one is that there is no useful work to be done in the villages where a huge sum of money needs to be spent.

However, it should be noted that NREGA is social security measure to protect the deprived sections from hunger and destitute and keeping them off from social and political crimes of the nature of extremism earlier in the North-East, Punjab, Jammu and Kashmir and now the eastern states suffering heavily from Naxlism. One should also not forget how much resources were spent to bring back the situation to normalcy. In addition to spending money to fight the terror losing number of lives on three sides –common innocent people, forces and extremists, a huge sum of money in thousands of crores, Rs.8000 crore were spent in Punjab by the centre to start the development process again and rehabilitate the displaced persons. We do not know how much we shall need to spend to bring back the Naxals to mainstream. So it would be futile to judge a social security programme on the ground of usefulness of the assets created. But that does not

mean that those who have the clout should be allowed to line their pockets at the cost of the society, innocent hard working people and the state.

We looked into this aspect through the responses of the respondents. A large amount is spent on labour power and a small portion on materials. Therefore, one cannot assure that if modern techniques and materials are not used how long the structures created would last. 66% respondents were of the view that it would last for a year while 28% were of the view that the structure may last up to 5 years. However, almost 2/3<sup>rd</sup> opined that it is worth to create such a structure and 62% were of the view that it was inadequate. Only 27% needed no structure.

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

In Haryana, Punjab and Northern districts Sriganaganagar and Hanumangarh of Rajasthan where agriculture is quite developed and requires a huge amount of human labour notwithstanding heavy use of mechanized equipment like harvester combine, tractors etc. the labour generally was coming from other states for wage work. Local people did not need to migrate out for search of work. Hence migration of wage labour was not the question in the area. On NREGA projects as it is mandatory that local people with domicile proof should be involved, outsiders who did not have necessary documents like ration cards, voter cards etc. due to lack of NREGA opportunity did not get attracted. Therefore, there was no reporting of movement of manpower, neither migration and nor immigration. However, in districts like Mewat many people used to move out and still they do but not as wage labourers, rather they acquire some skill to work as masons, carpenters etc. and go to city areas like Delhi, Gurgaon, Rewari and Alwar. Hence, not much information on such type of migration was available.

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

NREGA has been in operation for more than last three years; its main operation has been in the village; village as far as interaction is concerned, is a small community, howsoever big the size, population and area may be, people remain in touch with each other, either through the ladies or chaupal meetings or through children. Moreover the Pnachayti Raj has made many people as voters, as

candidates and activists aware of the functioning of Panchayats and the programmes being undertaken. Additionally, in some villages there is loud speakers system, in Gurdwaras, Mosques, and/or temples, through which announcements are made to make the people aware of any common agenda, be it arrivals of PDS items, fertilizers, irrigation slips, revenue officials or anything else, like lost and found. Therefore what happens, becomes public within no time. And matters related with work, money cannot remain hidden. People have become aware of the happenings and also of the politics involved. But awareness and deep understanding of the issues related with NREGA are two different ball games. 80% of the respondents were aware of implementation of NREGA, while 18% were not. 77% respondents were aware of right to apply for work and getting it within 15 days of their application and 11% were not aware of it. 57% were aware of the application process and quite a good number 32% were not. About 37% were aware of right to minimum wages out of NREGA and almost half (47%) were not aware of right to minimum wages. About 20% knew the rate of minimum wages and a huge majority about 2/3<sup>rd</sup> did not know. The details of wage calculation, mostly if it was on daily basis was known to about 25%, while almost 49% of the respondents did not know. What minimum working facilities should be available at the work site was known to only 31%, while 55% did not know. Two important things about NREGA implementation – right to unemployment allowance in absence of work and list of works allowed under NREGA were known to only 22% and 17% respectively, while about 2/3<sup>rd</sup> did not know about them.

Thus overall a lot of work needs to be done for making the people aware of NREGA details, work site details and facilities, amount involved and its utilization, their entitlement to work, minimum wages, unemployment allowance and quality of assets created. All this can be possible with regular meetings of the Gram Sabha and through social audit, strict provisions and implementation of penal action with regard to deliberate misappropriation / misuse of funds and provisions.

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

“Livelihoods programmes like NREGA have an immense potential as a social safety-net and climate change adaptation through preservation and eco-regeneration activities in rural India.”<sup>28</sup>

NREGA has been a flagship programme of the UPA I govt. It was the result of serious efforts made by theorists, NGOs deeply involved in the evolution of the concept and of course the hard work done by the NAC. Surely, they have to counter a number of genuine and fake arguments for the operationalization of the programme. If there had not been any tangible benefit to the poor, the economy, to the state for itself calling a welfare state, it would not have been wide spread in the second and third year.

Some qualitative questions were asked from the respondents as to what they think of the Scheme in general, for example, about its usefulness to the villagers. A huge majority, 88% of the respondents, told it was a very useful Scheme to the villagers and the remaining 12 % said it was quite useful. None said that it was useless or not useful.

“In addition to the above, as pointed out time and again by the supporters of NREGA, it has helped in many ways by ensuring a minimum level of work and income, which in return has ensured food and many more things for the daily wage earners, their credit worthiness for example. On these questions a huge majority responded positively. For example, about 2/3<sup>rd</sup> were of the view that NREGA ensured food security, 83% were of the view that NREGA provided protection against poverty, about 85% felt it reduced distressed migration, as far reduction in indebtedness, providing greater economic independence to women, enhancement of purchasing power of the local economy were concerned between 78 to 80% respondents agreed. The most important aspect of these questions is that those who were not in agreement of these views their percentage varied between 0.5 to 2%. Thus as per the peoples’ opinion the NREGA has great potential. The NREGA can give people an opportunity to make

---

<sup>28</sup> Shailly Kedia: Development Studies Association (DSA) Annual Conference, September 2009

the entire system truly transparent and accountable. Properly supported, people's struggles for basic entitlements can, in turn, become the strongest political initiative to strengthen our democratic fabric not only as a Scheme for employment guarantee but also an effective process of promoting citizen's active engagement and commitment in creating social assets in improving their living condition at the local level. <sup>29</sup>

### **5.3.9 NREGA and Food security:**

Food has always remained a priority and will always remain so with the humanity. It is only after fulfillment of this priority requirement that other things come into focus. The famous Engel's consumption law<sup>30</sup> highlights that with the increase in income expenditure on food does not increase proportionately. But always fulfillment of food requirement to a certain level, irrespective of income, remains priority and other things, education, entertainment etc. are considered after that. With the poor families, for whom the NREGA has been envisaged clearly lack that level of income to go for secondary expenditures. Therefore priority with them is to ensure food for all the family members. Even in many poor households, particularly AAY and BPL card holders many times two times meals for the entire family is not secure. To mitigate such distressing situation it is expected that at least 100 days' work per household under NREGA, along with other income from other non-NREGA work or from resources like live stock etc, if one has , will secure at least two times meals for the family, and none should go to bed with empty stomach.

In Haryana, though people below poverty line as well as without any tangible resources do exist, but because agriculture is developed, state govt. has been providing social benefits, like 100 Rs. pension for the old, benefits to girl child for education, marriage etc. food for School children, some medical relief for the poor (jachcha, bachcha suraksha, for example), the situation that people will go without food, is rare. But when the family is largely of old people, or there exists some disability to earn, or serious sickness, particularly in absence of insurance

---

<sup>29</sup> A. Roy and N.Day: CATALYST Vol. VII. Issue 2, 19

<sup>30</sup> Engel, Ernst [1857] (2nd ed.). pp. 28–29



cover and with no young person to earn due to a number of reasons, there is every possibility that such families without solid resources base are likely to fall under the trap of hunger. Under these circumstances, task of securing food with the implementation of NREGA attains greater importance. We have checked the food situation of the respondents who were specifically asked some questions related with their food security.

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

Some questions related with food supply situation were asked from the respondents. To the question as to whether the family had sufficient food during the whole year, only respondent out of a sample of 200 answered it did not have. The reason stated was that happened due to sickness in the family. None confirmed that they faced any other deprivation in addition to food insufficiency. The same family who faced threatening food insufficiency told that it was the difficulty of sickness. Not a single household answered in the affirmative that their household lacked something important. Probably their requirement remains only the food supply for two times and nothing else or they have made up their mind set not to wish any thing covered under demonstration effect as is the case with middle classes of urban areas. About their suggestions to ameliorate their situation, the answer was given by only one respondent, that the wage rate should be increased. So far as improvement of the functioning of NREGA was concerned, another respondent was of the opinion that the work should be made available for the whole year instead of merely 100 days.

Thus overall the situation regarding availability of food two times a day is not a serious matter, if NREGA is in practice. Also, NREGA alone will not be powerful enough with current mode of implementation, i.e., providing less than 100 days' work per household if PDS is weekend or restricted to a limited number of households or commodities supplied through the PDS are not subsidized or number of commodities is reduced.

Hence, to secure food for the poor, along with further improvement in the functioning of the NREGA, universalisation of the PDS, inclusion of more food and non-food items will be helpful to increase the real income of the poor by way

of less essential expenditure, which will further help in their education, health, and more social integration with the mainstream.

### **5.5 Sum Up:**

We found that during the period, whatever a few assets the respondents had, they were slightly more in the case of beneficiary households as compared non-beneficiary households. Availability of credit to the resource-less households always remains problematic. Only in one case a small loan was reported for establishing a shop. The people reported working for the persons whom they were indebted. Though cooperative credit societies were functioning in the villages and some good number of respondents was holding membership also, but loan facility probably was not available to them.

Problems with issuance of, maintenance, entries into the job cards were reported. For example, all the needy people were supposed to get within a certain time free of cost Job cards, these should be left after entry with the holders and no overwriting etc. should be made in the cards. But all these were observed.

Wages were supposed to be paid within a specified period without any discrimination on the basis of gender. But it was not the case. Gender differential in wages was observed, delay in payment was also reported. Even mistakes were reported in the measurement of work done which led to less payment to the workers.

Worksite facilities were not in existence except drinking water. Child care facility, medical care or even first aid was not provided at many places. Complaints were also lodged in some cases but only minuscule were taken care of or solved. In most of the cases even complaints were not lodged. Hence these aspects need to be focused.

Work was being monitored, but the monitoring in absence of regular meetings of the Gram Sabha and of the monitoring committee was not effective as it should have been. In a good number of cases there was no monitoring at all. But still the assets created were rated very highly, either very good or in some cases of good quality and expected to last for 5 years in many cases.

One positive thing is that NREGA has successfully made the people more aware and conscious about the Schemes, though they may not be very well versed with the nitty-gritty of all the technical aspects of NREGA. Along with that NREGA has generated great potential for the most deprived sections of the society, the poor, socially depressed classes and the women, who got employment and income during the lean period when it was most needed and thus helped them secure their food two times a day.

