

Management Systems that Promote Participatory Processes
in Watershed Program
Report of Process Study in Ranga Reddy District
(2nd and 3rd Phases)

A Report Prepared by WASSAN
(Dec 2001)

Table of Contents

CHAPTER 1—INTRODUCTION	5
1.1.BACKGROUND:	5
1.2. OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY:	5
1.3. LOOKING AHEAD....	6
1.4. THEORIES OF MANAGEMENT:	7
1.5. MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS FOR DPAP:	7
1.6. OBJECTIVES OF THE WATERSHED PROGRAM:	7
1.7. ROLE OF ZILLA PARISHADS/ DRDAS (DPAP, IN CASE OF AP) IN THE WATERSHED PROGRAM (AS PER GUIDELINES):	8
1.8. NON-NEGOTIABLES:	8
1.9. CORE VALUES:	10
1.10. SYSTEMS AND SUB SYSTEMS OF MANAGEMENT OF DPAP:	10
CHAPTER 2: -- SUB SYSTEM 1: GOALS, PROCESSES, VALUES AND TRACKING	12
SUGGESTION 1: SETTING A GOAL	12
SUGGESTION 2: DEVELOP COMMON VISION (SHARED VISION)	13
SUGGESTION 3: INTERNAL REFLECTIONS/ RETREAT FOR DPAP:	14
SUGGESTION 4: CREATING OPPORTUNITIES FOR REFLECTION AND REORIENTATION	14
SUGGESTION 5: REGULAR REVIEW BY DISTRICT WATERSHED ADVISORY COMMITTEE:	15
SUGGESTION 6: INDEPENDENT ANNUAL REVIEWS ON SELECTED THEMES/ ISSUES	16
SUGGESTION 7: CAMPAIGN ON NON NEGOTIABLES, CORE VALUES AND OBJECTIVES OF THE PROGRAM:	16
CHAPTER 3: SUB SYSTEM 2: PLANNING AND COORDINATION	18
SUGGESTION 8: PLANS TO BUDGETS, BUT NOT FROM BUDGETS TO PLANS:	18
SUGGESTION 9: SUPPORTING ACTION PLANNING PROCESSES BY CREATING A POOL OF FACILITATORS, WHO CAN SUPPORT ACTION-PLANNING PROCESS AT THE FIELD LEVEL.	19
SUGGESTION 10: FLEXIBILITY IN ACTION PLANS -- REVISION OF PLANS, BASED ON EXPERIENCE/ DEMAND:	19
SUGGESTION 11: ACTION PLANS AS THE BASIS FOR ANY ACTION	20
SUGGESTION 12: PLAN OF ACTION FOR BUILDING CAPACITIES (P ABC) FROM PIAS	21
CHAPTER 4: SUB SYSTEM 3: IMPLEMENTATION	23
SUGGESTION 13: EACH FUNCTION IS DIFFERENT AND INDEPENDENT.	24
SUGGESTION 14: IDENTIFY FUNCTIONS WITH SIMILAR NATURE AND GIVE THOSE RESPONSIBILITIES TO ONE PERSON/ MDT, FOR EFFECTIVE UTILIZATION OF AVAILABLE HUMAN RESOURCES.	24

<u>CHAPTER 5: SUB SYSTEM 4: MONITORING, REGULATION AND FEEDBACK SYSTEMS</u>	<u>26</u>
SUGGESTION 15: DECENTRALIZED REVIEW OF IMPLEMENTATION	26
SUGGESTION 16: USE OF INFORMATION FROM MONITORING AND FEED BACK, DURING REVIEW OF IMPLEMENTATION:	27
SUGGESTION 17: REFINING MONITORING SYSTEMS/ RATIONALIZING DATA NEEDS AT VARIOUS LEVELS.	27
SUGGESTION 18: IMPROVING ABC CLASSIFICATION OF WATERSHEDS	29
SUGGESTION 19: ENCOURAGING PARTICIPATORY COMMUNITY BASED MONITORING SYSTEMS:	30
<u>CHAPTER 6: SUB SYSTEM 5: RESOURCES SYSTEMS (FINANCES)</u>	<u>31</u>
SUGGESTION 20: DEVELOP AN INVENTORY OF ALL LINE ITEMS OF EXPENDITURE THAT ARE RELEVANT TO DPAP.	31
SUGGESTION 21: STREAMLINE FUND FLOWS (LEDGERS AND CASH BOOKS, WITH ALL LINE ITEMS AS PER SUGGESTION NO 17, IF POSSIBLE) AS PER EACH BATCH OF WATERSHED.	32
SUGGESTION 22: REGULAR INTERNAL AUDITING	32
SUGGESTION 23: ANNUAL EXTERNAL AUDITS	32
SUGGESTION 24: ONLY AUDITOR’S STATEMENT AND UTILIZATION CERTIFICATE FROM PIAs/ WATERSHED COMMITTEES AND BE ACCEPTED. THE PRACTICE OF “COLLECTING ALL VOUCHERS OF ALL EXPENDITURES FROM ALL PIA/ WATERSHED COMMITTEES” SHOULD BE DISCONTINUED.	33
SUGGESTION 25: ONLY CHEQUE PAYMENTS FOR ALL PAYMENTS ABOVE ONE THOUSAND RUPEES.	33
SUGGESTION 26: SYSTEMATIC PROCEDURES FOR FUND RELEASES:	33
SUGGESTION 27: TRACKING UNIT COSTS OF ALL LINE ITEMS:	34
SUGGESTION 28: ANALYSIS OF ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENDITURE OF DPAP AND PIAs/ WATERSHED ASSOCIATIONS	34
<u>CHAPTER 7: SUB SYSTEM 6:RESOURCES SYSTEMS (HUMAN)</u>	<u>36</u>
SUGGESTION 29: OBJECTIVE PROCESS OF SELECTION OF PIAs/ WDTs/ MDTs/ PDs.	36
SUGGESTION 31: ANALYSIS OF WORK LOADS, DEPLOYMENT AND DEVELOP JOB CHARTS.	37
SUGGESTION 32: TIPS ON RETENTION OF STAFF:	38
<u>CHAPTER 9: CLASSIFICATION OF SUGGESTIONS AND ACTION POINTS:</u>	<u>42</u>
<u>CHAPTER 10: CONCLUSIONS</u>	<u>46</u>

Chapter 1

Introduction

1.1. Background:

Watershed program in Andhra Pradesh is one of the key interventions in regenerating natural resource based rural economy in many drought prone districts. Government departments/ agencies, independent development organizations/ voluntary organizations, community based organizations and other institutes are involved in the program in various capacities and with different responsibilities. Office of Drought Prone Areas Program (DPAP) in Ranga Reddy district is providing leadership to watershed program in nearly 250 villages in the district, over last six years.

Guidelines for Watershed Development (GOI, 1994) demand significant “shifts” at various levels --in thinking, management systems & practices and activities. For a government organization like DPAP, promoting and facilitating a participatory development program is a new experience. Over a period of time, a need was identified for “understanding more about the processes on the ground”. This understanding is expected to develop appropriate strategies for strengthening the program at various levels.

However, one is aware of the strong influence of management systems at DPAP level on the processes at grass root level. The processes at village level do not become “participatory”, if the promoting organizations like DPAP/PIAs adopt an “authoritarian” style of functioning. For a government organization to support and promote a participatory program like watershed program, an entirely new style of functioning and management systems needs to be designed so that the main objectives of the program can be realized.

With this background, the “Study of Process in Watershed Program in RR Dist” is conceived. The scope of the study is expanded from “understanding the processes at grass root level” to “understanding the management systems at DPAP office”. The study is conceived in three phases, with the following objectives.

1.2. Objectives of the Study:

The objectives of the study are

- To understand the process of operationalising watershed program in Ranga Reddy district and to analyze major gaps
- To analyze the role perceptions, capacity building needs and enabling systems in place (with respect to participatory processes) at various stakeholder groups
- Based on the above analysis, identify strategies and management systems to bridge the gaps through a participatory process.

The Study is divided into three phases with respect to each of the above objectives. The objectives of each phase of the study and its specific output are presented in the Study Proposal.

The first phase of the study only attempts to understand and have a broad consensus on the most common practices in the field. First phase of the study is completed in Dec 2000 and a report was submitted to DPAP, RR Dist.

The second phase of the study was completed in July/ Aug 2001. A multi disciplinary team conducted the study in the 2nd Phase and a report is submitted to DPAP in Dec 2001.

During the 3^d Phase of the study, a working group is constituted with experts/ experienced persons and representatives from DPAP/ PIA/ Commissionerate. This group is expected to critique the report of 2nd

Phase and contribute to the process of improving the contents/ strategies/ suggestions proposed in 2nd Phase. This group met on 8th may 2002 and discussed the contents of the report of 2nd Phase and proposed improvements in the strategies/ suggestions. At the end of this consultative process, this final report is prepared incorporating all the inputs provided by the members of working group.

Phase 2: Objectives and Methodology

Having arrived at a consensus on the processes followed in the watersheds, the second phase attempts to explore, understand and analyze the reasons contributing to the trends observed in the first phase. This analysis will provide the scope and a framework for building proactive management strategies/ systems.

The objectives of the 2nd Phase of the study are

- To analyze the processes identified in Phase 1 with respect to.
 - Role Perceptions
 - Capacity gaps / needs
 - Enabling environment
- To understand systems of management including monitoring, data management etc., at various stakeholders levels i.e. at PIA, MDT and at PD levels.

Methodology:

For the first objective, a brief analysis of processes is presented, based on the report of 1st Phase. However, it is to be noted that main focus of the study in 2nd Phase is on DPAP and its immediate partners (Mainly PIAs). A multi disciplinary team met with various key persons with in DPAP – MDTs, administration staff and PD. The methodology mainly consists of the following.

- Personal interviews
- Studying documents/ records
- Consultation Workshop with MDTs/ Administration Staff/ PIA Representatives

During this process, the team tried to grasp the procedures, processes, systems and functions of each group in within DPAP. Observations of the team are shared with the MDTs/ Administrative staff and a general consensus is developed. A report is prepared to conceptualize management systems for DPAP. This report is shared with working group members.

Phase 3: Objectives and Methodology

The Objectives of Phase 3 is

To evolve appropriate strategies and systems for improving the quality of the processes in watershed program.

Methodology:

A working group to identify intervention strategies – consisting of representatives from MDTs, PIAs, Experts in the organization development and human resource development fields, Project directors, members of study team and representatives of WASSAN.

- The working group is expected to critique the draft report of the 2nd Phase and improve the strategies, suggestions and options.
- Incorporate all the suggestions and prepare a final report.
- The multi-stakeholder group will also reflect on the proposed interventions to be organized by DPAP, RR District to understand reflect the suggestions proposed.
- Submitting the final report for the consideration of DPAP, RR District for implementing the strategies and suggestions.

1.3. Looking Ahead....

Based on the observations from the interactions with various groups/ individuals, the study team evolved a “Management Strategy” for the DPAP, keeping in mind the spirit and objectives of watershed guidelines. This report basically deals with the proposed strategy in detail.

The study and the proposed strategy basically call for a “change” in the current practices and systems. “Change management” is likely to create some tension and defensive mechanisms, within the systems and organizations. Some times, these forces are too strong and defeat the purpose of the initiative itself. To minimize this tendency, the team consciously decided, *“not to dwell too much upon”* the existing practices/ systems. Discussing the current systems/ practices might lead to “creating of a defensive atmosphere” among primary users of the strategy, which defeats the purpose of the exercise.

Instead, the team tried to project/ conceive a “most pragmatic and ideal management system” that are necessary for the program. A *“Frame Work”* for developing a management system is proposed, in which a collective and participatory process of envisioning the necessary systems can take place. In the light of well-accepted core management principles, a set of “Non-Negotiables” is proposed.

In the third phase, the working group critiqued the contents of proposed systems and improved them. In this process, an accepted and pragmatic “management system” is developed.

1.4. Theories of Management:

Many concepts and theories (Management by objectives, Results based management, etc) are developed and successfully applied to different sectors (corporate and development sectors). Even in public sector organizations, different management models are developed. Some of the common concerns/ thrust areas of these management philosophies/ concepts are briefly mentioned below.

