

# Understanding Processes In Watershed Program

Report of Process study in Nalgonda  
An Abridged Version

## Abridged Version of Report of Process study in Nalgonda

### 1. Background:

- The Guidelines (MoRD, 1994) for implementing watershed program in DPAP districts are a breakthrough in promoting community participation in a state supported program.
- Government of Andhra Pradesh scaled up the program (5500 projects, highest number of projects in the country) by developing innovative administrative systems & collaborating with large number of Non Governmental Organizations (NGOs) and Government Organizations (GOs) as Project Implementing Agencies (PIAs).
- In this background, the conflict between “quality” and “quantity” also became more prominent in various situations. There is a growing concern that appropriate systems and adequate preparations are not in place. For developing such systems, a need was identified to closely look at the processes in watershed development program.
- Andhra Pradesh Academy of Rural Development (APARD) and Watershed Support Services and Activities Network (WASSAN), an autonomous support organization are asked to conduct the study to understand the “PROCESSES” of the program in Nalgonda, Mahabubnagar, Kurnool, Prakasam and Anantapur Districts, in which APRLP is being implemented.
- Selected functionaries from NGOs participated as field investigators in the study. They developed methodology for understanding processes at community level in a participatory manner. APARD and WASSAN facilitated this processes.
- WASSAN coordinated the study in Nalgonda District along with the active support from APARD and Mr. Kishan Das, Project Director, Nalgonda. This report is an output of the study of Processes on watershed program in the district.

#### **A Study on “What” is happening?**

The study primarily focuses on “WHAT” is happening on the ground, in terms of practices, processes, events, sequencing of events, main actors in that event, etc. It also aims at understanding “To what extent this practice is happening?”. Analysis of the same can help in understanding “WHY” is it (practice/ process) happening, the way it is happening?”.

- A sample of 29 watersheds was selected for the purpose of the study, by random sampling method.
- With this approach, the study does not study the impacts of the program (to what extent ground water levels increased, area under irrigation increased, etc). One can see that these “physical” impacts can be achieved even without participatory processes.

#### **Objectives of the Study:**

- *To understand the process of implementation right from identification, community organization, training, preparation of plans and execution of works and identify gaps in operationalization.*
- *To contribute to the strategies of up scaling of programs with quality.*
- *To develop proactive policy implications for a process oriented project like APRLP being undertaken in the five districts.*
- Focused Group Discussions were organized with Committee members, UG members and SHGs. Report contains responses of committee members, users, SHGs classified into Most Common Practices (practices that are happening 60 to 100% of cases) and Special

Practices (practices that are happening in less than 40% of cases). Implications of each set of practices were not presented in this abridged version.

## 2. Findings of the Study:

### 2.1. On Group Building Processes

#### 2.1.1. Awareness

##### **Most Common Practices:**

*GO & NGO share the platform...*

- ✓ In the initial stages, PIA leaders and WDT organized awareness programs, which created reasonable awareness levels (what is this program, what can be done in the program, etc) in the communities, including many users.
- ✓ Majority of the PIAs does not have any previous relationship with the village (before the program is launched in the village)
- ✓ Awareness camps with Grama Sabha were most common practices.
- ✓ Government officers AO, MDTs and PD also addressed community meetings and explained about the watershed program.

*Contents*

- ✓ People remembered mostly descriptions related to watershed bunds, tree plantations, check dams, small tanks, etc. in these awareness camps (In 23 watersheds).
- ✓ In 2 watersheds, community members could not recollect any message/ media event on watershed program.

*Exposure Visits...*

- ✓ Compared to common villagers, key functionaries like Chairman/ President/ Secretary developed fair understanding of the program, as a result of exposure visits/ other programs.

##### **Special Practices:**

*Local Initiatives.....*

- In three watersheds (out of 28), the committees reported that they organized awareness programs in the village at their own initiative. This created a general empathy towards the program in the village.
- Sarpanch played important role in bringing in the program to the village and also to organize awareness programs in the villages.
- In limited number of cases (only two out of 28), community/ users mentioned that main message was collective community action.
- When a PIA is involved with other programs (Eg: IPM, SHGs) other than watershed they tried to include the details of these programs also during awareness programs.
- Though especially not targeted, women/ poorer sections of the village also participated in the awareness generation activities. Some times, issues like SHGs were also discussed in the Kala Jathara/ Burra Katha, etc.

