



**Independent Process Monitoring of APRLP  
By  
WASSAN**

**1<sup>st</sup> Report of State (8 Districts) (Draft)  
March 2007**

## INDEX

Cluster - 1.	Awareness Generation and Rapport Building.....	3
Cluster - 2.	Conducting Situation Analysis.....	6
Cluster - 3.	Integrating Existing Institutions.....	9
Cluster - 4.	Identification of Poor Families.....	11
Cluster - 5.	Formation of New Groups.....	13
Cluster - 6.	Experiential Learning of Communities.....	15
Cluster - 7.	Action Planning (NRM).....	17
Cluster - 8.	Action Planning for Productivity Enhancement and Enterprise Promotion.....	20
Cluster - 9.	Gender Scrutiny of Action Plans.....	24
Cluster - 10.	Approval of Action Plans.....	26
Cluster - 11.	Implementation of Action Plans – Initial Tasks.....	27
Cluster - 12.	Capacity Building Inputs.....	29
Cluster - 13.	Role of User Groups in Execution of Works.....	31
Cluster - 14.	Completion of Works and Records.....	36
Cluster - 15.	Implementation of Productivity Enhancement and Enterprise Promotion Plans..	37
Cluster - 16.	Sustainability and Growth.....	39

<b>Report of Independent Process Monitoring of APRLP</b>			
<b>District</b>	8 Districts in the state	<b>Time Period</b>	Upto November 2006
<b>Cluster</b>	Awareness Generation and Rapport Building	<b>Cluster No</b>	1
<b>Details of Sample</b>	Total 37 Projects in 8 Districts (Adilabad, Anantapur, Kurnool, Mehaboobnagar, Nalgonda, Prakasam, RR district, Srikakulam) - <i>Old APRLP (10 Nos); Hariyali (22 Nos) and APRLP+ (5 Nos)</i>		
<b>Key Questions:</b>			
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. What methods were used to bring awareness about watershed program in the village?</li> <li>2. Where were they conducted to bring awareness in the village watershed program?</li> <li>3. Where special efforts made to target women in awareness camps?</li> <li>4. Did men and women discuss together about the issues of watershed project, during awareness / initial phase? How did these discussions happen?</li> <li>5. Were there any formal agreements / MOU between PFA and GP? How did this happen? Do you know the details/content of the same?</li> </ol>			
<b>Good Processes:</b>			

<b>Report of Independent Process Monitoring of APRLP</b>			
<b>District</b>	8 Districts in the state	<b>Time Period</b>	Upto November 2006
<b>Cluster</b>	Awareness Generation and Rapport Building	<b>Cluster No</b>	1
<b>Details of Sample</b>	Total 37 Projects in 8 Districts (Adilabad, Anantapur, Kurmool, Mehaboobnagar, Nalgonda, Prakasam, RR district, Srikakulam) - <i>Old APRLP (10 Nos); Hariyali (22 Nos) and APRLP+ (5 Nos)</i>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Grama Sabha is the most common method of generating awareness in almost all districts (29 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>○ Kala Jaatha is another popular medium used for generating awareness (23 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>○ Small Group Meetings are used in limited number of villages (8 Nos/ 37 Villages).</li> <li>○ TV shows, wall writings are also used in limited number of villages (5 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>○ Ratch Banda/ Panchayat Office is the most common place for organizing meetings.</li> <li>○ Comparatively APRLP projects had made more efforts on generating awareness (more number of events in variety of places).</li> <li>○ Among Hariyali Projects, Adilabad based projects made more efforts in awareness generation.</li> <li>○ Efforts were made to reach out women and their institutions (27 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>○ Women leaders took initiative to share the knowledge of the project to other women in the village (1 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>○ Men and women discussed together about project (20 Nos/ 37 Villages).</li> <li>○ MoU is entered between Grama Panchayati, DWMA/ PFA. (18 Nos/ 37 Villages).</li> </ul>			
<b>Processes that Need Improvement:</b>			

<b>Report of Independent Process Monitoring of APRLP</b>			
<b>District</b>	8 Districts in the state	<b>Time Period</b>	Upto November 2006
<b>Cluster</b>	Awareness Generation and Rapport Building	<b>Cluster No</b>	1
<b>Details of Sample</b>	Total 37 Projects in 8 Districts (Adilabad, Anantapur, Kurmool, Mehaboobnagar, Nalgonda, Prakasam, RR district, Srikakulam) - <i>Old APRLP (10 Nos); Hariyali (22 Nos) and APRLP+ (5 Nos)</i>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Limited or one time efforts in new watershed projects (Hariyali).</li> <li>○ No efforts were made to reach out to women (specially) during awareness campaigns (10 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>○ There are no common meetings for men and women (12 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>○ Either men or women dominated the common meetings (6 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>○ Men and women leaders discussed together about project. Other men and women did not participate in these meetings (1 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>○ The concept of MoU is not operational (17 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>○ The details of MoU are known to only leaders of the village. (18 Nos/ 37 Villages).</li> </ul>			
<b>Recommendations for Improvement:</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Focus on Hariyali Projects and improve the general awareness levels in these projects.</li> <li>○ Develop communications strategy. Encourage “Two Way” communication processes. Improve the diversity and frequency of awareness camps. Go beyond meetings and Kala Jaatha.</li> <li>○ Make special efforts to reach out women and women leaders of the village. Organize joint meetings in which “prepared women” take key roles. Go beyond women and men leaders.</li> <li>○ MoU could be displayed in the village and “read out” in the village meetings. Roles of WDT/ PFA needs to be discussed in the village.</li> </ul>			

<b>Report of Independent Process Monitoring of APRLP</b>			
<b>District</b>	8 Districts in the state	<b>Time Period</b>	Upto November 2006
<b>Cluster</b>	Conducting Situation Analysis	<b>Cluster No</b>	2
<b>Details of Sample</b>	Total 37 Projects in 8 Districts (Adilabad, Anantapur, Kurnool, Mehaboobnagar, Nalgonda, Prakasam, RR district, Srikakulam) - <i>Old APRLP (10 Nos); Hariyali (22 Nos) and APRLP+ (5 Nos)</i>		
<b>Key Questions:</b>			
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. What methods are employed to conduct situation analysis of the village?</li> <li>2. On what themes, PRA was conducted?</li> <li>3. What important problems were identified during the initial phases?</li> <li>4. Who played key role in identification of problems?</li> <li>5. Whether issues related to women were discussed (work loads, etc)?</li> </ol>			
<b>Good Processes:</b>			

<b>Report of Independent Process Monitoring of APRLP</b>			
<b>District</b>	8 Districts in the state	<b>Time Period</b>	Upto November 2006
<b>Cluster</b>	Conducting Situation Analysis	<b>Cluster No</b>	2
<b>Details of Sample</b>	Total 37 Projects in 8 Districts (Adilabad, Anantapur, Kurmool, Mehaboobnagar, Nalgonda, Prakasam, RR district, Srikakulam) - <i>Old APRLP (10 Nos); Hariyali (22 Nos) and APRLP+ (5 Nos)</i>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ PRA is the most common method to conduct situation analysis. Social map, Resource map, transect walk are the methods used for this purpose (25 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>○ Data available from other sources (EG: IKP) is also accessed (1 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>○ Formal data related to socio economic profile of families is generated in limited number of villages. (1 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>○ Situation related to natural resources, socio economic profile of families is the most common theme of PRA.</li> <li>○ Gender Issues, drinking water, employment related issues were discussed during these events (5 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>○ Several problems were discussed and identified during this stage. However, NRM related issues dominated the discussions.</li> <li>○ Livelihoods of single women/ drinking water related issues were discussed (9 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>○ WDT/ MDT/ PIA provide crucial inputs in situation analysis (20 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>○ Grama Panchayati played a key role in problem analysis (11 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>○ Village Organization played a key role in problem analysis (9 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> </ul>			
<b>Processes that Need Improvement:</b>			