- Focus on the main objectives/ purposes of the organization
- Focus on results that an organization is expected to achieve.
- Role of an organization in the larger context
- Needs/ demands of the clients of the organization
- Resource position of the organization

Each philosophy/ concept emphasizes on certain core values (like efficiency, transparency, honesty, equity, profit, responsiveness, responsibility, accountability, safety, punctuality, etc). Obviously different organizations have different core values – a business firm would have “profit” at its core, while a transport organization would have “safety and punctuality” as core values. In a given organization, it is essential to see that these core values are consistent with each other to avoid confusion within the organization.

1.5. Management Systems for DPAP:

With this background, the study team tried to conceptualize the “Management Systems” for DPAP, along with DPAP team (who contributed their ideas in the consultative workshop). The guiding principles of the program are adopted from the Guidelines of Watershed Program, since the organization is mainly involved with this program and created specially for this program. Before going ahead with the rest of the report, it is very important to understand the objectives of the watershed program and roles and responsibilities of various stakeholders (as envisaged in the guidelines).

1.6. Objectives of the Watershed Program:

Para No.14, Guidelines for Watershed Development (GOI, 1994)

1. To promote the economic development of the village community which is directly or indirectly dependent on watershed through –

- *Optimum utilization of the watershed’s natural resources like land, water, vegetation, etc, that will mitigate the adverse effects of drought and prevent further ecological degradation.*
- *Employment generation and development of the human and other economic resource of the village in order to promote saving and other income-generation activities.*

2. To encourage restoration of ecological balance in the village through –

→ Sustainable community action for the operation and maintenance of assets created and further development of the potential of the natural resources in the watershed.

→ Simple, easy and affordable technological solutions and institutional arrangements that make use of, build upon, local technical knowledge and available material.

3. Special emphasis to improve the economic and social condition of the resource- poor and the disadvantaged sections of the watershed community such as the asset less and the women through

→ More equitable distribution of the benefits of land and water resources development and the consequent biomass production

→ Greater access to income generating opportunities and focus on their human resource development.

1.7. Role of Zilla Parishads/ DRDAs (DPAP, in case of AP) in the Watershed Program (as per Guidelines):

(Para No.29, Guidelines for Watershed Development (GOI, 1994)

The Zilla Parishads/ DRDAs, as the case may be, shall be responsible for implementation of these guidelines at the Zilla Parishads as envisaged under the Panchayat Raj Legislation come into operation with adequate powers and resources, watershed development programs under these guidelines may be supervised and implemented by DRDAs. They will approve the watershed development plans and the selection of Project Implementation Agencies. The Zilla Parishads/ DRDAs, as the case may be, shall receive funds directly from the Government of India/ State Governments for implementing the watershed development programs under these guidelines. Funds for implementing the approved watershed development projects will be released by the Zilla parishads/ DRDAs, as the case may be, to the Panchayat/ Watershed Development Committee. Besides, the Zilla parishads/ DRDAs will exercise necessary administrative and financial control over the Project Implementation Agencies, Watershed Development Teams and the Village level Watershed Development Committees in terms of release of funds, inspection of works, super check on the maintenance of accounts, enquiries in to complaints/ allegations against Project Implementation Agencies/ Village Panchayat/ Watershed Development Teams. They shall also lay down formats/ norms and guidelines for maintenance of accounts, community organization, campaigns, farmers training, exposure visits, etc.

1.8. Non-Negotiables:

The concerns expressed in the guidelines of the program provided sufficient in sights into identifying a set of “Non- Negotiables “. The Process Study (Phase 1 and 2) also helped in identifying the exact nature of these “Non-Negotiables” in the context of DPAP. The working group helped in the refinement of these “non negotiables” in terms of their choice, explanatory notes and expression. While these “Non Negotiables” are fairly popular and well-established principles in management of participatory development programs, their relevance in the context of DPAP need to be particularly reinforced.

Faith in Partnerships:

DPAP has to deal with various sets of organizations (line departments, development organizations, community based organizations/ Panchayat Raj institutes, academic/ research organizations, financial organizations, etc). Faith in partnerships means commitment of DPAP in creating institutional space to other organizations that have a role in the program. This “institutional space” also indicates that in critical areas of the program, “decision making” opportunities are shared with relevant organizations, in a systematic manner.

Supporting Participatory Planning:

Participatory Planning processes demand the involvement of communities and PIAs at different levels. DPAP should facilitate such participatory planning processes and respect the outputs/ outcomes of such participatory planning processes. This implies that “Planning should be in the field, but not in the offices of PIAs/ DPAP”. The consolidated plans of communities/ PIAs should determine the plans/ agenda of MDTs/ DPAP. Contents of plans prepared at all levels should be “communicated” or “shared” with others involved.

Faith in People’s Abilities:

Faith in the abilities of communities to plan, implement and transact funds is key factor in strengthening the participatory processes. If this faith is not there, the organization would constantly and consistently undermine the local initiatives and processes.

Rationalizing the Responsibilities:

If a person/ team is involved in implementation, monitoring and facilitation responsibilities in a given context (say in a Mandal), it is likely that one compromises on one of/ all of these functions. So the responsibilities of implementation, monitoring and facilitation should be separated from each other. Same person/ team should not be handling all functions in a given context. All the functions with similar nature could be grouped together (supervision and quality control) and the responsibility of such functions could be given to one person/ team.

Keeping Track of Inputs:

All inputs (functions like implementation, monitoring and facilitation) at the field should be “traceable” in the field. Appropriate records/ systems should be developed to keep track of inputs. This helps in fixing up “responsibility centres” with in the system.

All Resources Should be deployed closer to the field:

All resources (financial/ human/ other) resources should be deployed closer to the field. This improves the efficiency and effectiveness of the system in resource utilization. “Field is where the action is”

Building and using local resources:

For promoting sustainable programs, building and using local resources (human and material) is very essential. The principle also builds the capacities of local communities in addressing their own developmental issues, over a period of time.

Access WDTs through PIAs:

It is to be realized that WDTs are staff of PIA, not of DPAP. To promote and strengthen autonomy of PIAs, it is to be realized that PIA is the “supervisor” of the WDTs. For accessing the services of WDTs, DPAP has to seek permission of PIAs.

Budgets or actuals, which ever is less:

This is a control mechanism on finances. This principle calls for rigorous exercise on estimating budgets before allocating resources/ taking up activities and keeping a track of actual expenditure. Unplanned expenditure can be minimized with this practice.

Independent Monitoring:

Various components of program – achievement of results/ objectives, progress as per plans, budget vs expenditure, processes, staff, etc need to be monitored “independently”. The frequency of this exercise can differ from theme to theme. The outputs of this exercise should be effectively used in designing future programs.

Demystification of Technology:

Technical interventions have significant role in watershed program. Apart from other issues, members of watershed association need to be strengthened on technology related aspects also. This process also makes the watershed interventions more sustainable over a period of time. Demystification of technology is a key factor in achieving this.

Faith in Capacity Building Processes:

Communities and different functionaries need to build their capacities in various aspects of the program. This capacity building process should be supported and strengthened and supported by DPAP. The key objectives of the program can be achieved only if the capacity building needs and process are addressed by DPAP.

1.9. Core Values:

The core values, for which the program stands for, need to be an integral part of the DPAP management systems. These core values are

Institutional Development that facilitates

- Participation of Resource Poor
- Equity
- Transparency
- Sustainability

Other Values that define the nature of management systems of DPAP are

- Responsive
- Professionalism
- Flexibility
- Accountability
- Commitment
- Decentralization

1.10. Systems and Sub Systems of Management of DPAP:

The DPAP has to reinvent itself and adapt to the needs of participatory watershed program. The role of DPAP is also envisaged to be “responsible for implementation of guidelines” rather than “direct implementation agency”. The first and second phase of the study to understand the processes at grass root level and management practices at the DPAP/ PIA levels helped to conceptualize the basic elements of “Management Systems” for DPAP. The list of “Non-Negotiables” and the objectives of the program formed the basis for the proposed system.

The Management System for DPAP consists of 7 SUB SYSTEMS. These 7 sub systems are considered to address the needs of DPAP in an adequate manner.

Sub System 1:

Tracking Goals, Processes and Values

Sub System 2:

Planning and Coordination

Sub System 3:

Implementation and Client Orientation

Sub System 4:

Monitoring, Regulation and Feedback Systems

Sub System 5:

Resources Systems (Finances)

Sub System 6:

Resources Systems (Human)

Sub System 7:

Other Democratic Institutions

For each sub system, the “rationale” of the sub system in the context of DPAP is explained. After this, the study team comes up with a number of strategies/ approaches/ suggestions under each sub system. For each suggestion, the following points are described.

Statement of the Suggestion

- Why to do? (Rationale of the suggestion)
- What to do? (For operationalizing the above suggestion)
- Who should do? (Responsible person/ organization/ team)

Obviously the report cannot complete all aspects of suggestions, since some of them need different types of skills/ expertise and also further detailed studies. However, some core aspects of each suggestion are briefly mentioned. It is expected that this study would be followed up to operationalize these suggestions.

Chapter 2

Sub System 1: Goals, Processes, Values and Tracking

Rationale for this Sub System:

DPAP is mainly created to steer the watershed program. It consists of persons on deputation from various departments (for a period of one year or more). These persons may or may not have any previous experience of watershed program or participatory natural resource management programs.

Goal Setting:

When people with different backgrounds are pooled together to work for a program, (that is predominantly different from their parent department's programs), it is very important that these persons do "share a common vision". Since this visioning exercise does not happen on its own, the organization has to facilitate this process by developing appropriate systems.

Goal Tracking:

The previous exercises (setting goal, developing common vision and demonstrating by appropriate practices) need to be regularly and rigorously followed up in a systematic manner. This process is called "Goal Tracking". Without this process/ system, earlier exercises would not lead to any tangible results. If this system is not in place, the team might lose interest in the entire exercise, which is a real threat to the entire program. Apart from this, the review/ tracking systems also help to re-strategize the approach so that one can achieve the objectives. In a way this helps to understand "where one stands?" in the course of time

This Sub System discusses the ways and means of this process. The suggestions are mainly into two sub sets namely Goal Setting and Goal Tracking.

Suggestion 1: Setting a Goal

Why to do this?

Each district has its own character and a set of strengths and weaknesses. While the watershed program has a broad framework at national/ state level for participatory resource development, this program can be effectively utilized for addressing local (district) level issues/ development concerns. This process helps to conceptualize the role of this program in the district and prioritize the regions within the district. The expected results of the program can also be visualized from such an exercise.

What to do?

Box

Concerns/ Issues related to Sub System 1

Goal Setting and Tracking

- Differential emphasis on various watershed activities like soil/ moisture conservation, reducing migration, SHGs strengthening.
- Selective / Partial emphasis on basket of watershed program's goals. (Some components get missed completely)
- Differential articulation of concept of watershed (perhaps related to their roles or functions, departmental influences),
- Predominance of delivery mode vis a vis institution development and capacity building.
- Varying understanding of community participation and sustainability. (Community is perceived as receivers of support only)
- Do they share same vision? (Differs with roles and responsibilities)
- Varying levels of confidence on goal achievements.
- How do they use evaluation?

Perspective plan for the district should be developed, based on the needs of the district. A brief note on the methodologies and process of developing this perspective plan is presented in Annexure No. Some of the key steps in the process are

- A detailed analysis and zoning of district in terms of its strengths/ weaknesses/ opportunities/ threats.
- Prioritization of the regions of the district in terms of its needs/ problems.
- Setting region specific goals and achievable results from watershed program.

Who should do this?

PD, DPAP can constitute a multi disciplinary team consisting of MDTs/ PIAs/ Villagers/ Other Line Departments/ Academic Institutes/ People's Representatives to participate in this process. This process requires considerable amount of facilitation and conceptualization, based on a structured analysis of available data (from existing and new sources).

Suggestion 2: Develop Common Vision (Shared Vision)

Why to do this?

