

**National Rural Employment Guarantee Act in Andhra Pradesh**  
*Claims and questions in operationalisation (2007-08)*

- CH. Ravi Kumar, D. Rakesh Kumar and S.  
 Seethalakshmi

*This paper presents a brief analysis of performance of NREGS-AP in 2007-08 based on the official data. We expect that the issues raised in this paper will be critiqued and tested at various levels by both policy makers and practitioners and better processes of operationalisation will be evolved.*

The Government of Andhra Pradesh formulated the Andhra Pradesh Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme (APREGS) under the NREGA for implementation in 13 districts from February 2006 and later extended this scheme to 19 districts in the State from April 2007. From April 2008, the APREGS is being implemented in 22 districts and 1098 mandals across the state. This is perhaps the first time in the country's history that such large amounts are systematically being invested in rural areas through an institutionalized framework with the twin objectives of creating durable assets and at the same time providing 100 days of guaranteed wage employment to the poor.

**Overview of NREGA in A.P:**

There are certain salient features related to the implementation of APREGS that indicate the thinking of the implementation machinery in the state

- i. Firstly, extensive computerisation of the entire Scheme has been done to facilitate availability of information up to the individual wage seeker level merely at the touch of a button. This information update is not post facto but inbuilt into the process of works sanctioned and payments made. Extensive efforts have gone into this computerisation process and it is indeed a commendable achievement. Periodically, the information is updated and one can see the details of job card holders, no of persons who have worked, number of wage days generated, type of works taken up, amount of wages paid etc., of every household registered and those who have worked.
- ii. Secondly, under the scheme, the minimum wage entitlement has been pegged at Rs.80 as compared to Rs.60 of the Act, a Rural Standard Schedule of Rates through has been evolved based on work-time motion studies and periodically the rates are modified as per the ground and weather conditions
- iii. The third significant feature in the implementation of APREGS lies in building a Social audit process into the mainstream system. The

Government initiated a massive campaign in one of the districts in collaboration with NGOs and various civil society organisations and conducted a social audit in the villages. Drawing from this experience, the Rural Development Department constituted a cell dedicated for Social audit, which trains and supports district level resource persons, who continuously carry out social audit in teams and submit reports to the respective mandal, district and state officials

More than two years of APREGS implementation has led to rich insights and learning's from the field as well as raised several questions and challenges related to the processes involved in the realisation of the entitlements that this Act guarantees to the poor. Without limiting itself either to the successes or the shortfalls of the scheme, this paper will attempt to present an overview of the whole scheme in A.P by drawing on the data presented in the GOAP's website (**as on March 2008**) and focusing the analysis on some of the following aspects of the APREGS implementation

- Extent of registered households that got employment
- Average days of wage employment per House Hold
- Category of works taken up - Priorities of the Government
- Caste and Gender Analysis
- Delayed payments and Compensation
- Technology
- Intra-regional variations

Using facts and figures from the official website, each of the above mentioned aspects are interpreted and analyzed in detail to draw out some of the key implications.

## **1. Demand and Provision of Employment**

The most important aspect of the APREGS is that it is a demand driven program unlike the earlier poverty alleviation and employment generation programs. Thus, the onus is on the government to provide employment to all those who demand work. In turn the onus is also on the people to demand employment. Hence, the crucial factor here is enabling as well as meeting, the demand for provision of work. A look at the number of households registered under the scheme as compared to the number of households that demanded work gives a clearer idea of the status of implementation.

### ***Facts and figures:***

- **According to the GOAP's website, till March - 08, about 88.7 lakh job cards were issued to a same number of households in 19 districts where as the number of households that reportedly demanded employment and got employment for the year 2007-08 was at 46.43 lakhs. This means that only 52.34% of the total registered households demanded employment and were provided the same.**
- **The Number of individual adult members who registered was at 2 crores whereas the number of individuals who attended work was only 73.51 lakhs. This comes to a dismal 37% of the individuals whose names are entered in the job cards.**

Firstly, the disparity between the households and individual members who sought and were provided work may be due to the uneven distribution of average wage employment days between and within the households.

