



**Independent Process Monitoring of APRLP
By
WASSAN**

**1st Report of Anantapur District (Draft)
March 2007
Nov 06 to Feb 2007**



INDEX

Cluster 1: Awareness Generation And Rapport Building.....	3
Cluster 2: Conducting Situation Analysis.....	5
Cluster 3: Integrating Existing Institutions.....	6
Cluster 4: Identification Of Poor Families.....	7
Cluster 5: Formation Of New Groups.....	8
Cluster 6: Experiential Learning Of Communities.....	9
Cluster 7: Action Planning.....	10
Cluster 8: Action Planning For Productivity Enhancement And Enterprise Promotion.....	12
Cluster 9: Gender Scrutiny Of Action Plans.....	14
Cluster 10: Approval Of Action Plans.....	15
Cluster 11: Implementation Of Action Plans – Initial Tasks.....	16
Cluster 12: Capacity Building Inputs.....	17
Cluster 13: Role Of User Groups In Execution Of Works.....	18
Cluster 14: Completion Of Works And Records.....	20
Cluster 15: Implementation Of Productivity Enhancement And Enterprise Promotion Plans.....	21
Cluster 16: Sustainability And Growth.....	22



Report of Independent Process Monitoring of APRLP			
District	Anantapuram	Time Period:	Up to November 06
Cluster: Awareness Generation and Rapport Building			Cluster No: 1
Details of Sample: Total 5 Projects Old APRLP (2 Nos); Hariyali (2 Nos) and APRLP+ (1 Nos)			
Key Questions:			
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What methods were used to bring awareness about watershed program in the village? 2. Where were they conducted to bring awareness in the village watershed program? 3. Where special efforts made to target women in awareness camps? 4. Did men and women discuss together about the issues of watershed project, during awareness/ initial phase? How did these discussions happen? 5. Were there any formal agreements / MOU between PFA and GP? How did this happen? Do you know the details/content of the same? 			
Good Processes:			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Dandora, Meetings, Gram Sabha were the common processes followed to generate awareness (3 Nos/ 5 villages). o Unlike the other processes Kalajatha was most common process followed to generate awareness (4 Nos/ 5 villages). o Awareness programmes were conducted in temple premises (2 Nos/ 5 villages) o Gram Panchayat / Ratcha barda were used as venue for awareness programmes at village level (1 Nos/ 5 villages) o Special efforts were made to target women in awareness programmes (4 Nos/ 5 villages) o Men and women discussed together about the issues of watershed project during awareness/initial phase (5 Nos/ 5 villages) o Village organization members/ Gram Panchayat members knows about the details of MoU made between PFA and VO/GP (3 Nos/ 5 villages) 			
Processes that Need Improvement:			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Only Kalajatha was conducted (1 Nos/ 5 villages) o No efforts were made to involve women in awareness programmes (1 Nos/ 5 villages) o Discussions between men and women were incomplete (1 Nos/ 5 villages) o No one knows about the details of MoU made between PFA and VO/GP (2 Nos/ 5 villages) 			
Recommendations for Improvement:			



WASSAN



- Kalajatha programme to be conducted in all villages
- Orientation to WDT on gender aspects in regular intervals
- Transparency to be maintained at all levels (PIA, GP and VO) in all stages of the watershed programme. Details about each and every aspect have to be shared to the community through meetings and displaying on walls.



