



Research Paper

The Problems in Implementing the Gram Panchayat Development Plan (GPDP): An Analytical Study in the Gram Panchayats, Odisha.

***Mr.Sudam Tandri**

**PhD Scholar, Centre for the Study of Social Exclusion and Inclusive Policy, University of Hyderabad, India*
Corresponding Author- Sudam Tandri

Abstract

The paper explores the implementation, status, and guidelines in preparing the gram panchayat development plan (GPDP) in Odisha. The primary purpose of the study is going to identify: first, to find out whether there is a constraint in implementing the GPDP process; second, to know the role and responsibility of the elected representatives in the process of the GPDP process at the gram panchayat level; third, to explore the guideline of the GPDP which followed or not in Odisha. Regarding the respondents' selection, the methodology chose the direct interview of the elected representatives and discussed in a quantitative and qualitative approach. Moreover, the study adopted a stratified sampling method from across seven gram Panchayats from Balangir district comprising three types Elected Representatives from ward members, naib sarpanch and Sarpanch and focusing on the SCs, STs, and OBCs category. The findings followed that the guideline of the GPDP did not follow, and no proper visioning and situational analysis were prepared in the gram panchayat. The key findings are that most elected representatives were not aware of the GPDP programmes and did not implement the GPDP. Even though they have taken training on the GPDP programme, they did not know its objectives. According to the guidelines of the GPDP, it was generating the participatory environment for the programme is missing in the gram panchayat. They had no idea how the project to complete in the process of the GPDP. Finally, this paper suggests the policy implication of the GPDP programme.

Keywords- gram panchayat development plan, vision, situation analysis, participatory environment, planning and resource.

Sudam Tandri, PhD Research Scholar, Centre for the Study of Social Exclusion and Inclusive Policy, School of Social Science, University of Hyderabad, Email id:-sudamtandimsw@gmail.com, MOB-8249844080

“True democracy cannot be worked by twenty men sitting at the centre. It has to be worked from below by the people of every village.”

Mahatma Gandhi

Received 29 June, 2021; Revised: 11 July, 2021; Accepted 13 July, 2021 © The author(s) 2021.

Published with open access at www.questjournals.org

I. INTRODUCTION

India's constitution has empowered the gram panchayat to plan and implement the schemes and developmental programmes for economic development and social justice. Last twenty-five years India and the state government released to have a constitutional decentralising planning process. In 2015, the ministry of the panchayat raj, Govt. of India issued the gram panchayat development plan (GPDP) guideline and advised the state government to devise their guideline for the GPDP. Thus, keeping in mind the centre's guidelines, Odisha has devised a guideline of the GPDP, it is called 'AMA-GOAN AMA-YOJANA' that enables the planning process at the gram panchayat level.

Gram Panchayats have been mandated to prepare Gram Panchayat Development Plan (GPDP) for economic development and social justice, utilising the resources available by the 14th central finance commission and finances provided by governments of India. The 14th Central Finance Commission (14th CFC) has awarded 200,092 crore rupees to the Gram Panchayats (G.P.) across the country for the period 2015-20 for social and economic development. Ninety per cent of this is provided as a basic grant and ten per cent as a

performance grant in the gram panchayat. The 14th central finance commission, the 4th state finance commission, MGNREGA and other development flagship programmes directly have transferred the fund to the gram panchayat. (Centre for Budget and Policy study, 2018) In order to utilise these funds, the GPDP is so essential not only in the planning process and participation of elected representatives in decision making but also in the process of good governance in the gram panchayat. The GPDP is a constitutional planning process where all elected representatives and the villagers of the gram panchayat make a plan with due process of felt need priority of the people. Section 44 and 45 of the Odisha gram panchayat act, 1964 empower the gram panchayats to provide the obligation and discretionary functions such as drinking water facilities, village infrastructure development, essential service to the village, poverty alleviation programme and so on to the villagers. (Manual of the Odisha gram panchayat act, 2015)

The AmaGaonAmaYojana (AGAY) guidelines were issued by the Department of Panchayat Raj, Govt. of Odisha vide circular no. 9293 dated 3rd December 2015, which is known as the Gram Panchayat Development Plan. As per the Odisha guideline of the GPDP (2015), the GPDP is a planning process, and the Gram Panchayat has to play the role: firstly, the Gram Panchayat has to identify the resource envelope; secondly, they can generate the participatory planning environment; thirdly, the leaders have to conduct the situation analysis and participatory planning; fourthly, projection and finalisation the development plan by the Gram Panchayat; fifthly, the Gram Panchayat has to get the technical and administrative approval from the line department; sixthly, post plan arrangement by Gram Panchayat.; finally, the training institute like State Institute of Rural Development And Panchayati Raj (SIRD and PR) should provide system support and capacity building for participatory planning to the Gram Panchayat. (Our village, our plan, SIRD, Bhubaneswar)