Different persons/ stakeholders (within a program context) have different understanding and appreciation of objectives/ purpose of the watershed program. It is very important to "orient" the staff on the purpose of the program/ organization so that their capacities (knowledge, skills and attitudes) are effectively channeled to achieve the vision of the same. This process also helps to establish role clarity of each person in achieving the goals of the organization.

What to do?

PD, DPAP has to see that every person associated with the program is oriented on the basic elements of the program.

Table No:

What	For whom	Brief Contents
Immersion/ Induction Program	Existing Staff with in DPAP New Recruits Members of District Watershed Advisory Committee PIAs/ WDTs	Goals and Objectives of the program. Elements of Participatory Development (Shifts in focus) Attitude and Behavior Changes for Development (ABCD) Developing partnerships and their Importance in development

Who should do this?

PD, DPAP can facilitate this process by collaborating with appropriate institutes (mainly training and development agencies like APARD/ MANAGE). Commissionerate, Rural Development might be requested to develop/ conceptualize a module on this issue so that they can use this module in other districts also.

Suggestion 3: Internal Reflections/ Retreat for DPAP:

Why to do this?

Rarely government organizations get an opportunity to reflect and ponder their own experiences. Without this process, the organization cannot learn from its own experiences and improve upon its previous experiences. It is found that this process of internal reflection in a relaxed manner would help in reinventing the organization and refining its strategies.

What to do?

Most difficult task for DPAP staff is to take some "time off" for this purpose. But it is important that the entire team (program and support staff) spends some time together and gets into a process of reflection. DPAP can identify external facilitator for supporting this process. It is to be realized that the role of external resource person(s) is very critical for effective results of this process.

Who should do this?

Commissioner, Rural Development/ District Collector/ Project Director, DPAP have to recognize the need for such processes and facilitate them in a systematic manner. Such processes lead to creation of new culture within DPAP. Such investment in staff development would yield desirable results.

Suggestion 4: Creating opportunities for reflection and reorientation

Why to do this?

The goals/ vision/ objectives need to be internalized by the team members. The vision of the organization/ program should act like a "beckon" to the members. It is important to see that all strategies/ activities/ practices of the members should be consistent with this vision. It is important to create opportunities for all stakeholders to reflect upon their experiences and reorient themselves on the vision of the organization. This process would be very useful to orient the newly recruited persons. Continued processes in this regard would help in developing a shared vision among the team members.

What to do?

The following activities can help in demonstrating the belief/ commitment towards the vision of the organization.

- Displaying the posters/ slogans on the vision of organization
- Singing songs that communicate the vision of the program in all meetings

Box

Large Scale Interactive Processes and Future Search

These are the tools/ methods in which all stakeholders can interact with each other in an organized and systematic manner and arrive at the common understanding regarding their situation, problems, experiences, opportunities, future plans, concerns, expectations from each other, etc. These exercises generate significant amount of energies and enthusiasm among the participants. Sincere follow up of these events would induce confidence and transparency in the system and process.

Box

Platform for NGOs and CBOs

Generally government officers dominate the common meetings of NGOs and GOs (in terms of decision making). It would be useful to create a separate forum for NGOs and CBOs to interact with each other. This forum can facilitate the sharing of experiences and identify critical bottlenecks. DPAP can support the process of addressing these bottlenecks. Such platforms can play a critical role in enhancing the participation, capacities and transparency in the system.

Box

Annual Conventions and Combined Exposure Visits

Depending on the learning needs of communities/ functionaries, DPAP has to organize combined exposure visits (GO/ NGO/ CBO representatives) within and outside the district. It is important to conduct these programs in a professional and systematic manner. The frequency could be every quarter.

- Organizing events like “Large Scale Interactive Processes (LSIP)” and “Future Search” with the support of experts and professionals.
- Creating platform for NGOs and CBOs to share their concerns with the DPAP.
- Office Administrative Staff to visit field/ villages and understand and orient themselves on the concept of watershed program.
- Organize annual conventions of all watershed functionaries and make this exercise an interesting process that facilitates interactions, rather than “lecture based” event.
- Organize combined exposure visits within the district and outside the district for key functionaries of the program and communities. This process has to be organized in a systematic and professional manner to reap the benefits.

Who should do this?

PD, DPAP along with DPAP staff (mainly MDTs/ Administration) should take initiatives to operationalize the above suggestions. PD can form a core team to sphere head this within the organization. There are institutes/ organizations, which have experience and expertise in organizing events like “Large Scale Interactive Processes (LSIP)” and “Future Search”. DPAP can take their support in organizing these events.

Suggestion 5: Regular Review by District Watershed Advisory Committee:

Why to do this?

The District Watershed Advisory Committee plays a critical role in streamlining the program and creating favorable and supportive environment in the program. Periodical review by this committee would improve the quality of the program and helps DPAP in enhancing the participatory processes in the watershed program. This committee can play an important role in planning and promoting watershed development projects, sanctioning them and removing all the bottlenecks in the implementation process. District

Box

Functions of District Watershed Advisory Committee

It has been stipulate by the Ministry of Rural Development that this committee shall be constituted under the chairman of Zilla Parishad of DRDA as the case may be. It shall consists of PD, DPAP and district level officers of the line departments associated with the implementation of watershed development projects, one representative of the State Remote Sensing Center, one member from relevant research and training institute in the district, one NGO representatives at least two prominent women workers and one prominent social worker. The District Watershed Development Committee will advise on matters, regarding selection of PIAs, members of watershed development teams, training, community organizations, publicity campaigns, and such other activities/ items. The committee will also approve the detailed action plans for watershed development projects in then district. Its should meet al least once in a quarter and review the progress of the watershed development projects, assists them in resolving, management and administrative problems, guide in implementation, identify policy issues, if any, for reference to the State Government / Government of India.

It is to be presided by the District Collector. Apart from taking up all functions and responsibilities as envisaged in Guidelines, this committee is be an empowered committee to take decisions related to policy matters at district level and provide guidance on important aspects like PIA/ village selection, approval of watershed development plans, action plans for capacity building support, communication strategies and other aspects of the program. Since the heads of district level related development/ line departments such as Agriculture, Forest, Animal Husbandry, minor irrigation, other important departments are member in the committee, it can function as a plat form of convergence of various development activities, on a watershed basis. The meetings of this committee should be held regularly (at least bi monthly) and the Commissioner, Rural Development will monitor the functioning of this committee. It is desirable that the representative of Commissionerate, Rural Development participates in the meetings of this committee.

Watershed Advisory Committee should ideally consists of various experts and knowledgeable persons, who can provide necessary support on policy matters and other aspects of the program.

What to do?

Constitute DWAC (as per Guidelines Para 30 and the box) and organize periodic reviews by this committee. PD, DPAP has to sincerely call for these meetings and see that this committee gets complete information about the program so that the members of the committee can contribute to the decision making processes in the district on policy related issues. District Collector has to be the Chairperson of this committee, while the Project Director is the convener. Minutes of the meeting of this committee should be widely shared with all members of committee and PIAs in the district.

Who should do this?

PD, DPAP and District Collector.

Suggestion 6: Independent Annual Reviews on selected themes/ issues

Why to do this?

Independent reviews on selected themes/ issues (say participatory processes, gender issues, capacity of village level institutions, etc) help in generating insights into the program and the way it is implemented in an objectives manner. Such reviews provide new sources of knowledge and directions to future programs.

What to do?

Inventory of selected themes on which DPAP would like to know more/ understand from field can be identified. On sample basis, selected watersheds can be studied and lessons learned can be documented in a systematic manner.

Who should do this?

DPAP can engage institutes of expertise in such studies. It is important to see that these institutes have necessary expertise and understanding of the issues concerned. Necessary budgetary support for such activities need be mobilized from appropriate sources.

Suggestion 7: Campaign on Non Negotiables, Core Values and Objectives of the Program:

Why to do this?

It is important to share the essence of watershed program (its objectives, core values, processes and potential interventions and end results) with the villagers in which watershed program is being implemented. For organizing this, a communications campaign can be organized in a systematic manner.

What to do?

Some districts in Andhra Pradesh have very effectively organized communications campaigns. A separate note on Communications Strategy is prepared and presented in Annexure No . Main guiding principles of this communications strategy are

The message(s) should

- *Directly* reach women and poorer sections of the village.
- *Be in tune* with philosophy & spirit of Guidelines
- Reach target groups *independently* (irrespective of PIAs/
- WDTs/MDTs)
- *Include* messages related to other aspects of over all development of community.
- *Be consistent* with each other
- Be consistent in time frame
- Facilitate two way communications

Who should do it?

PD, DPAP has to collaborate with resource organizations and media groups, as indicated in the strategy.

Some Common Suggestions in the Sub System:

This set of points/ practices is applicable to all the above suggestions. It is expected that these practices improve the transparency of the DPAP.

- Meetings should provide “space” for all participants to express their opinion. These occasions should not be treated as “one way communications” by DPAP.
- The decisions should be taken within review meetings in an objective manner.
- All meetings should be minuted and these minutes should be circulated to all participants/ wider audience.

Chapter 3:

Sub System 2: Planning and Coordination

Rationale for this Sub System:

Planning is an important “Sub System” in any organization. In an organization like DPAP, the planning systems are often deciding the nature of the program and relationships. It is observed that significant time and energies go into planning exercise each month/ year. However, these efforts are found to yield limited results on expected lines.

Planning process often treats all partner organizations as “delivery channels/ routes”, rather than putting emphasis on creating “enabling environment” for decentralized decision-making processes.

The suggestion made in this chapter call for a shift in thinking and operationalisation of participatory planning processes. These suggestions (if followed) can create an environment in which local communities can make appropriate choices about their own development, instead of taking orders from top. However, it is to be noted that the DPAP has to “part its power” with PIAs and watershed communities in this process.

Suggestion 8: Plans to Budgets, but Not from Budgets to Plans:

Why to do this?

A participatory planning exercise in communities would lead to generation of various options/ choices. Since these choices would differ from village to village (as per local conditions), the budgets would also differ from village to village. If a rigid allocation of budgets (in terms of percentage of allocations) were decided at the district level in the very beginning of the program, it would limit the scope for community participation in the planning process. In such a situation, the role of watershed communities is reduced to minimum.

What to do?

DPAP should generate significant awareness on the objectives and potential of the watershed program in reducing the impact of drought.

Capacities of WDTs should be enhanced to see that they would be

Box

Concerns/ Issues related to Sub System 2

Planning

- ↘ People's demands were asked for, but could not deliver/not respect. (Eg: Plantations)
- ↘ Is it facilitating or driven from top?
- ↘ Adhoc planning and responding to crisis
- ↘ Not bound by implementation/ promise in planning
- ↘ As a delivery mechanism. Not to generate demand.
- ↘ Not adequate time for preparation for planning. Impossible target setting unrealistic to complete set tasks.

Coordination

- ↘ Planning only activities (what about results)?
- ↘ Weekly meetings help in coordination and review. Do they have space for coordination?
- ↘ Periodic interactions (coordination with limited partners).
- ↘ Coordination between NGO PIAs and MDTs - Is it an issue?
- ↘ Coordination within PIA (PIA and WDT) PIA/WDT & Committee?
- ↘ Communication Top Down or One Way or Two Way or Impersonal?
- ↘ What is your team? Team spirit -- How is your team spirit?

Box

What not to do?

Fixing up “%” of budget allocations for each component of watershed program is detrimental to community participation in planning process.

able to facilitate the planning processes within watershed communities.

Adequate time should be provided for the communities to participate in the planning process, without compromise.

In case of any uneven distribution of budgets across various interventions (Eg: excess allocation of budget towards soil conservation activities), DPAP can review the plan and provide inputs in revising the plans, if necessary.

Who should do this?

PD and MDTs should provide necessary support to PIA/ WDTs to build their capacities in participatory planning processes, by collaborating with appropriate institutes.

Suggestion 9: Supporting Action Planning Processes by creating a pool of facilitators, who can support action-planning process at the field level.

Why to do this?

Developing watershed development plan in a participatory manner requires mainly three factors.

