

---

## UNIT 5 JAWAHAR ROZGAR YOJANA

---

### Structure

- 5.0 Objectives
- 5.1 Introduction
- 5.2 Background of Wage Employment Programmes
- 5.3 Objectives of JRY
- 5.4 Salient Features of JRY
  - 5.4.1 Main Features of JRY
  - 5.4.2 Earmarking of Funds
  - 5.4.3 Types of Works Allowed Under JRY
  - 5.4.4 Components of JRY
- 5.5 Planning and Implementation of JRY
- 5.6 Achievements of the Programme
  - 5.6.1 Financial and Physical Progress
  - 5.6.2 Impact of the Programme
- 5.7 The Second and the Third Streams of JRY
- 5.8 Impact of JRY
- 5.9 Current Status of JRY
- 5.10 Let Us Sum Up
- 5.11 Key Words
- 5.12 References and Suggesting Readings
- 5.13 Check Your Progress – Possible Answers

---

### 5.0 OBJECTIVES

---

After studying this unit, you should be able to :

- explain the characteristics of the rural poor;
- differentiate between self and wage employment;
- comment on wage employment as a strategy for poverty alleviation;
- describe rural infrastructure and community asset formation under the wage employment programmes; and
- explain as to how these programmes can help in arresting rural—urban migration.

---

### 5.1 INTRODUCTION

---

India is basically an agrarian economy, as more than two third of the rural population is directly dependent on agriculture. The distribution of the land, however, is skewed. Nearly 78 per cent of the cultivators are small and marginal (possessing less than 2 hectares of land each) farmers. Of these 31.15 per cent have less than 0.2 ha of land and 11.25 per cent are almost landless (Agriculture census 1990-91). The main source of employment for most of these people is agriculture labour. Agriculture wages are also available only during agricultural activities, which is 90 to 120 days in a year. During the lean season, most of these people are either underemployed or even unemployed. Our growing population is adding to the labour force at quite a high rate, and to create jobs for an ever increasing working population is a very difficult task.

The rural unemployed can be divided into four categories: (i) literate skilled, (ii) literate unskilled, (iii) Illiterate skilled and (iv) illiterate unskilled. Majority of the rural unemployed belong to the fourth category and these people survive with only their physical labour. Poverty is therefore more concentrated among the people of this category. Keeping these factors in view and to provide employment to these people, the Government of India, for the first time, introduced a Crash Rural Employment Programme (CREP) in 1969 on a pilot basis in some selected districts and later expanded it to a few more districts, where the agriculture labour population was comparatively high. Again in 1973-74, a Pilot Rural Employment Programme (PIREP) was launched in areas presumed to be critically affected by the problem of unemployment .

Though the problem of underemployment among small and marginal farmers and artisans has existed all along, it is most acute among the agriculture labour which is growing in size day by day. It is for this reason that the wage employment programmes have become an essential part of the poverty alleviation programmes.

---

## **5.2 BACKGROUND OF THE WAGE EMPLOYMENT PROGRAMMES**

---

It has already been discussed earlier that during the Fourth Five-year Plan wage-employment programmes were introduced on a trial basis to help agriculture labour to get employment during the lean season. The two programmes under implementation during the Fourth and the Fifth Five-year Plans were CREP and PIREP covering nearly 2000 blocks, which were identified as having concentrations of agricultural labourers with acute problems of unemployment and underemployment. In the year 1978-79, these two programmes were merged and a new programme called Food For Work (FFW) was launched. During that period, the food stocks of the country were plentiful and it was thought that by providing food-grains as part of the wages, it would not only provide food at a cheaper rate to the wage earners, but also solve the problem of financial resources needed for the wage employment and at the same time make the best use of the available food stocks in the country.

In the year 1980, FFW was redesigned and renamed the National Rural Employment Programme (NREP) and extended to all the districts and blocks in the country. The NREP has twin objectives.

- i) to generate wage employment for the needy rural labour who cannot be covered under self-employment programmes; and
- ii) to create rural infrastructure and durable community assets which would in the long run help in economic development of the rural areas.

With the expansion of the coverage of the NREP, the resources for generating wage employment at the village level were found to be inadequate and therefore it was not possible to provide adequate wage employment to the wage seekers in the rural area. It was observed that NREP was not able to cover even 50 per cent of the villages in the country. In order to supplement the coverage of NREP and also to ensure wage employment for a minimum of 100 days in a year for at least one person from each family of agriculture labourers, another programme called the Rural Labour Employment Guarantee Programme (RLEGP) was introduced during the year 1983. RLEGP was a Centrally sponsored programme with 80 per cent share from the Central Government and 20 percent from the states.