*On popular Demand....*

- News Papers helped to generate basic awareness about the program in the community (advertisements in paper).
- Program implementation in neighboring villages also helped to motivate communities to seek information from PIA/ DPAP office.

#### 2.1.2. Entry Point Activity

##### **Most Common Practices:**

*Initial momentum...*

- ✓ EPA was not allowed in 17 watersheds (out of 29)
- ✓ Wherever EPA is organized, people contributed genuinely in the form of shrama daanam/ land (4) & cash (2).
- ✓ There is no contribution from village towards EPA in 5 villages.

What are the choices? In how many villages?	
No EPA	17
Road	1
Drinking Water	4
Watershed Works	1
Bus Shelter	4
Hospital for animals	1

## WASSAN

- ✓ Community mobilization at village level could be seen during this EPA stage, as it addressed the common issue of the community. But this tempo came down in later stages of the program.
- ✓ PIA/ WDT along with key persons from committee (Chairman/ President/ Sarpanch) organized these works. Others in the village broadly gave their consent to the above activities.

### **Special Practices:**

*Half done...*

- Certain works are not completed (Bus Shelters/ Veterinary Hospital).
- PIA itself organized the works without community's involvement (even notional).

## 2. 2. Formation Of Committee

### **Most Common Practices:**

*Only key positions, rest of them are nominal...*

- ✓ Committees are constituted before forming groups. Since groups are not formed, committees are the main institutional face of the program at the village level.
- ✓ Grama Sabha was the most common platform on which watershed committee is formed (In 27 villages).
- ✓ First chairman/ president/ secretary is selected. After this, other members were selected in Grama Sabha.
- ✓ Criteria like women, land less person, farmer (user) were also notional while forming the committee.
- ✓ Time taken for forming committees ranged from one day to three months (in one case it took even 18 months).
- ✓ Majority of the men in the village are aware of this process of formation of committee and association (In 20 watersheds).

Number of meetings organized before forming the committee	Number of Villages
No meetings	2
1 Meeting	7
2 Meetings	8
3 Meetings	7
More than 3	4

In one village, 13 meetings were organized before forming a committee.

### *Selections or elections?*

- ✓ Sarpanch played an important role in formation of committees – suggesting/-nominating names, organizing village meetings, supervising the process of formation of committee, etc.

### *Purpose & Profile of members*

- ✓ Committee's main agenda is to organize watershed works – this is a common understanding among the members on the role of committee.
- ✓ Majority of members in committee do not represent any group.
- ✓ There are only 8 Grama Panchayat representatives in the committee.

### **Special Practices:**

*Balancing Act...*

- In two watersheds, political groups dominated the committee formation process. As a result the formation is delayed for almost 18 months.
- Balancing caste groups & political influences seems to be key elements during the formation of committees.

Committee Profiles Consolidated						
Position	Total Number	Representative of				
		User Group	SHG	Panchayat	Other Groups	Non Group
Chairman	29	11	0	1	0	17
President	29	8	1	0	0	20
Secretary*	28	7	0	0	0	21
Members	228	55	26	7	4	136

\* In once case, secretary is not selected.

### 2.3. Formation of Watershed Association (WA):

#### Most Common Practices:

- ✓ Committee members and association members (5 persons) were selected/ elected in the same Grama Sabha
- ✓ All watershed associations were registered. 5 members from Grama Sabha were selected/ elected to be members of watershed association.
- ✓ Grama Sabha and Association are not synonymous in operational terms.
- ✓ DPAP, Nalgonda prepared standard format/ circular of watershed byelaws and circulated to all watersheds.

Where are the copies of byelaws?	Number of Villages
At Committee	6
At PIA's office	6
Committee is not aware	16

#### *Silent Association...*

- ✓ There is no clarity on the concept of membership criteria in the association in the village.
- ✓ Common belief is that only those 5 members are members of association and committee is group of 9 or 11 persons.
- ✓ PIA made efforts to get this registration.
- ✓ In 15 watersheds, the byelaws are approved/ read in the Grama Sabha. PIA presented gist of byelaws in Grama Sabha.
- ✓ In remaining villages, it is a silent affair (except the nomination/ selection/ election of 5 persons)

#### *Membership Criteria....*

- ✓ In 20 watersheds there is no process of discussing/ develop membership criteria for association.
- ✓ In 8 watersheds, some criteria are in place. But they are informal and meant for only office bearers.