Why is the GPDP so crucial for the Gram Panchayat? Why the planning and participation are so crucial in the gram panchayat? Indeed, planning and participation are two significant techniques that need transparency and accountability in the gram panchayat's functioning. In Odisha, each Gram Panchayat is mandated to prepare an annual development plan, i.e. the Gram Panchayat Development Plan (GPDP), in consultation with its voters of the village, to represent the identified needs and problems the villagers in development allocations. Then, Block authorities approve the GPDP before it was discussed and approved in the gram sabha, subsequently implemented by the Panchayat body during the next financial year. The funds received in the GPDP programme are two primary sources, i.e. the central and state finance commission—this is an untied fund—thus, the Gram Panchayats are free to use these funds for any kind of development activities in their respective village. (Muherjee, R, 2019)

The main impediment of the gram panchayat was no proper planning and people's participation in the operation of the gram panchayat. Therefore, the GPDP—the planning process in the gram panchayat—was developed by India's government to make vibrant gram panchayat. The primary purpose of the preparation and implementation of the GPDP is to achieve economic development and social justice. Here, the same purpose in Article 243G of the Constitution provides for and is endowed with “Powers, authority and responsibilities of Panchayat” by the state legislature. The primary work of the Panchayat is (1) the preparation of plans for economic development and social justice; (2) the implementation of schemes for economic development and social justice as may be entrusted to them, including those concerning the matters listed in the Eleventh Schedule.” Therefore, based on the gram panchayat's role in the planning process, the GPDP programme was developed to provide planning as a right for people in the gram panchayat.

II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Chinnadurai, R & Aruna Jayamani, R (2020) highlighted how are the gram panchayat development facing the problem in the five states, viz., Sikkim, Punjab, Kerala, Maharashtra and Bihar. We found that most of the people did not know about the GPDP. Regrettably, even elected representatives do not know about the importance of the gram panchayat development plans, their goal and their purpose. Holistic development of the GPDP is missing in this study. The states government did not carry out information Education Communication (IEC) activities to educate the people about the GPDP. The majority of the gram panchayat is not conducting a situation analysis and resource envelope. In the case of the prioritisation of the problem, the people have not reported these problems to the gram sabha. The majority of the gram panchayat does not have the visioning for rural development. However, it found that states majority reported non-compliance with the guideline of GPDP.

Sinha, Rajesh Kr (n.d) find that one organisation, namely, ADIG- Association for Democratic and Inclusive Governance, Haryana, started a project to make GPDP inclusive and enhance participation in the Gram Sabha mobilising SHGs in the five gram Panchayat. They had undertaken the key activities in the process of the GPDP: started orientation programme for the elected representatives on Panchayati Raj; completed the Baseline Survey of Gram Panchayats; imparted the training on Gram Panchayat Development Plan (GPDP); partnering with local media to create awareness; initiated the mobilisation support to G.P. in the conduct of Gram Sabha, and support to G.P. in organising Ward Sabha. By doing so, the training helps the Elected Representatives and functionaries on GPDP created a better understanding of processes of GPDP and the need

to make it participatory and helped generate goodwill about the project. The SGH group was helped in community mobilisation for GPDP and for activating Gram Sabha. One of the key findings of this was that despite orientation, training and capacity building, some women elected representatives found it difficult to get out of patriarchal control in their families and did not participate completely in the GPDP process or mobilisation of the Gram Sabha.

There are very few published results about the GPDP process in the gram panchayat. Research in these areas requires studies of the GPDP process, such as a gap, implementation and status in the GPDP programme. More research is needed to understand the performance of the GPDP programme. Thus, this paper is going to fill the gap in the implantation of the GPDP process.

Objectives of the study

The study aims to determine whether there is a gap in implementing the GPDP; second, to know the role and responsibility of the elected representatives in the gram panchayat in the GPDP process at the gram panchayat level.

III. METHODOLOGY

We base this paper on both secondary and primary data. In comparison, we were reviewing the secondary data, such as analysing the guideline of the GPDP of India, the state's guideline of the GPDP and the literature of the local governance. The study area is Loisinga Block of Balangir District: there is 259 elected representative; out of that, 61 elected representatives from the Block involved in the study, i.e. 23 percent of the elected representatives out of the total. We showed it as enough proportion for the representation in this Block. Stratified random sampling used to select a sample of the elected representatives based on social categories, viz., SCs, STs, and OBCs in the gram panchayat. We conducted a direct interview with the elected representatives regarding implementing the GPDP process in this Block. A structured interview schedule was used to know the status, guidelines and performance of the GPDP process. In each social category, we selected over 23 percent of the elected representative, resulting in a sample of 61 across the seven gram Panchayat. We used simple random sampling for the selection of the gram panchayat. Thus, out of 20-gram panchayat in this Block, we selected seven gram Panchayat; Mugurbeda, Upparbhal, Taliuddar, Kusmel, Kandajuri, Baidipali and Rengali, where the data was collected. Then, 30 villages visited to meet the elected representatives for interviews across these said gram panchayats.