The evaluation of these programme, however, revealed that even after 7-8 years of implementation, their coverage was just around 55 per cent. It was also pointed out that the objective of providing assured 100 days' employment to at least one person

of an agriculture labour family could not be met. One of the main drawbacks of these two programmes was that there was practically no participation of the village people either in identifying projects or in the planning and implementation of the works under NREP and RIEGP. Another objective of these programmes was to provide wage employment to the labourers closer to their villages. This objective either could not be met as the projects were identified by the block or district authorities at locations which were far from the villages of the employment seekers.

In order to realize the benefits of the wage employment programmes it was felt necessary to involve village people, especially through the village panchayats, and to cover all the villages, NREP and RIEGP were merged and a new programme Jawahar Rozgar Yojana (JRY) was launched in 1989.

<p><b>Check Your Progress I</b></p> <p><b>Note:</b> a) Write your answer in the space provided.</p> <p>b) Check your answer with the possible answer provided at the end of the unit.</p> <p>1) Why are the wage employment programmes necessary? Which programmes were implemented for wage employment before the introduction of JRY?</p> <p>.....</p> <p>.....</p> <p>.....</p> <p>.....</p> <p>.....</p>
--

---

### 5.3 OBJECTIVES OF JRY

---

Jawahar Rozgar Yojana was started with a view to expand the coverage of wage employment opportunities to all villages and to achieve the objective of providing employment to all wage seekers in close proximity to their villages. Accordingly, the responsibility to implement the programme was given to the Gram Panchayats.

The primary objective of JRY was to generate additional gainful employment for the unemployed and the underemployed in rural areas.

The secondary objectives of JRY were: (a) to create productive community assets for direct and continuing benefits to the poor and strengthening rural economic and social infrastructure which would lead to rapid growth of rural economy and as a result improve the income levels of the poor and (b) to bring about improvements in the overall quality of life in rural areas.

---

### 5.4 SALIENT FEATURES OF JRY

---

#### 5.4.1 Main Features of JRY

We know that JRY came into being after the merger of NREP and RIEGP, the two wage employment programmes, and its objective is also the same, but there are some differences in the process of its planning and implementation. The main features of the programme are as follows:

- Expenditure for the programme was shared by the Centre and states on 80:20 basis.

- DRDA/Zilla Parishad were made responsible for implementation at the district level and gram panchayats at the village level. The funds were directly released to the DRDA/ZP.
- Six per cent of the total JRY funds were earmarked for Indira Awas Yojana (IAY). Of the remaining, 20% were to be retained at the district level (DRDA/ZP) for inter-block/ inter-district projects and 80% to be distributed to gram panchayats.
- The works were to be executed by the village people and employment of contractors was totally banned as in the case of NREP and RLEGP.
- Preference was given to SCs and STs.
- Employment opportunities for women were reserved up to 30 per cent.
- Food-grains as part of the wages could be provided at subsidized rates.
- Non-wage component or material component was not allowed to exceed 50% of the total project cost.
- Up to a maximum of 5% of the annual allocation was allowed to meet administrative expenditure and 1/5 of it could be spent on training of the officials/non-officials involved in the implementation of JRY.
- Up to 10% of the total allocation of DRDA/ZP and gram panchayats was meant for maintenance of the assets created under earlier programmes (NREP/RLEGP) and JRY.

#### 5.4.2 Earmarking of Funds

The allocation of funds from the Government of India to the states for the programme were as follows:

- a) 6% of the total district allocation for IAY.
- b) 20 % of the total for MWS.
- c) 5% of the total district allocation for administrative expenses.
- d) Of the remaining funds – 20% for DRDA/ZP and 80% to the Gram Panchayats.
- e) Funds to be utilized for various types of scheme were as follows:
  - i) Economically productive assets - 35%
  - ii) Social infrastructure works - 25%
  - iii) Individual beneficiary schemes for SCs/STs -15%  
including Million Wells Scheme
  - iv) Other works including roads and buildings, etc. - 25%

#### 5.4.3 Types of Works Allowed under JRY

According to the JRY guidelines, such works are to be taken up as generate wage employment and also result in the creation of community assets and/or village infrastructure. Preference should be given to the following activities:

- i) Works that have potential for maximum direct and continuing benefits to the members of poverty groups;
- ii) Creation of such assets as are or can be owned by the beneficiary groups, either for direct use or for gains from the sale of the services/facilities created by the assets to ensure continuing incoming to the poverty groups.
- iii) Higher priority is to be given to works which are required for infrastructure of poverty alleviation programmes like IRDP, DWACRA, TRYSEM, DDP and

DPAP. In addition, construction of primary school buildings in the villages which have schools without buildings is also to be prioritized.