Report of Independent Process Monitoring of APRLP			
District	Anantapuram	Time Period:	Up to November 06
Cluster: Conducting Situation Analysis			Cluster No: 2
Details of Sample: Total 5 Projects Old APRLP (2 Nos); Hariyali (2 Nos) and APRLP+ (1 Nos)			
Key Questions:			
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What methods are employed to conduct situation analysis of the village? 2. On what themes, PRA was conducted? 3. What important problems were identified during the initial phases? 4. Who played key role in identification of problems? 5. Whether issues related to women were discussed (work loads, etc)? 			
Good Processes:			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Participatory tools were used to conduct situation analysis (4 Nos/ 5 Villages). o Natural Resource Management was the major theme which PRA was conducted on (3 Nos/ 5 villages) o Natural Resource Management related problems were discussed during situation analysis (1 Nos/ 5 Villages) o Farmers, SHGs, User Groups, Village elders and Village Organization played key role in identifying problem (1 Nos/ 5 villages) o Gram Sabha played key role in identification of the problems (3 Nos/ 5 villages) o Issues related to women were discussed (2 Nos/ 5 villages) 			
Processes that Need Improvement:			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Situation analysis was not done (1 Nos/ 5 villages) o PRA was not conducted on any theme (1 Nos/ 5 villages) o Problem identification was not performed during initial stage of the watershed programme (1 Nos/ 5 villages) o Issues related to women were not discussed (3 Nos/ 5 villages) 			
Recommendations for Improvement:			
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Promote systematic approach for situation analysis for each component of watershed project. 2. Orient and develop capacities of WDTs and facilitators to conduct participatory situation analysis. 			



Report of Independent Process Monitoring of APRLP			
District	Anantapuram	Time Period:	Up to November 06
Cluster: Integrating Existing Institutions			Cluster No: 3
Details of Sample: Total 5 Projects Old APRLP (2 Nos); Hariyali (2 Nos) and APRLP+ (1 Nos)			
Key Questions:			
1. What existing institutions/groups were recognized, during initial phase?			
2. What inputs were provided from the project, to the identified existing groups?			
Good Processes:			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ SHGs were most common groups which were recognized at village level (5 Nos/ 5 villages) ○ Village organization was recognized (2 Nos/ 5 villages) ○ Training inputs were provided to all identified institutions/groups (5 Nos/ 5 villages) ○ Credit and financial linkages were provided to identified institutions/groups (3 Nos/ 5 villages) 			
Processes that Need Improvement:			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Farmers' groups were not identified (5 Nos/ 5 villages) ○ Inputs are limited to only training programs, but not financial inputs (2 Nos/ 5 Villages). 			
Recommendations for Improvement:			
1.			



Report of Independent Process Monitoring of APRLP			
District	Anantapuram	Time Period:	Up to November 06
Cluster: Identification of Poor Families			Cluster No: 4
Details of Sample: Total 5 Projects Old APRLP (2 Nos); Hariyali (2 Nos) and APRLP+ (1 Nos)			
Key Questions:			
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. How poor families were recognized? 2. Whether women dependent families/ poor women were recognized? 3. Whether families of wage laborers were recognized? 4. Are there any poor people, who were not members of any group? 			
Good Processes:			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Survey conducted by Indira Kranthi Patham (Velugu) was used to identify poor families in the village (2 Nos/ 5 Villages) o PRA exercise was performed for identification of the poor (2 Nos/ 5 Villages) o Women dependent families/ poor women were identified formally (5 Nos/ 5 Villages). o Families dependent on wages are identified formally (4 Nos/ 5 Villages) o There are no poor families/ members, who are not part of any group (2 Nos/ 5 Villages) 			
Processes that Need Improvement:			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Poor families are not formally identified (1 Nos/ 5 Villages) o Families dependent on wages were not identified formally (1 Nos/ 5 Villages) o There are still poor families/ members, who are not part of any group (3 Nos/ 5 Villages) 			
Recommendations for Improvement:			
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Sensitize WDT/ MDT/ Grama Panchayati and Village Organization to formally recognize women dependent/ wage dependent/ poor families. 2. IKP PoP list to be used as a basis for PoP identification, but triangulation to be done as IKP list was old. 3. Organize special "drive" with appropriate support services (community facilitators/ activists/ book writers and IKP teams) to identify poor, form and strengthen their institutions in a time bound manner. 			