Universe of the Study

Table 1 describes the universe of the study and presents the social group of Ward Member and Sarpanch from Loisinga Block.

Loisinga Block	Total GP	SC	SC(W)	Total	ST	ST(W)	Total	OB	OBC(W)	Total	U	UR(W)	Total	Total WM
W.M	20	14	27	41	16	30	46	26	40	66	58	28	86	239
Loisinga Block Sarpanches	Total GP	SC	SC(W)	Total	ST	ST(W)	Total	OB	OBC(W)	Total	U	UR(W)	Total	Total Sarpanches
Sarpanches	20	2	2	4	2	2	4	2	5	7	3	2	5	20
Balangir District Sarpanches	Total GP	SC	SC(W)	Total	ST	ST(W)	Total	OB	OBC(W)	Total	U	UR(W)	Total	Total Sarpanches
Sarpanches	317	26	34	60	32	40	72	44	49	93	53	39	92	317
Balangir District W.M	Total GP	SC	SC(W)	Total	ST	ST(W)	Total	OB	OBC(W)	Total	U	UR(W)	Total	Total WM
W.M	317	34	345	689	43	435	879	512	513	1025	60	607	1214	3798
		4			5					5	7		4	

Source-Loisinga Panchayat Samiti, Balangir 2019 and Odisha state election commission, 2017 reservation of ward members and sarpanches. * W.M =Ward member, SC=Scheduled caste, W=women, ST=Scheduled tribes, OBC=other backward caste, UR= Un-reserved Category

Table 1 describes the study's universe;3798 ward members and 315 sarpanches in the Balangir district. We selected Loisinga Block as the study area; the total ward members and sarpanches are 239 and 20, respectively. In this Block, the ward members from the social group are three categories: the Scheduled Caste ward members are 41; the STs ward members are 46; the OBCs ward members are 40; and the general ward members are 86. In this Block, nearly 60 percent are women ward members in the reservation category of SCs, STs and OBCs. In Balangir District, almost 50 percent of women elected ward members are reserved in the SCs, STs and OBCs. Among all of the ward members, the general category is the highest at 1214 in the district. In the general category, 50 percent male and 50 female, respectively. In the district, the total SCs, STs and OBCs ward members are 689,879 and 1025, respectively. Concerning the number of sarpanches, there are 60, 72 and 93

reserved for the total SCs, STs, and OBCs, respectively. The general category sarpanches are 92. On average, 55 percent of women sarpanches are reserved in SCs, STs, OBCs and general categories. We focused the present study on the SCs, STs, and OBCs elected representatives in Loisinga Block of the Balangir District, as it considers this social group as a marginalised people.

Profile of the study area

In Loisinga Blocks, the total male and female are 48208 and 47725, respectively; among them, the SC population: the total male and female are 8491 and 8493, respectively. So, there are 17.7 percent of SCs population and 18.34 percent of STs population in this Block. Similarly, in the Balangir district, SCs and STs population is 17.9 percent and 21.1 percent, respectively. (Census, 2011) The literacy rate is 69.82 percent in this Block, while 64.72 percent of the literacy rate is in Balangir District. It is higher than the district. The main worker, marginal workers and are 25.85 percent, 61.36 percent, respectively. In Balangir District, 2011, the sex ratio is 987, and it is 979 in Odisha. Keeping the services provided by the gram panchayat in this Block, there are 63 Public Distribution Service, 2201 BPL card holders, 1206 Antodaya card beneficiaries and 16 Annapurna beneficiaries who are getting essential commodities such as wheat, rice, sugar and kerosene. In 2013-14 of the Block, there is 801 cumulative number of women SHG groups formed. Further, 175 of Anganwadi centre is working in this Block. Social security programmes such as Madhubabu Pension Yojana, Indira Gandhi National Old Age, Indira Gandhi National Disabled Pension, Indira Gandhi National Widow Pension, and National Family Benefits Schemes are running beneficiaries numbers are 5342, 4367, 247, 1078 and 24, respectively in this Block. (District statistical Hand Book Balangir, 2015)

IV. RESULTS OF THE STUDY

The following are the results of the study:

Education qualification of the elected representatives

The result of the study is that 5 (8.2 per cent) are illiterate, and the highest percentage of the respondents are 29 (47.5 per cent) who have upper secondary education. Having a good education of elected representatives make a difference in the decision making process at the grassroots governance. Out of the 61 elected representatives, the primary education and lower secondary education are 9 (14.8 per cent) and 8 (13.1 per cent).