- iv) Works benefiting individuals including (i) SCs/STs, (ii) bonded labourers and (iii) allottees of ceiling surplus land holders, wastelands and government lands;
- v) Social forestry on community lands as well as private lands of SCs and STs to generate income for the poor and also to develop ecological balance and environment of the village and surrounding areas.

IAY was separated from JRY in 1995-96 and made a separate programme.

#### 5.4.4 Components of JRY

There are three sub programmes of JRY, as the funds for these are provided from the allocation under JRY. Details about these programmes are provided below:

##### *Indira Awas Yojana (IAY)*

This programme was introduced as a component of RLEGP in 1984-85. After its merger with JRY, it became one of its components for which initially 6 % of the total allocation was earmarked. This allocation was enhanced to 10 % of the total allocation under JRY in 1992-93. IAY was initiated to provide housing facilities to the most poor among Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes with hundred percent subsidy. From 1992-93 onwards, poorest of the poor from other categories were also allowed the benefits of IAY.

##### *Million Wells Scheme (MWS)*

This programme was introduced during 1988-89 and became a component of JRY in 1989. Under this scheme, open wells for irrigation were provided to the SC/ST beneficiaries free of cost. And 20 % of the total allocation was earmarked for the MWS. In 1992-93 this amount was enhanced to 30 % of the total JRY allocation. MWS was separated from JRY in 1995-96 and made a separate programme.

**Operation Black Board:** A provision for the construction of classrooms in school buildings was made under JRY in 1990-91 under the programme called Operation Black Board (OBB). Since the material component in the construction of classrooms was higher, the Department of Education provided 40 % of the cost for material and the remaining 60 % was met from the JRY with labour and material component being 40 : 60.

---

## 5.5 PLANNING AND IMPLEMENTATION OF JRY

---

The Gram Panchayats (GPs) are empowered to identify and plan for the projects they decide as most useful for the village. The GPs are also competent to accord approval to the identified projects after they are technically appraised and approved by the technical staff of the Panchayat Samiti. It is, however, necessary to discuss the project or its work plan in the Gram Sabha before it is approved. Care should be taken to safeguard the interest of weaker sections in the village and give priority to the works benefiting SCs, STs, women and other weaker section. The Gram Sabha should be appraised of the programme of the works from time to time.

In order to facilitate the technical scrutiny of the plan of action of the Gram Panchayats, the block/district authorities should prepare and approve standard designs and cost estimates of those items of works which are generally taken up by the GPs. DRDAs/ZPs were required to prepare a shelf of projects so that it helps in selecting the works are various levels. No work can be taken up unless it forms part of the annual action plan, completion of the incomplete works to be given priority over new ones. DRDA/ZP should not take such works which cannot be completed within two years.

## 5.6 ACHIEVEMENTS OF THE PROGRAMME

### 5.6.1 Financial and Physical Progress

From the inception of JRY (1989) till 1998-1999, the total availability of funds was Rs.36,826.32 crores against which Rs.28,892.71 crores could be utilized (Table-5. 1).

Table 5.1: Investment on JRY

(Rs. in Crores)

Sl. No.	Year	Total funds available	Funds Utilized	% utilization
1	1989-90 to 1991-92	9576.37	7709.83	80.51
2	1992-93	3594.63	2709.59	75.38
3	1993-94	4767.63	3878.71	81.36
4	1994-95	5418.22	4268.33	78.78
5	1995-96	5791.90	4466.91	77.12
6	1996-97	2583.38	2163.98	83.12
7	1997-98	2872.03	2451.65	82.82
8	1998-99	2222.16	1243.71	55.97
	<b>Total</b>	<b>36826.32</b>	<b>28892.71</b>	<b>78.45</b>

While the financial achievement from 1989 to 1999 was 78.45 per cent, the achievement of the targets to generate man days wages was 97.64 per cent, which is quite satisfactory. Table - 5.2 shows the targets and achievements in term of the generated man days wages.