<b>Report of Independent Process Monitoring of APRLP</b>			
<b>District</b>	8 Districts in the state	<b>Time Period</b>	Upto November 2006
<b>Cluster</b>	Conducting Situation Analysis	<b>Cluster No</b>	2
<b>Details of Sample</b>	Total 37 Projects in 8 Districts (Adilabad, Anantapur, Kurmool, Mehaboobnagar, Nalgonda, Prakasam, RR district, Srikakulam) - <i>Old APRLP (10 Nos); Hariyali (22 Nos) and APRLP+ (5 Nos)</i>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o No situation analysis was conducted (1 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>o No PRA was conducted to understand the situation of the villages (2 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>o Community members could not remember the discussions during the PRA exercises (8 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>o Problem analysis is not conducted systematically. No problem analysis was conducted (8 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>o Issues related to women were not discussed during situation analysis (26 Nos/ 37 Villages). However, APRLP Projects are marginally better than Hariyali Projects on this issue.</li> </ul>			
<b>Recommendations for Improvement:</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Situation analysis should be linked to the project components. It is important to develop a standard set of tools for conducting situation analysis (as per the project components).</li> <li>o Orient the WDT and GP/VO members on gender, equity issues and basic facilitation skills for conducting situation analysis.</li> <li>o Ensure that women are involved in this process and their issues get attention.</li> </ul>			

<b>Report of Independent Process Monitoring of APRLP</b>			
<b>District</b>	8 Districts in the state	<b>Time Period</b>	Upto November 2006
<b>Cluster</b>	Integrating Existing Institutions	<b>Cluster No</b>	3
<b>Details of Sample</b>	Total 37 Projects in 8 Districts (Adilabad, Anantapur, Kurnool, Mehaboobnagar, Nalgonda, Prakasam, RR district, Srikakulam) - <i>Old APRLP (10 Nos)</i> ; <i>Hariyali (22 Nos) and APRLP+ (5 Nos)</i>		
<b>Key Questions:</b>			
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. What existing institutions/groups were recognized, during initial phase?</li> <li>2. What inputs were provided from the project, to the identified existing groups?</li> </ol>			
<b>Good Processes:</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o SHGs (33 Nos/ 37 Vilages), Village Organization (17 Nos/ 37 Villages) and Rythu Mitra (14 Nos/ 37 Villages) Groups are the most common existing institutions that were recognized.</li> <li>o Labour groups are also recognized (1 Nos/ 37 Villages).</li> <li>o Relatively, Hariyali projects recognized more number of existing institutions during this stage (in comparison to APRLP projects).</li> <li>o Most common input to these existing institutions was capacity building. These inputs included training programs and exposure visits (24 Nos/ 37 Villages).</li> <li>o Another important input to these groups is credit linkages/ fund releases from watershed projects. (22 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> </ul>			
<b>Processes that Need Improvement:</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Existing groups were not recognized (3 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>o No inputs are provided to recognized existing groups (6 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> </ul>			
<b>Recommendations for Improvement:</b>			

Report of Independent Process Monitoring of APRLP			
<b>District</b>	8 Districts in the state	<b>Time Period</b>	Upto November 2006
<b>Cluster</b>	Integrating Existing Institutions	<b>Cluster No</b>	3
<b>Details of Sample</b>	Total 37 Projects in 8 Districts (Adilabad, Anantapur, Kurmool, Mehaboobnagar, Nalgonda, Prakasam, RR district, Srikakulam) - <i>Old APRLP (10 Nos); Hariyali (22 Nos) and APRLP+ (5 Nos)</i>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Sensitize Grama Panchayati and WDT members to facilitate the involvement of SHGs and Village Organization in watershed development project activities.</li> <li>○ Explain the provisions made in guidelines of watershed project to women SHGs and Village Organization, by organizing special “drives”.</li> <li>○ Explore the possibilities of strengthening existing groups and their relationship with natural resources of the village.</li> </ul>			

Report of Independent Process Monitoring of APRLP			
<b>District</b>	8 Districts in the state	<b>Time Period</b>	Upto November 2006
<b>Cluster</b>	Identification of Poor Families	<b>Cluster No</b>	4
<b>Details of Sample</b>	Total 37 Projects in 8 Districts (Adilabad, Anantapur, Kurnool, Mehaboobnagar, Nalgonda, Prakasam, RR district, Srikulam) - <i>Old APRLP (10 Nos); Hariyali (22 Nos) and APRLP+ (5 Nos)</i>		
<b>Key Questions:</b>			
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. How poor families were recognized?</li> <li>2. Whether women dependent families/ poor women were recognized?</li> <li>3. Whether families of wage laborers were recognized?</li> <li>4. Are there any poor people, who were not members of any group?</li> </ol>			
<b>Good Processes:</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Largely dependent on PoP list prepared by IKP/ VELUGU/ Previous surveys (21 Nos/ 37 Villages).</li> <li>o Door to Door survey was conducted to identify poor and develop village profile (5 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>o Women dependent families are identified (23 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>o Wage Dependent families are identified (23 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>o All poor families are covered in one of the SHGs in the village (4 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> </ul>			
<b>Processes that Need Improvement:</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Poor families were not recognized (6 Nos/ 37 Villages).</li> <li>o Too much of dependency on existing data (21 Nos/ 37 Villages).</li> <li>o Hariyali projects need to make efforts to identify poor families</li> <li>o Women dependent families are not identified (13 Nos/ 37 Villages). Hariyali projects dominate this practice.</li> <li>o Wage dependent families are not identified (13 Nos/ 37 Villages). Both APRLP and Hariyali projects follow a similar process in this case.</li> <li>o Poor families are yet to become in any of the SHGs (32 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> </ul>			
<b>Recommendations for Improvement:</b>			

<b>Report of Independent Process Monitoring of APRLP</b>			
<b>District</b>	8 Districts in the state	<b>Time Period</b>	Upto November 2006
<b>Cluster</b>	Identification of Poor Families	<b>Cluster No</b>	4
<b>Details of Sample</b>	Total 37 Projects in 8 Districts (Adilabad, Anantapur, Kurmool, Mehaboobnagar, Nalgonda, Prakasam, RR district, Srikakulam) - <i>Old APRLP (10 Nos); Hariyali (22 Nos) and APRLP+ (5 Nos)</i>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Sensitize WDT/ MDT/ Grama Panchayati and Village Organization to formally recognize women dependent/ wage dependent/ poor families.</li> <li>○ Build their capacities to generate relevant data from the field and conduct situation analysis and the provisions made for them in the watershed project.</li> <li>○ 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.</li> </ul>			