**Table 5.1**  
**Assets Holdings (Rs. per household)**

<b>Description</b>	<b>Beneficiaries</b>	<b>Non-Beneficiaries</b>	<b>Aggregate</b>
Land	47275	30000	43820
House property	30823	27260	30110
Livestock	3728	3380	3658
Agricultural implements	0	0	0
Consumer assets	4363	5160	4522
Business assets	250	0	200
Ornaments	196	126	182
Utensils	1205	1391	1242
Others	1112	1028	1095
Total	88951	68345	84830

**Table 5.1b**  
**Assets Holdings per HH.**  
**(Non-Beneficiaries as ratio of Beneficiaries)**

<b>Description</b>	<b>Beneficiaries</b>	<b>Non-Beneficiaries</b>
Land	1.0	0.63
House property	1.0	0.88
Livestock	1.0	0.91
Agricultural implements	-	-
Consumer assets	1.0	1.18
Business assets	1.0	0.00
Ornaments	1.0	0.64
Utensils	1.0	1.18
Others	1.0	0.92
Total	1.0	0.77

**Table 5.2**  
**Borrowing by Sample households (Rs. per household)**

	Description	Beneficiaries	Non-Beneficiaries	Aggregate
Source of Loan	Institutional loan (banks)@	250	0	200
	Trader cum money lenders	0	0	0
	Commission agents	0	0	0
	Landlord/Employer	0	0	0
	Friends/Relatives	0	0	0
Purpose of Loan	Daily consumption	0	0	0
	Social ceremony	0	0	0
	Purchase of land, livestock or other assets	250	0	200
	Consumer durables	0	0	0
	Construction of house	0	0	0
	Health treatment	0	0	0
	Others	0	0	0
Rate of Interest (percent per annum)		13	-	13

@ Note: one household got a loan of Rs. 50000/ from the SBI

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

Description	Beneficiaries	Non-Beneficiaries	Aggregate
Doing wage work to those whom they are indebted	23	18	22
Availability of Co-operative credit society in village	20	10	18
Family member being member of such society	5	10	6
Availability of informal credit society/ SHG in village	13	8	12
Family member being member of such society	7	8	7
Having account in a bank/ post office/ other institution	53	44	51
Having any stock/bond/shares/other similar assets	8	8	8
Having life insurance policy	10	14	11

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

Description		Yes	No	Not sure
Job card issuance	Paid any fee/charges or bribe to get a job card	1.0	99.0	0.0
	The amount paid for job card (exorbitant)	0.0	0.0	0.0
	The amount paid as bribe (exorbitant)	0.0	0.0	0.0
Irregularity in the job card	No entries were made, even though the job card holder(s) had worked on NREGA	2.5	79.0	18.5
	Some entries were incomplete or missing or fake information was entered	0.5	93.0	6.5
	Some entries had been over written	0.5	93.5	6.0
	The signature column was blank or partly blank	4.5	89.5	6.0
Where was the card generally kept	With the card holders	49.5	0.0	0.0
	With Sarpanch or Sachiv	40.0	0.0	0.0
	With contractor	5.5	0.0	0.0
	With the gram rojgar sevak	0.0	0.0	0.0
	Elsewhere	5.0	0.0	0.0
Work application	Are you employed in response to an application for work	66.5	33.5	0.0
	If applied, did you get a dated receipt for the application	65.0	35.0	0.0
	If applied, did you get work within 15 days of application	77.0	23.0	0.0
	In case of failure to provide work within 15 days, is unemployment allowances paid	70.5	29.5	0.0
Payment of wages	Are the wage rates same for men and women	71.0	29.0	0.0
	Wage rate higher for men	21.5	78.5	0.0
	Wage rate higher for women	7.5	92.5	0.0
	Wage paid on 'daily-wage' basis	20.5	77.5	2.0
	Wage paid on 'piece-rate/task-wage' basis	77.5	20.5	2.0
Measurement of work	Work was measured by individual's work	23.5	0.0	0.0
	Work was measured by team measurement	69.0	0.0	0.0
	Work was measured by collective measurement	6.0	0.0	0.0
Period of wage payment	Wages were paid within a fortnight	0.0	0.0	0.0
	Wages were paid within a month	81.0	0.0	0.0
	Wages were paid more than a month	19.0	0.0	0.0
	Wages were paid after one year	0.0	0.0	0.0
Who made the wage payment	Sarpanch or Sachiv	13.0	0.0	0.0
	Post Office	8.0	0.0	0.0
	Bank	78.0	0.0	0.0
	Representative of line department	1.0	0.0	0.0
	Other government official or any other	0.0	0.0	0.0
In case wages payment made in the bank	Bank account was on self's name	92.0	0.0	0.0
	Spouse's name	7.5	0.0	0.0
	Parent's name	0.0	0.0	0.0
	Children's name	0.0	0.0	0.0
	Others	0.5	0.0	0.0
	Individual account	86.0	0.0	0.0
	Joint account	14.0	0.0	0.0
Did bank follow usual procedure of banking	81.5	18.5	0.0	

.....Table 5.4

In case wages were not paid thru bank	Wages paid in front of all labourers	76.0	14.0	10.0
	Wages paid on the work site	59.0	0.0	0.0
	Wages paid in Panchayat bhawan	30.0	0.0	0.0
	Wages paid on other public/private place	10.5	0.0	0.0
	Wages paid on some one's private residence	0.5	0.0	0.0
Complaints regarding wage payment	There were delays in wage payments	20.5	64.5	15.0
	Wage paid less than the minimum wage	8.0	83.0	9.0
	Wage paid less than asked for sign/thumb impression	7.5	82.0	10.5
	Task was too much compared to the wages paid	10.5	80.0	9.5
	Faced problems in accessing post office/ bank accounts	7.5	82.0	10.5
	On what basis wages were calculated not clear	7.5	82.5	10.0
	Others	7.5	82.5	10.0
Details of work-site facilities	A Board/GP member gave details of the sanctioned amount, work dimensions and other requisite details	37.5	42.5	20.0
	The worksite and drinking water facility	97.0	3.0	0.0
	Worksite had shade for periods of rest	61.5	37.5	1.0
	Worksite had child care facility	10.5	89.0	0.5
	Worksite had first aid kit/ medicines	17.0	82.5	0.5
Monitoring	Was there any authority to monitor the functioning of the NREGA administration	4.0	96.0	0.0
	Any complaint lodged relating to worksite etc., to the Gram Panchayat, Programme Officer or other officials	1.5	80.5	18.0
	If yes, was any action taken on your complaint	1.0	91.0	8.0
Economic usefulness of the work	Work is very useful to the villagers	88.0	0.0	0.0
	Work is quite useful to the villagers	12.0	0.0	0.0
	Work is not particularly useful to the villagers	0.0	0.0	0.0
	Work is useless for the villagers	0.0	0.0	0.0
Nature of assets and their durability in which the interviewee involved	The structure created may last up to one year	65.5	0.0	0.0
	The structure created may last up to five years	28.0	0.0	0.0
	The structure created may last up to ten years	0.0	0.0	0.0
	The structure created may last more than ten years	0.0	0.0	0.0
	It is worth creating the structure	67.0	0.0	0.0
	Was the structure created adequate	62.0	0.0	0.0
	No, structure needed more attention to be able to last long	27.0	0.0	0.0
How has NREGA has affected labour migration	Did your family members migrated out for job after implementation of NREGA (Year 2005 onward)	-	0.0	0.0
	If yes, only one member of the family migrated	-	0.0	0.0
	More than one member of the family migrated	-	0.0	0.0
	Are wages high in city or other states than NREGA	-	0.0	0.0
	Any family members migrated back to village to work under NREGA	-	-	0.0
	If yes, only one member of the family migrated back	-	-	0.0
	More than one member of the family migrated back	-	0.0	0.0
	Any family members migrated as wage labourer with dissatisfaction from NREGA	-	-	0.0
	If yes, only one member of the family migrated	-	0.0	0.0
	More than one member of the family migrated	-	0.0	0.0

.....Table 5.4

Respon dents' awareness about NREGA imple mentation	Are respondents aware about NREGA implementation	80.0	17.5	2.5
	Right to apply for work and get employed within 15 days	76.5	11.5	12.0
	To work application procedure	56.5	32.0	11.5
	Right to minimum wages	37.5	47.0	15.5
	The level of minimum wages	20.0	63.0	17.0
	The wage calculation method	24.5	48.5	27.0
	Right to the unemployment allowance	30.0	43.0	27.0
	Minimum worksite facilities (drinking water, first aid)	31.0	55.0	14.0
	Mandatory availability of muster rolls at the worksite	22.0	64.0	14.0
	The list of permissible works under the NREGA	17.0	65.0	18.0
Potential benefits of NREGA	NREGA enhanced food security	67.0	6.0	27.0
	NREGA provided protection against extreme poverty	83.0	1.0	16.0
	NREGA helped to reduce distress migration	84.5	0.5	15.0
	NREGA helped to reduce indebtedness	78.0	0.0	22.0
	NREGA gave greater economic independence to women	79.5	2.0	18.5
	NREGA generated purchasing power at local economy	78.0	1.0	21.0
Questions related to food security	Did your family get full two meals throughout year 2009	100.0	0.0	0.0
	Family did not get sufficient food for one month	0.0	0.0	0.0
	Family did not get sufficient food for two months	0.0	0.0	0.0
	Family did not get sufficient food for above two months	0.0	0.0	0.0
	How did you cope with situation - take loan		0.0	0.0
	Catch fish/rat/crab etc.	-	0.0	0.0
	Near/sometime starvation/take meal only once	-	0.0	0.0
	Begging	-	0.0	0.0
	Any other	-	0.0	0.0

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

Q1.	If you paid some amount to get job card: how much for job card and how much bribe.
Answer	No data
Q.2	If the job card is not kept with you, what is the reason for that?
Answer	No data
Q.3	If there is any authority that monitors the functioning of NREGA then describe the details?
Answer	No data
Q.4	If you lodged any complaints give details and also provide details of what action was taken
Answer	3 hh lodged complained, 2 hh said action taken.
Q.5	Provide description of the work and its starting date?
Answer	Earth work, digging (March09) Dam work, Land and Road work, Digging, filling of earth, digging of ponds (Jan, Feb, Mar, may, june, dec09)
Q.6	Provide details of family members migrated to city after implementation of NREGA and why?
Answer	Not Migrated
Q.7	Provide details of family members migrated back to village to work in NREGA and why?
Answer	Not Migrated
Q.8	Provide details of family members migrated to city after implementation of NREGA and why?
Answer	Not Migrated
Q.9	Provide details of family members migrated to city with dissatisfaction of NREGA and why?
Answer	Not Migrated



**Table 5.6:**  
**Provide details on the following potential benefits of NREGA (% hh)**

Q1.	NREGA enhance food security
Answer	67 % hhs agreed
Q.2	NREGA provided protection against extreme poverty
Answer	83 % HHs agreed
Q3.	NREGA enhance food security
Answer	Question repeated
Q.4	NREGA helped to reduce distress migration
Answer	84.5 % Hhs agreed
Q5.	NREGA helped to reduce indebtedness
Answer	78% HHs agreed
Q.6	NREGA gave greater economic independence to women
Answer	79.5 % HHs agreed

**Table 5.7:**  
**Quantitative questions related to food security (%hh)**

Q1.	Do you feel that your family does not have sufficient food for the whole of year give reasons
Answer	Only 1 HH, reason sickness.
Q.2	Have you faced any deprivations other than food insufficiency? If yes, explain
Answer	No.
Q.3	What were the main difficulties you and your family faced during the last year?
Answer	Only 1 HH, faced sickness.
Q.4	What is the most important thing your household lacks
Answer	Nothing
Q.5	. What is the suggestion for amelioration
Answer	Rate should be increased (1 HH)
Q.6	Any suggestions to improve NREGA functioning
Answer	Family member should get money for sickness and work all year (1 HH)

## Chapter - VI

### Impact of NREGA on village economy

This chapter is associated with the village conditions, infrastructure availability and the village economy in general. The purpose was to find out how introduction of NREGA has affected the infrastructure, agricultural operations and village economy? What changes have started appearing in the improvement of infrastructure of the villages, changes in the occupational structure of the people of the villages, changes in cost of production due to changes in wage rates and thereby on the village economy after the implementation of NREGA?