### 2.4. Formation of User Groups:

(Based on data from 27 watersheds)

#### Most Common Practices:

##### *User Vs User Groups....*

- ✓ In majority of the cases (17 out of 27), Users are not organized into groups. They are individuals as far as program interventions are concerned.
- ✓ Since bunding is also a popular program (which covered majority of individual farmers), PIA did not identify the need to organize user groups.
- ✓ Farmers benefiting by a particular intervention are formed in user groups (in 6 watersheds)
- ✓ In 4 watersheds, based on the location of farms, owners are asked to form user groups.

How are they formed	Number of Watersheds (W/S)
Not formed at all	17
Based on works	6
Location/ Land ownership	4

#### *Roles of UG members:*

- ✓ Committees tried to organize community into groups. Though this is a notional arrangement, users could relate to only this process as group building process.
- ✓ Wherever groups are formed, their roles and responsibilities are not well defined as group, in majority of the cases. In fact, farmers from 7 watersheds think that they do not have any role in the program. It is for the committee to do/ organizes every thing.
- ✓ Users (either as group or individually) perceive their role as "Implementers" (in 18 watersheds).
- ✓ When works are implemented in one's own land, one is expected to over see the works. Majority of the users take up this responsibility.

- ✓ While implementing the works, these members (As individuals) participate as laborers/ supervisors (in 18 watersheds).
- ✓ In completed works, users are maintaining the structures (mainly earthen bunds) on their lands.
- ✓ There are no separate meetings for these user groups. Their functionality is almost nil as a group.

What is your role in watershed program?	Number of Watersheds (W/S)
No role	7
Implement works	18
Follow Committee's directions	2

**Special Practices:**

*Misnomer:*

- In some cases (2 out of 27), people with land are organized into user groups and people without land are organized into SHGs. Though these groups are notional, this seems to be the generally agreed concept of group formation.

*Who is in? Who is out?*

- In one case, farmers mentioned that small farmers did not get any space (in terms of program benefits and membership) in the program.
- Similarly, in one village Reddy community was not involved in the program as most of them absentee land lards. Program benefits were given only to resident farmers in the village.

**2. 6. Planning Processes**

**2. 6. 1. BANK ACCOUNT**

**Most Common Practices:**

- ✓ Two accounts per watershed are opened in the name of works and WDF. Guidelines were followed in case.
- ✓ In 50% of cases, cheque books are with WDT/PIA. In remaining 50% of case, functionaries keep them. (See box item for details)
- ✓ In case of bank passbooks, chairman keeps them in his custody in 17 watersheds. In 8 watersheds, PIA/ WDT keeps these pass books.
- ✓ In 50% of cases, permission of the committee/ discussions in the committee meetings is essential before withdrawing the money from the bank.
- ✓ Dealing/ transactions with local banks seem to be okay.

Cheques and Controls...	
Where is the cheque book?	Number of Villages
With PIA/ WDT Committee	14
Chairman	1
Secretary	11
	2

**Special Practices:**

*Committees, not in control...*

- In two watersheds, only one account is opened.
- In three watersheds, Passbooks could not be found during the study time.
- Majority of cheques are issued in the name of chairman/ secretary in one watershed.

**2. 6. 2. Delineating Watershed Area**

**Most Common Practices:**

*Who identified?*

- ✓ In 17 watersheds, committee members, villagers along with WDT/ MDTs identified the watershed area through transacts walk/ field visits.
- ✓ In 5 watersheds, PIA/ WDT dominated the process of identification of watershed area. Community members had little space for influencing the process.
- ✓ In 5 watersheds, external actors (WDT/PIA) had little role in identification process of watershed. Sarpanch with other leaders

How are the watersheds delineated? & In how many villages	
Based on Roads	5
Based on streams/ drainage	3
Dividing area of village	5
Grouping lands based on survey numbers	2
From ridge to valley	2
No particular method	10
Don't Know	1

(elders) dominated the process of delineation.

*Basis for delineating...*

- ✓ In majority of cases (10), no particular method/ criteria are followed in identification of watershed area.
- ✓ Presence of MDT/ WDT also helped in facilitating the watershed delineation and to know the norms of the program (Size of watershed 500 hect)
- ✓ Dividing area of the village based on roads/ streams/ survey number is another practice
- ✓ In general, ridge valley principles are not strictly followed for both identification of watershed & implementation of program.