Report of Independent Process Monitoring of APRLP			
District	Anantapuram	Time Period:	Up to November 06
Cluster: Formation of New Groups			Cluster No: 5
Details of Sample: Total 5 Projects Old APRLP (2 Nos); Hariyali (2 Nos) and APRLP+ (1 Nos)			
Key Questions:			
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What new groups were formed after the watershed development program was initiated in the village? 2. How was the user groups formed? What was the basis for forming/ identification of UG member? 3. Whether UG were formed for private land? 			
Good Processes:			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o New SHGs were formed (4 Nos/ 5 Villages) o User Groups were formed (2 No/ 5 villages) o Labour Grops, Village organization, watershed committee and watershed association were formed (1 Nos/ 5 villages) o User Groups were formed based on the resources (3 Nos/ 5 villages) o User groups were formed for private land (2Nos/ 5 Villages) 			
Processes that Need Improvement:			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o SHGs were not formed (1 Nos/ 5 villages) o Diversity of institutions is limited. Largely Self Help Groups, User Groups and Labor Groups are the new institutions. o User Groups are not formed (2 Nos/ 5 Villages) o User Groups are not formed for private land (3 Nos/ Villages) 			
Recommendations for Improvement:			
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Strengthen institution development process of watershed projects. 2. Build the capacities of WDT to strengthen institution development of the project. 3. Ensure that social mobilizers/ community level facilitators are deployed in adequate numbers. 4. Orient the WDT members on the importance of user groups and formation process of user groups. 			



Report of Independent Process Monitoring of APRLP			
District	Anantapuram	Time Period:	Up to November 06
Cluster: Experiential Learning of Communities			Cluster No: 6
Details of Sample: Total 5 Projects Old APRLP (2 Nos); Hariyali (2 Nos) and APRLP+ (1 Nos)			
Key Questions:			
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Whether watershed is divided into sub watershed or not? 2. Who participated in the above process? 3. How action plan was prepared for identified sub watersheds? 4. How was the approval for action plan taken? (First Sub Watershed)? 			
Good Processes:			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Watershed is divided into sub watersheds (3 Nos/ 5 villages) o Farmers, User Groups and Village organization participated in delineation process (1 Nos/ 5 villages) o Action plans for identified sub watersheds are prepared (1 Nos/ 5 villages) o Action plans was approved by Gram Sabha/ Watershed Committee (1 Nos/ 5 villages) 			
Processes that Need Improvement:			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Watershed is not divided into sub watershed (3 Nos/5 village) o Action plan for identified sub watersheds was not prepared (2 Nos/ 5 villages) o Only financial estimates was prepared (1 Nos/ 5 villages) 			
Recommendations for Improvement:			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Clear instructions to be passed from project authorities to PIAs regarding watershed delineation. o This phase is meant for developing the capacities of communities/ Grama Panchayati by experiencing/ executing the watershed development project activities on a small scale. The WDT/PIA members seem to have limited understanding on this provision of guidelines. o Orient the WDT/ MDT on the importance of experiential learning phase of the project and ensure that all activities during this phase are well understood and appreciated by the project facilitators. o Make this phase and related activities as a mandatory process. o Organize technical training programs on the process of watershed delineation and sub watershed/ user group based action planning process. o Ensure that project activities and funding are co-related. 			

Report of Independent Process Monitoring of APRLP			
District	Anantapuram	Time Period:	Up to November 06
Cluster: Action Planning			Cluster No: 7
Details of Sample: Total 5 Projects Old APRLP (2 Nos); Hariyali (2 Nos) and APRLP+ (1 Nos)			
Key Questions:			
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What kinds of plans were prepared in watershed project? 2. How are the action plans prepared for NRM? 3. Who participated in the preparation of action plans for NRM? What activities are identified? 4. Whether common property resources are identified in the village or not? 5. What are they common property resources are identified in the village? 6. Whether any action plans are prepared for developing common property resources in the watershed area? 7. Whether men and women participated in action planning process of private lands and other CPR? 			
Good Processes:			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Horticulture, Land development, Ground water development and enterprise promotion plans are prepared (5 Nos/ 5 villages) o Productivity and Irrigation plans are prepared (4 Nos/ 5 villages) o Livestock and Drinking water for Human plans are prepared (2 Nos/ 5 villages). o Action plans are prepared through transact walk (1 Nos/5 villages) o NRM action was prepared based on the needs of the community (1 Nos/ 5 villages) o Farmers and village organization were participated in preparation of action plans (2 Nos/ 5 villages) o User Groups and Gram Panchayat were participated in preparation of NRM action plans (1 Nos/ 5 villages) o Common Property Resource were identified in the village (3 Nos/ 5 villages) o Tamarind orchard Block plantation and Waste land were identified as a common property resources (1 Nos/5 villages) o Action plan was prepared for identified common property resources (3 Nos/ 5 villages) o Men and women participated in action planning process (3 Nos/ 5 villages) 			
Processes that Need Improvement:			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o No livestock plans are prepared (3 Nos/ 5 villages) 			