Occupation of the elected representatives

Out of the 61 elected representatives, 34 (55.7) women representatives are housewives or home-maker. Out of 30 women ward members, 2 (6.7 per cent) and 1 (3.3 per cent) women representatives work as a labour and business. The majority of the elected representatives' occupation is a housewife. Out of 61 elected representatives, 15 (24.6 per cent) male representatives are doing the agricultural work. Moreover, 10 (24.6 per cent) elected representatives are labour.

Economics status of the elected representatives

The Above Poverty line cardholder is a total of 13 numbers; among this, 6 (85.7 per cent) sarpanches, 2 (40 per cent) naib sarpanches and 5 (10.2 per cent) ward members. 75 percent of the Below Poverty Line cardholder is the highest among the elected representatives.

Monthly income status of the family

The monthly income determines the performance of the elected representatives in the decision-making process at the grass-root governance. It is the family's monthly income of elected representatives. Out of the 61 elected representatives, 35 (57.4 per cent) elected representatives, the highest percentage, have the lowest income group, viz. 1000 -5000. Moreover, 19 (31.1 per cent) elected representatives earn a monthly income group of 5000-10000. 5 (8.2 percent) of elected representatives had made between 10001 to 15000 who became the sarpanch.

Table 2 the social category of the elected representatives

sex	designation	SC	ST	OBC	GENERAL	Total
Male	Sarpanch	1(33.3%)	1(33.3%)	0	1(33.3%)	3(100%)
	Naib sarpanch	0	0	2(100%)	0	2(100%)
	Wards Members	8(42.1%)	7(36.8%)	4(21.1%)	0	19(100%)
Female	Sarpanch	2(50%)	0	1(25%)	1(25%)	4(100%)
	Naib sarpanch	2(66.7%)	0	1(33.3%)	0	3(100%)
	Wards Members	13(43.3%)	6(20%)	11(36.7%)	0	30(100%)
Total		26(42.6%)	14(23%)	19(31.1%)	2(3.3%)	61(100%)

Source-Field survey,2019

Table 2 shows that 61 elected representatives took part in the interviews from 7 Gram Panchayat. Further,26 (42.3 percent) of SCs, 14(23 percent) of the STs, 19(31.1 percent) of the OBCs and 2 (3.3 percent) of general category elected representatives were selected as a sample. Because the study focused on marginalised elected representatives; therefore, more percent of respondents were selected from the SCs, STs and OBCs. Then, 24(39.3 percent) of the male and 37(60.7 percent) of the female elected representatives undertaken: 3 men and 4 female sarpanches, 2 men and 3 women naibsarpanches, 19 men and 30 women ward members were participated to express their opinion on the process of the GPDP. In Loisinga Block, there is 259 elected representative; out of them, 61 elected representatives from the Block participated in the study. Finally, we chose 23 percent of the elected representatives out of the total, which is shown as enough proportion for the representation in this Block. Concerning the sampling method, the stratified sampling method was applied because each group of SCs, STs, and OBCs, and both men and women, were proportionately represented.

Table 3 shows awareness details of the respondents on the GPDP programme

sex	designation	Aware	Somewhat aware	No aware	Total
Male	Sarpanch	3(100%)	0	0	3(100%)
	Naib sarpanch	1(50%)	1(50%)	0	2(100%)
	Wards Members	1(5.3%)	15(78.9%)	3(15.8%)	19(100%)
Female	Sarpanch	4(100%)	0	0	4(100%)
	Naib sarpanch	2(66.7%)	1(33.3%)	0	3(100%)
	Wards Members	9(30%)	10(33.3%)	11(36.7%)	30(100%)
Total		20(32.8%)	27(44.3%)	14(23%)	61(100%)

Source-Field survey,2019

Table 3 shows that 20 (32.8 percent) of the elected representatives were aware of the GPDP, and 27(44.3 percent) of the elected representatives were somewhat aware of the process. At the same time, 14(23 percent) of the elected representatives were not aware of it. All sarpanches were conscious of it. The ward members who trained on the GPDP with the support of the State Institute of Rural Development and Panchayati Raj through the Non-Government Organisation were only somewhat aware of the process of the GPDP. However, they cannot express the details of the process, aim, and objectives of the GPDP. Women elected representatives were more ignorant than men elected representatives. To illustrate that in this study, 3(15.8 percent) male ward members and 11(36.7 percent) women ward members did not know the GPDP process. All respondents replied that there is no such committee for the GPDP where they can take part to deliberate on the GPDP process. Similarly, all respondents agreed that they had not followed the proper guideline of the GPDP, which the Odisha Government issued in 2015.