*Response of User Community:*

- ✓ Farmers participated in transact walks, during the delineating process of watersheds in 20 villages.
- ✓ Out of this 20, only in 3 villages farmers recognized the concept of “top to bottom” or “ridge to valley”. In remaining villages, various other considerations dominated the process of delineating the watershed.
- ✓ In 8 villages, farmers did not know the process of identification of watershed area. In these villages, there are some disagreements/ conflicts between committee and farmers, as the project implementation progresses.
- ✓ Wherever farmers participated in identification of watershed (in 20 villages), these types of conflicts are not observed.

**Special Practices:**

*Which area & Where?*

- Only in three cases, the area of watershed is consciously limited to 500 hecets.
- In 3 cases, ridge to valley concept is followed consciously.
- To avoid any conflicts due to delineation of watersheds, it was decided to cover all farmers in the village (In 4 villages).

**2.6.3. Identification Of Problems, Resources And Works**

**Most Common Practices:**

*Problem Analysis.*

- ✓ The process of identifying watershed problems & interventions is not very systematic.
- ✓ Village leaders (mainly committee members) were key actors at this stage from village side.
- ✓ Users perceive that planning is the responsibility of the committee (particularly of Chairman, Secretary and President).
- ✓ WDT is a key payer in identifying technical interventions that were suitable to a particular land/ area. Village leaders accompanied them.
- ✓ These events were organized/ facilitated by WDT/ PIA/ MDT.

Who identified the problems?	
User's Perception	Number of Villages
Sarpanch/ Important Persons	9
User/ People	7
WDT/ PIA	3
Sarpanch/ Important Persons and People	1
Committee	3
Don't Know	4

*Data Collection*

- ✓ Transact walk was the main method to identify resources, problems and needs of the community. Though this process was rather quick, this method seemed to have generated sufficient data for planning purpose.
- ✓ During this process, watershed treatment options were identified (mainly by WDTs).

- ✓ Earthen bunds and water conservation works (Kuntalu, check dams) were given priority in majority of the watersheds.
- ✓ Horticulture/ plantations were also identified as interventions.

*Deciding sites.....*

- ✓ WDT with WC decided/ selected sites in 9 watersheds.
- ✓ Users joined WDT & WC in deciding sites only in 5 watersheds.
- ✓ Users identified sites on their own in 4 watersheds. In three watersheds, committee alone identified sites (without the support of WDT & UGs).
- ✓ In 7 watersheds, users are not aware of this process.

**Special Practices:**

*Narrow perspective....*

- PRA (mapping exercises, etc) is used to identify problems/ needs in 4 watersheds.
- Repairing of existing structures, construction of health center was also identified as treatment options/ works that were needed in the village.
- Understanding/ analysis of problems was carried out only in one case, which mentioned that the loss of fertility as main problem in the village.

**2. 6. 4. Preparation Of Plans And Estimates:**

**Most Common Practices:**

*My job....*

- ✓ PIA/ WDT takes key responsibilities at this stage. WC actively supports PIA/ WDT.
- ✓ Users role ends with transact walks.
- ✓ After, this stage, estimations/ budgets are prepared. WDT/ PIA provided technical inputs into preparation of estimates. Engineer from WDT had to play important role. Engineers use SSRs for preparing estimates. Other WDTs have minimum role in this process.

Who prepares Plans?	Number of Villages
WDT & WC	22
WDT, WC and Users	3
Don't Know	1
Villagers	1

- ✓ The earlier surveys and transact walks (at data collection stage) have some notional linkage with this exercise. This process is disjointed from earlier exercises.
- ✓ At this stage, chairman/ president offer necessary support to WDT.
- ✓ The notional role of community (at estimation stage) is clearly indicated in majority of the cases, as they could not recollect the events, norms, rules, budget figures and activities in the plan document.

Who prepares estimates?	Number of Villages
WDT alone	22
WDT, WC and Users	2
Don't Know	3

*General VS Specific...*

- ✓ Many of the user community do not know the specific details of the program interventions that are implemented in their own field. (eg: bund, check dam in his field).
- ✓ About 50% of them know that the total budget of the program is between 15 to 20 lacs.

*Who changed & How?*

- ✓ In some cases, priority was changed from soil conservation works to minor irrigation/ water conservation works. Accordingly budgets were also changed.
- ✓ Some committees mentioned about the norms, which mainly relate to implementation of program. But not to the planning process.
- ✓ Though there are some differences between committee and users, both of them mentioned that action plans are not changed in majority of the villages.

- ✓ This gap in understanding indicates the absence of appropriate communication systems between committee and user community.
- ✓ In limited number of cases (2 out of 27), user community did not even know whether the plans were changed at all or not. Since they are not familiar with original document, they did not know if there are any changes, who could make those changes, etc.
- ✓ In one watershed, the users participated in taking resolutions when plans are changed.
- ✓ The role of Grama Sabha in approving these changes was minimum, almost negligible.