The other important aspect of the demand-driven nature of the REGS is the registration of this demand for employment. The government records tend to provide the impression that all those who demanded employment were provided employment. But there is no documentary evidence in the form of any paper given to the wage seekers to prove that all those who demanded work were actually provided with the same. Consequently, all those households/individuals who attended work were treated as those who have demanded employment in written form. Given that the APREGS is considered a self targeting scheme, the inference appears to be that the number of households participating and the number of days they worked are actually the reflection of the scale of the demand or need for work. But is it possible that only half of the registered households needed employment and the other half did not demand or need employment? Or are there any indicators to prove that the households participating are actually the needy households and those not participating are those that do not require employment? Similar is the case with the number of days of employment, as the average for the year ending March 2008 was only 42 days.

There are a couple of ways to understand the above issues. Either the way the Government measures and records demand is not foolproof or the manner in which the success of this program is calculated is misleading. It is also worth noting that the Government here seems to be placing the onus on the poor and disadvantaged to record their demand for work without ensuring any operational systems to facilitate this process.

In assessing the Poverty focus of this programme and its outreach to the poor, there are again many ambiguities or questions that need to be addressed.

- ***The population of Agricultural labourers in the 19 districts of Andhra Pradesh is around 1.25 crores, but the participant population in this program for the year 2008 was only 73 lakhs (this number represents all the sections and not only agriculture labourers). These figures indicate that most of the agriculture labourers are left out of the program.***
- ***Around 38% of the participant households in this program are shown as being from the S.C and S.T communities. This is definitely higher than the percentage of their total population in the state which is around 24 %. But if we consider the percentage of their population amongst the poor and agricultural labourers, this figure of 38% is very less (according to different estimates their proportion is more than 60% in the BPL category as well as agriculture labour category)***

Unless the data of the households participating in APREGS and the number of days they have actually worked is calculated according to the above parameters, it is difficult to assess the effectiveness of the NREGA as a self targeting program.

Secondly, as a demand driven program , the success of APREGS lies in targeting more and more number of households in need of /demanding work. A very interesting facet of the APREGS implementation is that the outreach of the program to more number of households seems to be increasing every month. But the worrying aspect is also that more than 50% of the registered households are not demanding work. **This also brings out the lack of awareness and education about the program and its guidelines amongst the registered households.**

Though social audits are integrated in the design, they seem to be focussing more on the fund utilization rather than the process related aspects of the program. There is an immediate need to integrate the training, awareness and more importantly the demand related components as well as the implementation aspects into the social audit exercise. The very essence and spirit of the scheme is to make the poor and the disadvantaged realize their entitlements through an institutionalized framework and this element is missing to a large extent in the current scheme of things. Unless the poor are organized and demand employment as their entitlement, the program will fail to

fulfil the core spirit laid out in the Act, irrespective of the impressive data.

## **2. Wage Days and Entitlement**

The NREGA provides for a maximum of 100 days of wage entitlement per household per year. It is therefore important to take a look at the average number of wage days per household who demanded work.

### ***Fact and figures:***

- ***Till March-08, the total number of person days of employment generated is about 19.6 crores. When estimated for the 46.43 lakh households who accessed work under the scheme, the average number of wage days per household works out to 42.21 against the maximum entitlement of 100 days. (This is 42% of the maximum entitlement).***
- ***If we take into account the total number of registered job card holders (88.7 lakh households), the average number of wage days per registered household works out to just 22 days per household. (22% of the maximum entitlement)***

Even after 2 years of the APREGS implementation, the average wage employment days per household has not crossed the halfway mark of what is laid out under the act. This raises questions on the awareness levels and capacities of the beneficiaries as well as the efficiency of the Government machinery in implementing the program. At a related level, the data also raises questions on wage employment needs of different households registered under the scheme and the type/shelf of works actually being taken up. However, as compared to the previous year (2007), where the average number of work days provided per household was around 30 days, there is a significant increase in the current year.

Based on observations from field experiences, the following are some of the major reasons for poor participation of the households as well as lower provision of work days.

- Delayed payments (around 35 % payments were made after more than 15 days of work)
- Works were taken up for short duration(less than 10 days at a stretch)
- Long periods of gap after completion of one type of work to sanctioning the next

- Low participation of the wage seekers in planning the shelf of works
- Inadequate capacities of field and technical assistants

These need to be addressed in order to ensure that the scheme actually reaches out to the needy households.