<b>Report of Independent Process Monitoring of APRLP</b>			
<b>District</b>	8 Districts in the state	<b>Time Period</b>	Upto November 2006
<b>Cluster</b>	Formation of New Groups	<b>Cluster No</b>	5
<b>Details of Sample</b>	Total 37 Projects in 8 Districts (Adilabad, Anantapur, Kurnool, Mehaboobnagar, Nalgonda, Prakasam, RR district, Srikakulam) - <i>Old APRLP (10 Nos); Hariyali (22 Nos) and APRLP+ (5 Nos)</i>		
<b>Key Questions:</b>			
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. What new groups were formed after the watershed development program was initiated in the village?</li> <li>2. How was the user groups formed? What was the basis for forming/ identification of UG member?</li> <li>3. Whether UG were formed for private land?</li> </ol>			
<b>Good Processes:</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ New SHGs (In 27 Nos/ 37 Villages); User Groups (21 Nos/ 37 Villages) and Labor Groups (17 Nos/ 37 Villages) are formed.</li> <li>○ Apex bodies of basic groups – Village Organization (8 Nos/ 37 Villages); Watershed Associations (2 Nos/ 37 Villages) and Watershed Committees (5 Nos/ 37 Villages) are formed.</li> <li>○ Different criteria are used to form user groups (21 Nos/ 37 Villages) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Resource as a basis (18 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>▪ Block/area as a basis (2 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>▪ Activity as a basis (1 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> </ul> </li> <li>○ There is little variation between APRLP and HARIYALI projects in the context of user group's formation.</li> <li>○ User Groups are formed for private lands also (17 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>○ Groups of disabled persons were formed (1 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> </ul>			
<b>Processes that Need Improvement:</b>			

<b>Report of Independent Process Monitoring of APRLP</b>			
<b>District</b>	8 Districts in the state	<b>Time Period</b>	Upto November 2006
<b>Cluster</b>	Formation of New Groups	<b>Cluster No</b>	5
<b>Details of Sample</b>	Total 37 Projects in 8 Districts (Adilabad, Anantapur, Kurmool, Mehaboobnagar, Nalgonda, Prakasam, RR district, Srikakulam) - <i>Old APRLP (10 Nos); Hariyali (22 Nos) and APRLP+ (5 Nos)</i>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o No new groups are formed (2 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>o Basic building blocks of watershed institutions (user groups, SHG and Labor Groups) are not formed in all watersheds.</li> <li>o User groups were not formed (10 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>o User groups were not formed for private lands (19 Villages/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>o Apex bodies of basis groups are not formed in all watersheds.</li> </ul>			
<b>Recommendations for Improvement:</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Strengthen institution development process of watershed projects.</li> <li>o Build the capacities of WDT to strengthen institution development of the project.</li> <li>o Ensure that social mobilizers/ community level facilitators are deployed in adequate numbers.</li> <li>o Orient the WDT members on the importance of user groups and formation process of user groups.</li> <li>o User groups are basis for taking up NRM and productivity enhancement related activities. If these institutions are not in place, the watershed management would be devoid of community participation and would be unsustainable.</li> </ul>			

<b>Report of Independent Process Monitoring of APRLP</b>			
<b>District</b>	8 Districts in the state	<b>Time Period</b>	Upto November 2006
<b>Cluster</b>	Experiential Learning of Communities	<b>Cluster No</b>	6
<b>Details of Sample</b>	Total 37 Projects in 8 Districts (Adilabad, Anantapur, Kurnool, Mehaboobnagar, Nalgonda, Prakasam, RR district, Srikakulam) - <i>Old APRLP (10 Nos); Hariyali (22 Nos) and APRLP+ (5 Nos)</i>		
<b>Key Questions:</b>			
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Whether watershed is divided into sub watershed or not?</li> <li>2. Who participated in the above process?</li> <li>3. How action plan was prepared for identified sub watersheds?</li> <li>4. How was the approval for action plan taken? (First Sub Watershed)?</li> </ol>			
<b>Good Processes:</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Watershed area is sub divided into sub watersheds (16 Nos/ 37 Villages).</li> <li>o Grama Panchayati participated in watershed delineation (8 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>o WDT played a key role in watershed delineation (16 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>o User groups/ farmers played a key role in watershed delineation (12 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>o Village Organization played a key role in watershed delineation (9 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>o Five Year Perspective Plan is prepared, but not a sub watershed wise plan (1 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>o Sub watershed based action plans are prepared. Several criteria are used to develop these plans – Ground water, needs of farmers, land conditions and so on (16 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>o User Group based action plans are prepared (1 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>o Grama Sabha approved the action plans (13 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>o Grama Panchayati approved the action plans (3 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>o Watershed Committee and Association approved action plans (1 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>o Only in Kurnool, all watershed plans were approved by grama sabha (5 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> </ul>			
<b>Processes that Need Improvement:</b>			

<b>Report of Independent Process Monitoring of APRLP</b>			
<b>District</b>	8 Districts in the state	<b>Time Period</b>	Upto November 2006
<b>Cluster</b>	Experiential Learning of Communities	<b>Cluster No</b>	6
<b>Details of Sample</b>	Total 37 Projects in 8 Districts (Adilabad, Anantapur, Kurmool, Mehaboobnagar, Nalgonda, Prakasam, RR district, Srikakulam) - <i>Old APRLP (10 Nos); Hariyali (22 Nos) and APRLP+ (5 Nos)</i>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Watershed area is not divided into sub watersheds (20 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>○ Both APRLP and Hariyali projects made little efforts to delineate watershed areas.</li> <li>○ Action plans for sub watersheds is not prepared (18 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>○ Only financial estimates are prepared. But not the action plans for each sub watershed (1 Nos/ 37 Nos)</li> <li>○ There is no formal approval of action plans (12 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>○ In Srikakulam, no plan was approved by grama sabha (3 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> </ul>			
<b>Recommendations for Improvement:</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ 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.</li> <li>○ 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.</li> <li>○ Make this phase and related activities as a mandatory process.</li> <li>○ Organize technical training programs on the process of watershed delineation and sub watershed/ user group based action planning process.</li> <li>○ Ensure that project activities and funding are co-related.</li> <li>○ Formal approval by grama sabha/ Grama Panchayati is a mandatory requirement of the project. This process should be ensured to improve the transparency and accountability.</li> </ul>			

<b>Report of Independent Process Monitoring of APRLP</b>			
<b>District</b>	8 Districts in the state	<b>Time Period</b>	Upto November 2006
<b>Cluster</b>	Action Planning (NRM)	<b>Cluster No</b>	7
<b>Details of Sample</b>	Total 37 Projects in 8 Districts (Adilabad, Anantapur, Kurnool, Mehaboobnagar, Nalgonda, Prakasam, RR district, Srikakulam) - <i>Old APRLP (10 Nos); Hariyali (22 Nos) and APRLP+ (5 Nos)</i>		
<b>Key Questions:</b>			
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. What kinds of plans were prepared in watershed project?</li> <li>2. How are the action plans prepared for NRM?</li> <li>3. Who participated in the preparation of action plans for NRM? What activities are identified?</li> <li>4. Whether common property resources are identified in the village or not?</li> <li>5. What are they common property resources are identified in the village?</li> <li>6. Whether any action plans are prepared for developing common property resources in the watershed area?</li> <li>7. Whether men and women participated in action planning process of private lands and other CPR?</li> </ol>			
<b>Good Processes:</b>			