Table 5.2: Man days generated under JRY

(Lakh man days)

S. No.	Year	Target	Achievement	Percentage Achievement
1	1989-90 to 1991- 92	25402.64	25481.47	100.31
2	1992-93	7537.95	7821.02	103.76
3	1993-94	10383.26	10258.40	98.80
4	1994-95	9865.45	9517.07	96.47
5	1995-96	8480.05	8958.25	105.64
6	1996-97	4141.37	4006.32	93.24
7	1997-98	3864.90	3960.79	102.48
8	1998-99	3966.57	1902.80	47.97
	<b>Total</b>	<b>73642.19</b>	<b>71906.12</b>	<b>97.64</b>

Assets created under the programme from 1990 to 1995-96 are detailed in Table-5.3. In 1996, the Indira Awaas Yojana (IAY) and Million Wells Scheme (MWS) were separated from the JRY and made independent programmes. Hence, a comprehensive list of assets created under JRY up to 1996 only is available.

Table 5.3: Assets created under JRY from 1990 to 1995-96

Sector	Unit	1990-91	1991-92	1992-93	1993-94	1994-95	1995-96
1. Area covered under social forestry	Lakh Ha.	2.44	0.16	0.64	0.70	0.75	0.43
2. Trees Planted	Crores	20.66	7.22	15.12	28.01	24.73	7.41
3. Works benefiting SCs & STs	Lakh No	3.79	2.21	5.31	5.48	3.11	0.37
4. Area benefited through minor irrigation	Lakh Ha.	0.36	0.22	0.21	0.43	0.29	0.19
5. Area benefited through soil conservation works	Lakh Ha.	0.16	0.07	0.14	0.16	0.08	0.03
6. Rural Roads	Lakh Km	1.30	0.33	1.23	1.17	0.79	0.30
7. Other works	Lakh No.	1.97	0.57	2.09	2.00	1.14	0.551.14
8. Indira Awaas Yojana	Lakh No.	1.70	1.20	1.92	3.60	.72	2.16
9. Land Development	Thousand Ha	12.10	5.40	8.50	5.14	6.97	685
10. Mahila Mandal	No	1477	319	1923	2571	2146	20.05
11. Construction of Houses	Thousand No	75.10	21.50	75.00	76.00	37.83	14.75
12. Development of Houses	Thousand No	12.80	4.60	10.22	5.45	4.80	19.77
13. Sanitary Latrines	Thousand No	32.30	6.20	15.27	25.58	25.07	36.59
14. Drinking water Well/Ponds	Thousand No	73.90	18.00	80.35	91.01	61.37	1.57
15. Village Tanks	Thousand No	10.70	2.70	10.72	7.47	14.14	2.35
16. Balwadies / Panchayat Ghars	Thousand No	11.40	2.00	9.32	10.69	6.74	N A
17. Wells constructed under MWS	Thousand No	56.40	110.55	180.99	149.41	158.54	

### 5.6.2 Impact of the Programme

The Ministry of Rural Development (MoRD) instituted concurrent evaluation of JRY in 1993-94 covering 470 districts, 933 blocks and 4700 Gram Panchayats. The findings of the evaluation in brief are as follows:

- a) Among the positive aspects highlighted by the concurrent evaluation one was that nearly 82.16 per cent of the available funds were spent on community projects. Construction of link roads was the highest priority. Average wages paid to the labourers were more or less close to the minimum wages presented by the state governments. The wage component was more than 52 per cent. The wages were paid either on daily basis or weekly basis. Muster rolls of the total assets created were maintained and 76 per cent of the assets were found to be good/satisfactory. The share of SCs and STs was satisfactory.
- b) On the negative side, the evaluation revealed that more than 50 per cent of elected panchayat leaders were not imparted any training for the implementation

of JRY works. The share of women in employment generation was less than the prescribed 30 per cent. Nearly half of the total works could not be completed on account of the shortages of funds. There were some discrepancies in the payment of wages to male and female workers. The use of locally available material in various works undertaken by panchayats were not satisfactory.

---

## 5.7 THE SECOND AND THE THIRD STREAMS OF JRY

---

In the year 1992-93, the *Second Stream of JRY* was introduced in 120 backward districts which had concentration of the unemployed and the underemployed. The type of works under the second stream of JRY included construction of all-weather roads, minor irrigation works, soil conservation, water harvesting structures, watershed development, farm forestry, drought proofing works, etc. The priority was for the labour intensive works and also the creation of assets leading to sustainable development of the area. In 1998-99, the Second Stream of JRY was merged with EAS.