Table 3 awareness details of the elected representatives on the 14th Central Finance Commission funds

sex	designation	Aware	Somewhat aware	No aware	Total
Male	Sarpanch	3(100%)	0	0	3(100%)
	Naib sarpanch	2(100%)	0	0	2(100%)
	Wards Members	4(21.1%)	9(47.4%)	6(31.6%)	19(100%)
Female	Sarpanch	4(100%)	0	0	4(100%)
	Naib sarpanch	3(100%)	0	0	3(100%)
	Wards Members	5(16.7%)	15(50%)	10(33.3%)	30(100%)
Total		21(34.4%)	24(39.3%)	16(26.2%)	61(100%)

Source-Field survey,2019* CFC means central finance commission

Table 4 mentioned that the 14 Central Finance Commission grants are untied funds. The G.P. can utilise these funds for essential services like water, sanitation, electricity, roads, parks, playgrounds, crematoria, burial grounds, and other crucial services specified in the State Acts. In this context, 21(34.4 percent) of the elected representatives were aware of CFC grants and their usage. Whereas 24(39.3 percent) of the elected representatives were somewhat aware of the funds, they could not know the details utilising it. Further, 16(26.2 percent) of the elected representatives conveyed that they are not aware of these funds. All sarpanches were aware of these funds and it's utilisation. Unfortunately, more women elected representatives than men

counterparts were uninformed regarding the utilisation in the process of the GPDP. Although the central government directly releases these funds to the G.P. for the services mentioned above, the G.P. cannot utilise the funds to achieve the target.

Table 5 details the functioning of the standing committees (S.C.) in the gram panchayat

sex	designation	all (S.C.)	some (S.C.)	No Committee	Total
Male	Sarpanch	0	3(100%)	0	3(100%)
	Naib sarpanch	0	2(100%)	0	2(100%)
	Wards Members	0	4(21.1%)	15(78.9%)	19(100%)
Female	Sarpanch	0	3(75%)	1(25%)	4(100%)
	Naib sarpanch	0	3(100%)	0	3(100%)
	Wards Members	0	13(43.3%)	17(56.7%)	30(100%)
Total		0	28(45.9%)	33(54.1%)	61(100%)

Source-Field survey,2019,* S.C.- Standing Committee

As per the Odisha gram panchayat rule, 2014 and guideline of the GPDP, 2015, there is seven standing committees: planning and finance, drinking water and sanitation, PDS and forestry, education and culture, agriculture and animal husbandry, health and women and child development, and handicraft and village industry. Some of these committees formed, of which 28 (45.9 percent) of the elected representatives agreed. Besides, 33(54.1 percent) of the elected representatives reported no such committees are functioning in their respective G.P. Even if some standing committee was formed, most of the committees are inactive.

Table 4 describes having the vision of the elected representatives for the gram panchayat

sex	designation	Yes	No	Total
Male	Sarpanch	3(100%)	0	3(100%)
	Naib sarpanch	1(50%)	1(50%)	2(100%)
	Wards Members	3(15.8%)	16(84.2%)	19(100%)
Female	Sarpanch	3(75%)	1(25%)	4(100%)
	Naib sarpanch	3(100%)	0	3(100%)
	Wards Members	13(43.3%)	17(56.7%)	30(100%)
Total		26(42.6%)	35(57.4%)	61(100%)

Source-Field survey,2019.

Table 6 display the importance of visioning of the gram panchayat;visioning is an essential value for the elected leaders to develop their locality. Every leader should have the vision to make the upliftment of the people. In the GPDP process, visioning is an important goal to create a model panchayat. Here, 35(57.5 percent) of the elected representatives answered that they do not have the vision to develop their locality. Fortunately, 26(42.6 percent) elected representatives had the vision to develop their locality. For instance, they provide drinking water and sanitation to all households, open defecation accessible villages, pucca houses for every household, etc. However, visioning for the GPDP is completely missing in the Block. We found that elected representatives had their personnel vision to develop their locality but no collective vision for the gram panchayat described in the guideline of the GPDP.

Table 5 describes having the planning of the elected representatives for the next year

sex	designation	Yes	No	Total
Male	Sarpanch	3(100%)	0	3(100%)
	Naib sarpanch	2(100%)	0	2(100%)
	Wards Members	9(47.4%)	10(52.6%)	19(100%)
Female	Sarpanch	4(100%)	0	4(100%)
	Naib sarpanch	1(33.3%)	2(66.7%)	3(100%)
	Wards Members	15(50%)	15(50%)	30(100%)
Total		34(55.7%)	27(44.3%)	61(100%)

Source- Field survey,2019

Of course, planning is the apparent goal of the gram panchayat. Without planning of the gram panchayat for rural development, the works and execution become disorganised. As a result, the developmental goal of the gram panchayat remains unfulfilled. The fundamental idea of the GPDP is all about planning; therefore, we asked the respondents to have any plan for the upcoming year concerning rural development in the village. Table 7 shows that 34(55.7 percent) of the elected representative's accords have chalked out the forthcoming year's schedule. For example, they installed the streetlight in the village, installed the drinking water tank, built the bathing ghat for the ladies, repaired the school building, and constructed the culvert and small check dam. All sarpanches had well-known the planning for the developmental work in their respective gram panchayat. In this study, 35(55.7 percent) of the elected representatives conceded that they plan the gram panchayat for rural development. Unfortunately, 27(44.3 percent) respondents alleged that they did not know their Panchayat planning. In sum, the ideas of the GPDP is moving backwards in local governance.