### **3. Planning and Prioritisation of Works:**

In A.P there are certain works that are centrally decided and incorporated into the APREGS such as promoting bio-diesel plantations, housing schemes, laying of C.C roads and renovation of minor irrigation tanks. While plantations and repair of tanks are in the schedule -1 of the Act under works allowed, provision for laying foundation etc., for housing scheme and Cement roads was not mentioned in the possible list of works in the Act. Though housing schemes taken up as part of the APREGS may help the housing beneficiaries in mobilizing an additional amount, it raises other questions such as diversion of funds from the program as well as weakening the possibility of providing additional wage earning opportunities to the workers. The NREGS is aimed at providing supplementary/additional wage opportunities to the poor in addition to existing sources of wage income.

This can set a precedent for other state Governments for using the scheme to further their political agenda/priority by allocating the amount under REGS to similar schemes of the various state governments such as housing etc and in the process undermining the 'supplementary wage factor'. Also, because of the special emphasis on Housing in APREGS, the participation of the wage seekers who are not allotted houses gets limited.

A brief look at the work division in 2007-08 reinforces the assumption that the works are centrally decided and there is little scope for Gram sabhas either to decide on the nature of work or set the priorities.

#### ***Facts and Figures:***

<b><i>Type of Work</i></b>	<b><i>Wage Amount (in Rs Crores)</i></b>	<b><i>Percentage of Total</i></b>
<i>Water Conservation &amp; Harvesting</i>	<i>525.69</i>	<i>30%</i>
<i>Drought Proofing</i>	<i>21.52</i>	<i>1%</i>
<i>Provision of Irrigation Facilities</i>	<i>65.95</i>	<i>4%</i>
<i>Renovation of Traditional Water bodies and Tanks</i>	<i>396.81</i>	<i>23%</i>

<i>Flood Control and Protection</i>	34.44	2%
<i>Rural Connectivity to provide all weather access</i>	36.87	2%
<i>Others - Includes the housing scheme which constitutes at least 60% of this head</i>	673.85	38%

- ***It is estimated that a total of around 300 crores (constituting 20% of the total amount was paid as wages to the unskilled labour in 2007-08) for raising foundations to houses. This is in total contravention to the permissible list of works specified in the Schedule 1 of the NREGA act 2005. One wonders what the monitoring mechanism of the Central government is over this kind of deviation from the central act by a State government. (Later in the month of June,08 Government of India has initiated action to stop the works of housing under EGS)***
- ***Bio-diesel plantations, housing schemes and renovation of minor irrigation tanks constitute around 50% of the total expenditure. The major share of these three centrally decided programs mocks the whole exercise of evolving the shelf of works through active participation of all the wage seekers in the gramsabhas.***
- ***For 2007-08, out of the total works that were given administrative sanction, only 17.5% of the works have been completed. 31.9% of the works are still in progress. More than 50% of the works are either on shelf or not initiated. From these figures it is clear that most of the works are being prolonged, not being completed or not being reported as complete.***
- ***Some of the important works like land development of weaker sections etc., were presented as others, which does not give clarity on the exact spending on those type of works.***

**Key issue:**

One of the key priorities in the APREGS is the development of lands of S.C/S.T's and other weaker sections and provision of irrigation facilities to their lands. But, there are no details on how many acres of land belonging to how many S.C/S.T households have actually been developed during the year through wage provisions in the program.

Significantly though, the investments related to housing have been presented under the head “development of lands of weaker sections.” This is another factor that undermines the poverty focus of the program.

#### **4. Caste and Gender Aspects**

One of the very important aspects of the NREGA is the special emphasis that the Act places on Women, the Scheduled Castes, Scheduled Tribes and the other backward castes. The Act clearly spells out that priority be given to these groups in terms of wage employment and the formation of different committees for overseeing the implementation of the scheme at various levels of Governance.

##### ***Facts and Figures:***

***The following table gives an overview of the caste wise distribution of the wage seekers and also the distribution in terms of the registered job cardholders,***

<i>Caste/ Community</i>	<i>Registered %</i>	<i>Working %</i>
<i>Scheduled Castes</i>	<i>25</i>	<i>26</i>
<i>Scheduled Tribes</i>	<i>11</i>	<i>12</i>
<i>Backward Castes</i>	<i>46</i>	<i>48</i>
<i>Others</i>	<i>18</i>	<i>14</i>

- Out of around 73.5 lakh individuals who accessed wage employment in the 2007-08, 54% are women and 46% are men.***
- However, if one considers the distribution of wage days among men and women, 51 % of the total wage days are accessed by the 54% women wage seekers; men accessed rest 49% wage days. This means that the average per head wage days of women is marginally lower than men.***

But there is a catch in this metric. Most of the payments made for housing are booked as wages paid to women, which in practice is not true. If one deducts the amount paid to housing, then the number of wage days will be definitely far less for women than men. However, the condition of ensuring that at least 33% of the total wage labourers are women as well as wage days provided as per the guidelines has been largely satisfactory.