The third stream of JRY called Innovation JRY was introduced during the same period aiming at the prevention of migration of labour and for providing employment to women through special projects. The funds for it were managed by keeping apart 10 per cent of the total allocation by the Ministry of Rural Development. Under this, innovative or specific projects, which could not be taken up under normal JRY or the second stream JRY, could be taken up in difficult or backward areas benefiting specific groups of poor people. Such projects were to be prepared by the DRDAs/ZPs or even by the NGOs and submitted to the MoRD, Government of India, directly for approval. The special features of the Innovative JRY were as follows :

- j) The projects should contain innovative elements, specially in terms of the convergence of programmes and participation of people at the ground level.
- ii) The projects should aim at benefiting special groups of people or areas that were being bypassed by ongoing rural development programmes.
- iii) Such projects as could be taken up through normal JRY should not be included under this programme.
- iv) The projects should have a tight-knit management structure.
- v) The total cost of the project should not exceed Rs. 3 Crores.
- vi) Release of funds would be made on an annual basis. The second and the subsequent installments were to be released after satisfactory implementation of annual plans.
- vii) Recurring costs such as new staff and maintenance should not be admitted in the project.
- viii) The project should not involve contractors for the execution of works.
- ix) Project should contain well planned strategy based on a thorough assessment of the geographical factors and local resources to tackle specific problems and needs of the area and the people.

After the expansion of EAS to cover all the blocks of the country during 1996–1997, the second and the third stream of JRY were merged with the Employment Assurance Scheme (EAS).

---

## 5.8 IMPACT OF JRY

---

Since the inception of JRY till March 1999, nearly Rs. 35,508 crores were spent and 73,640 lakh man-days of wage employment were created. Evaluation studies of the

programme revealed that employment generated was too inadequate to bring about any meaningful increase in the earnings of the poor wage earners. The Concurrent Evaluation conducted by the Ministry of Rural Development during June 1993 – May 1994 shows that against the target of a minimum of 100 man-days of wage employment per family per year, only 11 man-days were created. This shows that one of the major objectives of the programme, i.e. to generate employment for the rural wage earners and for the unemployed/underemployed could not be achieved.

There are many reasons for the poor performance of the programme in terms of employment generation. Some of these are: (i) the resources were too thinly spread to maximize coverage of the area and the beneficiaries, (ii) selection of the works was neither labour intensive nor did they have much relevance to the area or local needs, and (iii) the programme was perceived to be for building assets. It was also expected that by interventions in the labour market through employment generating programmes, the market wages would show an upward trend, but this did not happen either.

Notwithstanding the deficiencies of the programme as cited above, two positive results were achieved by the programme. First, the programme did succeed in creating durable community assets like School Buildings, Panchayat Ghars, Community Halls, and other such infrastructure in the villages, though some of these assets were of poor quality and in certain cases inappropriate. Secondly, the programme was executed by the Gram Panchayats, a fact that has created a sense of empowerment among local governments, besides providing sound training to the panchayat leaders in planning and managing the development of the villages. Due to growing awareness among the people about such programmes, and pressure on elected representatives, the panchayat leaders are likely to implement the programme more efficiently than the government machinery. For the fear of being voted out, the panchayat leaders are expected to be more responsive to people's needs.

---

## 5.9 CURRENT STATUS OF JRY

---

The JRY which emerged from the merger of NREP and RLEGP in 1989 was renamed Jawahar Gram Samridhi Yojana (JGSY) in 1999. Also, as the objectives and the operational strategies of JGSY and EAS were similar and overlapping, these two programmes were merged into one programme in 2001 with a new name—Sampoorna Gramin Rozgar Yojana (SGRY). While the operational methodology of the programme continues to be the same as that of the earlier programmes, one of the important features of the programme is to give equal importance to the development of rural infrastructure.

### Check Your Progress II

**Note:** a) Write your answer in the space provided.

b) Check your answer with the possible answer provided at the end of the unit.

1) Describe the objectives, funding pattern and the implementation process of JRY.

.....  
.....  
.....  
.....  
.....