Table 6 describes the participation of the elected representatives in the process of the GPDP's process

sex	designation	Yes	No	Total
Male	Sarpanch	3(100%)	0	3(100%)
	Naib sarpanch	2(100%)	0	2(100%)
	Wards Members	1(5.3%)	18(94.7%)	19(100%)
Female	Sarpanch	4(100%)	0	4(100%)
	Naib sarpanch	0	3(100%)	3(100%)
	Wards Members	0	30(100%)	30(100%)
Total		10(16.4%)	51(83.6%)	61(100%)

Source- Field survey,2019

It is essential to emphasise that most of the respondents, viz.51(83.6 percent) did not participate in the process of the GPDP. (Table 8) Only 10(16.4 percent) of the elected representatives participated in this process. All sarpanches participated in the process of the GPDP. In brief, only sarpanches were active in the formulation of the GPDP's strategy. However, most of the ward members abstained from the process of the GPDP of their respective G.P. The guideline of the GPDP did not correctly follow in a way: however, there was not functioning any standing committee for the improvement of any developmental work; there was no special gram sabha for the GPDP in the gram panchayat. Only the sarpanch and Panchayat executive officer sit together in the office; they decide a plan for the GPDP. Later, they submit this to the Block Development Officer(BDO) for approval and releasing funds. Finally, at the BDO office, support for the plan was done and uploaded on its website.

Table 7 shows capacity building details of the elected representatives on the GPDP programme

sex	designation	Yes	No	Total
Male	Sarpanch	3(100%)	0	3(100%)
	Naib sarpanch	2(100%)	0	2(100%)
	Wards Members	16(84.2%)	3(15.8%)	19(100%)
Female	Sarpanch	3(75%)	1(25%)	4(100%)
	Naib sarpanch	3(100%)	0	3(100%)
	Wards Members	20(66.7%)	10(33.3%)	30(100%)
Total		47(77%)	14(23%)	61(100%)

Source-Field survey,2019

A skill training institute (Network for Information and Computer Technology, Indore) engaged as empanelled organisations to provide the areacapacity building & training to the elected representatives. This activity is sponsored by State Institute Rural Development and Panchayati Raj, Bhubaneswar, under the Rashtriya Panchayat SasaktikaranKaryakram.

In 2017-2018, the elected representatives attended the capacity building training programme only twice a year on the role and responsibility in the GPDP programmes. Table 9 shows that 47(77 percent) of the elected representatives were trained on the GPDP in this Block. Nonetheless, they could not remember what they had

learned in the training programmes about GPDP. Unfortunately, 14(23 percent) of the respondents conceded that they did not attend any training programme on the subject of their GPDP.

Table 8 details knowing the identification of the resource envelop of the elected representatives in the gram panchayat

sex	designation	Yes	No	Total
Male	Sarpanch	3(100%)	0	3(100%)
	Naib sarpanch	0	2(100%)	2(100%)
	Wards Members	9(47.4%)	10(52.6%)	19(100%)
Female	Sarpanch	4(100%)	0	4(100%)
	Naib sarpanch	0	3(100%)	3(100%)
	Wards Members	10(33.3%)	20(66.7%)	30(100%)
Total		26(42.6%)	35(57.4%)	61(100%)

Source- Field survey,2019

Table 10 depicts the identifying the resource in the gram panchayat is an essential process in the GPDP; therefore, it is paramount for the elected leaders to know the source of the resource in the gram panchayat. Notably, the elected representatives had no idea the source of the gram panchayat source is coming from. However, in this study, 35(57.4 percent) respondents stated no ideas on the fund's source. However, all sarpanches know the source of the funds in their respective gram panchayat. The gram panchayat's major source is the following: the 14th central finance commission grants, the 4th state finance commission, centrally sponsored schemes, state-sponsored schemes, own resource of the revenue, and donation. However, most of the respondents were not aware of these sources for the gram panchayat funds. As far as the resources envelop in the GPDP is concerned, the elected representatives and government officials of the panchayat raj institution are undertaking the process of the GPDP without the participation of people and channelisation of all sources of the resource.