#### 6.1 Infrastructure availability in the villages:

We had used two types of schedules for the collection of data – one household schedule for 250 respondents and the second village schedule for village data. In general, the villages in Haryana are in much better conditions from the point of view of development of infrastructure as compared to many villages in the neighbourhood, be it in Rajasthan or some districts of Punjab, but not all the villages in all the districts of Haryana are at similar pedestal. We have data collected from the leading personalities of the 10 sample villages. The respondents for villages schedules included, village Pardhans, Panchayat secretaries, school teachers living in the villages and other knowledgeable senior persons of the villages and some of the household respondents. The data related with infrastructure availability are presented in table 6.1.

The data show that 90 % villages were connected with roads. In 50% villages there were double roads connecting the villages to different cities/ towns on different routes. It was only in one village that the nearest road was 2 kms. away and that makes 10% of the sample. No village was connected with railway station. The rail station on average was away by 21 kms. In fact, the selection of villages was distance based, i.e., 50% selected villages were away from the district at least by 20 kms. In a small state like Haryana with 21 districts a distance of 20 kms is not a small distance. Telephone connectivity was 100%. All the villages were connected through either landline or mobile phones and almost in all the cases by both. In a few villages even paid phone booths were noted.

Post office facility was available only in 60% villages and the cooperative credit society in 40%. Despite the clear cut policy of the RBI that a bank branch with population of more than 2000 has to be opened, there was no bank branch, RRB, Co. Bank, or scheduled commercial bank, neither public sector and not private. In fact, the situation of rural banking is the poorest one. We can cite the case of the author's own village.<sup>31</sup> It is not surprising that banks have failed the RBI, the planners and all those who are concerned with rural development and not have opened a branch in the villages where they as per rules were supposed to. It was not that the branches in many villages would not be profitable, for example the case of author's village. A leading public sector bank was ready to open the branch. Two reasons were cited by its manager for not opening the branches in villages, one, the officials and employees were not willing to go to the villages and two, the system of lead bank was responsible for killing competition.

Self help groups were working in 70% villages, primary school was working in all the villages, secondary school in 80% and senior secondary in 50%, PHC in 60%, dispensary and fair price shop in 40% each. The problem is related with distance also. The fair price shop on average was distanced at about 14 kms. The gram panchayat office was in all the villages.

The main concern of the nation now seems food security, i.e., assuring nearly 70% people food accessibility. In absence of fair price shops in 60% villages the task would be very difficult if not impossible. Therefore, urgent and effective steps would be needed to achieve the goals of the national food security bill, likely to be made law very shortly.

Other infrastructure facilities like veterinary hospital/ dispensary, village purchase centre, mechanical workshop etc. did not exist in any of the sample villages.

---

<sup>31</sup> While actively working with NREGA and brick kiln workers of my village in the Hanumangarh district of Rajasthan (adjoining district Sirsa of Haryana) the difficulty in deposits and credits of these people was realized. The village concerned is very big with more than 6,000 voters and population being nearly 10- 11 thousand. Still there is no bank branch. The banks working in nearest town Hanumangarh were contacted for opening a branch. It was revealed during the process that the lead bank (in this case SBBJ) has to take a decision. On contacting the lead bank it was found that for the last 40-50 years the Rajasthan Bank is having the license to run a branch in the village and is operating since then. It was found that the said branch was working from the city of Hanumangarh. The matter is still pending with the ICICI bank as the Rajasthan bank was taken over by them. In short, the branch with village license was operating from the town.

Village purchase centres have been a major successful story of the state, which helped not only the farmers to sell their produce at the nearest place, but many times at minimum support prices also. Additionally, they have been a source of non-farm employment generation through linkages as well.

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

Agriculture in Haryana has been on the development track since its separation from Punjab in the late 60s because this was the time when the green revolution was introduced in the country. It is presumed that with the development process employment pattern also changes. The people world over have been shifting away from agriculture. The share of agriculture in the GDP has been declining and so has been the peoples' dependence upon agriculture. But in the case of India, the rate of decline of share of agriculture in the GDP has been much faster as compared to decline in the rate of peoples' dependence upon agriculture.

We have tried to find from first hand village information as to what happened during the decade to occupational pattern of the village people. The percentage of cultivator households increased from 64.5% in 2001 to 65.2% in 2009. The percentage of agricultural labourers decreased from 33% to 30% in the respective years. Those involved in trade and commerce activities increased from 0.5% to 1.3%. The number of households doing other activities like working in household small industry, construction activities, transport and the like increased marginally from 2.1% in 2001 to 2.7% in 2009 (table 6.2).

The number of cultivator households increased due to subdivision of households and holdings. The percentage of agricultural workers decreased due to availability of other less tiring and more rewarding works like small scale shops and trade etc. Overall, the development and nature of works do not seem contradictory to the historical development process. But increase in number of households on cultivation should be a matter of concern. Another important and worrying aspect is that the new generation, in absence of alternative occupations is unwillingly taking up agriculture as profession. The situation during the late nineties was much worse, when farmers were committing suicides, village after village were putting notices for sale. The situation improved after 2005 6.

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

As pointed out earlier, wage rates in rural areas of Haryana during the peak agricultural operations, be it harvesting of wheat and paddy, planting of paddy or picking up of cotton, kinnu fruits in some parts of Sirsa and Hissar or horticulture in the NCR areas, have generally been higher than the minimum prescribed wage rates and that has been the great attraction for immigrant workers from Bihar and Orissa to come to Haryana. Even the effect of immigrant workers was not much to reduce the prevailing wage rates. However, introduction of NREGA has further increased the wage rates, because, one - that number of immigrant labour has come down, though not eliminated completely, now they get work in their respective states, and two –due to lean season earnings from NREGA local workers are not that much hard pressed to work under distress conditions, which SEN and DEREZ have described as bargaining potential. The average wage rates based on the village information are given in table 6.3. The increase in all type of wages for both male and female workers, during the period under reference and before NREGA has been noticed all around. In the wages of male workers almost 30% increase in agricultural wages, 40 % increase in non-agricultural wages, 36% rise in wages for construction work, more than 50% for mining, between 28% and 48% increase in male semi skilled work like electrician, plumber, and pump set operators, mechanics have been noticed. Similarly in the case of female workers, almost 44% increase for agricultural work, more than 49% for non-agricultural work, about 43% increase for construction work and 50% increase in mining has been noticed. Along with effect of NREGA, general increase in price index, relatively more profits, more demand for work in construction and mining etc. due to overall increased growth rate of the economy and increase in agricultural output may also have caused the spurt in wage rates. MGNREGA has made substantial impact on the prevalent wage rate in the area. Wage rates have gone up by two to two and a

half times around Kaluana prior to MGNREGA depending upon the seasonal variation in demand of labour.<sup>32</sup>

#### **6.4 How has NREGA affected charges in agricultural operations:**

It is pointed out by many studies/ reports (the latest being report by the Secretary Rural Development, who personally stayed for the night in village, Kaluana, distt. Sirsa, visited work sites and met all types of persons, workers- male and female from all social groups, village pardhan, panchayat and govt. officials) that NREGA has affected the wage rates positively by 2 to 2.5 times as compared to pre NREGA situation<sup>33</sup>. The data collected from village schedules about wages for various operations have been reported in table 6.4. In fact, for finer details we need many aspects to be included, for example, let us consider the operation of ploughing. In addition to two types of working charges – one on daily basis and the other on the basis of per unit of area, charges differ if one use his/her own sources of energy, be it tractor or bullocks along with his own services, and in that situation it becomes difficult to separate the charges for his own labour and charges for his sources of energy. Secondly, charges also differ for different types of soils or for the purpose it has to be done. For example, ploughing for paddy plantation is done in the muddy soil requiring extra energy both for the source of energy as well for the labourer, therefore the extra cost as compared to ploughing for other crops. Even ploughing of dry land will cost differently if it has to be done on totally dry land, i.e., in pre irrigation condition vis-à-vis post irrigation fields. Therefore there was variation in answers given. However we have tried to work out labour charges alone without machine or animal power and for all types of soils. Thirdly, labour charges vary substantially for different seasons, depending upon the peak or off season also. This is valid for all other operations also. The labour charges per day for ploughing vary between Rs 200 to 300, which were Rs. 100 to 140 in 2005 and Rs. 60 to Rs. 80 per day in 2001. Leveling of the fields is not done separately. On per acre basis the charges are

---

<sup>32</sup> Tour Report on the visit of Sirsa(Haryana) by a Team of Officers headed by Shri B.K. Sinha, Secretary(RD) & Shri T. Vijay Kumar, JS(SGSY) and Shri N.K. Sinha, JD(NREGA)

<sup>33</sup> Tour Report , ibid

included in the ploughing itself and for daily basis no labour is hired separately for the operation, therefore it is generally done along with ploughing. The task of weeding in three districts, barring Mewat and Rewari is mostly done chemically and therefore no labour is generally hired. But the wage rates are slightly less by Rs. 10 to Rs. 20 and that is due to both the nature of work being slightly lighter and also due to generally it is not the peak season, be it wheat, cotton or any other crop. However for paddy it is absolutely chemical treatment. Transplantation of paddy is mostly done on the basis of per unit of area and the rates vary between Rs.1800 to Rs. 2500 per acre, which on average were Rs. 1200 and Rs. 800 per acre during the two pre NREGA periods. As far as harvesting of paddy was concerned, it includes thrashing as well, therefore some extra cost of about Rs. 200 per acre is charged. If threshing of paddy is tedious as compared to wheat which is mostly done mechanically now, harvesting of paddy is slightly easier as compared to harvesting of wheat, if done manually. The charges for cane cutting were not noticed, because generally cane cutting is done for the sake of leaves which are used as green fodder by the workers for their animal. However, in case there is no such agreement, may be workers with animal are not available then the wage rates were equal to those for weeding. As far as harvesting of other crops is concerned, the rate does not differ on the basis of crops, except in the case of wheat which is mostly done mechanically and in case of manual operations, it is generally on the basis of payments in kind, some pre agreed amount of harvested crop varying between 1/14<sup>th</sup> to 1/15<sup>th</sup> is charged. Surprisingly there is no change in this amount of harvested crop during the last decade or so. This is probably due to the fact that value and volume of crops – grains as well as chef (value alone), has been increasing proportionately. As far as thrashing of wheat is concerned, it is mostly with thrashers or harvest combine. The labour is hired separately in the first case and it is for few hours to half a day, in general due to the size of holdings being very small and wherever the size is large then mostly it is done with harvest combine. In this case labour charges are included in the cost of the combine which is mostly on the basis of per unit of area.

