CHAPTER – IV

Accounting Framework and Financial Management

The funds for implementation of schemes / projects were allocated to the departments in their respective budget head by the Finance, Revenue and Expenditure Department (FRED) without any district-wise segregation except for the direction and administration head for which district specific department-wise allocations were reflected. The funds required by the districts for implementation of scheme / project was allocated to the district by their head office on receipt of requisition by the district offices based on resources made available by the FRED.

Neither the district administration nor any other authority was vested with the responsibility to maintain consolidated accounts of the funds inflow to the district and expenditure incurred there against. As a result, total quantum of funds received by the district during 2006-07 to 2010-11 and the expenditure there against was not available centrally with any of the district authorities such as DC, DDO or DPO.

4.1 Budget and Expenditure

As mentioned in the preceding paragraphs, fund flow statement was not available in the district centrally with any of the authorities. The details of funds received and expenditure for the selected major schemes during 2006-07 to 2010-11 was, however, collected from the various implementing departments/agencies and have been shown in the table below:

Table-4.1 (₹ in lakh)

Department	Scheme	Receipt/ Provision	Expenditure	Unspent balance	Percentage of non- utilisation of funds
Rural Management and Development	NREGA	5619.48	5370.48	249.00	4.43
	PMGSY	13652.07	13652.07	Nil	0
	PMGY	184.88	177.36	7.52	4.07
	ARWSS (CSS)	975.52	966.70	8.82	0.90
	VWSS (State)	384.44	382.70	1.74	0.45
	NLCPR	578.98	579.98	-1.00	
	NABARD	282.07	280.32	1.75	0.62
	IAY	455.55	381.42	74.13	16.27
	RHS	1067.42	986.70	80.72	7.56
	Total Sanitation	183.64	173.04	10.60	5.77
Zilla Panchayat	BRGF	742.90	682.42	60.48	8.14
	12 th Finance Commission	173.20	125.95	47.25	27.28
	Others	1312.32	849.86	462.46	35.24

Department	Scheme	Receipt/ Provision	Expenditure	Unspent balance	Percentage of non- utilisation of funds
Tourism	NLCPR&Other CSS	6362.59	4210.36	2152.23	33.83
Health Care, Human Services and Family Welfare	NRHM	1062.13	947.29	114.84	10.81
Human Resource Development	SSA	2517.44	2333.02	184.42	7.33
	MDM	761.05	761.03	0.02	0
	NLCPR	330.34	330.35	-0.01	-
	NABARD	302.73	302.41	0.32	0.11
	NEC	82.02	82.02	Nil	-
District Collector	MPLADS	791.72	634.43	157.29	19.87
	Land Bank Scheme (State Plan)	158.55	146.96	11.59	7.31
Energy and Power	RGGVY	2564.00	1826.30	737.70	28.77
	NLCPR	2071.76	2086.08	-14.32	•
	NEC	443.91	443.85	0.06	0.01
Roads & Bridges	NLCPR	1647.41	1284.97	362.44	22.00
	NABARD	1776.23	1701.18	75.05	4.23
	NEC	4058.81	4055.76	3.05	0.08
	CRF	30.44	30.43	0.01	0.03
Water Security &	NEC	792.41	775.97	16.44	2.07
Public Health	ACA	925.77	894.58	31.19	3.37
Engineering	PMGY	10.00	10.00	Nil	ı
Urban Development & Housing	NABARD	593.39	593.37	0.02	0
Irrigation & Flood Control	ACA	314.51	314.51	Nil	=
	NABARD	235.15	205.85	29.30	12.46
	Bramhaputra Board	737.85	724.46	13.39	1.81
	AIBP	258.40	181.92	76.48	29.66

Source: Departmental figures

The unspent balances ranged between 0 and 35.24 per cent, the highest being ZP followed by Tourism, Irrigation & Flood Control, Energy and Power, Roads & Bridges, Member of Parliament Local Area Development Scheme (MPLADS), IAY, National Rural Health Mission (NRHM), Rural Housing Scheme (RHS), Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan (SSA) and National Rural Employment Generation Scheme (NREGA). Audit analysis of the reasons for unspent balances in case of IAY revealed that the funds could not be utilised in full as the beneficiaries could not complete the construction within the scheduled time and thus could not claim subsequent second instalment. The constitution of various Committees as enshrined under NRHM guidelines for implementation of the schemes in the district and village level was delayed in initial years leading to unspent balances under NRHM. The position, however, showed improvement in the subsequent years.

4.2 Decentralised Financial Planning

The State Government announced (September 2009) its decentralised planning for speedy implementation of schemes / projects through payment of bills of the district at their doorsteps and accordingly delegated following financial powers:

Table-4.2

Authority	Tenders		
Gram Panchayat	Up to ₹ 20 lakh		
Block Development Officer	₹ 20 lakh to ₹ 50 lakh		
Sub-Divisional Magistrate	₹ 50 lakh to ₹ 100 lakh		

It was noticed in audit that decentralisation was only partially successful as the line departments were dependent upon the resources released by their head of the department who in turn were dependent upon FRED for resource allocation. Accordingly, although the powers were vested with the district authorities, bills could not be released without the consent and approval of the head of the departments. This was not only against the intent of the notification but also time consuming and adversely affected the progress of works in the district.

4.3 Conclusion

The total quantum of funds received by the district during the financial year and expenditure there against was not available centrally either with DC or any other district authorities and the unspent balances ranged upto 35.24 *per cent* in case of flagship programmes (NLCPR, IAY, NRHM, NREGA, etc.).

4.4 Recommendation

DC may be vested with the authority to exercise control over the receipt of funds and expenditure there against by the various offices of the district through submission of returns to DC on monthly basis.