<b>Report of Independent Process Monitoring of APRLP</b>			
<b>District</b>	8 Districts in the state	<b>Time Period</b>	Upto November 2006
<b>Cluster</b>	Action Planning (NRM)	<b>Cluster No</b>	7
<b>Details of Sample</b>	Total 37 Projects in 8 Districts (Adilabad, Anantapur, Kurmool, Mehaboobnagar, Nalgonda, Prakasam, RR district, Srikakulam) - <i>Old APRLP (10 Nos); Hariyali (22 Nos) and APRLP+ (5 Nos)</i>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Water Resource Development plans (Irrigation/ Ground Water Recharge) are prepared (27 Nos/ 37 Villages).</li> <li>○ Plans for drinking water for human beings ( 4 Nos/ 37 Villages) and livestock (2 Nos/ 37 Villages) are prepared.</li> <li>○ Land Development plans are prepared (21 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>○ Horticulture plans are prepared (21 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>○ Fodder development plans are prepared (10 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>○ Productivity Enhancement and Enterprise promotion plans are prepared (20 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>○ Transact Walk is used as methodology to prepare NRM action plans (13 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>○ Ridge to Valley concept is followed in preparation of NRM action plans (6 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>○ Based on the discussions with user groups, NRM action plans are prepared (5 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>○ Entire community along with WDT participated in NRM action planning (1 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>○ WDT played a key role in action planning and identification of NRM interventions (30 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>○ Farmers played a key role in NRM action planning process (17 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>○ Grama Panchayati played a key role in NRM action planning process (15 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>○ Village Organization played a key role in NRM action planning process (12 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>○ Single women participated in action planning (1 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>○ Common Property Resources (CPRs) are identified (15 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>○ Action plans are prepared for CPR (8 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>○ Men and women equally participated in action planning process (13 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>○ Though more men participated, women also participated in action planning process (3 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> </ul>			
<b>Processes that Need Improvement:</b>			

<b>Report of Independent Process Monitoring of APRLP</b>			
<b>District</b>	8 Districts in the state	<b>Time Period</b>	Upto November 2006
<b>Cluster</b>	Action Planning (NRM)	<b>Cluster No</b>	7
<b>Details of Sample</b>	Total 37 Projects in 8 Districts (Adilabad, Anantapur, Kurmool, Mehaboobnagar, Nalgonda, Prakasam, RR district, Srikakulam) - <i>Old APRLP (10 Nos); Hariyali (22 Nos) and APRLP+ (5 Nos)</i>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Plans are not prepared for all components for each watershed</li> <li>○ Communities could not mention the process of preparing NRM action plans (1 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>○ Group building process and action planning for NRM need to hand in hand. The involvement of potential user groups members seem to be low.</li> <li>○ Common Property Resources are not identified (22 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>○ Action Plans for Common Property Resources are not prepared (28 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>○ Only men participated in NRM action plans and women did not participate (18 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>○ Community could not mention about the participation of men and women in action planning process (3 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> </ul>			
<b>Recommendations for Improvement:</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Orient the WDT/ Village Level Facilitators/ Grama Panchayati/ VO members on the basic components of watershed action plan.</li> <li>○ Orient the WDTs on importance of CPRs in action plans and the process of preparing comprehensive action plans for CPRs (including usufruct rights).</li> <li>○ User Group based action planning could be promoted.</li> <li>○ Components such as drinking water for livestock and human beings could be made compulsory components in watershed project plans.</li> <li>○ Orient the Village Organization to take the responsibilities of action planning for productivity enhancement and enterprise promotion. Encourage Village Organization to ensure women's participation.</li> <li>○ Sensitize men to encourage women's participation in action planning process.</li> <li>○ Sensitize WDT members to play the role of a facilitator, rather than the main active "decision takers" role.</li> </ul>			

<b>Report of Independent Process Monitoring of APRLP</b>			
<b>District</b>	8 Districts in the state	<b>Time Period</b>	Upto November 2006
<b>Cluster</b>	Action Planning for Productivity Enhancement and Enterprise Promotion	<b>Cluster No</b>	8
<b>Details of Sample</b>	Total 37 Projects in 8 Districts (Adilabad, Anantapur, Kurmool, Mehaboobnagar, Nalgonda, Prakasam, RR district, Srikakulam) - <i>Old APRLP (10 Nos); Hariyali (22 Nos) and APRLP+ (5 Nos)</i>		
<b>Key Questions:</b>			
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. How the productivity Action Plans were prepared?</li> <li>2. How the interventions related to productivity enhancement are decided?</li> <li>3. Who participated in the Productivity enhancement works in action plan?</li> <li>4. How the interventions in enterprise promotion action plans were decided?</li> <li>5. How are the interventions related to enterprise promotion are decided?</li> <li>6. Who participated in E.P. Promotion planning process?</li> <li>7. Did they follow micro credit plan (MCP)?</li> </ol>			
<b>Good Processes:</b>			

<b>Report of Independent Process Monitoring of APRLP</b>			
<b>District</b>	8 Districts in the state	<b>Time Period</b>	Upto November 2006
<b>Cluster</b>	Action Planning for Productivity Enhancement and Enterprise Promotion	<b>Cluster No</b>	8
<b>Details of Sample</b>	Total 37 Projects in 8 Districts (Adilabad, Anantapur, Kurnool, Mehaboobnagar, Nalgonda, Prakasam, RR district, Srikakulam) - <i>Old APRLP (10 Nos); Hariyali (22 Nos) and APRLP+ (5 Nos)</i>		
<p><b>Productivity Enhancement Plans:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Village Organization/ SHG prepared PE action plans (4 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>○ Single women were given priority (1 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>○ Based on discussions with farmers, PE action plans are prepared (3 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>○ Exposure visits/ training programs were organized before PE plans are prepared (1 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>○ User groups participated in PE action plans (6 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>○ Village Organization decided the contents of PE action plan (16 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> </ul> <p><b>Enterprise Promotion Action Plans:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Priority was given to SHG/ PoP members/ Single Women while preparing EP plans (7 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>○ Existing skills of poor members was considered as basis for deciding interventions under EP plans (9 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>○ Needs of SHGs formed the basis for EP action plans (2 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>○ Village Organization decided interventions of PE plans. WDT provided key support in this process (15 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>○ Grama Sabha was used as a platform for deciding EP related interventions (7 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>○ WDT facilitated the discussion of SHG and VO for deciding EP plans (4 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>○ Door to Door Survey was conducted to develop EP plan (4 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>○ IKP/ Velugu teams participated in EP plans (1 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>○ Micro Credit Planning methodology was followed for preparing EP plans (17 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> </ul>			
<b>Processes that Need Improvement:</b>			

<b>Report of Independent Process Monitoring of APRLP</b>			
<b>District</b>	8 Districts in the state	<b>Time Period</b>	Upto November 2006
<b>Cluster</b>	Action Planning for Productivity Enhancement and Enterprise Promotion	<b>Cluster No</b>	8
<b>Details of Sample</b>	Total 37 Projects in 8 Districts (Adilabad, Anantapur, Kurnool, Mehaboobnagar, Nalgonda, Prakasam, RR district, Srikakulam) - <i>Old APRLP (10 Nos); Hariyali (22 Nos) and APRLP+ (5 Nos)</i>		
<p><b>Productivity Enhancement Plans:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Productivity enhancement action plans are not prepared (14 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>○ Grama Sabha is used as a plat form for preparation of PE action plans (14 Nos/ 37 Villages).</li> <li>○ WDT decided contents of PE action plans (15 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> </ul> <p><b>Enterprise Promotion Plans:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Enterprise Promotion plans are not prepared.(9 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>○ Gram Panchayati decided the interventions of EP plans (2 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>○ Micro Credit Plans are not followed for preparing EP plans (17 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> </ul>			
<b>Recommendations for Improvement:</b>			