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

How NREGA has affected the village economy, cost of production, consumption pattern, migration and immigration etc, some questions about these aspects were asked from the village representatives. The questions and answers in the form of percentages from all the villages are given in table no. 6.5.1. Shortage of agricultural wage labour at some point of time was reported by 70% and negated by 30%. Even shortage of agricultural labour was expressed by 40%. Because in addition to wage labour agriculture also employs labourers on crop sharing basis, on the basis of giving them some part of land for their (labourers) use in lieu of the services provided to work on the owner's land, on annual/ biannual contract basis etc. 60% did not agree to such type of shortage. Enhancement in cost of production from 20% to 50% was pointed out by 10%. On the question of movement of labour to cities, though migration of unskilled workers has almost stopped, but when they get opportunity to work for construction activities and the like they move out for the sake of significant wage differences. And such movement was answered positively by 10%. The increase in wage of casual workers was reported by 20%, while 80% said such wages remained unchanged. Similarly the trend of village people living in the village and going out for work has increased was accepted by 20% as against 80%. Movement of such labourers for longer periods was negated by 70% in comparison to 30% saying yes. The question of change in living standard after NREGA remained undecided as division remained 50-50. However, 70% negated increase in consumption due to NREGA while 30% agreed to. But pleasantly 70% agreed that more children after NREGA are going to school. Surprisingly and rightly all the people agreed that there was no change after NREGA in the position of attached labourers. And 20% agreed that after NREGA awareness about government schemes has increased, while 80% did not agree.

**No change after NREGA in the position of attached labourers** raises a few questions that need some explanation. Because, if there is change in the wages, income, food consumption pattern, awareness, children going to school etc. after



NREGA, why these people were not benefiting? Why they are continuing as attached labourers? And what does their position mean?

Based upon the responses got personally, we take up these questions. First, In addition to wages, income etc., their position includes terms of attachment, level of debt and alternative option of work. The attached workers are generally contract workers with the land owners, hired for one year initially, but continue to work for more than one year. In absence of institutional credit, generally workers take loan from the owners for a number of purposes, emergency loan for medical purpose, for social functions like marriage, death ceremony etc.. We observed two cases- in one case contract agriculture prior to attachment was undertaken, which did not yield enough returns, pushing the worker under debt of the land owner and in the second case milk animal was bought for making some earning, but the animal after falling sick died, with the same result.

In lieu of that amount, plus some more for buying food, clothes and meeting household's needs, one year agreement for work was signed. Instead of daily wages, as the land owners have a tractor each, a part of the produce, 1/15<sup>th</sup> and in that ratio depending upon the number of workers, with equal proportion of variable cost was signed, in case of absence from work, either he had to send a replacement or the owners hired a daily wager at the cost of the worker, to meet the daily household expenses of the worker, either the land owner pays in cash or get him the household goods from the commission agent. Thus all the costs, loan amount, previous outstanding loan and interest were added up at the end of the year and the returns from the produce were matched. Finally the balance was worked out, which the worker had to clear before leaving the land owner. In case he cannot, two options were given – one to continue for another year, and two to take loan from other owner to get rid of the first. In rarest case the worker turned up a net gainer at the end of the year. **The absence of institutional credit and alternative profitable work, and higher agricultural wage rate worked against them to worsen their position.** Some immediate remedial steps for these workers to assure institutional credit without collateral, health cover, cheap food, etc. are needed. Mostly these people belong to the most backward castes,

(in this case one was potter and the other barber by caste) earlier the attached workers mostly used to be from the scheduled castes and scheduled tribes along with MBCs. The scheduled caste people now get help from many other sources, but the most backward castes have no support of any kind. Hence, they need a special package like that for the bidi workers.

In table 6.5.2 we have tried to get answers to other set of questions. For example, to question of shortage of agricultural wage labour in particular months, 60% said in the month of April, 40% in the month of March, and in the months of May, June, August, October and November 10% pointed out such shortage. The total percentage goes beyond 100 because some respondents answered more than one month. Similarly shortage of agricultural wage labour was pointed out in the months of April, May and October 10% each and November and December by 20% each. 20% said that during last 5 years agricultural wages for casual workers have increased while 80% said no change. How the improvement in living standard after NREGA took place was answered in a very interesting way. For example, to 10% it was due to govt. employment, by pakka road to another 10% and 10% said there was no water shortage after NREGA. The consumption pattern has improved to 10% because of more money in their hands and also due to assured employment and enhanced creditworthiness. Due to NREGA more children are going to school because awareness has increased and also govt. schools and school buildings have come up. 20% said because there is more discussion in the village about NREGA therefore awareness has increased. Finally on the question **for improvement in NREGA two interesting suggestions were put forward – one more money, i.e., enhancement in wages and its immediate payment, and two, work for more than 100 days and not restricted to one member per household. Its scope should be enlarged to cover every one willing to work for as many days as one wants to work.**

## **6.6 Sum Up:**

The implementation of NREGA, we observed, has changed the household economic activity, through assured employment leading to enhancement in

income, assets holding pattern, consumption pattern and also the school going of the children to some extent. Some tangible changes and others not so deep have taken place. All these activities and economic changes affect the village economy along with addition to the infrastructure of the village. We have tried to capture the changes in the village economy.

The infrastructure roads, schools, electricity, panchayat's offices etc. were more or less available in most of the villages. But in none of the village bank branch of any bank was functioning, notwithstanding the RBI guidelines of opening a branch in villages with population of more than 2000. In 60% of the villages, the fair price shop was also non-existent. These two are the main concern from the point of view of providing economical credit and subsidized food to the poor. These need to be taken up on priority basis.

The positive / negative changes in occupational structure of the villages are observed. For example, number of household with agricultural labour as main occupation has gone down by 3% whereas number of cultivating households increased from 64% to 65% due mainly to subdivision of holdings. Similarly there is increase in other occupations like transport, commerce/ business etc. by 0.8 % and 0.7%.people have changed their daily wage earnings from agriculture to construction etc.

Along with development of the economy of the state, the reduction in number of rural households totally dependent on agricultural wage labour might be one reason that wage rates in the state have gone up. The increase in all type of wages both for male and female workers all around from 30% to 50% during the period under reference and before NREGA has been noticed. Not only there is increase in wage rates in general but increase in wages for different agricultural operations was also observed.

The labour charges per day for ploughing have almost gone up by two times since 2005 and by 3 times since 2001. Transplantation of paddy is mostly done on the basis of per unit of area and the rates vary between Rs.1800 to Rs. 2500 per acre, which on average were Rs. 1200 and Rs. 800 per acre during the two

pre NREGA periods, thus going up by 50% to 200% since 2005 and 250% to 300% since 2001.

Other operations, like harvesting and threshing of wheat etc. are generally being done mechanically to save on time and costs.

Some more questions about shortage of agricultural wage labourers, agricultural labourers and particular months of such shortages, etc. were answered by the respondents. Significant among all such questions were related with awareness of the people about NREGA, other govt. schemes and about sending the children to school. Most of the people agreed to on these questions and that is the positive impact of NREGA, if people are becoming aware of such vital issues like school education and welfare schemes that is very important for the future positive development of the state and society. One serious observation was about no change in the position of attached labour which needs attention on priority basis.

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

	Within village	Nearest village	If nearest village, average distance (kms)
Road connectivity	90	10	2
Railway connectivity	0	100	21.5
Landline or mobile connectivity	100	0	0
Post Office	60	40	6.75
Co-operative credit society	40	60	3.7
Regional Rural Bank	0	100	5.1
Commercial Bank	0	100	6.4
Agricultural Produce Market	0	100	11.7
Self Help Group Centre	70	30	3.7
School Primary	100	0	0
School Secondary	80	20	4.5
School Higher Secondary	50	50	4.2
Primary Health Centre	60	40	3.5
Hospital/Dispensary	40	60	7.0
Gram Panchayat Office	100	0	0
Fair Price Shop	40	60	14.3
Any other	0	100	0

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

Occupation	Reference period 2009	2001
1. Cultivators	65.2	64.5
2. Agricultural Labour	30.9	33.0
3. Household Small Industry	1.0	0.8
4. Other Manufacturing./mining	-	-
5. Construction	1.2	1.0
6. Trade, Commerce and Business	1.3	0.5
7. Transport and Communication	0.5	0.3
8. Other Services	2.7	2.1
9. Total	100	100

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

Activity	Reference period (2009)		Before NREGA - 2005	
	Male	Female	Male	Female
Prevailing Agricultural Wages	187	165	144	115
Prevailing Non Agricultural Wages	206	188	147	126
Construction	248	200	182	140
Mining	200	150	133	100
Other skilled work	Electrician	174	-	118
	Plumber	195	-	134
	Pump-set boring	240	-	188

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

(Unit – Rs/acre or Rs/day)

Activity	Reference period 2009	Before NREGA	
		2005	2001
Ploughing	200-300	100-140	60-80
Leveling	200-300	100-140	60-80
Weeding	180-250	80-120	50-60
Paddy transplanting Rs./acre	2000	1200	800
Harvesting of wheat Rs./acre	2000	1200	800
Harvesting of paddy Rs./acre	2200	1400	1000
Harvesting of grams	-	-	-
Harvesting of pigeon pea	-	-	-
Harvesting of ragi	-	-	-
Harvesting of jowar	-	-	-
Harvesting of maize	-	-	-
Cane-cutting Rs/day	1850-2000	100	80
Harvesting other crops Rs/day	1850-2000	100	80
Digging of potatoes			
Threshing of paddy	Included in harvesting		
Threshing of wheat Rs/day	180	80	50
Winnowing of wheat/paddy			