WASSAN



- Common property were not identified (2 Nos/ 5 villages)
- No action plan is prepared for identified common property resources (2 Nos/ 5 villages)
- Men and women didn't participate in action planning process (2 Nos/ 5 villages)
- Action plan for drinking water didn't participate (2 Nos/ 5 villages)

Recommendations for Improvement:

- Orient the WDT / Village Level Facilitators/ Grama Panchayati/VO members on the basic components of watershed action plan.
- Orient the WDTs on importance of CPRs in action plans and the process of preparing comprehensive action plans for CPRs (including usufruct rights).
- Orient the Village Organization to take the responsibilities of action planning for productivity enhancement and enterprise promotion.
- Sensitize men to encourage women's participation in action planning process.
- Sensitize WDT members to play the role of a facilitator, rather than the main active "decision takers" role.



WASSAN



Report of Independent Process Monitoring of APRLP			
District	Anantapuram	Time Period:	Up to November 06
Cluster: Action Planning for Productivity Enhancement and Enterprise Promotion			Cluster No: 8
Details of Sample: Total 5 Projects Old APRLP (2 Nos); Hariyali (2 Nos) and APRLP+ (1 Nos)			
Key Questions:			
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. How the productivity Action Plans were prepared? 2. How the interventions related to productivity enhancement are decided? 3. Who participated in the Productivity enhancement works in action plan? 4. How the interventions in enterprise promotion action plans were decided? 5. How are the interventions related to enterprise promotion are decided? 6. Who participated in E.P. Promotion planning process? 7. Did they follow micro credit plan (MCP)? 			
Good Processes:			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o PE interventions are decided by farmers through discussions (1 Nos/ 5 villages) o Village organization was participated in productivity enhancement action planning process (2 Nos/ 5 villages) o SHGs and User Groups were participated in productivity enhancement action planning process (1 Nos/ 5 villages) o Village organization decided the interventions in livelihood action plans (1 Nos/ 5 villages) o Village organization, SHGs and PIA participated in enterprise promotion action planning process (1 Nos/ 5 villages) o Micro credit plan was followed in preparing enterprise promotion action plan (4 Nos / 5 villages) 			
Processes that Need Improvement:			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o PE interventions are decided by WDT and VO (2 Nos/ 5 villages) o Interventions in Livelihoods action plans were decided by Gram Panchayat/ WDT (1 Nos/ 5 villages). o Micro credit plan was not followed in preparing enterprise promotion action plan (1 Nos / 5 villages) 			
Recommendations for Improvement:			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Organize orientation programs to WDT to facilitate action planning process on productivity enhancement and enterprise promotion. 			



WASSAN



- Collaborate with resource organizations to support the planning and implementation of productivity enhancement and enterprise promotion related activities.
- Develop clear methodological tools for action planning, implementing and monitoring PE and EP related interventions.
- Develop role models in the district as part of LRC strategy to promote