Report of Independent Process Monitoring of APRLP			
<b>District</b>	8 Districts in the state	<b>Time Period</b>	Upto November 2006
<b>Cluster</b>	Action Planning for Productivity Enhancement and Enterprise Promotion	<b>Cluster No</b>	8
<b>Details of Sample</b>	Total 37 Projects in 8 Districts (Adilabad, Anantapur, Kurnool, Mehaboobnagar, Nalgonda, Prakasam, RR district, Srikakulam) - <i>Old APRLP (10 Nos); Hariyali (22 Nos) and APRLP+ (5 Nos)</i>		
<p><b>Productivity Enhancement:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Organize orientation programs to WDT to facilitate action planning process on productivity enhancement and enterprise promotion. WDT should facilitate the PE action plan, rather than deciding the contents of the same.</li> <li>○ Orient the communities before PE action plans are prepared.</li> <li>○ Collaborate with resource organizations to support the planning and implementation of productivity enhancement and enterprise promotion related activities.</li> <li>○ Develop clear methodological tools for action planning, implementing and monitoring PE and EP related interventions.</li> <li>○ Develop role models in the district as part of LRC strategy to promote sustainable Productivity enhancement plans.</li> </ul> <p><b>Enterprise Development:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Develop effective collaboration with IKP team to facilitate EP plans.</li> <li>○ Teach Micro Credit Planning methodology to WDTs for facilitating EP plans.</li> <li>○ Evolve necessary monitoring systems to ensure that EP fund is revolved among the deserving applicants.</li> <li>○ At certain point of time, the participants in this plan might require higher level support to continue the activities. It is important to have “forward and backward linkages” with the participants of this action plan.</li> <li>○ Linkages with banks and other micro finance organization need to be established after the groups stabilize their activities.</li> </ul>			

<b>Report of Independent Process Monitoring of APRLP</b>			
<b>District</b>	8 Districts in the state	<b>Time Period</b>	Upto November 2006
<b>Cluster</b>	Gender Scrutiny of Action Plans	<b>Cluster No</b>	9
<b>Details of Sample</b>	Total 37 Projects in 8 Districts (Adilabad, Anantapur, Kurnool, Mehaboobnagar, Nalgonda, Prakasam, RR district, Srikakulam) - <i>Old APRLP (10 Nos); Hariyali (22 Nos) and APRLP+ (5 Nos)</i>		
<b>Key Questions:</b>			
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Who influences the action planning process and its contents?</li> <li>2. Whether contents of action plans were explained/ shared with Village Organization separately/ Community/ public?</li> <li>3. What kind of priority was given to women in action plans?</li> <li>4. Whether issue of contribution was discussed (during approval phase)?</li> </ol>			
<b>Good Processes:</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Village Organization played a key role in deciding/ influencing contents of action plans (17 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>o SHGs played a key role in deciding/ influencing contents of action plans (16 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>o User Groups played a key role (1 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>o Farmers decided the contents of action plan (8 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>o Labour groups contributed to action planning (4 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>o Action plan was shared with Village Organization (11 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>o Action plan was shared with grama sabha (7 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>o Women were given priority in NRM (6 Nos/ 37 Villages); PE and EP related activities (4 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>o Issues related to contribution was discussed during this stage (19 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> </ul>			
<b>Processes that Need Improvement:</b>			

<b>Report of Independent Process Monitoring of APRLP</b>			
<b>District</b>	8 Districts in the state	<b>Time Period</b>	Upto November 2006
<b>Cluster</b>	Gender Scrutiny of Action Plans	<b>Cluster No</b>	9
<b>Details of Sample</b>	Total 37 Projects in 8 Districts (Adilabad, Anantapur, Kurmool, Mehaboobnagar, Nalgonda, Prakasam, RR district, Srikakulam) - <i>Old APRLP (10 Nos); Hariyali (22 Nos) and APRLP+ (5 Nos)</i>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ WDT role is found to be very strong in influencing/ deciding contents of watershed action plans (23 Nos/ 37 Village)</li> <li>○ Men decided the contents of action plans and women had no role (4 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>○ Community members could not remember/ mention how the action plans are prepared and who influenced the process (3 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>○ Action plan was not shared with Village Organization (17 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>○ The was no occasion in which action plan was shared with any one (Village Organization/ Grama Panchayati/ Grama Sabha) (2 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>○ Women did not get any priority in action plans (18 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>○ The data on priority to women was not available (4 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>○ The issues related to contribution was not discussed during this stage (16 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> </ul>			
<b>Recommendations for Improvement:</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ 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.</li> <li>○ Orient the WDT to facilitate the above process at community level.</li> <li>○ 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.</li> <li>○ Ensure that non negotiable parameters – presentation to community/ Village Organization/ other institutions; discussions and agreement on contribution; analysis of allocations to different components/ target groups</li> </ul>			

Report of Independent Process Monitoring of APRLP			
<b>District</b>	8 Districts in the state	<b>Time Period</b>	Upto November 2006
<b>Cluster</b>	Approval of Action Plans	<b>Cluster No</b>	10
<b>Details of Sample</b>	Total 37 Projects in 8 Districts (Adilabad, Anantapur, Kurnool, Mehaboobnagar, Nalgonda, Prakasam, RR district, Srikakulam) - <i>Old APRLP (10 Nos); Hariyali (22 Nos) and APRLP+ (5 Nos)</i>		
<b>Key Questions:</b>			
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Who are involved in approval of action plans at village level?</li> <li>2. Whether any conflicts/ problems were faced during this time? What kind of conflicts? Explore further details.</li> <li>3. Whether budgets are released without formal approval of action plans?</li> </ol>			
<b>Good Processes:</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Grama Panchayati approved action plans (28 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>o Village Organization participated in approval of action plans (21 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>o SHGs played a role in approval of action plans (9 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>o Farmers also participated in approval of action plan (13 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>o User groups also played a role in approval of action plans (4 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>o Watershed delineation was not accepted by communities, when the action plan was presented (5 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>o There are no conflicts while approval of action plans (32 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>o Budgets were released after formal approval action plans (30 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> </ul>			
<b>Processes that Need Improvement:</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o WDT/ PIA played a key role in approval of action plans (31 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>o Action plans are not formally approved (1 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>o Budgets were released without formal approval of action plans (6 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> </ul>			
<b>Recommendations for Improvement:</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Approval of action plans is not followed as 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.</li> <li>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.</li> </ul>			

Report of Independent Process Monitoring of APRLP			
<b>District</b>	8 Districts in the state	<b>Time Period</b>	Upto November 2006
<b>Cluster</b>	Implementation of Action Plans – Initial Tasks	<b>Cluster No</b>	11
<b>Details of Sample</b>	Total 37 Projects in 8 Districts (Adilabad, Anantapur, Kurnool, Mehaboobnagar, Nalgonda, Prakasam, RR district, Srikakulam) - <i>Old APRLP (10 Nos); Hariyali (22 Nos) and APRLP+ (5 Nos)</i>		
<b>Key Questions:</b>			
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Whether budgets are released according to annual action plans? (as per agreed installments)</li> <li>2. Who operated the bank account of watershed funds (At Grama Panchayati, VO, User Group, SHG, Labor Group levels)?</li> <li>3. Who were given high priority?</li> <li>4. What was the role played by Grama Panchayati during prioritization of watershed activities?</li> <li>5. What was the role played by Grama Sangham during prioritization of watershed activities?</li> </ol>			
<b>Good Processes:</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Budgets were released as per approved annual action plans (30 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>o All poor families were given priority (13 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>o Poorest of the poor got priority (2 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>o Single women and women farmers were given priority (2 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>o Single women were given priority (11 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>o SC/ ST families were given priority (6 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>o Grama Panchayati played a key role in prioritization and identification of target groups (16 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>o Village Organization played a key role in prioritization of watershed activities (9 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> </ul>			
<b>Processes that Need Improvement:</b>			