**Table 6.5.1**  
**Qualitative questions on changes in the villages during last year (% of Villages)**

Description	Yes	No	Not sure
Was there shortage of agricultural wage labour at some point during last year	70	30	
After implementation of NREGA has there been a shortage of agriculture labour	40	60	
After implementation of NREGA the cost of production in agriculture increased by 10 percent because of Scarcity of labour	0		
Cost increased by 20 percent	10		
Cost increased by 20 to 50 percent	10		
Cost increased by 50 to 75 percent	0		
Cost increased by 100 percent	0		
Cost increased by more than 100 percent	0		
After implementation of NREGA labour who migrated earlier to town/city are coming back to work in the village	0		
More labour is migrating from the village as wage rate in the town is higher than wage rate under NREGA or other activities in the village	0		
Some labour has come back to work in NREGA but others are moving to the town/city because of wage differential	10		
There is no change in labour migration by NREGA activities	0		
After NREGA change in wages of casual labourers has increased	20		
After NREGA change in wages of casual labourers has decreased	0		
After NREGA change in wages of casual labourers remained same	80		
The trend of people living in village and going to work outside daily has increased	20	80	
The trend of people living in village and going to work outside for longer period has increased	30	70	
Has living standard improved in your village since the introduction of NREGA	50	50	
After NREGA have you witnessed increase in household consumption in village	30	70	
After NREGA have you witnessed more children are now going to the School	70	30	
After NREGA, have you witnessed change in trend of attached labour in agriculture	0	100	
After NREGA, have villagers' awareness towards Government Schemes increased	20	80	

**Table 6.5.2:  
Qualitative questions about the functioning of NREGA**

Q1.	Was there a shortage of agricultural wage labour at some point during last year? If so in which months?
Answer	March(4), April(6), May(1), June(1), August(1), Oct(1), Nov.(1)
Q.2	After implementation of NREGA has there been a shortage of agriculture labour? If yes in which years/months?
Answer	April(1), May(1), Oct(1), Nov.(2), Dec(2), Crop Season
Q.3	Give details of change in wages of casual labour during the last 5 years after NREGA
Answer	Increased (20%) Remained unchanged (80%)
Q.4	In what way the standard of living improved in your village since the introduction of NREGA?
Answer	Got employment(1), Pakki Road (1), No water shortage (1)
Q.5	In what way the household consumption improved in your village since the introduction of NREGA
Answer	Pakki Road (1), Positive(1)
Q6.	In what way NREGA has impacted the children education
Answer	Govt.School(1), Awareness(2)
Q.7	In what way NREGA has impacted the children education
Answer	Question repeated
Q.8	In what way NREGA has impacted the trends of attached labour in agriculture
Answer	No impact.
Q.9	In what way NREGA has improved villagers' awareness towards Government Schemes
Answer	20 % says increased awareness.
Q.10	Your suggestions to improve the implementation of NREGA for the benefits of both labourers as well cultivators?
Answer	Cash payment (1), More payment (2)

**Table 6.5.3****Quantitative questions related to NREGA functioning (Percentage of hh)**

Q1.	If you paid some amount to get job card: how much for job card and how much bribe.
Answer	No data
Q.2	If the job card is not kept with you, what is the reason for that?
Answer	No data
Q.3	If there is any authority that monitors the functioning of NREGA then describe the details?
Answer	No data
Q.4	If you lodged any complaints give details and also provide details of what action was taken
Answer	3 hh lodged complain (1.5%)t, 2 hh said action taken (1%).
Q.5	Provide description of the work and its starting date?
Answer	Earth work, digging (March09) Dam work, Land and Road work, Digging, filling of earth, digging of ponds (Jan, Feb, Mar, may, june, dec09)
Q.6	Provide details of family members migrated to city after implementation of NREGA and why?
Answer	Not Migrated
Q.7	Provide details of family members migrated back to village to work in NREGA and why?
Answer	Not Migrated
Q.8	Provide details of family members migrated to city after implementation of NREGA and why?
Answer	Not Migrated
Q.9	Provide details of family members migrated to city with dissatisfaction of NREGA and why?
Answer	Not Migrated



**Table:6.5.4****Details of potential benefits of NREGA (Percentage of hh)**

Q1.	NREGA enhance food security
Answer	67 % hhs agreed
Q.2	NREGA provided protection against extreme poverty
Answer	83 % HHs agreed
Q3.	NREGA enhance food security
Answer	Question repeated
Q.4	NREGA helped to reduce distress migration
Answer	84.5 % Hhs agreed
Q5.	NREGA helped to reduce indebtedness
Answer	78% HHs agreed
Q.6	NREGA gave greater economic independence to women
Answer	79.5 % HHs agreed

**Table 6.5.5****Qualitative questions related to food security (percentage of hh)**

Q1.	Do you feel that your family does not have sufficient food for the whole of year give reasons
Answer	Only 1 HH, reason sickness.(0.5%)
Q.2	Have you faced any deprivations other than food insufficiency? If yes, explain
Answer	No.
Q.3	What were the main difficulties you and your family faced during the last year?
Answer	Only 1 HH, faced sickness. .(0.5%)
Q.4	What is the most important thing your household lacks
Answer	Nothing
Q.5	. What is the suggestion for amelioration
Answer	Rate should be increased (1 HH) .(0.5%)
Q.6	Any suggestions to improve NREGA functioning
Answer	Family member should get money for sickness and work all year (1 HH) .(0.5%)

## **Chapter – VII**

### **Concluding Remarks and Policy suggestions**

**I Introduction:** Estimates of the total number of unemployed or underemployed people in India vary between 50 to 300 million. The Economic Survey of India has reported that the unemployment rate increased from 5.99 per cent in 1993-4 to 7.32 per cent in 1999-2000. To make matters worse, young people accounted for 53 per cent of the total unemployed in the country.

In absence of viable and reliable social or economic security of any kind, the majority of Indians have no option but to slave under appalling conditions for less than decent wages, often from childhood to old age. The case of brick kiln workers and also the efforts made by Swamy Agnivesh to get bonded labourers freed are telling. The brick kiln workers are not allowed to leave the work, even when some of them have no debt.

In 18 out of the 32 states and union territories where legislation on minimum wages applies, the minimum permissible daily wage is less than Rs 50; the range of minimum wages rises above Rs.100 only in four states. It goes without saying that even such low minimum wages are not always paid. To make matters worse, there are seasonal variations in availability of work and calamities of various kinds – from drought to social conflict – adversely affecting employment and livelihoods on a regular basis.

A number of programmes have been initiated in the country to provide gainful employment, enhancing rural peoples' skills, their income and thus to ensure their food security etc. but without the tangible and expected results from each of these programmes

Under the pressure of social groups, the congress party made NREGA a part of its election manifesto. Later on strong stand by the NAC and pressure of left parties on whose support the govt. was formed, it was made an essential aspect of National Common Minimum Programme of the UPA – I. The NREGA was passed in 2005 and brought into implementation in Feb. 2006, initially in 200 most backward districts spread over 27 states, another 130 districts in the following year (113 from 1<sup>st</sup> April and 17 districts of UP from 15<sup>th</sup> May). The entire

country was covered in the third year of its implementation, i.e., from 1<sup>st</sup> April, 2008.

The Act aims to provide on demand employment subject to 100 days minimum per household in a year to the rural poor through public works. It is expected to have the additional benefit of developing the infrastructure base in the countryside. Further, and importantly, an unemployment allowance has to be paid if work is not provided for any reason.

**Implementation in Haryana:** The Mahendergarh district of Haryana was one of those in the first phase. In its village Satnali, one Mr. Mahesh Kumar, 28 years of age, became the first person in the entire country to get himself registered on February 2<sup>nd</sup> to get 100 days employment @ Rs. 90/- a day. Now the wage rate under NREGA is Rs. 141 and minimum wage Rs. 151 in Haryana, which was revised on July 2009 from Rs 148 per day.

Along with Kumar, at around the same time, all 132 panchayats in the district held their special Gram Sabha meetings when work was a legal right. But in Haryana there had been labour shortage which was met by immigrant labour from states like Bihar on regular basis.

According to the information from the Department of Rural Development, Haryana fell short of the target in utilising funds as the number of applicants was insufficient.

The state could utilise only Rs 52.35 crore out of Rs 58.20 crore funds earmarked under NREGA in 2007-08.

Similarly, out of Rs 160.12 crore available, the amount spent under NREGA was Rs 110.00 crore in 2008-09. Thus only 70 per cent utilisation of the available funds could take place.

In the financial year 2007-08, 161,000 households were issued job cards which increased to 217,000 households in 2008-09.

The state has approved a labour budget of Rs 220 crore from the Union Ministry of Rural Development and this is for the first time that a labour budget has been sanctioned in advance, which is subject to revision, if required.

The Scope of NREGA has been enlarged which may help the state to fully absorb the funds which include land development, irrigation facilities and horticulture plantation which has been permitted to small and marginal farmers.

In Haryana, out of 1.5 million farmers, 998,000 (about 2/3<sup>rd</sup>) are small and marginal farmers. A number of reports have come out with unsatisfactory outcome of NREGA, particularly with regard to its implementation.

The present study based on Haryana experience attempts to look into the progress and achievements made in its implementation with the following specific objectives:

1. Identification of factors determining participation in NREGA
2. Impact of implementation of NREGA on employment generated, share of women in employment and change, if any, in their social status due to self earnings
3. Impact on wage differentials, across activities and also on non- NREGA works
4. Impact of NREGA on rural- urban migration.
5. Impact of NREGA on assets creation and their sustainability
6. Impact of NREGA on rural food security, and ,
7. Overall assessment and policy implications for further strengthening of the programme.

For collection of data, five districts, Mewat, Ambala, Panipat, Sirsa and Rewari were selected. From each district two villages – one within a radius of 5 kms and the other beyond 20 kms were to be selected. From each village 25 respondents – 20 beneficiaries of NREGA and 5 non-beneficiaries were selected for detailed enquiry. Overall the study is based upon a sample size of 250 individual respondents and 10 villages represented by the respective sarpanches/ Panchayat secretaries/ village pardhans/ or village level workers of the state government.

**II Functioning of NREGA:** We have used secondary data as available on the web site to analyse the functioning of NREGA in the state. The purpose was to have a broader picture of implementation of NREGA in the state. Data on the

web site are given quite in detail covering households with socio-economic characteristics (scheduled castes, scheduled tribes and other backward castes as well as forward castes and women workers with regard to issuance of job cards, employment generation, work demanded and provided etc. We have used data for the latest three years, viz. 2008-09, 2009-10 and 2010-11.