*DPAP's support underutilized...*

- ✓ DPAP gave some formats for planning purpose, many committees are not aware of them.
- ✓ Majority of them did not use them.
- ✓ Main users of the formats were WDTs, who prepared budgets for each works.
- ✓ Most of these plans were not really implemented. There were no changes made in document as such.

Where are the copies of action plans?	Number of Villages
With Committee	9
With PIA	6
Not with PIA and WC	12

**Special Practices:**

*Whose plan was it, anyway?*

- Even committee members also expressed their ignorance on the preparation of plans (in 1 watershed). They did not know how these plans were prepared and by whom, what were the contents.
- When government department was acting as a PIA, the process of planning generally ignored the community. PIA prepared plans and explained to limited number of village leaders about the content.

**2. 6. 5. Approval by Grama Sabha**

**Most Common Practices**

*Initial Processes..*

- ✓ In the very beginning of the program, perspective plans (total plan for 4 years) was presented and an approval is taken form the members present (In 18 watersheds).
- ✓ In two villages, the resolution from Grama Sabha is taken without actually presenting the plan to the Grama Sabha.
- ✓ Even though this indicates a good process, this process of involving Grama Sabha is not followed consistently in all other steps of the program.
- ✓ In 5 villages, this process is not adopted.
- ✓ Committee replaces the Grama Sabha. Approval of committee is considered to be the approval of Grama Sabha.

*Approvals by Officers....*

- ✓ These plans are sent directly to PD/ MDTs/ DPAP office for approval in 14 watersheds.
- ✓ Approval of plans by committees is not a common practice as observed by most users (only 4 watersheds reported that the committee/ association approves the plans).
- ✓ In 7 watersheds, common man in the village is not aware of the process of approval (by PD/ MDT/ WC/ WA).

**2. 7. Process of Implementation**

**2. 7. 1. Contribution**

Different groups/ individuals gave details of different practices of contribution. When all these versions are put together, a broad understanding of the issues emerged. Though there are inconsistencies in understanding of the issues among villagers, one can also see the reason.

**Most Common Practices**

A forced Concept...

- ✓ Concept of contribution was not explained to the community in a proper manner.
- ✓ There was not much process in deciding the type & amount of contribution. Most of the PIAs followed the norms given in Guidelines/ DPAP.
- ✓ The norms (as mentioned in the Guidelines) were announced in the Grama Sabha to the community members, but not negotiated.
- ✓ The consent of the community was not really sought. It is taken for granted.
- ✓ WDT/ PIA/ DPAP office almost dictated that contribution is compulsory. But, when it comes to actual practice, there are many differences in opinions and interpretations.

Who contributes and How? Gaps in Understanding:

- ✓ Committee members (particularly chairman/ secretary) and farmers do not share the same opinion.
- ✓ Only in 10 villages, committee members think that farmers are contributing. But farmers in 15 villages think that they themselves are contributing.
- ✓ In 12 villages, committee members mobilize contribution by deducting from payments (of users/ labourers). Farmers in these villages think that they are contributing, as deductions are made from payments due to them. But committees consider that as “deduction”, rather than “contributions.”
- ✓ Another practice is to cut from wages of the laborers who work in the fields. Though this practice is most common, it is not openly discussed in many meetings. Only in 7 villages, both users and committee member agreed that contribution is actually coming from laborers.

<b>Perceptions of Committees and Users</b>		
Who Contributes & How	Number of Villages	
	User's Opinion	Committee's Opinion
Farmers	15	10
Labourers	7	6
Deducted from payments (5 to 10%)	1	12
Don't Know	5	1

How is it mobilized?

- ✓ In majority of the cases (23 watersheds out of 28), contribution is collected after the work is over.
- ✓ Farmers worked in their own lands in majority of cases. This practice is considered as Shrama Daanam. This also facilitated easy deductions from payments.
- ✓ In 7 watersheds, wages from labor was deducted to mobilize contribution. Labourer usually pays 5% from their wages. Committee members, users and labourers are aware of this arrangement.

Systems & Documents:

- ✓ No systematic records were maintained in case of WDF. Only bank passbook was the source of information on WDF.