Report of Independent Process Monitoring of APRLP			
<b>District</b>	8 Districts in the state	<b>Time Period</b>	Upto November 2006
<b>Cluster</b>	Implementation of Action Plans – Initial Tasks	<b>Cluster No</b>	11
<b>Details of Sample</b>	Total 37 Projects in 8 Districts (Adilabad, Anantapur, Kurmool, Mehaboobnagar, Nalgonda, Prakasam, RR district, Srikakulam) - <i>Old APRLP (10 Nos); Hariyali (22 Nos) and APRLP+ (5 Nos)</i>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Budgets were not released as per approved annual action plans (6 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>○ Only WDT knows about the fund flows (1 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>○ Grama Panchayati played a nominal role (4 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>○ Grama Panchayati played no role in prioritization of watershed plans (12 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>○ Village Organization played no role in prioritization of activities (17 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>○ Village Organization played a nominal role (1 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>○ Role of Village Organization was limited to productivity enhancement and enterprise development plan only (1 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>○ Village Organization followed the decisions of Grama Panchayati (1 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> </ul>			
<b>Recommendations for Improvement:</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ 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).</li> </ul>			

<b>Report of Independent Process Monitoring of APRLP</b>			
<b>District</b>	8 Districts in the state	<b>Time Period</b>	Upto November 2006
<b>Cluster</b>	Capacity Building Inputs	<b>Cluster No</b>	12
<b>Details of Sample</b>	Total 37 Projects in 8 Districts (Adilabad, Anantapur, Kurnool, Mehaboobnagar, Nalgonda, Prakasam, RR district, Srikakulam) - <i>Old APRLP (10 Nos); Hariyali (22 Nos) and APRLP+ (5 Nos)</i>		
<b>Key Questions:</b>			
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. How many training programs are organized on watershed development program? Stage of the project and Training/ CB Inputs</li> <li>2. Whether women participated in training programs or not?</li> <li>3. Where are these training programs organized?</li> <li>4. Whether Exposure Visits were conducted or not?</li> <li>5. Whether the training inputs are used by the trainees? How?</li> </ol>			
<b>Good Processes:</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o More than 10 training programs were organized (5 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>o 3 to 8 training programs were organized (12 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>o Women participated in training programs (18 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>o Training programs were organized at CLRC (16 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>o Training programs were organized in Village itself (9 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>o Resource organizations were used as venues for training programs (ICRISAT/ KVK/ Others) (3 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>o Exposure visits were conducted (18 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>o Participants indicated that the training inputs were useful (in several ways – improvement in group functioning, implementation of activities, better site selection and so on) (21 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> </ul>			
<b>Processes that Need Improvement:</b>			

<b>Report of Independent Process Monitoring of APRLP</b>			
<b>District</b>	8 Districts in the state	<b>Time Period</b>	Upto November 2006
<b>Cluster</b>	Capacity Building Inputs	<b>Cluster No</b>	12
<b>Details of Sample</b>	Total 37 Projects in 8 Districts (Adilabad, Anantapur, Kurmool, Mehaboobnagar, Nalgonda, Prakasam, RR district, Srikakulam) - <i>Old APRLP (10 Nos); Hariyali (22 Nos) and APRLP+ (5 Nos)</i>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o No training programs were organized and/or communities could not remember any such events (8 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>o One or two training programs were organized (12 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>o Limited participation of women in training programs (1 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>o Only women participated in training programs (1 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>o Women did not participate in training programs (10 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>o Office of DWMA/ MDT/ PIA was used as venue of training (7 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>o No exposure visits were conducted or/and community is not aware of such events (17 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>o Training inputs were either not provided (6 Nos/ 37 Villages) or not useful (9 Nos/ 37 Villages).</li> </ul>			
<b>Recommendations for Improvement:</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o More number of institution based training programs (D CLRC centric) need to be organized. Avoid training programs at DWMA/ MDT/PIA office.</li> <li>o Encourage women participation in all training programs. Make adequate efforts and establish adequate support to women participants (EG: Facilities at D CLRC).</li> <li>o Action linked training programs need to be organized to make effective use of training inputs. (Project Management Cycle Linked CB Inputs)</li> </ul>			

<b>Report of Independent Process Monitoring of APRLP</b>			
<b>District</b>	8 Districts in the state	<b>Time Period</b>	Upto November 2006
<b>Cluster</b>	Role of User Groups in Execution of Works	<b>Cluster No</b>	13
<b>Details of Sample</b>	Total 37 Projects in 8 Districts (Adilabad, Anantapur, Kurnool, Mehaboobnagar, Nalgonda, Prakasam, RR district, Srikakulam) - <i>Old APRLP (10 Nos); Hariyali (22 Nos) and APRLP+ (5 Nos)</i>		
<b>Key Questions:</b>			
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?	
<b>Good Processes:</b>			

<b>Report of Independent Process Monitoring of APRLP</b>			
<b>District</b>	8 Districts in the state	<b>Time Period</b>	Upto November 2006
<b>Cluster</b>	Role of User Groups in Execution of Works	<b>Cluster No</b>	13
<b>Details of Sample</b>	Total 37 Projects in 8 Districts (Adilabad, Anantapur, Kurmool, Mehaboobnagar, Nalgonda, Prakasam, RR district, Srikakulam) - <i>Old APRLP (10 Nos); Hariyali (22 Nos) and APRLP+ (5 Nos)</i>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ User groups applied for works (19 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>○ Farmers contributed (2 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>○ User Groups members contributed (5 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>○ Grama Panchayat played a key role in deciding the activities (17 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>○ Farmers decided interventions (11 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>○ User Groups decided activities (10 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>○ Village Organization decided activities (10 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>○ WDT made estimates in majority of watersheds (33 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>○ User Groups made estimates (1 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>○ Watershed secretary and committee made estimates (2 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>○ Farmers made estimates (1 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>○ Approval of estimate is largely by DWMA/ MDT (32 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>○ Grama Panchayati approved estimates (8 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>○ Village Organization approved estimates (6 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>○ Farmers executed the works (4 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>○ User Groups members executed the works (4 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>○ Village level institutions executed the works. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Village Organization (9 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>▪ Grama Panchayati (4 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>▪ Watershed Committee (4 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> </ul> </li> <li>○ WDT played a critical role in execution of works (26 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>○ Para worker monitored the works (4 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>○ Farmers monitored the works (1 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> </ul>			

Report of Independent Process Monitoring of APRLP			
<b>District</b>	8 Districts in the state	<b>Time Period</b>	Upto November 2006
<b>Cluster</b>	Role of User Groups in Execution of Works	<b>Cluster No</b>	13
<b>Details of Sample</b>	Total 37 Projects in 8 Districts (Adilabad, Anantapur, Kurmool, Mehaboobnagar, Nalgonda, Prakasam, RR district, Srikakulam) - <i>Old APRLP (10 Nos); Hariyali (22 Nos) and APRLP+ (5 Nos)</i>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Village level institutions monitored the works <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Village Organization (10 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>▪ Grama Panchatyati (11 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>▪ Labour Group/ Committee (2 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>▪ Watershed Committee (5 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> </ul> </li> <li>○ External support was provided for monitoring the works <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ MDT (14 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>▪ WDT (34 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>▪ PD (2 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>▪ PIA (2 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> </ul> </li> <li>○ Ensuring quality of works is the main responsibility of the following external actors <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ MDT (14 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>▪ WDT (32 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>▪ PIA (2 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> </ul> </li> <li>○ Ensuring quality of works is the main responsibility of the following internal actors <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Grama Panchayati (8 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>▪ Watershed Committee (4 Nos/ 37 villages)</li> <li>▪ Village Organization (10 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>▪ User Groups (2 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> </ul> </li> <li>○ Measurement of works is the responsibility of the following actors <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ WDT (34 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>▪ MDT (4 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>▪ Grama Panchayati (5 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>▪ Village Organization (6 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>▪ Watershed Secretary (5 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>▪ User Groups (2 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> </ul> </li> <li>○ Payments are made to User Groups by Grama Panchayati in cheque (1 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>○ Payments are made through cheque (29 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>○ User Groups are found to be functional even after completion of activities (5 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> </ul>			