---

## 5.10 LET US SUM UP

---

Jawahar Rozgar Yojana (JRY) was essentially a carry forward of the earlier wage employment programmes like the Crash Rural Employment Programme (CREP), the Pilot Rural Employment Programme (PIREP) and the Food For Work (FFW) programme of the 1970s and NREP, RLEGP of the 1980s. Initially most of these wage employment programmes were implemented in isolation and had no practical links with any other rural development programme. Later on, however, NREP and RLEGP were linked to various MNP activities like social formats for producing fuel wood and fodder, rural roads, rural housing, etc. Subsequently, the process of wage employment under JRY took a concrete shape to support various poverty alleviation programmes mainly to provide activity and group specific infrastructure and assets to support the income generating activities of the beneficiaries under various other programmes. Indira Awas Yojana for providing fully subsidized dwelling units to the SCs/STs and the very poor of the other categories, irrigation wells under *million wells schemes* and projects aiming at continuing flow of income for the poor under IJRY were the specific features of JRY, besides generating wage employment for millions of poor people in the country. The programme also helped in the construction of community assets like Panchayat Ghars, Common Work sheds, Schools and Anganwadi buildings, etc. Now, JRY and EAS have been amalgamated into a single programme called Sampoorna Gramin Rojgar Yojana (SGRY), which has been designed to support the development of infrastructure for basic services and natural and community resources to provide more opportunities for rural livelihoods and also generate more wage employment.

---

## 5.11 KEY WORDS

---

<b>Wage Employment</b>	: Employment on daily wages.
<b>Community Assets</b>	: Assets like Community Halls, Village Roads, Village Markets, etc. which are used by all the village people.
<b>Rural Infrastructure</b>	: Roads, Electrification of villages and pump sets, Hospitals, Schools, Drinking Water facilities, Market Yards, etc.
<b>Man-days</b>	: Measurement of employment in terms of ‘work done by an average adult for one day (8 Hours)’ as a unit.
<b>Minimum Wages</b>	: A minimum daily rate prescribed by the government as wages for an adult worker per day.

---

## 5.12 REFERENCES AND SUGGESTED READINGS

---

*Fourth and Fifth Plan Documents*, Planning Commission, Government of India.

*Annual Reports of the Ministry of Rural Development*, 1989-90 to 1999-2000, GOI.

*Rural Statistics*, 1990 to 2001, NIRD, Hyderabad

Rajakutty, S., 2004, “Self and Wage Employment Programmes for Poverty Alleviation in India”, *Journal of Rural Development*, Vol. 23, No. 2 (April – June, 2004).

---

## 5.13 CHECK YOUR PROGRESS – POSSIBLE ANSWERS

---

### Check Your Progress I

- 1) The rural unemployed can be divided into four categories: (i) literate skilled, (ii) literate unskilled, (iii) Illiterate skilled, and (iv) illiterate unskilled. Majority of the rural unemployed belong to the fourth category and these people survive with only their physical labour. Poverty is therefore more concentrated among this category of people. Keeping these factors in view, wage employment is seen as the only alternative for such people.

The government of India introduced a Crash Rural Employment Programme (CREP) for the first time in 1969. Again in 1973-74, the Pilot Rural Employment Programme (PIREP) was introduced in areas presumed to be critically affected by the problem of unemployment. In the year 1978-79, these two programmes were merged and a new programme called Food For Work (FFW) was launched. In the year 1980, FFW was redesigned and called National Rural Employment Programme (NREP), which covered all the districts and the blocks in the country.

### Check Your Progress II

- 1) The primary objective of JRY was to generate additional gainful employment for the unemployed and the underemployed in rural areas. The secondary objective of JRY was: (a) to create productive community assets which would provide direct and continuing benefits to the poor and to strengthen rural economic and social infrastructure which would lead to rapid growth of rural economy and as a result improve the income levels of the poor; and (b) to improve the overall quality of life in rural areas. The allocation of funds was as follows:
  - a) 6% of the total district allocation for IAY.
  - b) 20 % of the total for MWS.
  - c) 5% of the total district allocation for administrative expenses.
  - d) Of the remaining funds – 20% for DRDA/ZP and 80% for the gram panchayats.
  - e) Funds to be utilized for various types of scheme were as follows:
    - i) Economically productive assets - 35%
    - ii) Social infrastructure works - 25%
    - iii) Individual beneficiary schemes for SC/ST - 15%  
Including the Million Wells Scheme
    - iv) other works including roads and buildings, etc. - 25%

The programme is implemented by the Panchayati Raj Institutions. The Gram Panchayats (GPs) are empowered to identify and plan for the projects they decide as most useful for the village. The GPs are also competent to accord approval to the projects they identify, after they are technically appraised and approved by the technical staff of the Panchayat Samitis. It is, however, necessary to discuss the project or its work plan in the Gram Sabha before it is approved.