**2. 7. 2. Awareness Levels of villagers on WDF:**

**Most Common Practices**

Our contribution

- ✓ In majority of the cases (18 out of 28), farmers know that the fund generated in the form of contribution is deposited in a separate bank account. But further details are not clear to them (Amount, name of the account, purpose of the fund, who manages, etc).

- ✓ Management of WDF is linked to individuals (chairman/ president) in majority of the cases. The institutional frame for management of WDF is not yet conceptualized.
- ✓ In remaining 10 watersheds, farmers are not aware of WDF.
- ✓ In 50% of watersheds, farmers are confident that their own money (deducted/ shrama daanam/ cash) is deposited in WDF. Remaining 50% of watersheds, farmers thought that their money is not going to WDF. Some one else is contributing. (Labourer, contractor, chairman, etc).
- ✓ About 20% of users could tell the total amount of contribution mobilized so far.
- ✓ Clarity of purpose...
- ✓ Only limited number of committee members could express the actual purpose of WDF (In 6 watersheds).
- ✓ The norms for contribution were not clear to the committee members. They did not contribute at all. Committee members thought that PIA would know every thing about contribution.
- ✓ Future of WDF:
- ✓ PIA seems to have significant influence on the use/ maintenance of WDF. What ever PIA/ WDT say, it is likely to be accepted by the committee.
- ✓ No rules and regulations were developed for the utilization of WDF.
- ✓ The common belief is that WDF can be used for ANY REPAIR works in the watershed, after the project period is over.
- ✓ Special Practaices
- ✓ New culture for horticulture...
- ✓ Cash payments are made as contribution in case of horticulture.
- ✓ For ponds (Kuntalu) a token contribution is made @Rs. 200 per kunta.
- ✓ Only one case indicated a separate record for WDF, which indicates work wise contribution.
- ✓ In one case, even committee members do not know how & who is contributing
- ✓ In 4 villages, users are not aware of contribution.
- ✓ Initially some villagers contributed. But over a period of time they stopped, after seeing that villagers from neighboring village are not contributing. How not to contribute, they learned from an exposure visit.
- ✓ **2.7.3. Organising Works:**
- ✓ **Most Common Practices:**
- ✓ Sharing of Responsibilities:
- ✓ There are informal arrangements in sharing responsibilities among WDT, WC and users, in most of the case, as mentioned in the box item.
- ✓ In 5 watersheds such division of responsibilities is not organized. It is centralized at WDT and WC committee level.
- ✓ Users are familiar with the process of organising works and implementing them. However, they think that management of works is the responsibility of secretary and Chairman/President.
- ✓ Labourers implement works in majority of the cases (In 13 watersheds), under the supervision of WDTs.
- ✓ Users also worked as labourers in 16 watersheds.

Who manages WDF?	Number of Villages
WDT/ PIA	3
Chairman/ President	11
Chairman & WDT	4
Don't Know	10

What Responsibility	Who
Supervision	WDTs
Quality Control	Users
Measurements	WDT
Committee with others	Payments.

## WASSAN

- ✓ Secretary/ WDT has the discretion of using the services of farmers. Usually secretary / chairman gets labourers on contract.
- ✓ In 7 cases, farming community complained that contractors are implementing works, without involving local farmers.
- ✓ In 7 cases, works were given to SHGs.

### Supervision & Quality Control: --

#### Engineers Hold The Key...

- ✓ It is an undisputed territory of WDTs, particularly of engineers.
- ✓ In 11 cases, WDT alone supervises the works.
- ✓ In 15 cases, other actors support him.
- ✓ Committee members (mainly chairman, president and secretary) play support role to the WDTs.
- ✓ In general, there is a consensus that the inputs of WDT are adequate.
- ✓ Users take interest in the quality of works. To ensure this, they work in their own field as labourers. This is more common with earthen bunds.

#### Special Practice:

- Watershed area is divided into 4 zones to share/ divide the responsibilities among committee members.
- Agreement from user is taken before works are implemented. This agreement talks of the responsibilities of users in maintenance of assets created.
- In limited number of watersheds, users also felt that there is no space/ value for their comments/ advice/ needs. They are neglected by WDTs.
- About 15% users are not aware of any practices/ systems to maintain quality of works.
- In 2 watersheds, works were implemented by machines.
- Preference is given to local laborers/ landless persons explicitly in 2 watersheds.
- Conditions regarding contribution (10%) were also discussed before implementing works

## **2. 7. 4. Measurements**

### Most Common Practices:

#### *Who measures?*

- ✓ Measurements are made by WDT in majority of the cases (15 out of 29).
- ✓ Secretaries support this process. Other committee members (mainly chairman/ president) also join in this process.
- ✓ Users in 12 watersheds keep track of some details of works that are being implemented in his own land. These details are mainly – number of labourers/ day, number of days a person worked, etc. Since they also work as labourers, these informal records help them to know whether they are getting their dues properly or not.
- ✓ In 15 watersheds, users do not keep any record formally or informally at their level. Absence of this practice leads to some misunderstanding between committee and users.