Facilitation Skills of WDTs

Time for communities to think and participate in the process

Understanding of basic details of watershed program (unit costs of interventions, technical options, etc).

The current process of preparing action plans does not have any of these three elements. The WDTs are not equipped with necessary facilitation skills, there is no time for communities/ user groups/ SHGs to identify their problems, resources and needs, there is no information on the unit costs, potential technical interventions, etc in the program. With this background, it is very difficult to expect that the action planning process would generate adequate interest and enthusiasm of communities. The need for support during action planning stage is obvious in most of the cases.

What to do?

DPAP has to support the process of creating a pool of facilitators with an expertise and experience in action planning processes. The members of this group can support the PIAs/ WDTs in facilitating the development of action plans in a participatory manner. DPAP can link up PIA/ WDT with the members of this group, so that the action planning process is facilitated in a professional manner. It is important to see that this facilitators group is properly oriented and equipped with necessary skills and information regarding the watershed program and its interventions.

The honorarium to the members of this group can be paid from the community organization/ training budgets of the watershed projects.

DPAP has to provide adequate time for developing action plans. This process should not be hurried up and top-driven.

Who should do this?

PD, DPAP can work with a group of individuals/ resource organizations to create a pool of facilitators.

Suggestion 10: Flexibility in Action Plans -- Revision of Plans, based on experience/ demand:

Why to do this?

It is to be noted that the "perspective plan" prepared in the initial stages of the program is only an "indicative plan" in the beginning. This perspective plan helps to identify the broad interventions and the potential user groups/ SHGs within watershed boundaries. Based on this plan, a more "pragmatic" action plan on yearly basis can be prepared. Many experiences indicate that communities would like to change the contents of "perspective plan", after the first year of implementation. This process of "revisiting" watershed development plan provides ample scope for community to reset its priorities and enhances the capacities of communities in addressing their own development concerns, in changing

times. It is to be understood that the revision of action plans is the prerogative of watershed committee/ user groups/ SHGs, but not of PIAs/ WDTs/ DPAP.

What to do?

At Village Level:

PIAs/ WDTs have to facilitate a participatory planning process at the watershed level. This exercise would lead to generation of a perspective plan for the development plan of watershed resources.

Based on this plan, an annual action plan (for the first year) need to be developed with a clear picture of user groups, potential interventions, budgets, contributions, management responsibilities, etc.

Budget allocation from DPAP should be according to this "Annual Action Plan".

After implementing the first year plan, WDT has to facilitate a review of action plan and its implementation at watershed level. This process would lead to developing "Action Plan for 2nd Year", with the same details.

In this review/ revision exercise, the experiences of community, seasonality (what activities are feasible in what season, etc) and demands/ needs of the groups should be given utmost importance, rather than pushing "new programs" from top.

Remaining funds at the community level should be assessed before allocating further grants to the watershed committee.

At PIA Level/ DPAP Level:

WDT/ PIA is expected to compile all the annual plans of villages/ watersheds that it is responsible for.

Similarly MDT is also expected to repeat this exercise for all watersheds/ PIAs, for which the MDT is responsible.

It is to be noted that the role of PIA and MDT is to see that the participatory processes are followed at the community level, rather than determining the contents of the action plans.

DPAP can support this process by establishing the linkages between the pool of facilitators and PIA/ WDTs (As per Suggestion 8).

Who should do this?

DPAP should provide adequate time and support to PIAs/ WDT/ Watershed Communities.

Support from DPAP can be in terms of

Capacity building of PIA/ WDTs/ Watershed Communities

Creating favorable environment (no prescriptions from top)

Providing necessary technical support and facilitation if necessary.

Suggestion 11: Action Plans as the basis for any action

Why do this?

There is some kind of ad hoc nature in doing things, priorities and activities. Certain activities/ themes are completely left out of action planning processes (Example: Community Organization and Training). This ad hoc nature is also providing space for "top driven" interventions. The project management gets very complicated and the objectives of the program cannot be achieved, in the absence of clear action plans for every activity. Currently, action plans for Watershed Development Activities is a fairly established practice (though there are some limitations).

What to do?

DPAP has to encourage detailed action plans for all activities that are necessary/ envisaged in the program. These activities are mainly relate to

Community Organization

Training and Capacity Building

Administration of PIA/ Watershed Committee.

DPAP can develop appropriate expenditure line items and relevant unit costs with the consultation of PIAs and MDTs.

DPAP also has to develop an appropriate methodology for developing action plans for the above purposes so that the action plans are prepared in a systematic manner and reflects the needs of the stakeholders.

Each plan also should have a monitoring mechanism to ensure that the action plans are implemented in a systematic manner.

This action plan also could be the basis for sharing/ allocating responsibilities to different actors in the system (MDTs, external resource persons/ facilitators/ organizations, PIA/ WDTs, others). Some indicative line items under each category are briefly mentioned in the boxes.

It is important to note that these plans would be successfully implemented only if there is some flexibility in operational terms. If the DPAP is rigid on any of the components, it is very likely that these action plans may not yield expected results.

Who should do this?

PD, DPAP has to facilitate this process with the support of MDTs and administrative staff of DPAP.

Suggestion 12: Plan of Action for Building Capacities (P ABC) from PIAs

Why to do this?

Without building awareness and capacities of watershed communities on various aspects of the watershed program, one cannot realize the objectives of the program. The Guidelines provide adequate financial support to organize capacity building activities like training and community organization programs. These budgets are currently centralized at the district level. In the absence of any reasonable action plans for this purpose from PIAs, it is unrealistic to decentralize these budgets. As a result of centralization and absence of action plans for capacity building, inputs to the watershed based community organizations are currently inadequate. To overcome this problem, it is very important to see that a systematic process is adopted to provide these grants to PIAs so that they can effectively build capacities of CBOs.

What to do?

(Refer to a separate chapter on Capacity Building Strategy)

Each PIA/ WDT has to identify capacity building needs at community level and PIA/ WDT level.

Based on this identification, a set of activities (training programs, awareness camps, demonstration, exposure visits, professional support, etc) needs to be planed. This action plan for capacity building purpose should contain the following details.

What are the proposed activities?

Who would organize these activities?

Who would support PIA in organizing these activities?

What is the time frame?

Box Indicative Line Items	
Administration of PIA and Watershed Committee	Salaries of WDTs Honorarium of PIA Coordinator Travel of WDT/ PIA Coordinator Office Rent & Maintenance Honorarium for Watershed Secretary
Community Organization	Media Material, Awareness Camps/ Cultural Programs Audio/ Visual Material Honorarium and Travel of social animators/ volunteers/ external facilitators for strengthening groups Exposure visits Any Other
Training and Capacity Building	Venue Charges Travel of Participants/ Resource persons, Food and accommodation of participants/ resource persons, Honorarium for resource persons/ centers, Course Material Any Other

What is the budget?

What are the expected results of such activities?

This plan can also indicate the nature and quantum of professional/ technical support from MDTs/ DPAP on various aspects of the program.

Based on these action plans, DPAP can grant necessary funds to PIA, after verifying the capacity of the PIA to undertake such activities.

The same plan can also be used to “deploy” human resources of DPAP (mainly MDTs) to PIAs. This process can establish a clear demand for the professional services of MDTs (Other purposes beyond approval of plans/ grant releases/ monitoring)

This system also develops a clear “Time Table” between PIAs and MDT, for predetermined support needs of PIAs.

The contribution of MDTs can be clearly established and traced in the field.

Who should do this?

The responsibilities are divided at various levels.

At PIA/ WDT level:

Developing clear time bound action plans for capacity building and resource deployment (human and financial) from DPAP.

Developing clear timetables of activities – where support of MDTs/ Others is required.

MDTs Level:

Compile action plans (for capacity building and resource deployment) from PIAs that the MDT is responsible for and allocate time.

PD, DPAP Level:

Facilitate the process of developing Action plans for Building Capacities (ABC), by providing sufficient time and providing professional support to PIAs.

Providing financial support to PIAs for operationalizing the action plans.

Coordinate between PIAs, MDTs and other organizations (if needed)

Monitor the program interventions as per the action plans on capacity building and resource deployment.

Chapter 4

Sub System 3: Implementation

Rationale for this Sub System:

Usually this system get main attention in public systems, there is significant emphasis on “doing things”. This is the most important sub system of all, since the motives and objectives get reflected in action. The implementation sub system gives shape all concerns of the program and instrumental realizing the goals of the program. Values and Non-Negotiables need to be kept in mind, before taking up any step in terms of action.

While the importance of this sub system is well understood, it is also most misunderstood sub system in terms of its operationalization. Certain complications are usually associated with this sub system – role conflicts, overlapping of responsibilities, and confusions on the purpose, absence of mechanisms for “review of implementation”, etc.

For facilitating an easy understanding of the “Key Functions “ of DPAP staff, an attempt is made to “define” each of them. (Refer Table No).

The further discussion is dependent on the clarity on these aspects. It is to be noted that this is a preliminary attempt to define these “terms” that are regularly used. It is important to identify “what exactly happens” under each function, to develop greater clarity. The MDT team can spend some time and arrive at these details.

Box

Concerns/ Issues related to Sub System 3

Implementation and Client Orientation

Role Clarity and differentiation:
 What is the role of PIA/ MDT/ WC?
 What do you expect from each other?
 Partnership (Between GO and NGOs)
 Who depends on whom? For what?
 Are you available to your partner? What do you bring in/ exchange?
 Is it equal or unequal partnership?
 Necessity of a role (MDT in PIA context or MDT having PIA responsibilities)

Management Information Systems:
 Information Flows – Duplication of reports (WSD and Neeru Meeru)

Table No

Function	What it means...
Implementation	Actually “doing” activities.
Supervision	Providing “On-line” inputs to implementers. Supervisor is responsible for “quality” of works.
Monitoring	Collecting data on progress of program in the light of Action plans, objectives, defined processes budgets, values, etc. Presenting the data collected in a comprehensive manner to Readers/ audience/ target group.
Inspection	Check measuring the completed works. Quality “control”, as per norms of the project. Adjusting the pace of the program, as per the progress of the works. Providing a “Snap Shot” of the field to higher authorities. Has power to penalize “Non-Doers”/ “Non-Performers”, as per agreed plans.
Facilitation	Making the “key actors” ready to work. Attempting to create a favorable and supportive environment to function. Bring in changes in processes, to achieve set results/ goals.
Training/ Orientation	One of the ways of improving the knowledge, skills and changing attitudes of persons.

Suggestion 13: Each function is different and independent.

Same person can have different responsibilities in different context/ theme/ zones, but not in the same context/ theme/ zone, if the nature of functions is unrelated.

Why to do this?

If the same person is handling all different functions, there are different kinds of implications.

One might concentrate on any one of the functions, in which one is more familiar/ as per the priority of the day.

Quality of the program would be the first victim, as monitoring would be partial, does not bring issues related to quality of the program.

One might be blind to needs of the program, which could be a function of one's own orientation/ capacity.

This principle/ suggestion would go a long way in defining "roles and responsibility centres" with in DPAP/ MDTs for different functions.

What to do?

Some of the action points that follow this suggestion are briefly mentioned below.

Specific teams/ individuals (MDT members) should be deployed for specific responsibilities/ functions in a given Mandal/ Theme. This responsibility/ functions should not overlap with other responsibility/ functions of the program.

An MDT (say MDT "X") working as PIA should be functioning like any other NGO PIA in a given Mandal. This particular team should not be responsible for other functions of the program (like supervising NGO PIAs, monitoring, facilitation, etc). For such functions, another MDT (say MDT "Y") should be deployed in this Mandal.

As par as possible, MDTs as PIAs should be avoided, as they are unable to justify their role as PIAs in many situations.

Who should do this?

PD and DPAP should work out further details on responsibility sharing and deployment of the staff for different functions. In this process, it is important that the contents of each function and to follow basic principle mentioned in this chapter.

Suggestion 14: Identify functions with similar nature and give those responsibilities to one person/ MDT, for effective utilization of available human resources.

Why to do this?