Table 9 details the involvement of elected representatives in generating the participatory environment for the GPDP

sex	designation	Yes	No	Total
Male	Sarpanch	3(100%)	0	3(100%)
	Naib sarpanch	1(50%)	1(50%)	2(100%)
	Wards Members	6(31.6%)	13(68.4%)	19(100%)
Female	Sarpanch	4(100%)	0	4(100%)
	Naib sarpanch	0	3(100%)	3(100%)
	Wards Members	8(26.7%)	22(73.3%)	30(100%)
Total		22(36.1%)	39(63.9%)	61(100%)

Source-Field survey,2019

According to the guideline of the GPDP of Odisha, it is a vital role of the government officials and the elected representatives to generate a participatory environment in the process of the GPDP. In Table 11, 39(63.9 percent) respondents didn't develop a participatory environment in implementing the GPDP programme. On the other hand, 22(36.1 percent) of the respondents have invested in generating a participatory environment in the gram sabha. It observed that people's participation in gram sabha is not augmenting, even though the effort had done by the elected representatives to make a participatory environment. However, most women ward members, viz, 22(73.3 percent) and 13(68.4 percent) men ward members, were not involved in the environment generating process.

Table 10 describes knowing the situation analysis and participatory planning by the elected representatives

sex	designation	Yes	No	Total
Male	Sarpanch	3(100%)	0	3(100%)
	Naib sarpanch	3(100%)	0	3(100%)
	Wards Members	8(42.1%)	11(57.9%)	19(100%)
Female	Sarpanch	4(100%)	0	4(100%)
	Naib sarpanch	2(66.7%)	1(33.3)	3(100%)
	Wards Members	6(20%)	24(80%)	30(100%)

Total	25(41%)	36(59%)	61(100%)
-------	---------	---------	----------

Source-Field survey,2019

In table 12,out of 61, 36(59 percent) of the elected representatives did not participate in situation analysis for participatory planning. The situation analysis means investigating the public service facility available in the gram panchayat in five areas: infrastructure, civic amenities,economic development, social development, and natural resources. Only 25(41 percent) respondents know the situation analysis because they had the gram panchayat's stock-taking idea.What is the gap in services providing in the village? Which infrastructure is not available in their villages? All sarpanches were aware of some issues that need to address these questions in their respective villages. The majority of 24(80 percent) women ward members did not seemfamiliarwith the situation analysis.

Table 11 knowing by the elected representatives on the projection and finalisation development plan by the Gram Panchayat

sex	designation	Yes	No	Total
Male	Sarpanch	3(100%)	0	3(100%)
	Naib sarpanch	2(100%)	0	2(100%)
	Wards Members	5(26.3%)	14(73.7%)	19(100%)
Female	Sarpanch	4(100%)	0	4(100%)
	Naib sarpanch	3(100%)	0	3(100%)
	Wards Members	7(23.3%)	23(76.7%)	30(100%)
Total		24(39.3)	37(60.7%)	61(100%)

Source- Field survey,2019

Table 13 depicts that after the situational analysis and participatory planning exercise in the process of the GPDP, all the focus items were submitted to Gram Panchayat for assigning the appropriate technical person to prepare cost norm, timeline, component, implementation strategy, and arrangement performance indicator and expected outcome of the projects. Then, the project proposal was prepared and submitted to the gram panchayat. As per the recommendation of the proposal, the funds allocated are based on the estimates prepared. In this context, 24(39.3 percent) of the respondents agreed that they knew the projection and developmental finalisation plan by the Gram Panchayat. Whereas 37(60.7 percent) of the elected representatives had no ideas on the projection and developmental finalisation plan by the Gram Panchayat

V. DISCUSSION ON THE GPDP AND PARTICIPATORY PLANNING

Overlapping with the GPDP's guideline's shortcoming, the gram panchayat of the Odisha somehow was following this guideline. Virtually, only the sarpanch and panchayat executive officer(PEO) prepare the plan of the GPDP without consulting either the standing committee of the gram panchayat or the ward members. Indeed, neither the ward members nor the government officer of the line department participated in the process of the GPDP.Only the panchayat executive and sarpanch prepare the plan for the GPDP. Yet, a few ward members were attaching to the GPDP process because they were the Sarpanch people. Even though the standing committees constituted in the gram panchayat of Odisha, these committees were not operative.

As the elected representatives had trained on the GPDP programme at the beginning of the year when they were placed as the elected representatives; so,47(77 percent) of the respondents were aware of the GPDP programme. For monitoring the GPDP process, the sarpanches and standing committee members did not receive prominent support from any government official regarding the formulation of the GPDP.

The project proposal was being submitted in the gram sabha for approval with a few people's participation. Even though 37(60.7 percent) of the elected representatives had no ideas in preparing the project proposal for the GPDP. The study reveals that the majority of people were not informed about the preparation of the GPDP. The people were called to attend Gram Sabha meetings like any other panchayat meeting, and eventually, resolutions were passed and approved.