<b>Report of Independent Process Monitoring of APRLP</b>			
<b>District</b>	8 Districts in the state	<b>Time Period</b>	Upto November 2006
<b>Cluster</b>	Role of User Groups in Execution of Works	<b>Cluster No</b>	13
<b>Details of Sample</b>	Total 37 Projects in 8 Districts (Adilabad, Anantapur, Kurmool, Mehaboobnagar, Nalgonda, Prakasam, RR district, Srikakulam) - <i>Old APRLP (10 Nos); Hariyali (22 Nos) and APRLP+ (5 Nos)</i>		
<b>Processes that Need Improvement:</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ User Groups did not make any applications for works (16 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>○ Community members could not mention any thing about applications (1 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>○ Contractor contributed (2 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>○ WDT contributed (1 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>○ Wages are deducted to mobilize contribution (21 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>○ Grama Panchayati members contributed (1 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>○ Communities could not give clear details about contribution (4 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>○ WDT played a key role in decision making related events (33 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>○ MPTC decided works (1 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>○ Sarpanch alone decided works (4 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>○ MDT/ Engineering dept made estimates (2 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>○ Contractors implemented the works (2 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>○ PIA executed the works (3 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>○ MDT executed the works (4 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>○ Ward Member/ Sarpanch executed the works (5 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>○ Role of user groups is nominal in quality control of activities (35 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>○ Role of user groups, paraworkers and secretary is nominal in measurements in majority of watersheds.</li> <li>○ Payments are made through cash (6 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>○ Role of labour groups in payments is not yet established in any watershed project.</li> <li>○ User groups are found to be dis-functional after the activities are completed (17 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>○ The role of Grama Panchayati in execution is found to be nil or nominal (14 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>○ Sarpanch played a dominating role (1 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>○ Grama Panchayati role was limited to making payments (1 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> </ul>			
<b>Recommendations for Improvement:</b>			

<b>Report of Independent Process Monitoring of APRLP</b>			
<b>District</b>	8 Districts in the state	<b>Time Period</b>	Upto November 2006
<b>Cluster</b>	Role of User Groups in Execution of Works	<b>Cluster No</b>	13
<b>Details of Sample</b>	Total 37 Projects in 8 Districts (Adilabad, Anantapur, Kurmool, Mehaboobnagar, Nalgonda, Prakasam, RR district, Srikakulam) - <i>Old APRLP (10 Nos); Hariyali (22 Nos) and APRLP+ (5 Nos)</i>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Promote demand driven activities and motivate users/ groups to formally apply for each activity.</li> <li>o Encourage mandatory advance contributions from users. Avoid wage deductions.</li> <li>o Build capacities of local functionaries in execution related tasks – estimates, measurements, book keeping and quality control. Enhance their role in quality control.</li> <li>o Develop a cadre of community level functionaries, who could perform several support roles in execution of works.</li> <li>o Ensure that the Grama Panchayati/ Village Organization perform different roles and do not encroach the roles of labor groups/ user groups.</li> <li>o Enhance the role of labor groups and user groups in execution of watershed activities.</li> </ul>			

Report of Independent Process Monitoring of APRLP			
<b>District</b>	8 Districts in the state	<b>Time Period</b>	Upto November 2006
<b>Cluster</b>	Completion of Works and Records	<b>Cluster No</b>	14
<b>Details of Sample</b>	Total 37 Projects in 8 Districts (Adilabad, Anantapur, Kurnool, Mehaboobnagar, Nalgonda, Prakasam, RR district, Srikakulam) - <i>Old APRLP (10 Nos); Hariyali (22 Nos) and APRLP+ (5 Nos)</i>		
<b>Key Questions:</b>			
1. Who maintaining the records related to works?			
2. Where was the cheque book?			
<b>Good Processes:</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Grama Panchayati is maintaining the records (7 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>o Village Organization is maintaining the records (7 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>o Village Livelihoods Activist is maintaining the records (2 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>o Secretary is maintaining the records (5 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>o Watershed Committee is maintaining the records (1 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>o WDT provides active support in maintaining the records (32 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>o Grama Panchayati and its office keep the cheque books (12 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>o Village Organization keeps the cheque book (10 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> </ul>			
<b>Processes that Need Improvement:</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o WDT also maintains records in several watersheds</li> <li>o PIA and MDT maintain records (3 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>o WDT keeps the cheque book with him (8 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>o PIA keeps the cheque book (5 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>o MDT keeps the cheque book (2 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>o Sarpanch keeps the cheque books with himself (1 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> </ul>			
<b>Recommendations for Improvement:</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Encourage women participation in all training programs. Make adequate efforts and establish Ensure that the WDT plays a support role in maintaining the records, rather than the main role.</li> <li>o Identify local level functionaries and build their capacities to maintain the records of the watershed development project.</li> <li>o The cheque book and other records are the property of Grama Panchayati and Village Organization. These books should be at their offices. Not at PIA/ WDT/ DWMA/ MDT offices.</li> </ul>			

Report of Independent Process Monitoring of APRLP			
<b>District</b>	8 Districts in the state	<b>Time Period</b>	Upto November 2006
<b>Cluster</b>	Implementation of Productivity Enhancement and Enterprise Promotion Plans	<b>Cluster No</b>	15
<b>Details of Sample</b>	Total 37 Projects in 8 Districts (Adilabad, Anantapur, Kurnool, Mehaboobnagar, Nalgonda, Prakasam, RR district, Srikakulam) - <i>Old APRLP (10 Nos); Hariyali (22 Nos) and APRLP+ (5 Nos)</i>		
<b>Key Questions:</b>			
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. What is the process of executing the plans of productivity enhancement plans?</li> <li>2. What is the role of SHGs?</li> <li>3. What is the role of individual persons/ members?</li> <li>4. What is the role of village organization?</li> <li>5. How are funds released (From where to where?)</li> <li>6. What kind of capacity building support is provided to the individuals/ groups/ VO for implementing the productivity enhancement plan/ enterprise plans?</li> <li>7. Who monitors the execution of action plans?</li> </ol>			
<b>Good Processes:</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Based on applications from SHG/ poor members, PE plans were prepared (2 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>o Village Organization conducted meetings to explain the PE related details and decide on priorities/ target groups ((3 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>o Priority is given to single women and Small Famers (8 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>o Village Organization is revolving the fund (1 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>o SHG members participated in training programs/ meetings related to execution of PE plans. They also identified beneficiaries; borrowed money and started repaying the same (20 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>o Village Organization is maintaining the records, monitoring the works, ensuring the quality of activities, take care of financial transactions related to execution of PE plans (17 Nos/ 37 Villages).</li> <li>o The funds are released from DWMA to Gram Panchayat, from Grama Panchayat to Village Organization and then from Village Organization to SHG (4 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>o Funds were released from DWMA to watershed committee to village organisation (1 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>o Capacity building inputs were provided on seed processing, vermin compost, etc (Training/ Exposure visits) (22 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>o Village Organization actively monitored the activities of PE (17 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>o WDT and PIA provide considerable monitoring support (23 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>o MDT provide considerable monitoring support (13 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> </ul>			
<b>Processes that Need Improvement:</b>			