There is always a scarcity of human resources. In such situation, it may not be possible to follow the above suggestion (Suggestion No) strictly (though it is desirable). In such situations, it is important to allocate responsibility of functions with similar nature (Eg: supervision, inspection, facilitation) to one person/ team in a given mandal/ zone. This arrangement would help in effective utilization of available human resources. This is next best solution in the given situation.

Box
 Basic Principles in Implementation Sub System
 Field is where action is
 All functions are separate and independent
 MDT/ DPAP has to take up functions that it is capable of.
 Deployment of resource closer to the field. Operating from head office could be costlier to the organization/ DPAP.
 Going to the field is "not doing things" (any function).
 Actual responsibility begins only after reaching the field.

Box
 Not too many hats on one head, under the same sun...
 Ex: Mr X, an MDT can be responsible for implementation in Mandal A, while he can be responsible for monitoring in Mandal B or supervise works in Mandal C. But he cannot be responsible for all functions like implementation, monitoring and supervision in the same Mandal A.

What to do?

Each theme of the program would need different kind of inputs. Some of these functions require professional/ special skills. As explained earlier, some of the functions could be contradicting with each other (Implementation and supervision), while some of them are similar in nature (Eg: supervision, inspection, facilitation).

In a participatory workshop in which all MDTs and office administrative staff participate, these functions and exact activities in each function can be developed. For this appropriate time frame should be allocated.

In this process, identify functions of similar nature and group them together. These responsibilities could be given to an individual/ team.

This process would lead to developing “job Charts” of each person/ team/ wing in the DPAP.

Similar exercise can be organized with other functionaries with PIA and watershed committee to evolve “Job Charts” of each functionary in the program.

This process of evolving “job charts’ should be carefully documented and formal “Job Charts” can be issued by DPAP.

A review of the newly defined responsibilities is essential to refine and fine tune the contents of the job charts.

Who should do this?

PD has to facilitate this process in participatory manner in which MDTs and administrative staff of DPAP. For achieving reasonable results of this exercise, good facilitation skills are essential. Collaborating with an institute with an expertise on Human Resource Development would be very useful for effective processes.

Box
<p>Guiding Principles for Defining Job Charts</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> → Faith in People’s Ability and Commitment to Building Capacities helps in decentralization of power, activities and responsibilities. → Level at which a task/ activity is to be operated, the job chart of persons at that level should contain that function/ responsibility of doing that activity. → Decentralization of power to local level community groups that are capable of performing their functions (approval of action plans, sanctioning of works, measurement of works, release of funds, etc) would help in defining job chart. In case of malpractices, the person responsible can be punished. → Ideally, the authority of approval and sanctioning of works/ plans should lie with watershed committee, but not with MDTs and WDTs. Keeping this “power’ with MDT/DPAP is against participatory principles. DPAP should concentrate on development of effective, transparent and community based monitoring and audit systems so that misusers of such opportunity can be punished.

Chapter 5:

Sub System 4 - Monitoring, Regulation and Feedback Systems

Rationale for this Sub System:

This sub system provides insights for improving the quality of program and changes its course of its direction. The effective monitoring, regulation and feedback systems can largely decide dynamic nature of the program in responding to emerging needs of the program. This system provides necessary grounds/ data for reflection on the path taken by the program, in the direction of achieving set goals.

Care should be taken to see that this process does not generate another set of formats. It is to be understood that this system is meant for review of implementation at the local level, so they might develop similar systems on their own, if one allows them to do so. However, proper orientation on the need of review of implementation should be organized by PD/PIA.

Suggestion 15: Decentralized Review of Implementation*Why to do this?*

This is one opportunity of changing the course of direction of the program. Involvement in this process provides opportunity to “participate” in decision-making processes. Such processes should be ideally “decentralized” to empower the communities.

What to do?

Develop Activity Calendar at watershed level, WDT and PIA level, MDT level, with clear details (See the box for details). Review should be based on this activity calendar/ plan of action. This system should be effectively used to induce “result orientation” to the members of review team/ actors.

Who should do this?

PD should regularly monitor this aspect. It is to be understood that such systems do not find roots and get institutionalized, unless the operationalization of the same is monitored and reviewed.

Box

Issues and Concerns on Sub System 4
Monitoring and Regulation System and Feedback Systems

- ↓ What do they monitor?
- ↓ What is monitoring – enabling or inspection?
- ↓ Who does monitoring? For what purpose?
- ↓ Monitoring reports?
- ↓ Planning & coordination for monitoring?
- ↓ How do they use the information/ data coming out of monitoring process? Who uses it? Monitoring information as feedback.
- ↓ What is the relationship between monitoring and fund flows?
- ↓ What are the problems in monitoring systems?
- ↓ Methods of feedback (both ways).
- ↓ Using feedback in planning and regulation.

Box

Activity Calendar

Which activity is planned?

Why to do this?

Who is expected to do this?

When to start and end this activity?

Who else is involved in the process?

What is the likely expenditure for this activity?

How to implement this activity?

Who should monitor and review this activity and when?

Suggestion 16: Use of information from monitoring and feed back, during review of implementation:

Why to do this?

Implementation of programs generates valuable experiences and builds capacities of the people involved. Such insights would also emerge from regular monitoring of the program. Such information of the program also generates useful insights into the way in which implementation takes place (process and their implications). This data/ feed back should be effectively “used” for changing the course of the program.

What to do?

Separate monitoring function with review/ decision-making process.

The monitoring team should collect the data on selected aspects of the program (as per predetermined parameters/ formats) and analyze the data in a scientific manner.

This data/ feed back from monitoring teams should be presented in the “review meetings”.

After debates and discussions among the key actors, decisions can be taken.

This process ensures effective utilization of feedback and monitoring data in stream lining the program implementation.

This process also disempowers the monitoring teams/ missions, from misusing the data/ feedback from monitoring data.

Who should do this?

Responsibility allocation of functions and deployment of staff within DPAP needs to be organized by PD, after analyzing workloads on the staff.

Supervisors (PD, PIAs, Watershed Committees and Association) have to ensure that regular monitoring of program implementation takes place, as per agreed norms.

This process should feed into review meetings, where larger group of key stakeholders take decisions.

Box

Increasing Effectiveness of Monitoring Some Practices

- All reports should be formally acknowledged.
- Monitors should explain the purpose of monitoring to the monitored.
- Provide feedback on the monitoring report. If the feedback is not provided, it means that the monitoring report is not read/ used. (So, why to send the report at all?)
- Utilization of monitoring reports (in reviews meetings and improving the program) needs to be organized in a systematic and scientific manner. This system needs to be demonstrated so that the “monitoring” function gets due credibility.

Suggestion 17: Refining monitoring systems/ rationalizing data needs at various levels.

Why to do this?

It is a common experience that most of the time is spent on filling up of formats, generating the data that is already submitted by the community/ PIA. Any improvement in this system (in such a way that the needs of state/ central governments are also taken care of) would go a long way in reducing the burden on the WDTs in a significant manner. Since DPAP is computerized, the computers can be effectively “put to use”, instead of wasting time of WDTs, in repetitive work.

DPAP is part of a larger system in the state and country. The monitoring systems for these large systems are already established. Changing them might be difficult for a single district. It is very important for a district office to negotiate with its head office and influence the process or rationalization in a small way. At the same time, certain initiatives at district level can make significant changes in monitoring/ regulation systems.

What to do?

Organize internal studies to find out the utility of the data generated from monitoring exercises in an objective manner (quality of data generated, methodology of generating data, time/energies spent on data generation and extent of utility, etc). From such case studies, one can see the relevance of such exercises in reality.

Collaborate with APRLP/ Other projects in understanding the latest developments in monitoring systems. Collaborate with Commissionerate and lobby for changes in the system of monitoring and evaluation. Collaborate with Centre of Monitoring & Evaluation, NIRD for suggesting the improvements in the monitoring systems at all levels (Central, state, district, PIA and community level).

A. Linking with Categories of Data with Frequency of Collection:

User-friendly compute programs can be used to link watersheds with monitoring reports that have dynamic and static data. This saves time of WDTs in repetitive data collection/ filling formats.

Table

Type of Data	Example(s)	Nature/ Utility of the data	Who does this monitoring? At what frequency?	Sample Size
Dynamic Data: Data that changes every month, with the progress of the program	Physical and financial progress, number of groups formed, etc.	Mainly Quantitative Aggregation is possible. Tool for Improvements.	DPAP Monthly	Universe (100% of watersheds)
Static Data: Data that does not change/ changes occasionally	Area of the village, names of functionaries/ PIA, etc	Mainly qualitative. Pattern based. Aggregation is difficult. Feed back for improving quality	DPAP. Only when there are changes	For those, which changed
Process related data/ Issue based Monitoring	Decision making processes, group building methods, addressing gender and equity concerns, etc.	Provides feedback on key themes. Facilitates reflection and review.	Independent agency, outside DPAP. Once in a year	On sample basis
Community based Project Monitoring	Ground Water, coverage of poor in the program, management of community assets, etc.	Reflections and reviewing by communities. Diversified. Difficult to aggregate. Self-learning and capacity building of community.	Communities Monthly/ Quarterly	In each watershed.

B. Support with appropriate capacity building modules/ material for facilitating community based monitoring systems. It might take some time before this system could be operationalized at the community level. For this, DPAP has to collaborate with appropriate institutes that have experiences/ understanding on this issue.

Who should do this?

PD, DPAP can lobby with Commissionerate to collaborate with resource organizations like Centre for Monitoring and Evaluation, NIRD and other resource centers to conceptualize the monitoring and

evaluation systems for the central/ state/ district levels and at PIA/ Community levels. With such collaborations, the systems at national level can also be improved.

Suggestion 18: Improving ABC classification of watersheds

Why to do this?

Evaluations provide an opportunity to reflect upon the objectives of the program, course of the program, utility of the program's interventions, etc. Any evaluation should lead to "perceivable changes" in the program. These changes could be – providing special inputs to "poor performers", rewarding the good performer, changing the emphasis/ strategy of the program, etc. If such attempt is not planned/ made, evaluations make no sense at all, for the people on the ground.

What to do?

DPAP has to initiate the process of changing the methodology of classifying the watersheds into A, B and C categories. A systematic and scientific methodology that has relevance to watershed interventions and processes should be developed. Collaborate with a resource organization that has expertise of participatory methodologies and evolve the methodology, tools and classification processes in which community members play active role. The outcome of such study/ process can be shared with larger number of PIAs/ other districts and Commissionerate, for mainstreaming purpose.

<p>Box</p> <p>Increasing Effectiveness of Evaluation Some Practices</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> → Evaluation is done on sample basis. → Entire universe is not studied for evaluation purpose. → Evaluations can be at regular intervals of time, in the project cycle. → Impact study should be at the end of the project period, only after the interventions "mature" to produce results. → Evaluations should be conducted in the context of objectives, action plans and interventions made in the program.

Who should do this?

PD, DPAP along with experts on the subject and Commissioner, Rural Development.

<p>Box</p> <p>Improving A B C Classifications of Watersheds</p> <p>Guidelines have defined -- Specific technical Criteria and General Criteria (Para 16 to 23). These criteria have strong sense of reasoning and scientifically conceptualized. It is very important to follow these criteria and develop systems around them.</p> <p>A, B and C Categorization of watersheds, based on physical impact of program does not make any sense, for the following reasons.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> → The methodology of this classification has conceptual limitations. The data generated out of this process does not stand the scrutiny of scientific methods. → The process of data collection has significant limitations, leading erroneous data. → Most importantly, this classification is not followed up DPAP. DPAP has to put special efforts to watersheds in "C" category to bring them into "A". Since such efforts are not made currently and also this system has severe limitations, it needs to be drastically improved or discarded. → All evaluation reports should be shared with the key stakeholders.

Suggestion 19: Encouraging Participatory Community Based Monitoring Systems:

Why to do this?

The watershed program has a significant emphasis on the participatory processes at all stages of the program. Transparent and participatory systems would enhance the involvement of communities in the program. A community based monitoring system helps them to analyze the situation by the watershed committee members, user groups and SHGs in the watershed. If this process is internalized, the groups would strive to improve the quality of participation of all groups in the program.