The work on NREGA in the state was started with two districts, Sirsa and Mahendergarh in the beginning, followed by other two, Mewat and Ambala districts in 2007 and in the remaining 17 districts in the third year. District Palwal was created in 2009-10. The progress of issuing job cards is significant during the three years. The share of SC households in the issuance of job cards was more than 50% during the three years, though it decreased from 55% 2008-09 to nearly 50% in the latest year. The percentage growth of households issued job cards in the state as a whole was around 54%.

As far as generation of person days of work was concerned, there was almost 41% increase in women participation in 2010-11 over 2009-10 and 50% increase in 2010-11 over 2008-09. Overall the share of women in generation of work days was more than 30% in the three years.

Among the districts, Mewat and Jind created more than 41% work for women in the year 2010-11, while in Karnal about 44% work was created for women. The state and some districts have achieved magnificent growth in employment generation for scheduled castes.

So far as completion of works was concerned, share of Rural Connectivity projects within the districts as well as in the state was almost 1/3<sup>rd</sup> during the last three years and it was continuously increasing from 32% in 2008-09 to about 42% in 2010-11. It was followed by Water Conservation and Rain Water Harvesting measures with more than 20% share during the three years. Other important projects getting about 15-16% share in the state as well as in the selected districts were Drought Proofing, Micro Irrigation etc. However, Rajiv Gandhi Gram Seva Kendra is also in focus. The utility of such Kendras is being questioned by the officials, village leaders and even by the conscientious NREGA workers.

About 25% of the total amount was spent in district Sirsa alone followed by Mewat among the selected districts in 2008-09. Among the activities about Rs. 5.5 crores were spent on renovation of traditional water bodies. In the following year the amount spent on ongoing/ suspended works increased by about 42%. However, in 2010-11, the amount spent increased by about 101% over 2008-09. Like 2008-09 district Sirsa topped the amount spent in the following two years as well, in 2009-10 by spending about 17% and in the year 2010-11 by spending about 19% of the total amount spent in the state.

Rural Connectivity attracted maximum of the amount spent. It was more than 38% of the total amount spent in the state in the year 2009-10 and also in the year 2010-11. Water Conservation and Water Harvesting followed the Rural Connectivity, wherein about 16% of the total amount was spent.

In sum maximum amount has been spent on Land Development, Rural Connectivity and Water Harvesting related works and all of them will have long term economies for the communities associated with.

Social audit of the works, verification of muster rolls, and, gram panchayats' and gram sabhas' meetings are key to the functioning of NREGA.

Total number of muster rolls used in the year 2008-09 for the state as a whole was 25985 but 93.8% were verified during the year. Similarly in 2010-11 about 98% muster rolls in the state were verified. However, among the districts selected for the sample, the muster rolls due and verified mostly match, except in Sirsa where only 67% muster rolls were verified.

The situation related with verification/ completion of Panchayats was no better than verification of muster rolls. In the state as whole, during the year 2010-11 about 40% verification of panchayats was not completed, whereas in the previous two years figure were about 29% and 40% less number than the total due.

In the state about 81 % and 78% works were inspected. During the first two years, whereas in the year 2010-11 almost all the works are shown as inspected, though at district level we find many lagging.

In many districts of the state meetings of the gram sabhas were not held, which as per the act was mandatory. It was in the year 2010-11 that in two districts, Ambala and Sirsa all the gram sabhas met. The assignment of social auditing is yet to mature.

We find number of individual and joint bank and post office accounts of NREGA workers increasing during the three years. But still a huge portion of wages is paid in cash. Secondly, money disbursed as wages through bank and post office accounts as percentage of total amount spent on completed and ongoing projects during the three years, 2008-09, 2009-10 and 2010-11 was merely 13.7%, 6.5% and 15.9. Keeping in mind the level of misappropriation of public funds, the disbursal of innocent workers' wages in cash is neither recommended and nor desired.

No unemployment allowance was paid even it had been reported as due for some considerable days during the year 2009-10 and for a few days in 2010-11.

As far as work projection is concerned, about 7.8 million work days for unskilled workers were projected to be generated which would mean that 78, 000 workers getting 100 days work during the year. A similar act for the urban poor will lift the entire state out of hunger and poverty and many more evils.

### **III Demographic profile of the respondents:**

The average size of the households of the beneficiaries was noted significantly large (5.59) than those non-beneficiaries (4.86) members per household. Also the earning members were more (2.68) in NREGA families than (2.36) in non-NREGA families. The ratio of male and female workers was about 55% and 45% under the NREGA category as compared to 56 and 44% under non- NREGA category. Also in the beneficiary households percentage of females was higher, 832 per 1000 males as compared to 783 in non-beneficiary households. In the working age groups of less than 60 more percentage of workers is found under beneficiary category as compared to non- beneficiaries. Whereas in the age group of more than 60 years, which is not considered suitable for physical labour a negative indicator, more people above 60 work under non-NREGA activities. Looking at the education level of both beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries, we

find more percentage of people educated at primary level in the case of beneficiary households. But in the case of illiterate persons, the major difference of about 5% exists as more people are illiterate in the case of beneficiary households.

As far as card holding pattern is concerned, we did not find any worker holding AAY card holder availing benefits under NREGA. Workers below poverty line were more than 80% in aggregate and 80% in the case of beneficiaries.

As far as migration is concerned, a very small number of persons (only 2 out of 1356) migrated during the reference year 2009.

The percentage of total man days per household as main profession was highest under agricultural casual work for the beneficiaries and non- agricultural casual work for the non-beneficiary category. But non- agricultural casual work provides significant work for the beneficiary households also. Nonetheless for 25% beneficiary households work under NREGA was main profession. Moreover, the extra employment generated through NREGA would create extra income pushing up demand for other items like fruit and vegetables, resulting in more employment and income to the venders and growers with forward and backward linkages.

For the NREGA beneficiaries, about 25% per household income also was received from NREGA activities, about 37% from agricultural labour, 33% from working on other than agricultural operations, and about 4% income came from livestock. In the case of non-beneficiary sample households, the largest share of household income (60%) came from non-agricultural wages, followed by (34%) wages received by doing casual agricultural work and about 5% income was generated by rearing livestock.

Across households the variation in income has been measured by Coefficient of variation. The CV in this case was the highest for beneficiaries, followed by income from agricultural wages. However, in the case of non-beneficiary households the highest variation was found in the case of income from agricultural wages then followed by non-agricultural wages.



As far as per capita monthly consumption of different edible items between beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries was concerned, no significant pattern emerged, except that overall food consumption was in favour of the beneficiaries. However, in terms of total monthly per capita consumption expenditure many important issues get highlighted. For example, monthly per capita consumption expenditure on food items works out to Rs, 487/- This small expenditure in both the cases of beneficiaries as well as non- beneficiaries may not be enough to save poor workers suffering from malnutrition, if not from hunger without NREGA. Even NREGA alone in the present form of providing 100 days' work at a fixed wage, will not address the issues of providing sufficient food, if the food was not provided at subsidized rates, mostly through the PDS. Because, per day per capita consumption expenditure of Rs. 13 per day in the case of beneficiaries and Rs. 12.4 in the case of non-beneficiaries, was not sufficient to provide two times food to satisfy one's hunger. Though NREGA seems to have benefited the poor directly by delivering some money and indirectly to non-beneficiaries by increasing overall wage rates, particularly during peak season, but to alleviate poverty and hunger some other steps need to be taken or improved. Wage rates need to be inflation neutral. Without effective PDS nothing will be effectively helpful to the poor to meet both ends. Many more items (food as well as non-food) need to be put under the PDS to increase their real income. Coming to the issues of beneficiaries vis-à-vis non-beneficiaries, overall persons benefiting from NREGA seem to be slightly better off, which further strengthens the arguments favouring NREGA.

In sum one can say that though progress of NREGA seems to be somewhat below targets to address the issues of gender equality with regard to employment generation and income, social equality by creating more opportunities for the deprived sections, it has helped in improvement of provision of food in the state, particularly in sections dependent mostly on wage labour.

**IV Work profile under NREGA:** As far as the work profile of the NREGA workers was concerned, the number of workers per household finding work under NREGA activities, varied from 1.35 to 1.98 in the selected districts. The average for the state as whole was 1.72 persons per household. Different social groups wise in the state as a whole, 1.75 members per household from the general category, 1.66 from scheduled Caste households, 2.33 from scheduled tribe households and 1.74 from the OBC households were getting work during the period. The number of females per household 0.62 working under NREGA activities was the lowest. Thus probably the targeted deprived sections like scheduled castes were the largest group of people to find per household work for number of family members under NREGA but the other deprived section the women, was the smallest.

The inter district variation observed in per household number of people finding work under NREGA was in the range of 1.98 in Mewat to 1.35 in Panipat. In other words, the most deserving region was able to generate more work for members per household. If the females could also be involved in a little more aggressive way, the objective of NREGA as far as involvement of different social and targeted groups and regional consideration was concerned, could have been largely met.

During the period under reference in aggregate 80 (exact 79.7) to 110 (109.5) days' work per household in the selected districts was provided, in two districts, Sirsa and Mewat, even exceeding the annual target of minimum 100 days work. In the state as a whole more than 94 days' work per household was provided during the period. Among different social groups ST households in districts Sirsa and Mewat were the largest beneficiaries getting more than 160 days' work per household during the period. In district Sirsa general category households got maximum work of 160 days. Overall in the state women got about 30 days' work per household in the state during the period.

However, per member work provided during the period varies drastically inter districts as well as inter social groups. In aggregate inter district variation is recorded from 44days (lowest) in district Rewari to 62 days in district Ambala.

Similarly among the SC members lowest number of days was 29.34 in district Sirsa to highest being 112 days in district Mewat. The lowest variation among all the groups is found in OBC members, varying from 47.47 per member in district Ambala to 58 the highest variation in district Sirsa. Among the women, the variation was found between 37 days to about 52 days.

As far as wage rate was concerned, during the period the average wage rate was about Rs 150 per day, varying across sections marginally, among ST and women workers for example. The ST workers received lowest wages (Rs. 147) among all. Though the difference in minimum prescribed (Rs. 148) at that time and the lowest paid (Rs. 147) was marginal but considering the prevalent higher rate of wages in the state at that time, it was not that small too.

The average distance of work place from the residence in the state was about 2.23 Kms, varying from 1.28 kms. in district Ambala to 2.7 kms in district Rewari. In the state between January and December 2009 (reference period) about 6% households were employed to work on rural connectivity projects. In two districts, Ambala and Panipat, there was no work on this activity whereas in the remaining three, percentage of households employed varied between 12.5 (Mewat) the maximum to 5% the minimum in Rewari. Surprisingly In none of the selected districts work on water conservation was being undertaken.

As far as quality of these works was concerned, maximum respondents, 79%, reported it to be very good, and about 20% reported it to be of good quality. None of the respondents stated it of bad quality, and that is very significant response.