Report of Independent Process Monitoring of APRLP			
District	Anantapuram	Time Period:	Up to November 06
Cluster: Gender Scrutiny of Action Plans			Cluster No: 9
Details of Sample: Total 5 Projects Old APRLP (2 Nos); Hariyali (2 Nos) and APRLP+ (1 Nos)			
Key Questions:			
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Who influences the action planning process and its contents? 2. Whether contents of action plans were explained/ shared with Village Organization separately/ Community/ public? 3. What kind of priority was given to women in action plans? 4. Whether issue of contribution was discussed (during approval phase)? 			
Good Processes:			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o SHGs influenced the action planning process and its contents (3 Nos/ 5 villages) o Action planning process and its contents was influenced by watershed committee (2 Nos/ 5 villages) o User Groups and Village Organization were influenced the action planning process and its contents (1 Nos/ 5 villages) o Action plan was shared with Gram Sabha / Village Organization (2 Nos/ 5 villages) o Women got priority in PE and LH related activities (2 Nos/ 5 villages) 			
Processes that Need Improvement:			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Action plan was not shared with Gram Sabha / VO (1 Nos/ 5 villages) o Community is not aware of the contents and process of action planning (2 Nos/ 5 Villages) o Women didn't get priority (2 Nos/ 5 villages) o No discussion was held about contribution (5 Nos/ 5 villages) 			
Recommendations for Improvement:			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Approval of action plans has to be sensitive to the values of APRLP (Equity, Gender, Transparency and Participation). The community based scrutiny of action plans has to verify the adherence of action plans to these values. WDT has to facilitate this process and help the communities to systematically analyze the action plans o Orient the WDT to facilitate the above process at community level. o DWMA also has analyze the contents of action plans and ensure that the action plans provide adequate space, funds and support to resource poor women and men in watershed projects on priority basis. 			



Report of Independent Process Monitoring of APRLP			
District	Anantapuram	Time Period:	Up to November 06
Cluster: Approval of Action Plans			Cluster No: 10
Details of Sample: Total 5 Projects Old APRLP (2 Nos); Hariyali (2 Nos) and APRLP+ (1 Nos)			
Key Questions:			
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Who are involved in approval of action plans at village level? 2. Whether any conflicts/ problems were faced during this time? What kind of conflicts? Explore further details. 3. Whether budgets are released without formal approval of action plans? 			
Good Processes:			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Gram Panchayat involved in approving the action plans at village level (5 Nos / 5 villages) o Village organization involved in approving the action plans at village level (3 Nos/ 5 villages) o Farmers involved in approving the action plans at village level (1 Nos/ 5 villages) o No problems were faced during action planning process (4 Nos/ 5 villages) o The budgets were released with formal approval of action plans (5 Nos/ 5 villages) 			
Processes that Need Improvement:			
o			
Recommendations for Improvement:			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Approval of action plans is not a formal process at the village level. It is important to ensure that previous cluster (Cluster No 9) is followed, before the approval of action plans. o It is important to ensure that funds are released as per action plans/ But budgets/ availability funds should not determine the contents of action plan. DWMA has to ensure that adequate funds are released as per approved action plans 			



Report of Independent Process Monitoring of APRLP			
District	Anantapuram	Time Period:	Up to November 06
Cluster: Implementation of Action Plans – Initial Tasks			Cluster No: 11
Details of Sample: Total 5 Projects Old APRLP (2 Nos); Hariyali (2 Nos) and APRLP+ (1 Nos)			
Key Questions:			
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Whether budgets are released according to annual action plans? (as per agreed instalments) 2. Who operated the bank account of watershed funds (At Grama Panchayati, VO, User Group, SHG, Labor Group levels)? 3. Who were given high priority? 4. What was the role played by Grama Panchayati during prioritization of watershed activities? 5. What was the role played by Grama Sangham during prioritization of watershed activities? 			
Good Processes:			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Budgets were released as per annual action plans (4 Nos/ 5 Villages) o Grama Panchayati (Sarpanch) and Village Secretary operated bank account (1 Nos/ 5 Villages). o Watershed committee and WDT operated bank account (1 Nos/ 5 Villages). o Small and marginal farmers were given high priority (2 Nos/ 5 villages) o All poor community was given high priority (1 Nos/ 5 villages) o Gram panchayat played a key role during prioritization of watershed activities (2 Nos/5 villages) o Village Organization is played key role (1 Nos/ 5 villages) 			
Processes that Need Improvement:			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Budgets were not released as per annual action plans (1 Nos/ 5 Villages) o Gram Panchayat was given high priority (1 Nos/ 5 villages) o Village Organization is played no or nominal role (3 Nos/ 5 villages) 			
Recommendations for Improvement:			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The coordination between Grama Panchayati and Village Organization in prioritization and approval of watershed action plans needs to be carefully facilitated. Since the approval and prioritization process is given low importance, the role of these two institutions is becoming nominal. DWMA has to ensure that such critical community level decision making processes are strictly followed in true spirit. The DWMA teams also have to participate in this process (Cluster 9, 10 and 11). 			