What to do?

Identify a pool of facilitators (**Refer to Suggestion No:** , who can facilitate the process of monitoring and reflection of the program by generating data/ experiences on selected parameters of the program (conduct of meetings, budgets/ expenditure, functioning of committee/ groups, etc).

The conclusions of such processes can be recorded graphically/ visually to present the position of the watershed on various aspects/ parameters.

The facilitators can motivate the community/ committee/ groups to take appropriate action to improve the situation and arrange the necessary support from WDTs/ PIA/ MDTs/ DPAP.

The effectiveness of this system can be improved only if the decisions are followed up with agreed actions by community/ WDT/ PIAs/ MDTs/ DPAP.

If this process is repeated regularly in the watersheds, the communities would show significant improvement in the levels of participation of the groups.

Who should do this?

PD, DPAP has to develop collaborations with resource organizations with expertise on participatory processes and take their support for a period of at least one year, till this is internalized in the system.

Box

Successful Experiences of Community Based Monitoring

- AP Well Project has initiated and standardized Participatory Hydraulic Monitoring of Ground Water in their project villages. This process helped in sustainable use of ground water.
- DRDA, RR District has evolved a system of group based monitoring and ranking system of DWCRE groups. This system helped in ranking the groups as per their performance and supported the process of creating MACTS at mandal level.

Box

Self Evaluation Toll Kit

WASSAN developed a self-evaluation tool kit for the functionaries of watershed program. This kit can be used by the community/ WDT/ MDTs for assessing the watershed related processes in their watersheds.

Chapter 6

Sub System 5 -- Resources Systems (Finances)

Rationale for this Sub System:

Finances drive the progress of development. Use of financial resources as per the project objectives and defined norms is a key factor in realizing the goals of the program. Transparent procedures and “checks and controls” are very essential for keeping track of the fund flows and expenditure. While the responsibility of handling finances might lie with limited number of persons, the responsibility of scrutiny and ensuring the legal systems are adhered to, can be broad based.

Suggestion 20: Develop an inventory of all line items of expenditure that are relevant to DPAP.

Why to do this?

Each program has a pattern of expenditure, as per the needs of the program. For effective planning and implementation, it is every important identify the purposes (line items), for which financial resource allocation is necessary. A financial planning/ resource allocation to each purpose is very critical to operationalize plans. It is observed that certain “activities” (Eg: Training, community organization) are not conducted, since a line item is not defined for those activities in the ledger/ financial planning. So the set of “Line Items” is very essential to support the process of operationalizing all plans, as per the needs of the program.

What to do?

In the light of program objectives and past experiences, DPAP has to identify all line items that are relevant to the program. Commissioner, Rural Development can also support his process by brining in experiences from other districts.

Who should do this?

PD and accounts department of DPAP and Commissioner, Rural Development DPAP can seek professional help (from chartered accountants) for this purpose.

Box

Issues/ Concerns/ Practices on Fund Flows/ Records:

Too many books with poor content? (More than necessary?)
 Too many, Too little.
 Do you need all of them?
 Comment on the quality of books.
 Are you happy with the quality of books? Poor Quality/ inadequately recorded MBs.
 Vouchers do not reflect actual work/expenditure. Material and labour is not separately recorded.
 Statements Monthly Statements Physical and Financial Progress.
 At DPAP and PIA, account heads are not adequately defined.
 Batch to batch some improvement. Some Line items are completely absent.
 Quality & content differs to PIA to PIA (who is responsible)
 PIA bank accounts not regular. Personal or official/ organization?
 At Hyderabad.
 Salary by cash payments

Box

Indicative Line Items, those need to be developed further:

- Grants to Watershed Committees for works
- Grants to Watershed Committees for administration of WC
- Grants to PIA for administration
- Grants to PI As for training
- Grants to PI As for community organization
- Grants to Others for training
- Grants to Others for community organization
- Grants for action research
- Administration of DPAP

Suggestion 21: Streamline fund flows (Ledgers and cash books, with all line items as per suggestion no 17, if possible) as per each batch of watershed.

Why to do this?

Often books of accounts provide useful information and helps to keep track of funds and expenditure, provided they are properly conceived and maintained. Since the early batches of watersheds do not have all line items well defined (but some expenditure is incurred), it is difficult to trace exact expenditure. Even in recent batches, similar trend is observed. Without streamlining these items, one does not know the funds position of the organization.

What to do?

A. Computerize accounts of DPAP

Very simple computer based accounting packages are available at affordable prices. DPAP also has adequate infrastructure to computerize the accounts. Computerization of accounting systems helps to minimize the work of accounts department and improves the efficiency. This system also helps in keeping track of the funds and expenditure in the quickest possible way.

B. Earlier accounts can be quickly streamlined and latest information can be obtained for each batch and for every line item.

Who should do this?

PD has to facilitate this process. Accounts department along with computer professionals/ chartered accountants can do this with in a span of two to three months, depending on the quantum of work. Separate budget support might be needed to operationalize this suggestion, but this investment is worth making.

Suggestion 22: Regular Internal Auditing

Why to do this?

Any auditing would basically act like an “early warning” in case of malpractices. Regular internal auditing should be practiced to identify areas that need careful scrutiny and monitoring. If this is not practiced, the errors get compounded and one might have no options over a period of time.

What to do?

PD, DPAP has to identify an independent agency to organize “Internal auditing” at regular intervals (6 monthly or yearly). Or staff from accounts department of any other DPAP can be given this responsibility. The report of these internal auditing should be shared with MDTs and others in DPAP to understand the issues and concerns in the auditing.

Who should do this?

Independent Auditors

Suggestion 23: Annual External Audits

Why to do this?

It is a statutory requirement to conduct external auditing of all programs/ organizations. This processes increases the transparency of the organization and accountability towards public funds.

What to do?

Commissioner, Rural Development has to identify accredited agency that can conduct external auditing of the program and DPAP.

Who should do this?

Commissioner, Rural Development.

Suggestion 24: Only auditor's statement and utilization certificate from PIAs/ watershed committees and be accepted. The practice of "Collecting all vouchers of all expenditures from all PIA/ Watershed committees" should be discontinued.

Why to do this?

All organizations that are receiving funds from DPAP (PIAs and Watershed Associations) are registered societies/ charitable trusts. Receiving grants from DPAP by a PIA/ Watershed Associations is legally valid transaction. PIA/ Watershed Associations are expected to spend this grant as per commonly agreed norms. As evidence to this process of expenditure, PIA/ WA has the right to retain the vouchers with them. These vouchers are considered to be "property" of the receivers of the grants, but these vouchers do not belong to the "givers of the grants".

What to do?

Organize six-monthly/ annual external auditing regularly for all receivers of grants (PIA/ Watershed Associations). The auditor's reports and utilization certificates are adequate for the purpose of DPAP.

It is important to get a "GO" from Commissioner to this extent. Commissioner might like to consult legal and financial experts on these issues and take necessary precautions to avoid any possible unwanted fallouts of this trend.

Who should do this?

PD, DPAP and Commissioner DPAP.

Suggestion 25: Only cheque payments for all payments above one thousand rupees.

Why to do this?

Cheque payments to receivers of money ensure transparent systems at grass root level. The credibility of program can be improved by such financial regulations.

What to do?

Issue circulars to PIA/ Watershed Committees/ Secretaries to inform that all financial transactions above one thousand rupees should be by cheques (if possible account payee cheques).

Who should do this?

PD, DPAP has to issue a circular to all concerned.

Suggestion 26: Systematic procedures for fund releases:

Why to this?

Fund releases so far seem to be ad hoc and there is no adherence to legal procedures. Keeping track of fund flows, releasing funds as per the needs/ balances available within PIAs/ Committees are feasible only if this system is followed.

What to do?

A. Fund releases should be for every six months

(Total number of installments for 4years of project is seven, as per guidelines).

For the proposed time period, the PIA and WCs have to provide the following details.

Plans for proposed time period (Activities and budgets)

Available balance of funds within PIAs/ Watershed Associations.

Amount needed for the proposed time frame, after deducting the balance.

PIA/ Watershed Associations have to submit Utilization Certificate along with Progress Reports and satisfactory Monitoring and Evaluation Reports. Without this UC, the grants should not be released to PIA/ Watershed Associations

Annul audit reports by PIA/ Watershed Associations, once in a year.

B. Payment of advances to PIAs/ Watershed Associations should be continued. Total amount required for the proposed time period should be released to PIA/ Watershed Committees, after ensuring the submission of required documents and reports. Part releases should be discouraged.

C. After receiving all details, a PIA/ Watershed Associations has to receive the grants within 10 days from DPAP. If DPAP cannot release grants to PIA/ Watershed Associations, DPAP is liable to explain the reasons to PIA/ Watershed Associations.

Who should do this?
PD, DPAP.

Suggestion 27: Tracking Unit Costs of all line items:

Why to do this?
Though the "unit Cost" concept is rigid, it is important to have a sense of expenditure on each line item. The unit cost helps to understand the deviation of the expenditure. Unit Coast also helps in estimating the budgets (tentatively).

What to do?
It is important to develop tentative "Unit Costs" for all line items. Past experience of DPAP would be useful in arriving these unit costs. (For certain components like overheads of PIAs, WDT salaries, etc unit costs are already developed and rigidly followed).

Who should do this?
PD, DPAP along with other members (particularly with accounts department) of DPAP.

Suggestion 28: Analysis of administrative expenditure of DPAP and PIAs/ Watershed Associations

Why to do this?
Currently budgets for overheads/ training/ community organization are pooled together at DPAP. As per unit costs developed for overheads of PIA, grants are released to PIAs. But from the records one does not clearly understand whether a PIAs/ Watershed Associations has received all the financial support that they are entitled for. This hypothesis needs to be proved with proper analysis of authentic data.

It is important to realize that the incentives for WDTs and PIA leaders in the program are fairly limited. Similarly the incentives of watershed functionaries are also not exactly reaching them (except for secretaries, in majority of the cases). In the absence of dependable data on this issue, one can infer that DPAP is retaining more money than it is actually entitled for (5% of project budget is retained for overheads of DPAP in AP). There are mainly two implications of this trend.

Box
<u>Issues/ Concerns related to Controls/Audits and fund</u>
High expenditure for xeroxing copying of vouchers.
No verification system. (UC, Voucher checking)
Office based auditing/verification. Is it all right?
MDTs PIAs - do they have adequate knowledge and systems to track expenditure?
Who keeps track? On what is the basis? What records?
Whether a PIA gets entire budget that it is supposed to receive?
Village administration budget is not properly recorded (recorded along in works) Community works and village admin budget are mixed up.
Large pool of fund without linking to expenditure heads and plans.
Books of PIAs at DPAP - Who is responsible?
Cash payment of salaries.
More number of WDTs than stipulated. (at lower wages)
Use of funds & Release of Funds:
Physical progress. No link with progress/ action plan. Linked with only utilization of fund/ expenditure.
Low importance to auditing (UC). Indent sheets are a good idea.
MDTs do they put signature of approval? Why do they shy away?

Poor incentives for functionaries at grass root level (though there is scope for enhancing levels of incentives with in available budgets) make them prone malpractices in terms of finances.

Efficiency of DPAP (in terms of its overheads) is not improved. DPAP does not have to think about "Producing more outputs from a unit of input (say one rupee/ person)".

What to do?

A. Prepare case study of a set of PIAs and Watershed Associations (completed watersheds) to understand the actual grant received for overheads purpose. From this analysis, one can see to what extent the PIAs/ Watershed Associations are receiving the grants that they are entitled for.

B. When MDT acts as a PIA:

The books of account with MDT PIAs are not systematically maintained. MDTs also seem to be not very sure of expenditure on various heads. Since these MDTs are handling large number of projects as PIAs (transferred from other NGO PIAs and directly given), a separate analysis of overhead expenditure of MDT PIAs is very essential to understand the efficacy of the system.

Note: The study team tried to do a case study on these topics, but unfortunately could not generate data as per the requirement (To test the hypothesis). The data at DPAP is not organized systematically. Even PIAs do not record these details in systematic manner. (For example, one cannot trace the budget releases to watershed committee for overheads purpose).