As providing employment allowance in lieu of work is state's responsibility, without any bearing on the central government, in the entire state efforts were made to see that not a single paisa is provided for allowance, and work to avoid stress on the state's resources is created as per demand. The introduction of more activities, such as developing horticulture, plantation, etc. will further reduce the pressure of finding and providing work to the needy in the village. If need be some categories of works presently covered under Khadi and village industries be considered for inclusion in NREGA. That will help provide work at door steps

and open up more opportunities for the village panchayats to create jobs and productive assets.

The sample data show that there were negligible cases of immigration during the period.

**V Household assets holdings:** The assets holding pattern of the respondents confirms that barring district Rewari, they were benefiting directly for the last two - three years in the state in the form of assured employment and extra income during the lean period. Barring utensils and other unspecified small items per household all major assets like land, house property, livestock, even a few ornaments of very little value were more valued in the case of beneficiary households vis-à-vis non-beneficiary households. The difference seems significant in the total value of assets. Aggregate value of all assets per household was Rs. 89 thousand and Rs.68 thousand respectively in the case of beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries. The major difference came from land and house property. Taking the value of beneficiary assets equal to one, we find that land in the case of non-beneficiary households is just 0.63, house property 0.88, live stock 0.91, ornaments 0.64 and some other assets 0.92. However, value of consumer assets was found slightly more than one, i.e. 1.18, and utensils 1.15 in the case of non-beneficiary households.

In fact, along with contribution in the creation of infrastructure like , water harvesting, land development, plantation, etc. contribution in enhancement of personal assets of the NREGA workers is important and NREGA seems to succeed in that area. Compared with Keynesian magical formula of digging the pits and then refilling them for the sake of creating jobs to lift the economy from depression, NREGA seems to be more effective way of doing many things simultaneously – removing poverty, ensuring food and nutrition for the most targeted sections, enhancing gender equality, productively utilizing the unused valuable human labour, creating infrastructure to be useful for future longer period, saving the society from turning chaotic or criminal, and most importantly, creating demand for the industry.

As far as financial position of the respondents was concerned, barring a solitary case of a loan of Rs. 50,000/- @ 13% interest from the SBI for establishing a shop by one beneficiary household, not a single case was reported by any other household, neither by beneficiaries nor by non-beneficiaries households because for getting a loan one has to provide some assets as collateral, which for the households dependent on wage labour if not impossible would be difficult to provide. To begin with, there seems a very positive impact of NREGA that people have begin to create productive assets even by taking loan, which otherwise could not be envisaged.

But the households both beneficiaries as well as non- beneficiaries did borrow from the private money lenders. The amount and terms of loan might not have been revealed by the respondents. The other information gathered from the respondents does provide an indication of the strict terms of loan from private sources. For example, 22% respondents in aggregate (23% beneficiary households and 18% non-beneficiary households) did work for the lenders, they were indebted to.

Even though 18% reported that cooperative credit society was in existence in the village, 5% and 10% households respectively from beneficiary and non-beneficiary households were members of such a society, additionally, for the 12% respondents facility from formal credit society or Self Help Group was also available, about 7% family members were holding the membership of such a society or SHG. As much as 51% were also having live accounts in bank branch or post office, still no formal substantial credit line was opened to them.

Not only providing some material asset for collateral is essential to get loan from private sources, but also terms of repayment of loan in such cases are harsher ones, for example, high rate of interest, large repayment installments for fast recovery and some other conditions, like retention of some amount (may be one installment) even before making payment etc. That is what 23% beneficiary households and 18% non- beneficiary households reported doing wage labour for the lender.

As per the Act and rules the payment of wages to the NREGA workers has to be made either through the bank or through the post office. But only 53% beneficiaries and 44% non-beneficiaries reported having bank or post office accounts. Here also large percentage of bank accounts of beneficiaries is positive impact of NREGA. But only 78% respondents got the wages transferred to their bank accounts and 13% were paid by the sarpanch, In 21% cases of delayed payment and in 8% cases of less payment of wages complaints were lodged while 65% did not lodge any complaint.

Worksite facilities like child care, medical care or even first aid, except drinking water were not in existence.

A few things, need to be considered seriously: One, to ensure economic welfare of these groups, along with implementing the provisions of the act seriously, credit facility with convenient terms and easy availability has to be provided, two, to protect their health some strong medical/ health arrangement, through strengthening public health care system, medical insurance cover, etc. need to be put in place so that these groups if come above poverty line do not fall back due to any such reason. Recent arrangement made for bidi workers can be extended through the National Rural Health Mission to bpl card holders at least, NREGA workers and other targeted groups.

To maintain quality of assets and to ensure that no genuine worker is left uncovered under NREGA, monitoring through regular meetings of the Gram Sabha and of the monitoring committee has to be made effective. In a good number of cases there was no monitoring at all. But still the assets created were rated very highly, either very good or in some cases of good quality and expected to last for 5 years.

Food expenses for the poor always remain main head of expenditure. In poor households, particularly AAY and BPL card holders many times meals for two times for the entire family is not secure. To mitigate such distressing situation it is expected that under NREGA, along with other income from non-NREGA work or from resources like live stock etc, if one has, one will secure at least two times meals for the family, and none would go to bed with empty stomach. Moreover,

to ensure that, the minimum work days under NREGA can be increased to let us say to 200 per hh or 100 days per job seeker in the beginning. In Haryana, though people below poverty line as well as without any tangible resources do exist, but because state govt. has been providing social benefits, like old age pension, benefits to girl child for education, marriage etc. food for school children, some medical relief for the poor, the situation that people will go without food, is rare. But that does not mean that these measures will not be needed.

The NREGA has also successfully made the people more aware and conscious about the schemes, though they may not be very well versed with all the technical aspects of NREGA.

The NREGA through assets and infrastructure creation thus has generated great potential for the most deprived sections of the society, the poor, socially depressed classes and the women, who get employment and income during the lean period when it is most needed and thus helped them secure their food at least two times a day.

## **VI Impact of NREGA on village economy:**

The information gathered through village schedules shows that 90 % villages were connected with roads. In 50% villages there were double roads connecting the villages to different cities/ towns on different routes. It was only in one village that the nearest road was 2 kms away. No village was connected with railway station. The rail station on an average was 21 kms away. Telephone connectivity was 100%. In some villages even paid phone booths were noted. Post office facility was available only in 60% villages and the cooperative credit society in 40%. Despite the clear cut policy of the RBI that a bank branch with population of more than 2000 has to be opened, there was no bank branch, RRB, Cooperative Bank, or scheduled commercial one, neither public sector and nor private. In fact, the situation of rural banking is the poorest one.

Self help groups were working in 70% villages, primary school was working in all the villages, secondary school in 80% and senior secondary in 50%, PHC in 60%, dispensary and fair price shop in 40% each. The problem is related with

distance also. On average the fair price shop was distanced at about 14 kms. The gram panchayat office was in all the villages.

The main concern of the nation now seems to be food security by providing nearly 70% people with subsidized food. In absence of fair price shops in 60% villages the task would be very difficult if not impossible. Therefore, urgent and effective steps would be needed.

Other infrastructure facilities like veterinary hospital/ dispensary, village purchase centre, mechanical workshop etc. did not exist in half of the sample villages. Village purchase centres have been a major successful story of the state, which helped not only the farmers to sell their produce at the nearest place, but many times at minimum support prices also. Additionally they have been a source of non-farm employment generation through linkages as well.

Historically with the development process, the people world over have been shifting away from agriculture. The percentage of cultivator households increased from 64.5% in 2001 to 65.2% in 2009. The percentage of agricultural labourers decreased from 33% to 30% in the respective years. Those involved in trade and commerce activities increased from 0.5% to 1.3%. The number of households doing other activities like working in household small industry, construction activities, transport and the like increased marginally from 2.1% in 2001 to 2.7% in 2009.

The number of cultivator households increased due to subdivision of households and holdings. The percentage of agricultural workers decreased due to availability of other less tiring and more rewarding works like small shops, trade etc. Overall, the development and nature of works do not suggest anything contradictory to the historical development process. Except that the rate of decrease of population dependent upon agriculture is much slower as compared to rate of decrease of share of agriculture in the GDP.

In Haryana higher wage rates have been the great attraction for immigrant workers from Bihar, eastern UP and Orissa.. Even the immigrant workers were not enough to reduce the prevailing wage rates. Introduction of NREGA has further increased the wage rates, probably due to, one - that number of



immigrant labour has come down, though not eliminated completely, and two – because due to lean season earnings from NREGA local workers are not that much hard pressed to work under distress conditions. The increase in all type of wages both for male and female workers, during the period under reference has been noticed all around. In the wages of male workers almost 30% increase in agricultural wages, 40 % increase in non-agricultural wages, 36% rise in wages for construction work, more than 50% increase in mining, between 28% and 48% increase in the wages of semi skilled workers like electrician, plumber, pump set operators and mechanics has been noticed. Similarly in the case of female workers, almost 44% increase in wages for agricultural work, more than 49% for non-agricultural work, about 43% increase for construction work and 50% increase in the case of mining has been noticed. Along with effect of NREGA, general increase in price index and relatively more profits and more demand for work in construction and mining etc. due to overall increased growth rate of the economy and increase in value of agricultural output due both to prices and production, can be the possible reasons.

Overall the average wage rate after NREGA has gone up handsomely.

It is pointed out by many studies/ reports. The latest being report by the Secretary Rural Development that NREGA has affected the wage rates positively by 2 to 2.5 times as compared to pre NREGA situation.

The labour charges per day for different agricultural operations have gone up two to three times in comparison to pre NREGA period. With so many changes all around, it is but essential that village economy, particularly cost of production, consumption pattern, migration and immigration etc, get affected. Shortage of agricultural wage labour at some point of time was reported by 70%. Even shortage of agricultural labour was expressed by 40%. Enhancement in cost of production by 20% to 50% was told by 10%.

Surprisingly and rightly too all the people agreed that there was no change after NREGA in the position of attached labourers, and probably it is the serious and negative aspect of NREGA. Because increase in wage affects them directly

when they have to pay for the hired labourer by the land owner when they (attached workers) absent from work.

Finally on the question of improvement in NREGA two interesting suggestions were put forward – one more money, i.e., enhancement in wages and its immediate payment, and two, work for more than 100 days and not restricted to one member per household. Its scope needs to be enlarged to cover every one willing to work for as many days as one wants to work.

### **Concluding Remarks:**

From the above discussion and the relevant data, two issues come up clearly – one directly related with NREGA – its positive aspects and shortcomings in its implementation, and two, issues related with other aspects where NREGA and other schemes intermingle. It can be concluded that NREGA has helped improve the income level of the beneficiaries, through both, increase in wage rates and enhancement in their bargaining power, their food security, and that too with productively utilizing the scarce resources. The targeted groups, scheduled castes, scheduled tribes and women (to some extent) are the main beneficiaries of NREGA. The assets created are worth the money. The increase in percentage of school going children should be the major gain of NREGA combined with other measures like mid day meal, scholarship, free uniform, books etc. The position of attached workers who have not come out of the clutches of the rural rich is revealing.