<b>Report of Independent Process Monitoring of APRLP</b>			
<b>District</b>	8 Districts in the state	<b>Time Period</b>	Upto November 2006
<b>Cluster</b>	Implementation of Productivity Enhancement and Enterprise Promotion Plans	<b>Cluster No</b>	15
<b>Details of Sample</b>	Total 37 Projects in 8 Districts (Adilabad, Anantapur, Kurnool, Mehaboobnagar, Nalgonda, Prakasam, RR district, Srikakulam) - <i>Old APRLP (10 Nos); Hariyali (22 Nos) and APRLP+ (5 Nos)</i>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Action plans are not prepared for productivity enhancement (17 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>○ So far only meetings were organized. No plan is prepared and implemented (2 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>○ SHG played little role or no role in execution of PE activities (10 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>○ PE plans are not prepared/ not relevant (8 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>○ Village Organization had nominal role in execution of PE plans (18 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>○ Fund releases related to PE activities are yet to be established clearly.</li> <li>○ No capacity building inputs are provided for executing PE plans (18 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>○ No one monitors the activities of PE (4 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> </ul>			
<b>Recommendations for Improvement:</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Make productivity enhancement related activities demand driven.</li> <li>○ Evolve rigorous methodologies for planning and execution of PE and EP action plans.</li> <li>○ Provide adequate capacity building support and orientation before planning and execution of PE and EP activities.</li> <li>○ Streamline funding systems and monitoring for PE and EP plans.</li> <li>○ Ensure that these interventions reach the deserving and right target groups (single women, small and marginal farmers in ridge area/ assigned lands, livestock rearers, etc)</li> </ul>			

Report of Independent Process Monitoring of APRLP			
<b>District</b>	8 Districts in the state	<b>Time Period</b>	Upto November 2006
<b>Cluster</b>	Sustainability and Growth	<b>Cluster No</b>	16
<b>Details of Sample</b>	Total 37 Projects in 8 Districts (Adilabad, Anantapur, Kurnool, Mehaboobnagar, Nalgonda, Prakasam, RR district, Srikakulam) - <i>Old APRLP (10 Nos); Hariyali (22 Nos) and APRLP+ (5 Nos)</i>		
<b>Key Questions:</b>			
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. What are the systems for asset maintenance/ repairs?</li> <li>2. Whether damages occurred? Who repaired?</li> <li>3. Whether Communities know about the amount of WDF?</li> <li>4. Whether Usufruct rights are allocated to anyone, on the works completed on CPRs?</li> <li>5. Whether UGs have any regulations/ rules for the use of assets/ benefit sharing from CPRs?</li> <li>6. Which institution is functional at the end of project period?</li> <li>7. How many new institutions are formed at the time of exit stage?</li> <li>8. What systems are employed to sustain the user groups?</li> <li>9. Who takes care of the assets? How long can they take up this responsibility?</li> <li>10. Is the fund for productivity enhancement and enterprise development circulated?</li> <li>11. Does the PE and EP plan include new members?</li> </ol>			
<b>Good Processes:</b>			

<b>Report of Independent Process Monitoring of APRLP</b>			
<b>District</b>	8 Districts in the state	<b>Time Period</b>	Upto November 2006
<b>Cluster</b>	Sustainability and Growth	<b>Cluster No</b>	16
<b>Details of Sample</b>	Total 37 Projects in 8 Districts (Adilabad, Anantapur, Kurmool, Mehaboobnagar, Nalgonda, Prakasam, RR district, Srikakulam) - <i>Old APRLP (10 Nos); Hariyali (22 Nos) and APRLP+ (5 Nos)</i>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Watershed Development Fund is established for future maintenance (17 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>○ A labor committee is formed for repairs and maintenance (1 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>○ Damages were repaired by the watershed committee (3 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>○ Entire community knows about WDF (4 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>○ Labour groups know about WDF as they contributed to WDF (1 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>○ SHG members also know about WDF (2 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>○ User Groups know about WD (2 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>○ Usufruct rights were allocated to user groups (1 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>○ SHGs and VO are functional even after the project activities are completed.</li> <li>○ New institutions were not formed at the end of project period, for future maintenance and any other purpose (37 Nos/ 37 Villages).</li> <li>○ Grama Panchayati/ Watershed Committee/ Village Organization/ Farmers agreed to take care of assets of watershed projects in an informal manner (19 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>○ Fund for PE and EP started circulating among the members (19 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>○ There are new members in PE and EP activities (17 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> </ul>			
<b>Processes that Need Improvement:</b>			

Report of Independent Process Monitoring of APRLP			
<b>District</b>	8 Districts in the state	<b>Time Period</b>	Upto November 2006
<b>Cluster</b>	Sustainability and Growth	<b>Cluster No</b>	16
<b>Details of Sample</b>	Total 37 Projects in 8 Districts (Adilabad, Anantapur, Kurmool, Mehaboobnagar, Nalgonda, Prakasam, RR district, Srikakulam) - <i>Old APRLP (10 Nos); Hariyali (22 Nos) and APRLP+ (5 Nos)</i>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The damages were not repaired, as there is no system (8 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>○ Program is being implemented. Issues related to maintenance are not yet discussed (8 Nos/ 37 Villages).</li> <li>○ No one knows about WDF (19 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>○ Only the following members know about WDF. Others do not know <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Only PIA (1 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>▪ Only Village Organization (2 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>▪ Only Watershed Committee (2 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>▪ Only Grama Panchayati (4 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> </ul> </li> <li>○ Usufruct rights were not allocated to any one (24 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>○ User groups do not have any regulations/ norms (25 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>○ No systems were formed to sustain user groups (37 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>○ No one takes the responsibility of maintenance of assets as of now (11 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>○ Fund for PE and EP are not being circulated till now (16 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> <li>○ No new members joined the PE and EP activities (9 Nos/ 37 Villages)</li> </ul>			
<b>Recommendations for Improvement:</b>			

Report of Independent Process Monitoring of APRLP			
<b>District</b>	8 Districts in the state	<b>Time Period</b>	Upto November 2006
<b>Cluster</b>	Sustainability and Growth	<b>Cluster No</b>	16
<b>Details of Sample</b>	Total 37 Projects in 8 Districts (Adilabad, Anantapur, Kurmool, Mehaboobnagar, Nalgonda, Prakasam, RR district, Srikakulam) - <i>Old APRLP (10 Nos); Hariyali (22 Nos) and APRLP+ (5 Nos)</i>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Ensure proper and sustainable institutional base by the end of watershed project.</li> <li>○ Sustainable user groups are critical for management of watershed resources. Allocation of usufruct rights, capacity building inputs, linkages to PE and EP related activities make the institutions functional.</li> <li>○ Ensure that WDT facilitate the development of norms for repairs and management of watershed resources/ assets.</li> <li>○ Ensure that deserving groups (user/ SHG/ Other) get usufruct rights from the beginning of watershed projects itself so that the maintenance and management becomes a mandatory responsibility of these groups.)</li> </ul>			