Who should do this?

PD, DPAP has to commission a study to generate data in an objective manner. The outputs of the study would help in understanding the details in a better way.

Since this trend is seen in other districts also, even Commissioner, Rural Development would also be interested to understand this issue, in the larger interests of the program.

Chapter 7

Sub System 6: Resources Systems (Human)

Rationale for this Sub System:

Human resources system is the one, which conceptualizes the other systems and sustains the interests and motivation of the teams in the program. If the human resources were neglected, the implications would be seen in all other sub systems. Taking care of this sub system is the function of the leadership of the program/ organization.

In public systems, this sub system is often neglected. As a result, one can see many “indifferent and less motivated teams” at work. There is a danger of this “virus” spreading to all partners of state supported program. To bring any transformation, this sub system needs to be carefully nurtured. The suggestions in this section mainly relate to WDTs/ PIAs/ MDTs/ PDs.

Suggestion 29: Objective Process of Selection of PIAs/ WDTs/ MDTs/ PDs.

Why to do this?

The system of selecting eligible human resources is the most critical stage in defining the quality of human resource system. Capable persons with right kind of motivation would be valuable assets to the program/ organization. This process has to be very objective and merit based.

What to do?

Selection of PIAs:

Formation of Empowered Selection Committee:

A committee consisting of representatives from reputed NGOs, academic institutions, government officers should be formed, which helps the process of accreditation of NGOs/ CBOs for watershed program. DPAP alone should not engage itself in this process. It is to be recognized that this pre-funding appraisal process is a collective effort of NGOs, GOs and academic institutions, for screening of potential PIAs. The committee should be empowered to select PIAs (both NGO/ CBOs/ GOs) based on set of objective indicators/ criteria. Indicative selection criteria are given in the box, for each category of PIAs.

Box

Issues/ Concerns related to Sub System 6:
Human Resource Systems

Gap between available human resources and utilization of resources (deployment of resources).
No job description and role clarification.

Incentives for motivating PIA Leader/ WDTs? Is it sufficient?

Capacity building:

Identification of training needs of all stakeholders.

Budgets of training and responsibility of training.

Institutionalization of organizational learning.

Selection of staff/ reasons for turn over.

Performance appraisals (rewards and punishments)

Box

Selection Criteria for Government Project Implementation Agencies:

- a. Only those Government Agencies/ Departments, with willingness to participate in program on full time basis for the project period should be selected as PIAs.
- b. Willingness to appoint a full time coordinator for the program to provide necessary inputs/ support to the WDT, who will also and full time and full complement of Watershed Development Team, who should be appointed as per norms on a full time basis.
- c. Proposed government agencies/ departments should have worked in any of the participatory development programs at least for 3 years, before getting identified.
- d. Government agencies/ departments should not have any vigilance enquiries pending on them and should have established good service record.

B. As far as possible, the Project Implementation Agency should be Non Governmental Organizations/ Voluntary Agencies.

C. For GOs to be eligible for PIA, they should be willing to provide full time coordinator and WDT. Among all government departments, preference should be given to those departments (like agriculture, animal husbandry, forestry, soil conservation, etc) that are more directly relevant to watershed program

D. The number of projects that a PIA can handle should be proportional to its capacity to handle the projects. However, it may be seen that each PIA should get at least 5000 hectares of watershed area, which is considered to be a viable unit from administration point of view.

Box

Selection Criteria for Community Based Organizations:

- a. The organization should be a registered body, with a proven track record in rural development/ natural resource management/ financial management/ social mobilization processes (of women and poorest of poor).
- b. Should be working locally and has commitment to/ willingness to continue its work in that region, even after the project is completed.
- c. The maturity of the Community Based Organization in terms of conduct of business, management of finances and democratic decision-making.
- d. The ability of Community Based Organization to make arrangements and manage the technical and financial elements of the project, such as WDTs and execution of works.

Selection of WDTs:

PIAs should have freedom to select WDTs/ deploy their existing staff as WDTs. However, for ensuring good quality of WDTs, a screening committee can be formed at PIA level, which consists of other PIAs/ Government officers.

Selection of MDTs/ PDs:

Highly motivated individuals with proven track record/ experience need to be selected for the position of PD and MDTs. Commissioner; Rural Development has to device a system (perhaps a committee of experts/ experienced persons with different backgrounds) for selection process of these government functionaries.

Suggestion 30: Organize Immersion (Induction) Programs to all staff:

Please see Suggestion 2 for details.

Suggestion 31: Analysis of Work Loads, Deployment and Develop Job Charts.

Why to do this?

Currently the roles of MDTs, PIAs, WDTs and village level

Box

Selection Criteria for Voluntary Organizations as Project Implementation Agencies:

- a. The organization should be a registered body, with a proven track record in rural development/ natural resource management/ social mobilization processes (of women and poorest of poor).
- b. Should be working locally with roots in the local community and has commitment to/ willingness to continue its work in that region, even after the watershed project is completed.
- c. Adequate capacity of organization in terms of its staff (qualification, skills and experience) and infrastructure.
- d. Sound financial history of organization (in terms of annual reports, annual budgets, programs, funding sources, transparent and accountable financial systems, efficient accounting systems, etc)
- e. Audited statement of accounts for proceeding three years of organizations by a recognized chartered accountant should be submitted along with the application.

functionaries are overlapping. This is leading to inefficient use of human resources and other resources like money, time and energies. Systems approach (suggestions in Sub System 3) to this issue would help in analysis of work loads, deployment to different functions and developing job charts for each persons in a given sub system. (Please Refer Suggestion 11).

Suggestion 32: Tips on retention of staff:

Why to do this?

First step is get right people. Next step is to retain them. Quick turn over of staff/ key persons is detrimental to institutionalization processes. There are well-established practices of developing incentive structure for staff and motivating staff. Some of the relevant strategies are suggested here.

What to do?

A. Compensation:

Allow differential payments/ salaries to WDTs, as per their experience/ expertise. PIAs should have freedom/ flexibility to decide about the compensation structure (without compromising on the quality of the staff and exploiting the WDTs), within the available budgets under overheads of PIAs.

Similarly, the time and inputs provided by NGO PIA leaders can also be compensated, from the overhead budgets of PIA. DPAP can develop appropriate norms for this purpose, in consultation of Commissioner, Rural Development.

B. Capacity Enhancement of functionaries:

Need assessment of training needs of different functionaries within PIA/ DPAP on functional, management and self-development aspects, as per a Training Calendar.

PD, DPAP and Commissioner, Rural Development need to develop effective and long term collaborative arrangements with resource centres, for this purpose.

C. Performance Appraisal:

Presently such systems do not exist. However, a performance appraisal (against set objectives/ plans/ results) can be used for the following purposes.

Redeployment of Staff

Providing incentives (monitory and non monitory)

Identifying capacity building needs of the functionaries.

For facilitating exit of non performing persons

Chapter 7:

SUBSYSTEM 7:

DEMOCRATIC INSTITUTIONS AND SOCIAL PRESSURE GROUPS:

Rationale For The Sub System:

Guidelines of Watershed Program have envisaged a largely passive or supportive role for the local Panchayati Raj Institutions in the day-to-day processes of watershed management. It has been somehow assumed that if a gram panchayat member is included as a watershed committee member this will be an adequate representation to the PRI and its interests in natural resource management. Also there is no clear mechanism of involvement of representatives of the other tiers of the polity viz.- the mandal/ Zilla Parishad members, and local MLAs. In other states where the implementation of watershed program is coordinated/ supervised by the Zilla Parishad, it is still possible to fix modalities for their involvement, by putting forth the process of village selection and getting the action plan approved in the Zilla Parishad; ensuring regular meetings between the watershed committee and the mandal level political representatives, arriving at a political consensus on the equity principle in watershed decision making etc.

In Andhra Pradesh, the unique organizational structure of the DPAP-- which is largely autonomous, working with/ through NGOs, little or no interaction between the Zilla Parishad and the DPAP, has lent itself to a system where inordinate amount of extra-systemic pressure/ invisible pressure is exerted on the program. It is found that this extra systemic pressure is generally exerted by non-legitimate means viz. pressure upon the Project Director / MDT / PIA to veto local level decisions, frivolous petitions for inquiry to satisfy local rivalries, attempt to make all decisions party based at the local level, a systematic attempt to render invisible the voices of women and marginal groups etc.

There is a gross underestimation of the actual influence that all political parties/ pressure groups and public representatives (Sarpanch, MPTC, ZPTC, MLA) have on day to functioning of watershed committee, process of planning/ implementing watershed works, its commitment to Grama Sabha/ agenda of watershed.

Box

Issues/ Concerns related to Sub System 7:

Democratic Institutions And Social Pressure Groups:

Hectic lobbying for party based or dominant caste based committees by local level pressure groups ensures that power remains with the powerful throughout the project period, and stifles the voices of the less powerful.

Also, the purpose of selection of Committee members is seen as reflecting upon the political strength of the party or caste group and their ability to "Distribute the Spoils" of development.

Extra- systemic pressure is exerted on the system by directly demanding that certain chosen persons should be selected as chairman/ president/ secretary, and by focusing upon elections as the critical event in the initial watershed process (rather than formation of user groups, Self Help Groups, transact walk or PRA). Preparation and Implementation of Action Plan: Even MLAs, instead of seeking local consensus put pressure on the MDT/ PIA to construct certain WHS that is beneficial to them either personally, or from a party point of view, even if there is no local agreement on the same.

Since the process of forming the committees is "politically" driven, the functioning of watershed committee is not transparent enough (Eg: Grama Sabhas are not conducted regularly by committee). This behavior invites greater pressures from political parties/ groups.

3. Non- conduct of Gram Sabhas by WSC: The most common complaints against Watershed Committees in Ranga Reddy is that they are not transparent enough, regular meetings are not conducted, no gram sabha is ever called for, there is personal bias in the selection of sites for WHS etc. One should not underestimate the organizational problems that this creates -- it leads to an exertion of pressure by all political groups upon the DPAP, in all other subsystems and their functioning. It has meant a lop-sided system wherein pressure which should be legitimately exercised on the committee at the local level instead gets exercised on other levels of the organization, and this erodes the legitimacy and power of the lowest tier.

Suggestion 33:

Training / capacity building for the members of PRIs:
Why to do this?

The democratic representatives (at all levels) to be given training / awareness workshops on NRM/ watershed development. This will help them understand how pressure on the system can be exercised through transparent and democratic means. Exposure visits can also be organized for the political representatives to good watersheds to show the benefits of implementation, where legitimate / visible pressure is exercised on the WSC rather than non- legitimate/ invisible pressure on the PIA/MDT/ PD.

2. Regular reviews and monitoring of the watershed committee by the gram panchayat-- In the hierarchy of village level committees, the gram panchayat holds the highest place. Hence, the power to review and monitor the functioning of the WSC lies with the gram panchayat. A regular (6-monthly) review of the WSC should be institutionalized in all the villages. This can also be in the form of a camp- PIA wise, and need not be completely individualized village wise.

1. The watershed committee chairman/ president/ secretary should attend the Mandal Parishad General Body meetings, so that the discussion regarding bcal conflicts, progress of works, transparency in functioning of the body etc. can be discussed in a democratic forum.
2. Focusing upon non-election based community involvement in watershed implementation: It is a fallacy that only the committee has a role to play in the watershed decision making processes. The PIA/ MDT has to actively encourage and give importance to those aspects of watershed planning that emphasize the community's involvement, or at least the involvement of a larger number of local players. For example making the transact walk the key to watershed decision making in the initial phase of the project will ensure that the selection of WHS is based upon the consensus of people who should be the actual decision makers in watershed program. Similarly indicating that the committee has to conduct regular meetings and learn to arrive at consensus based decisions rather than exacerbating local conflicts, by handholding during initial meetings will give the WSC some idea of the role they have to play in the village.

Chapter 9

Classification of Suggestions and Action Points

Based on the following parameters, all the proposed suggestions were classified into different categories. This classification helps to chalk out immediate and long-term action plans for the DPAP.