##### ***Key issues:***

1. ***The percentage of registered wage seekers as well as those who actually got work in Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes does not reflect the total population who are in need of wage employment. Representation of S.Cs in job card holders to the extent of 25% is definitely more than the composition of their actual population (16%). But when compared to their population in rural areas, their composition in the agriculture labourers and the BPL families, this percentage is lower than the real.***
2. ***The figures presented are a mere aggregation of the registered Individuals where as the reality is quite complex. Unless the percentage of the registered individuals from these communities is counted against the number of people in need of work from the respective communities, a true picture cannot emerge.***
3. ***Agricultural labour is not even counted as a category and details about how many of them sought employment against the actual population are not available in the current data.***

Though the numbers on the participation of the disadvantaged communities and the wage entitlements look impressive, the figures do not reveal a lot of other facets.. There has to be an immediate push from both the Government and Civil Society side to study the above aspects in detail and address the gaps to improve the program efficacy.

## **5. Delayed Payments and Compensation**

The NREGA act clearly states that wages must be paid within 15 days and failure to do so would attract payment of compensation as per the Wages act of 1936. In reality, the situation is totally different.

### ***Fact and Figures:***

- ***Out of 40.27 lakh payments made in the year 2007-08, only in 66% of the cases, the payment was made within 15 days, 23% of payments were made between 15 and 30 days, where as in 11% cases, payment was made after 30 days.***

Unlike other programmes where clear-cut timelines for payment of wages are not provided for, the NREGA empowers the wage seekers to demand their wages in time and this in turn acts as a built in safeguard to prevent misappropriation of funds to a large extent. In reality though, if the wage seekers have to wait for such long periods to get those few hundred rupees after few days of hard work, this certainly does not augur well for the program implementation. Delays in

payments also give scope for misuse of funds while discouraging wage seekers from actively participating in the program.

**Key issues:**

Another disturbing fact is that none of the wage seekers were paid compensation for the delay in payments. Most of the wage seekers are unaware of these provisions. There is also no information available on who is responsible for the delays and whom to seek compensation from. Unless the wage seekers are empowered with this information, this situation will not change. There will be no difference between a private contractor and the government if the delayed payments continue to be the trend. This will most certainly erode the confidence of the wage seekers there by making them averse to seeking wage employment.

There are also questions on the effectiveness of the provision to claim compensation under Wages Act of 1936. Can the ordinary rural wage seeker go through that rigorous procedure of claim and still end up getting meagre compensation? There is a suggestion to have a provision for compensation within the program itself similar to unemployment allowance

**6. Technology Related Issues**

One key aspect of NREGS-AP is the extensive use of information technology. NREGS- AP website is one of the best maintained websites. Here one can drill down to the wage seeker level and get details of individual wage seeker. Unfortunately this technology does not enable the wage seeker to legitimately demand his/her entitlement. Unless there is a drive to make use of existing technology that will enable the wage seeker to check malpractices, the existing technology will remain inadequate.

In the name of information technology, the maintenance of basic registers or details at the village level has been neglected. In almost all the villages, details related to job cards, work details, expenditure etc., are not readily available at the village level or the wage seekers. The Department should operationalise this process of updating and maintenance of records at village level and ensure their availability to the wage seeker on demand

It is also to be noted that the data presented is as true as it is collected. Therefore one needs to verify it on ground and feedback into the system. NGOs and other people's organisations need to play a more pro-active role in this aspect. Another important aspect is to include the presentation of month wise demand and participation of

wage labourers in the program, which will throw more insights into the seasonal variations and trends in relation to demand for wage labour in rural areas and the factors associated with the same. In the long run, this data will also be useful for seasonal planning of activities under the program in various places.