#### Special Practice:

#### *Measuring up to expectations...*

- Secretaries are independently doing measurements in about 10% of cases.
- Watershed area is divided into 4 zones to share/ divide the responsibilities among committee members.
- Agreement from user is taken before works are implemented. This agreement talks of the responsibilities of users in maintenance of assets created.
- In limited number of watersheds, users also felt that there is no space/ value for their comments/ advice/ needs. They are neglected by WDTs.
- About 15% users are not aware of any practices/ systems to maintain quality of works.
- In 2 watersheds, machines implement works.
- Explicit preference is given to local laborers/ landless persons in 4 watersheds.
- Conditions regarding contribution (10%) were also discussed before implementing works

**2. 7. 5. Payments:**

**Most Common Practices:**

*Who pays?*

- ✓ Chairman/ Secretary/ WDT makes payments (to the leaders of labour groups in majority of cases).
- ✓ Users make payments in limited number of cases (5 watersheds). They borrow money and make payments (to labourers and materials). When payment to the users is delayed, he also has to pay interest on this amount.
- ✓ In general, users are not involved in making payments to the labourers/ materials.
- ✓ For labour payments, no advance is given. For materials (cement, stone, etc) payments are made and material is procured.
- ✓ Labour contractors (Mutha Mestri) act like leaders of the labour groups. Cheques are issued on their name, when the works are completed.
- ✓ Payments are made on the basis of Measurement Book and as per SSR in majority of the cases (In 14 cases). In two cases, daily wages are given.
- ✓ In 11 watersheds, users and labourers do not know about the system of payments (daily wages or SSR).
- ✓ The wage rates are different for men (higher) and women (lower), when they are employed on daily wages. Weekly payments, mid term payments are also in practice.
- ✓ Cheques are issued in the name of leader of labour group.

**Special Practice:**

- When payments are made on volume basis, equal wages are given to men and women. It is observed that the man and woman in such cases belong to the same family.

**2. 8. Expenditure Patterns of GO PIAs & NGO PIAs Compared:**

Based on PIA category (GO PIA and NGO PIA), total expenditure is classified.

**2. 8. 1. On Expenditure Pattern by NGO PIAs:**

- NGOs have almost equal share of expenditure for S & M works and water conservation works (About 38%).
- Both of these interventions consume about 76% of the total budget.
- Plantation has a share of 20%.
- Animals did not get their due share from the program.

S.No	Type of Activity	As % of NGO's Expenditure	As % of GO's Expenditure
1	S & M Conservation	38.7%	41.7%
2	Water Conservation	37.7%	30.1%
3	Plantation	19.8%	24.4%
4	Animal Husbandry	0.7%	1.4%
5	Others	3.1%	2.4%
6	Grand TOTAL	100.0%	100.0%

**2. 8. 2. On Expenditure Pattern by GO PIAs:**

- Government PIAs have higher % of expenditure on S & M works (41%).
- Water conservation & plantation have 30% and 25 % of the budgets.
- Though small % of the total expenditure, compared to NGO PIAs, GO PIAs have higher expenditure on fodder development.

**Diversity of Interventions:**  
The diversity of works in NGO PIAs is higher than that of GO PIAs. Total Number of interventions made by NGO PIAs is 19 and by GO PIAs is 7.

**2. 8. 3. COMMON FEATURES:**

- Both NGO and GO PIAs have similar share of expenditure. In both the cases, S & M conservation has highest % of the expenditure. After this water conservation, followed by plantation.

S.No	Activity	As % of Total Expenditure (As% of 6)		
		Public	Private	Total
1	S & M Conservation	6%	30.6%	36.4%
2	Water Conservation	9%	29.7%	38.9%
3	Animal Husbandry	0%	0.8%	0.8%
4	Plantation	9%	11.3%	20.2%
5	Other	1%	2.3%	3.8%
6	ALL WORKS	25%	75%	100.0%

- In terms of proportionate investments, NGO PIAs have almost equal amount of investments on S & M Conservation & Waters

Conservation (38% and 37%). In case of GO PIAs, the expenditure on S & M works & Water Conservation is not same. S & M works have highest investments (41%). Water conservation programs have 30% investments. In both NGO and GO PIAs, S & M works & Water Conservation Works take about 70 to 75% of the budget.