However, many more things need to be done to improve the situation of rural India, for example, strict monitoring through Gram sabhas of the projects, list of beneficiaries, muster rolls, job cards, payment etc. In fact, the sarpanch centric system of panchayati raj needs to be made gram sabha centric through devolution of more democratic powers to the people. However, we would like to emphasize a few things for policy consideration:

8. Expansion of NREGA (200 days work per hh or 100 days work per job card) should be the minimum.
9. For improvement in the implementation, toll free application registration, complaint registration call centre scheme be made compulsory.

10. For accounts in banks, payments, job cards etc related issues administrative camps (like administration to the villages in Rajasthan, where all the officers camp in the village on specified day to settle all the issues) should be started.
11. Flow of Funds needs to be regular and not at the end of the year. For proper maintenance of records trained staff should be need based and recruited in a more liberal way instead of the present system of one project officer and one accounts assistant.
12. For monitoring of work, selection of work etc. involvement of workers' association along with some independent committee of village educated persons, may be teachers and retired government officials residing in the village, senior officers of the district, and academic staff of the local college etc. may be involved.

However, some other measures related with overall situation, other institutions also should be considered.

1. Credit facility through financial institutions needs to be improved to lift the poor above the poverty for longer periods.

2. For enhancement in real income through strengthening the PDS by inclusion of more edible as well as non-edible items at reasonable rates like CSD for the armed forces may be considered.

3. Immediate and effective steps for the welfare of the attached labour need to be taken.

4. More effective steps to strengthen the economy of the most backward sections of the society like artisans who have lost their traditional work under the new policies and development process like lohars, kumhars, carpenters, etc. need to be taken up on priority basis.

5. Health care of the rural poor needs to be taken care of either through the more effective way of public sector health services (NRHM) or through the insurance coverage.

6. For all these and many more welfare activities, the already going on schemes, like RKVY, Khadi and Village Industries, Sarve Shiksha Abhiyan,

Mother- Child care etc. need to be integrated and converged. Broad policy framework under the total monitoring of the Gram Sabha and grass root associations of the poor should be considered. The integration of schemes will help reduce the duplicity of works and projects.

7. Funds available under MPLAD, RKVY, RD and from other state and centre govt. departments should be pooled and used on the lines of RKVY and for that a greater coordination among centre and state governments, different ministries and departments need to be explored.

## References:

Sinha, B.K Secretary (R.D), T. Vijay Kumar, JS(SGSY) and N.K. Sinha, JD(NREGA): Tour Report on the visit of Sirsa (Haryana)

P. Sainath: Hindu (various write ups)

A. Roy and N.Day: CATALYST Vol. VII. Issue 2, 19

Engel, Ernst [1857], 2nd ed. pp. 28–29

SHAILLY KEDIA: Development Studies Association (DSA) Annual Conference, September 2009

Vidhya Das: NREGA – Orissa Experience, ceva

Dr`eze and Sen 1991, Dev 1995 “Strategies of Entitlement Protection”. In Hunger and Public Action, pp. 104 – 121

India Centre for Research in Rural and Industrial Development, (CRRID): Appraisal of impact assessment of NREGS in selected districts of Himachal Pradesh, Punjab, Haryana. Districts Hoshiarpur, Sirsa and Sirmaur, July-August, 2009

Prime Minister, Dr. Manmohan Singh: various speeches, address to the nation

Drèze and Sen: Hunger and public action, oxford, 1989

Reetika Khera Economic & Political Weekly, August 30, 2008

Jean Drèze and Christian Oldiges: How NREGA is doing?

Sapna kedia: Sustainable Development through Inter-sectoral Convergence

IFPRI discussion Paper 00963, 2010

ET Bureau, 26.3.2010

Aruna Roy and N Day: NREGA: Breaking new ground, The Hindu

Komal Gera, Business Standard, New Delhi, Sep.22, 2009

Sonu Jain: Indian Express, Feb 03, 2006

Economic Survey 2009-10

A. Joseph. Is the media watching poverty enough, India Together,

Times of India, Oct. 28, 2005

Prof. CHH Hanumantha Rao and Dr. P. Rangaswamy: evaluation of IRDP, Planning Commission, Govt. of India

<b>Coordinator's comments</b>	<b>Action Taken</b>
<p>1 Title to be changed and summary of details of chapters to be incorporated in the overview. Add determinants of participation in objectives.</p> <p>2. In stead of 5 selected districts, all the districts to be included in the analysis</p> <p>3 Table 3.1 to be deleted</p> <p>For Education only 6+ age to be considered</p> <p>Number of AAY card holders less</p> <p>Inconsistency in tables 3.2 and 3.3</p> <p>4. Consumption expenditure (table 3.6) to be relooked and expenditure on non-food items to be included (table 3.5)</p> <p>5. Additional regression exercises to be included</p> <p>6. Two additional rows- one for male members employed per hh and the other for % of households getting work for =&gt; 100 days to be added</p>	<p>1. No information about this change was received, but title is changed as per advice. Chapter wise summary of details provided. The objectives were copied from the available letters. Hence no deviation. But addition has been made as asked for now.</p> <p>2. Analysis of the non-sample districts has also been incorporated</p> <p>3. Table 3.1 shows horizontal % comparison with respect to sample size, therefore 2 migrants are shown as 50% each. Hence, no inconsistency in data, still the table is deleted</p> <p>Data show &lt;6 years children attending school, but calculations are redone as per the suggestion.</p> <p>Actual number of AAY ration cardholders was given, no action is needed.</p> <p>Recasting of tables 3.2 and 3.3 carried out as per the advice taking the entire sample as denominator in place of within the group average which was misunderstood as inconsistency in data.</p> <p>4. No inconsistency in consumption expenditure. It is annual as was mentioned in the table but misunderstood to be monthly. Available information on Non-food expenditure is added as suggested</p> <p>5. As mentioned in the text no major change in determinants of participation in NREGA takes place with the addition of more exercises, however, two more are incorporated as per the advice</p> <p>6. Additional rows added as desired now.</p>

**Coordinator's Comments on the Draft Report  
Impact of NREGA on Wage Rates, Food Security and  
Rural Urban Migration in Haryana**

**D.S. Bhupal  
Agro Economic Research Centre  
University of Delhi  
Delhi - 110007**

1. The title of the report was changed and indicated to all the agro centres. Kindly change the title as, **Impact of (MG)NREGA on Wage Rates, Food Security and Rural Urban Migration in Haryana**. There is slight diversion in the objectives circulated and as elaborated in the report. For example, the objective of Identification of factors determining the participation of people in NREGA scheme is not mentioned in the report. Kindly stick to the original plan. The subtitle **1.5 An Overview**: it should provide summary of details of the report. In other words, it should indicate what is the subject matter discussed in different chapters of the report.
2. It was very clearly indicated in the Proposal of the study as well as in Chapter and Table Plan that the analysis in the Chapter 2 will be based on the data available through NREGA website and this chapter presents aspects of NREGA functioning in **all the districts of the state**. The author have analyzed only the five selected districts in the report. In the subsequent chapters analysis is restricted only to the selected districts but Chapter 2 should present the desired tables for all the districts in the state. So the author should **rewrite** the chapter and include all districts (not only the selected districts) while preparing the tables as done at present in the draft report and the write up should be done in the context of functioning of the NREGA in all the districts comparing higher and lower performing districts in the state.
3. Chapter 3, Table 3.1 and Table 3.1a: It is difficult to understand the data presented in Table 3.1 (e.g., for beneficiary male percentage is given 81.4 and female 88.6 that does not make any sense, similarly data in all rows and columns is inconsistent). However, Table 3.1 is repeated as Table 3.1a for which data is consistent. The author is requested to either delete Table 3.1 or make it clear what data is being discussed and make changes in the text accordingly. The last column of Table 3.1a is about the percentage of households migrated. In the text the author has written that only one or two members have migrated while in the Table it is shown that 50 percent of the households have migrated. Kindly make appropriate corrections. While calculating education status consider only 6+ age people. Kindly check no representation of AAY card holders does not look realistic when more than 60 percent of the respondents belong to SC and all cannot have only BPL card while none having AAY card (As AAY are those BPL who are at the bottom of poverty). There seems to be problem of data inconsistency. Refer to Tables 3.2 and 3.3: For beneficiary: the share of salary in maydays per households is 0 whereas share of income from salary for the same category is 25 percent. For salaried the working days are considered as 365 man-

days per person per annum. Similarly, the average household income for beneficiaries from NREGA work is shown as 14086 and for non beneficiaries as 0 with weight of 0.8 and 0.2 for each category the aggregate average income would be 11269 whereas the figure is shown as 14016. There are similar inconsistencies. The author is advised to go through it carefully and make the necessary corrections.

4. Chapter 3, Table 3.5: Monthly consumption expenditure, the amount for non food is not given. The author is requested to provide the data for non food as well so that the comparable data is available for the consolidated report. The total expenditure shown in Table 3.6 is quoted as 32218 for the beneficiaries and 27696 for the non beneficiaries however, if you multiply the consumption expenditure per capita by the household size it should not be more than 2739 and 2303. Is the different non food consumption which is not shown in per capita consumption, If so then the author is requested to quote the per capita non food consumption by each head and correct the inconsistency in the data.
5. For the determinants of participation in NREGA, author has run one logit regression with hh size, BPL card and land value. Here is the suggestion to experiment with two sets of equations, at the household level and at the member level: taking dependent variable as participation=1 and non participation=0. The independent variables can be chosen from the list of variables on which data is collected during the field work. Some of the possible relevant independent variables list is given below for the household regression and member level regression:

Household level Regression:

Employment other than NREGA	HH Income other than NREGA	HH Size	Land ownership Dummy	Value of HH Asset	Dummy AAY card holding	Dummy BPL card holding	Dummy SC	Dummy ST	Dummy OBC
-----------------------------	----------------------------	---------	----------------------	-------------------	------------------------	------------------------	----------	----------	-----------

Member level regression only for the NREGA participating households

Wage rate in NREGA	Age	Education	HH Size	Dummy AAY card holding	Dummy BPL card holding	Dummy Sex	Dummy SC	Dummy ST	Dummy OBC
--------------------	-----	-----------	---------	------------------------	------------------------	-----------	----------	----------	-----------

In addition to logit regression, authors can also use OLS, using numbers of days worked in NREGA as the dependent variable at the household level as well as the member level and using the above mentioned variables as independent variables. Try to find out some meaningful determinants of participation in NREGA.

Chapter 4, Table 4.1: while providing information on numbers of members 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.