There are two contrasting and unequal scenarios that come up in relation to the use of technology in APREGS. On the one hand, A.P leads the country in terms of innovative use of IT and massive computerisation of the entire implementation process. Considerable amounts of money, time and energy have gone into this process. The use of IT in program planning, report generation and monitoring enables the bureaucrats, program managers as well as tech-savvy practitioners and consultants to access the data according to their requirements and in making complex analysis, power point presentation etc.,

At another end of the spectrum, one can see a different picture in relation to the workers. Here, in fact there is a complete absence of skill building of wage seekers in any form. Further, there is also no provision for training around new skills, innovation and introduction of drudgery saving tools and technologies. On the contrary, there appears to be a systematic process of deskilling that is occurring in various forms, following the introduction of APREGS. For example, it has been observed in many places that handloom weavers are moving from a skilled occupation for lack of adequate work and wages into 'unskilled' manual labour based activities in the program.

## 7. Region Wise Comparison

Item	Sub Item	Telangana	Andhra	Rayalaseema
<b>Number of districts</b>	-	<b>9</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Households</b>	Registered Number	<b>41.28 Lakh</b>	<b>25.88 Lakh</b>	<b>21.42 Lakh</b>
	Number who demanded work	<b>22.45 Lakh</b>	<b>12.75 Lakh</b>	<b>11.05 Lakh</b>
	Percentage of HH who demanded work	<b>54.38%</b>	<b>49.26%</b>	<b>51.58%</b>
	Avg number of Registered	<b>4.58 Lakh</b>	<b>4.31 Lakh</b>	<b>5.35 Lakh</b>

	Households per district			
<b>Wage</b>	Average Wage Days per household	<b>41.14 days</b>	<b>33.64 days</b>	<b>52.27 days</b>
	Average wage per household for the year	<b>Rs 3450</b>	<b>Rs 2709</b>	<b>Rs 4310</b>
	Average wage per day per household	<b>Rs 83.82</b>	<b>Rs 80.52</b>	<b>Rs 82.44</b>
<b>Type of Work - Amount &amp; % of total amount spent on specific type of work</b>	Amount spent on Water Conservation & Harvesting	<b>251.73 Crores</b>	<b>72.40 Crores</b>	<b>201.29 Crores</b>
	Percentage of Total Amount for Water Harvesting	<b>29 %</b>	<b>18.95 %</b>	<b>39.70 %</b>
	Amount spent on Renovation of Traditional Water bodies and Tanks	<b>221.51 Crores</b>	<b>101.1 Crores</b>	<b>74.13 Crores</b>
	Percentage of Total Amount for Renovation of Traditional Water bodies	<b>25.5 %</b>	<b>26.46 %</b>	<b>14.62 %</b>
	Amount spent on Other (includes	<b>291.16 Crores</b>	<b>190.56 Crores</b>	<b>191.86 Crores</b>

	Housing scheme)			
	Percentage of Total Amount for others - Housing Scheme	<b>33.63 %</b>	<b>49.89 %</b>	<b>37.84 %</b>

Region Wise comparison of the various parameters again throws up some very interesting facts.

i) In every region, the percentage of registered households who demanded work is identical with minor variations. The interesting aspect here is the average number of registered households in district which is substantially higher in Rayalaseema (about 5.35 lakh households per district) as compared to both Telangana and Andhra regions.

ii) As with the other parameters, Rayalaseema is doing far better than the other two regions with about 52 wage days per household on an average. This figure for Telangana is at 41 days where as for Andhra, it is at 34 days. The Average wage per household is similar across all regions. But because of the considerable difference in the number of wage days, the total wage per household per year is varying substantially across the three regions with Rayalaseema leading.

iii) There are vast differences in the priorities given to the different types of work in different regions. Water harvesting and Conservation received maximum funds in Rayalaseema with about 40% of the total funds. However, this figure for Andhra stands at a dismal 19% and for Telangana at about 29%.

Renovation of traditional water bodies received less attention and hence low funds in Rayalaseema with the amount spent on this coming to a mere 14.5 %. The other two areas spent about 26% of the funds each.

The only common factor seems to be the huge amounts spent on Government Housing schemes (in the guise of other works). In the Andhra region, a whopping 50% of the total funds were spent on this. The other two regions are not far behind with Rayalaseema standing at about 38% of the funds and Telangana at about 34%

A common feature in all the above parameters is the considerable difference between Rayalaseema and other regions. This region is far ahead on most of the indicators than the other two regions, the reasons of which need to be explored more in detail.