Report of Independent Process Monitoring of APRLP			
District	Anantapuram	Time Period:	Up to November 06
Cluster: Capacity Building Inputs			Cluster No: 12
Details of Sample: Total 5 Projects Old APRLP (2 Nos); Hariyali (2 Nos) and APRLP+ (1 Nos)			
Key Questions:			
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. How many training programs are organized on watershed development program? Stage of the project and Training/ CB Inputs 2. Whether women participated in training programs or not? 3. Where are these training programs organized? 4. Whether Exposure Visits were conducted or not? 5. Whether the training inputs are used by the trainees? How? 			
Good Processes:			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o More than 10 training programs are organized (2 Nos/ 5 Villages). o About 4-5 training programmes were organized (2 Nos/ 5 villages) o Women participated in the training programmes (4 Nos/ 5 Villages) o CLRC was used as venue for training programs (4 Nos/ 5 Villages) o Training were conducted within the village (3 Nos/ 5 villages) o Exposure visits were conducted (2 Nos/ 5 villages) 			
Processes that Need Improvement:			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Only one training programme was conducted in the village (1 Nos/ 5 villages) o Exposure visits were not conducted (2 Nos/ 5 villages) o Trainees were not used the training inputs (2 Nos/ 5 villages) 			
Recommendations for Improvement:			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o More number of institution based training programs (D CLRC centric) need to be organized. o Encourage women participation in all training programs. Make adequate efforts and establish adequate support to women participants. o Action linked training programs need to be organized to make effective use of training inputs. (Project Management Cycle Linked CB Inputs) 			

Report of Independent Process Monitoring of APRLP			
District	Anantapuram	Time Period:	Up to November 06
Cluster: Role of User Groups in Execution of Works			Cluster No: 13
Details of Sample: Total 5 Projects Old APRLP (2 Nos); Hariyali (2 Nos) and APRLP+ (1 Nos)			
Key Questions:			
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Application form from users 2. Who Contributes? 3. Who decided the interventions? 4. Who estimates? 5. Who approved estimates? 6. Who executed the works? 7. Who supervised the works? 8. Who maintains the quality of works? 9. Who authenticates the quality of works? 10. Who measures the works? 11. How is the payments made? 12. Is the group functional after the completion of activity? 13. What is the role of Grama Panchayati in the above process? 			
Good Processes:			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o User groups/ members applied for watershed works (3 Nos/ 5 Villages) o Farmers contributed (1 Nos/ 5 villages) o User Groups decided interventions (2 Nos/ 5 villages) o Farmers, SHGs, VO and Gram Panchayat decided interventions (1 Nos/ 5 villages) o WDT prepares the estimates (4 Nos/ 5 villages) o Gram Panchayat prepared the estimates (1 Nos/ 5 villages) o User groups executed works (3 Nos/ 5 villages) o GP, VO and Watershed committee monitors the execution of works (1 Nos/5 villages) o WDT ensures the quality of work (4 Nos/ 5 villages) o User Groups measures the works (1 Nos/ 5 villages) o Payments are made in the form of cheque (4 Nos/ 5 villages) o Group is functional after the completion of activity (2 Nos/ 5 villages) 			



WASSAN



<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Gram Panchayat was played key role in forming user groups and selection of works (3 Nos/5 villages)
Processes that Need Improvement:
<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ There is no demand from users (which is expressed in the form of applications) (2 Nos/ 5 Villages)○ Wages are deducted from laborers for mobilizing contribution (1 Nos/ 5 Villages)○ Gram Panchayat executed works (1 Nos/ 5 villages)○ Payments are made in the form of cash (1 Nos/ 5 villages)○ WDT is maintaining the records (4 Nos/ 5 villages)○ Group is not functional after the completion of activity (2 Nos/ 5 villages)
Recommendations for Improvement:
<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Contribution to be collected from the farmers, not from the labour component