Viewing the situation analysis and participatory planning in the gram panchayat, most elected representatives had no ideas on what resources are available, how the resource map in the gram panchayat, and then found the service delivery gap. It was found that no collective vision for the GPDP is absent in the gram panchayat. Regarding disseminating the information to people, no IEC (Information, Education, and Communication) activities about the GPDP were carried out by the elected representatives in the gram panchayat. Thus, the majority of the elected representatives and people did not know the GPDP process.

The guideline of the GPDP, Odisha Government, has no mention the role of the ward members in the formulation of the plan. Similarly, there is no specific role of the standing committee's member in the process of the GPDP. In this guideline of Odisha, it had stated that people should participate in gram sabha for approval of the GPDP. The main impediment to the people's participation is that fewer people are participating in the gram sabha. Thus, people are not aware of the GPDP programme. It has not recognised the voice of women members of the gram sabha as mandatory in the guideline of the GPDP in Odisha. It observed that there was no stipulate to recognise the voice of the marginalised group, viz., scheduled caste, scheduled tribe and women, their special representatives in different standing committees in the process of the GPDP in Odisha. It was observed in this study that no special gram sabha for the GPDP process in Loisinga Block.

VI. POLICY IMPLICATION ABOUT THE GPDP

Gram Sabha has gained importance in rural development where people can participate directly to make their plans. Therefore, there should conduct a special gram sabha for the GPDP programme. The campaign for people's participation in the planning process should be organised at the gram panchayat level. More people's participation can enhance the governance process in the gram panchayat. This programme, which aims at the planning and people's participation, should give importance to scheduled caste, scheduled tribe and women's participation in gram sabha. The capacity building and training should organise existing PRI staff to perfect the social welfare project. Besides, office personnel, skill human resources and inter-departmental convergence need to improve their sheer interest in implementing the GPDP. It is an impetus to train continuous Capacity building for elected representatives to enhance motivation, leadership, and attitude towards the village's development. As a result, it strengthens the process, the status of preparation of GPDP.

VII. CONCLUDING REMARK

This is consistent with the previously drawn conclusion that the Block and District level coordinating committee on the GPDP programme should activate and channel the gram panchayat level. The GPDP programme would follow proper guidelines in the gram panchayat. State institutes of rural development should frequently organise the elected representatives' capacity building in terms of the GPDP to enhance participatory planning skills. By employing frequent visits by the district officer and block level to the gram panchayat, the monitoring committee and the standing committee would activate and comply with preparing the GPDP process. Finally, including the subject specialist, planning expert and line department representatives in the planning committee in the gram panchayat can bring the subjective changed in the worth of the GPDP. All elected representatives should be provided with incentives by the state government to mobilise people in order to participate in the process of the GPDP. Since several issues remain unaddressed, it suggests a future extension that the research needs to explore the several problems in the GPDP programme.

REFERENCES

- [1]. Census, 2011, retrieved from <https://www.censusindia.gov.in/2011>
- [2]. Centre For The Budget And Policy Studies. (2018). An Analysis on Devolution of Funds to Panchayats under 14th CFC and 4th SFC and their impact on Outcomes for Social Sector with reference to Women and Children in Odisha. Retrieved from <http://www.cbps.in/governance>
- [3]. Chinnadurai, R & Aruna Jayamani, R (2020) status and process of gram panchayat development plan (GPDP) – an analysis from selected states in India, Volume 8, Issue 6 June 2020, IJCRT, [http:// www.ijcrt.org](http://www.ijcrt.org). pp.2031-2036
- [4]. District statistical handbook Balangir. (2015). Government of Odisha, District planning and monitoring unit, Balangir
- [5]. Government of Odisha, Panchayati Raj Department (2015). Our village our plan, Retrieved from <https://www.panchayat.gov.in/documents>
- [6]. Muherjee, R. (2019) Creating enabling environments for civil society to influence annual budgets, the case study of two gram panchayats in Ganjam district, Odisha, watershed empowering citizen, retrieved from <http://courseware.cutm.ac.in/wp-content/uploads/2020>
- [7]. Our village, our plan, (2015) Government of Odisha, Panchayati Raj Department, SIRD and PR, Bhubaneswar, Retrieved from <https://sirdodisha.nic.in/>
- [8]. State Institute of Rural Development and Panchayati Raj, Bhubaneswar (n.d.). *Our village, our plan*, retrieved from <https://www.sirdodisha.nic.in/>
- [9]. Sinha, Dr Rajesh Kr (n.d) Action Research Findings on Participation in Gram Sabha and Gram Panchayat Development Planning, Volume I, Issue 1, Indian Journal of Democratic Governance, Indian Institute of Democratic Leadership, pp.47-53
- [10]. The Orissa gram panchayat manual. (2016). Orissa Law Reviews, Cuttack