### 8. Comparison of Phase 1 and Phase 2

Subject	2006-07 (13 districts)	2007-08 (19 districts)
Number of registered Households	50 lakh	88.7 lakh
Number of households to whom employment was provided	17.5 lakh	46.43 Lakh
Percentage of registered Households to whom employment was provided	36%	52.34%
Number of Individuals to whom wage employment was provided	34.4 Lakh	73.51 Lakh
Average number of wage days per worked household	27	42
Average number of wage days per registered household	14	22
Percentage of Delayed Payments	43%	34%
Percentage of women to whom wage employment was provided	51%	54%
% of women wage days	25%	51%

Compared to 2006-07, there has been some improvement in the year in 2007-08. But this is slower than what is expected in such an important program. Most of the important indicators have shown little improvement. Much improvement is need in some of the most important indicators like percentage of registered households that demanded employment and the average number of wage days of employment provided. The delay in payments continues to be a significant concern along with efforts to prevent misuse of funds while at the same time compensates the wage seekers as per the provisions in NREGA 2005. A lot needs to be done if this program is to realize its true potential. Special drives with emphasis on the issues discussed above will be useful in exploring corrective actions for effective implementation of the APREGS in future.

### 9. Not a Conclusion....But more work ahead!

The primary objective of NREGA is to arrest distress migration, address starvation and hunger deaths by providing wage security of a maximum of 100 days to the needy and willing households in the rural areas. But the data presented by the department does not exactly provide an adequate basis for measuring the above indicators. By

limiting the data generation to aspects like number of households and number of days, type of works etc., many process related aspects are not being captured.

People's organisations need to decode this data and examine the impacts in detail to provide greater insights on the effectiveness and scope of the program. The most important of these are the participation of the needy households, process of works selection, saturation of the works for the development of resources of S.C and S.T, role of local panchayat bodies, functioning of program functionaries, work application and receipts process, transparency at the local level, operationalisation of grievance redressal system etc. The Rural Development Department needs to evolve appropriate information systems and studies to capture these elements so as to strengthen the program. Investment in technology development in favour of wage labourers, especially women as well as awareness building on the above aspects of the program in a massive way are other priority areas.

**Data sources: NREGA-AP website: <http://nrega.ap.gov.in>**

<b>Total No of Districts under EGS</b>		22	
<b>Total No of Mandals</b>		1098	
<b>Total No of Grampanchayats</b>		22109	
<b>Total No of Habitations</b>		73701	
<b>Total No of Jobcards Issued</b>		1,04,45,447	
<b>Total No of Adult members enrolled in Jobcards Issued</b>		2,35,12,475	
		<b>Financial Year of 2007-2008</b>	<b>Cumulative Since Inception</b>
<b>Wage Employment Demanded</b>	<b>Household (Nos)</b>	48,20,344	60,78,299
	<b>Individual (Nos)</b>	77,17,075	99,71,854
<b>Works administratively Sanctioned</b>	<b>Number</b>	10,60,642	13,01,017
	<b>Value-(Rs in Lakhs)</b>	1,02,75,36.17	1,19,38,64.68
<b>Works in-progress</b>	<b>Number</b>	3,38,423	-
	<b>Value-(Rs in Lakhs)</b>	42,27,74.60	-
<b>Total No of Works Completed</b>	<b>Number</b>	1,86,348	3,80,809
	<b>Value-(Rs in Lakhs)</b>	12,49,54.73	24,35,86.17
<b>Total Expenditure</b>	<b>Wages (Rs in Lakhs)</b>	17,24,88.61	27,98,80.83
	<b>Material and Skilled Wages (Rs in Lakhs)</b>	2,71,73.89	3,45,17.60
	<b>Contingency (Rs in Lakhs)</b>	93,71.92	1,61,44.03
	<b>Total (Rs in Lakhs)</b>	20,90,34.42	33,05,42.46
<b>Wage Employment Provided</b>	<b>Household (Nos)</b>	48,20,344	60,78,299
	<b>Individual (Nos)</b>	77,17,075	99,71,854
	<b>Men (Nos)</b>	35,47,487	45,78,515
	<b>Women (Nos)</b>	41,69,588	53,93,339
	<b>Disabled (Nos)</b>	49,223	63,186
<b>Total No of Person days generated</b>		20,82,60,362	33,91,05,188
<b>Average Wage rate per day per person (Rs.)</b>		82.82	82.54
<b>Average No of days employment provided per Household</b>		43.2	-
<b>Total No of Households completed 100 Days of Wage Employment</b>		4,44,943	5,39,113
<b>Labour Vs Material (%)</b>		87.91	12.09
		90.18	9.82

**Report for the Financial Year of 2007-2008**  
**Report as on Date 02. 06. 2008**