Report of Independent Process Monitoring of APRLP			
District	Anantapuram	Time Period:	Up to November 06
Cluster: Completion of Works and Records			Cluster No: 14
Details of Sample: Total 5 Projects Old APRLP (2 Nos); Hariyali (2 Nos) and APRLP+ (1 Nos)			
Key Questions:			
1. Who maintaining the records related to works?			
2. Where was the cheque book?			
Good Processes:			
o Gram Panchayat is maintaining the records (1 Nos/ 5 villages)			
o Cheque book is with Gram Panchayat/ watershed committee office (1 Nos/ 5 villages)			
Processes that Need Improvement:			
o WDT role is more in maintaining the records (5 Nos/ 5 villages)			
o Cheque book is with WDT, PIA (1 Nos/ 5 villages)			
Recommendations for Improvement:			
o			



Report of Independent Process Monitoring of APRLP			
District	Anantapuram	Time Period:	Up to November 06
Cluster: Implementation of Productivity Enhancement and Enterprise Promotion Plans			Cluster No: 15
Details of Sample: Total 5 Projects Old APRLP (2 Nos); Hariyali (2 Nos) and APRLP+ (1 Nos)			
Key Questions:			
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What is the process of executing the plans of productivity enhancement plans? 2. What is the role of SHGs? 3. What is the role of individual persons/ members? 4. What is the role of village organization? 5. How are funds released (From where to where?) 6. What kind of capacity building support is provided to the individuals/ groups/ VO for implementing the productivity enhancement plan/ enterprise plans? 7. Who monitors the execution of action plans? 			
Good Processes:			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o SHGs played key role in Identification of beneficiaries, organizing meetings, taking loans and ensuring repayment (1 Nos/ 5 villages) o Village organization is played role in ensuring quality of work (2 Nos/ 5 villages) o Trainings provided on vermin composte, horticulture, seed processing, livelihood (4 Nos/ 5 villages) o Gram Panchayat, Village organization monitors the execution of works(1 No s/ 5 villages) 			
Processes that Need Improvement:			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o SHGs were not played any role (1 Nos/ 5 villages) 			
Recommendations for Improvement:			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o 			

Report of Independent Process Monitoring of APRLP			
District	Anantapuram	Time Period:	Up to November 06
Cluster: Sustainability and Growth			Cluster No: 16
Details of Sample: Total 5 Projects Old APRLP (2 Nos); Hariyali (2 Nos) and APRLP+ (1 Nos)			
Key Questions:			
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What are the systems for asset maintenance/ repairs? 2. Whether damages occurred? Who repaired? 3. Whether Communities know about the amount of WDF? 4. Whether Usufruct rights are allocated to anyone, on the works completed on CPRs? 5. Whether UGs have any regulations/ rules for the use of assets/ benefit sharing from CPRs? 6. Which institution is functional at the end of project period? 7. How many new institutions are formed at the time of exit stage? 8. What systems are employed to sustain the user groups? 9. Who takes care of the assets? How long can they take up this responsibility? 10. Is the fund for productivity enhancement and enterprise development circulated? 11. Does the PE and EP plan include new members? 			
Good Processes:			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o WDF is established for future maintenance (3 Nos/ 5 villages) o Damages occurred and repaired by Watershed Committee (2 Nos/5 villages) o Damages not occurred (1Nos/ 5 villages) o Entire community knows about WDF (2 Nos/ 5 Villages) o Watershed association is functioning at the end of project (1 Nos/ 5 villages) o Gram Panchayat will take care of the assets (2 Nos/ 5 villages) 			
Processes that Need Improvement:			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Damages occurred and nobody did repairs (1 Nos/ 5 villages) o Community doesn't know about WDF (2 Nos/ 5 villages) o Usufruct rights are not allocated to anyone, on the works completed on CPRs (4 Nos/ 5 villages) o No systems is employed to sustain the user groups (4 Nos/ 5 villages) o Nobody was responsible for taking care of assets (2 Nos/ 5 villages) o PE and EP fund is not circulated (2 Nos/ 5 villages) o PE and EP plan not included new members (2 Nos/5 villages) 			



WASSAN



Recommendations for Improvement:

- Transparency to be maintained by displaying all financial details on the walls
- Public hearing to be conducted on financial matters