- Suggestions that can yield results in short terms and long term
- Levels at which the action has to be taken (PIA/ DPAP/ Watershed Committee/ Commissionerate)
- To what extent the activities under this suggestion can be centralized/ decentralized?
- As per the priority of the action point.
- Nature of suggestion - experimentation/ action research or advocacy.
- Suggestions that are too prescriptive/beyond district level could be given low priority.

It is to be noted that action is to be initiated by Project Director for most of the suggestions. It is needless to explain the role of leadership in such processes of change. However, the report identifies support groups/ individuals who could take part/ share the responsibility of the processes.

Sub System 1: Goal Setting and Tracking						
No	Suggestion	Priority	Time Frame	Responsibility Centre lies at	Sources of support	Nature of Suggestion
1	Setting a Goal	Medium	Long Term	PD	Resource Organizations with expertise on OD issues	Organization Development (OD)
2	Develop Common Vision (Shared Vision)	Medium	Long Term	PD	Resource Organizations with expertise on OD issues	Organization Development
3	Internal Reflections/ Retreat for DPAP	Low	Long Term	PD	Resource Organizations with expertise on OD issues	Organization Development (OD)
4	Creating opportunities for reflection and reorientation	High	Short Term	PD and PIA	Resource organizations with expertise and experience on LSIS and Future Search	Enhances Transparency in the system
5	Regular Review by District Watershed Advisory Committee	High	Short Term	PD	Commissionerate	Policy Advocacy
6	Independent Annual Reviews on selected themes/ issues	Low	Long Term	PD	Resource Organizations with expertise on participatory research	Action Research and Review
7	Campaign on Non Negotiables, Core Values and Objectives of the Program:	High	Short Term	PD	Resource Organizations with expertise on development communications	Enhances Transparency in the system

Sub System 2: Planning						
N O	Suggestion	Priority	Time Frame	Responsibility Centre lies at	Sources of support	Nature of Suggestion
8	Plans to Budgets, but Not from Budgets to Plans	Low	Long Term	PIA and WDT	PD and MDT	Improvement in planning processes
9	Supporting Action Planning Processes by creating a pool of facilitators, who can support action-planning process at the field level.	Medium	Long Term	PD	Resource Centers with expertise in participatory processes	Capacity Building of PIAs and WDTs in action planning
10	Flexibility in Action Plans -- Revision of Plans, based on experience/ demand	High	Long Term	PIA and WDT	PD and MDT	Improvement in planning processes
11	Action Plans as the basis for any action	High	Short Term	PD	MDTs and Administrative Staff of DPAP	Streamlining of administrative procedures
12	Plan of Action for Building Capacities (P ABC) from PIAs	High	Short Term	PD	Resource Organizations with the experience and expertise	Capacity Building

Sub System 3: Implementation and Client Orientation						
13	Each function is different and independent. Same person can have different responsibilities in different context/ theme/ zones, but not in the same context/ theme/ zone, if the nature of functions is unrelated.	Medium	Long Term	PD	Resource Organizations with expertise on OD issues	Organization Development (OD)
14	Identify functions with similar nature and give those responsibilities to one person/ MDT, for effective utilization of available human resources.	Medium	Long Term	PD	Resource Organizations with expertise on OD issues	Organization Development (OD)

Sub System 4: Monitoring, Regulation and Feedback Systems						
15	Decentralized Review of Implementation	Medium	Short Term	PD	MDTs	Enhanced Participation
16	Use of information from monitoring and feed back, during review of implementation	Low	Long Term	PD	MDTs	Enhanced Transparency
17	Refining monitoring systems/-rationalizing data needs at various levels	Low	Long Term	Commissioner ate	PD and Other resource centers (NIRD)	Reduced burden on WDTs and improved efficiency.
18	Improving ABC classification of watersheds	High	Long Term	PD	Resource Organizations with experience in	Policy Advocacy and Action Research

					participatory processes	
19	Encouraging Participatory Community Based Monitoring Systems:	High	Short Term	PD	Resource Organizations with experience in participatory processes	Policy Advocacy and Action Research

Sub System 5: Resource Systems (Finances)

20	Develop an inventory of all line items of expenditure that are relevant to DPAP	High	Short Term	PD	Administrative Staff of DPAP	Streamlining the financial systems
21	Streamline fund flows of each batch of watershed.					
22	Regular Internal Auditing					
23	Annual External Audits					
24	Only auditor's statement and utilization certificate from PIAs/ watershed committees and be accepted.	Medium	Short Term	PD	Commissionerate	Streamlining the financial systems
25	Only cheque payments for all payments above one thousand rupees	High	Short Term	PIA	PD and MDTs	Transparency in systems
26	Systematic procedures for fund releases	High	Short Term	PD	MDTs and PIAs	Transparency in systems
27	Tracking Unit Costs of all line items	High	Short Term	PD	Administrative Staff of DPAP	Control mechanism
28	Analysis of administrative expenditure of DPAP and PIAs/ Watershed Associations	Medium	Long Term	PD	Commissionerate and administrative Staff of DPAP	Control mechanism

Sub System 6: Resource Systems (Human)

No	Suggestion	Priority	Time Frame	Responsibility Centre lies at	Sources of support	Nature of Suggestion
29	Objective Process of Selection of PIAs/ WDTs/ MDTs/ PDs	Medium	Long Term	Commissionerate	PD	Capable organizations and individuals as team members.
30	Organize Immersion (Induction) Programs to all staff	Medium	Short Term	PD	Resource Organizations with experiences and expertise	Capacity Building and orientation

31	Analysis of Work Loads, Deployment and Develop Job Charts.	Medium	Long Term	PD	Resource Organizations with expertise in Organization Development related issues	Stream lining the functions and functionaries.
32	Tips on retention of staff	Low	Low	PD	PIA	Flexible Incentives

Chapter 10

Conclusions

The 2nd Phase of Process Study in Ranga Reddy District has generated clear understanding of function of DPAP in managing the watershed program. An analysis of existing practices at grass root level, PIA level and DPAP level provided an opportunity to see the strengths and weakness of each unit.

The study tried to approach the issues in “management of watershed program by DPAP” from systems analysis perspective. In the context of watershed development program (Guidelines, objectives, roles and responsibilities as envisaged in Guidelines), a set of “Non-Negotiables” and “Core Values” is proposed. In the framework of these elements (Guidelines, Non-Negotiables, Core Values), Seven Sub Systems are identified, that are relevant to DPAP and appropriate suggestions () are proposed.

For each suggestion, the following points were discussed.

- Why is this suggestion made? (Rationale)
- What to do? (Action)
- Who should do? (Actor)

It is obvious that most of the responsibilities to operationalise these suggestions lie with Project Director. It is strongly recommended that PD, DPDP Ranga Reddy should develop effective collaborations with Commissioner, Rural Development, Other resource centers/ organizations to transform these suggestions in to reality. It is also very essential that PD, DPAP facilitate a “team building” exercise within DPAP to maximize the potential of human resources within DPAP. Similarly, effective partnerships need be developed between DPAP and PIA/ Communities, in the true sense of it.

However, some of the issues in the report could not be substantiated, for want of adequate & reliable data. So study recommends collecting some reliable data/ conduct studies to (dis) prove the hypothesis proposed in the report. Depending on the insights from these studies/ data would be very useful in expanding the understanding of the management of the program.

Perhaps some of the suggestions proposed are relevant to other districts also. Particularly, issues like roles definitions/ clarity of various functionaries can be effectively tackled in this framework. The role of Commissionerate is considered to be very critical in supporting this process and also strengthen them by establishing effective linkages with other resource organizations. Also in providing enabling environment to operationalizing the key suggestions. If any useful lessons emerge from this experience, Commissionerate would hopefully mainstream them in other parts of the state.

Annexure No1:

A Detailed Note on Objectives, Methodology and Expected Output(s) for each Phase of the Study.

PHASE 1:

a. Objective:

To understand existing processes and systems in the implementation of watershed development program at watershed level in Ranga Reddy District.

b. Methodology:

Study of the processes involved in planning and implementation of the watershed program in a representative sample of 10 watersheds in the district representing variations in PIA, Year of starting and geographical location (in case of any diversity)

To share the results in a workshop with program managers, selected PIAs and watershed committee members (Stakeholder workshop 1).

c. Output:

At the end of this exercise two things will emerge:

Common understanding and consensus on the existing processes in practice among stakeholders

List of Issues identified for further inquiry. These issues may be separately studied with different time frame and budget.

PHASE 2:

a. Objective: Having arrived at a consensus on the processes followed in the watersheds, the second phase attempts to explore, understand and analyse the reasons contributing to the trends observed in the first phase. This analysis will provide the scope and a framework for building proactive strategies.

To analyze the processes identified in Phase 1 with respect to ..

Role Perceptions

Capacity Gaps / Needs

Enabling Environment

To understand systems of management including monitoring, data management etc., at various stakeholders levels i.e. at PIA, MDT and at PD levels.

b. Methodology:

Two stakeholder workshops (3 days each) will be organized with participants from MDT, PIA, WDT, WC & WA, UG and SHG.

Focus group discussion with selected PIAs, MDTs and the PD's Office to assess the management systems.

c. Output:

Capacity building needs & role perceptions

An assessment report on the management systems

PHASE 3:

a. Objectives:

To evolve appropriate strategies and systems for improving the quality of the processes in watershed program

b. Methodology:

A working group to identify intervention strategies – consisting of representatives from MDTs, PIAs, WDTs and Watershed Committees

A multi-stakeholder workshop to present results of Phase 1 and 2 studies and reflecting on the working group report

The multi-stakeholder group will also reflect on the proposed interventions.

Presenting the final results for consideration of the district administration.

c. Output:

Proposed interventions in Capacity Building

Proposed interventions in Management Systems

Terms of Reference:

WASSAN will be the project holder and be responsible for organising the study

WASSAN will organize the study jointly in collaboration with APARD

Other resource organisations like Rural Development Trust, MANAGE etc., will also be consulted as per the needs of the study

Project Director, DPAP has to extend necessary co-ordination with PIAs, WDTs, MDTs and watershed community for the purpose of survey and organizing stakeholder workshops.

Total budget for each phase should be released in advance as a consultative grant to WASSAN at the start of each phase.

PD, DPAP and WASSAN together will decide on any revision in time frame and budgets with mutual consent.

WASSAN will submit the outputs of the study to the Project Director as mentioned in the proposal.

Annexure No: 2

Methodology for Preparing Perspective Plan and Setting Goals:

The GoAP has formulated a perspective plan for watershed development program in AP. The salient features of this perspective plan are

Based on the perspective plan of the state, DPAP, RR District can prepare its perspective plan, for the development of rain-fed areas of the district with special priority to drought prone, degraded and waste lands of the district. DPAP, RR District has to conduct a special exercise to identify wastelands, rain-fed areas and degraded forest areas requiring treatment with the support of wasteland atlas of India and remote sensing data provided by APSRAC. Based on this exercise, the district can be divided into different macro watersheds/zones, according to status of resources as suggested by APSRAC. Level of urbanization and proximity to urban centers (Hyderabad and other towns) could be one of the criteria for defining these zones. Using Geographical Information Systems (GIS), data related to various criteria (connectivity, poverty, position of water and other natural resources, population profile, existence of community based organization, any other) can be superimposed on these zones. Based on the composite picture emerging from this visualization, the priority zones can be decided and accordingly the perspective plans (goals for each zone, key interventions, expected end results, time frame and budgets) can be prepared for each zone.

Based on the present inflow of funds for the watershed program, requirement of total funds for the treatment of entire rain fed area within time frame can be developed. While allocating projects, the approach should aim at comprehensive treatment of watersheds/ zones in the district giving due consideration to implementation and community mobilization aspects. It is expected that this perspective plan would address the need for sequencing the implementation of watershed projects in the district giving due consideration to the capabilities and experience in the implementation of the projects within the community. This perspective plan helps in allocation of watershed projects in an objective manner to deserving villages. This plan should also indicate "goals and achievable results" for each zone in the district.