- GO PIAs did not have any expenditure on de-silting/ silt application, feeder channel, sub surface dam, kunta repairs, farm ponds, nursery, animal husbandry, bio gas, bush clearance & sprayers. NGO PIAs have promoted/ facilitated these interventions.
- NGOs have zero expenditure on diversion drains, while GO PIAs have 14% of it's total expenditure on the same.

**2. 8. 4. Investments on Public & Private Lands:**

Data on investments on public and private lands is not readily available at committee/ WDT level. Study teams with the support of WDTs compute this.

**2. 8. 5. Investments made on Public and Private Lands:**

- Investments on water conservation the highest on both public and private lands 39%.
- After this, S & M Conservation works have 36%.
- Plantation works have an investment of 20%.
- Lowest investment is on animal husbandry/ fodder development (0.8%).
- Other investments are primarily targeted individuals. Since EPA is clubbed into this category (on public lands), investments on public lands appear to be high.

**2. 8. 6. Investments on Public Lands:**

- Expenditure on public lands is about 25% of the total investment. However, area covered under public land treatment is not exactly available.
- Important works that are organized in public lands are – water conservation (9%), plantation (9%), and soil & moisture conservation (6%).
- Expenditure on water conservation and plantation on public land is equal. 9% each of the total expenditure.
- Expenditure on plantation is the single largest intervention on public land. Compared to private lands, higher investments are made on public lands in case of plantation. 44% of total investment on plantation is on public land.
- De-siltation of public tanks actually benefited private lands (in terms of silt application).

**2. 8. 7. Investments on Private Lands:**

- Total share of investments on private lands is about 75%.
- Soil & Moisture conservation and water conservations activities on private lands share almost equal amounts of expenditure (nearly 30% each).

- Important interventions on private lands are “earthen bunds” with a budget of 20%. This is also the single highest single investment in the entire program.
- Of the total investment on S & M works, 54% is spent on private lands.
- Even in the case of bunds, number of farmers benefited is not available, with the PIAs, when the study teams visited
- Next to this, check dams have a share of 16%, second highest investments. In this case also, there is no data of users.
- Percolation tanks located on private lands have a share of 11% of the total budget.
- Of the total expenditure on water conservation, 41% is spent on check dams in private lands. About 28% of total investment on water conservation is on percolation tanks on private lands.
- There is demand for repairing of structures (kuntalu, etc), which are allowed only in limited number of cases.
- Horticulture is demanded program by the farmers, which has a share of 22% of total expenditure on plantation. Farmers are willing to contribute towards this intervention.
- The following works are completely done on private lands – farm ponds, animal husbandry, pasture development, horticulture, bio gas plants, and bush clearance.
- Activities like pasture development (though small investments –0.8% of total) could benefit poorer communities those are dependent on commons, if they are organized on common lands of the village. But these programs/ interventions are targeted at farmers (private lands).
- Similarly, small investments (like sprayers, bio gas plants, etc) need to be properly targeted & institutional framework need be developed. Otherwise, these small investments can send very wrong signals to the community on the contents of the program.

#### **2.9. Budget Releases to Watershed Committees:**

Participatory processes can be negatively impacted, if the expectations are raised and promised are not kept. Plans prepared by community will have no value if the funds do not flow according to agreed time frames and amounts. The following tables provide insights into this aspect of the program. These fund flows are compared with the norms of Guidelines. Since the projects are at various stages, the comparison is made only up to 4<sup>th</sup> installment.

#### **Following are the broad conclusions:**

- Amount released in each installment ranges from Rs.50, 000 to 6,00,000.
- Average amounts indicate that about Rs.2 Lac per installment is released in most cases, making the total number of installments required 7 per project.
- Majority of the installments range from Rs. 1 to 2 Lac, in all installments.
- Only 6 cases, installments are more than Rs. 5 Lac.
- The Guidelines are not strictly followed in fund releases. The usual constraints are availability of funds at DPAP office, lack of progress at committee level, absence of action plan, etc.
- Gap between two releases is broadly between 200 to 300 days, in majority of the cases. This means that total time frame for the project should be approximately 5 years (1750 days) per project.
- The number of installments as per Guidelines is 7 in 4 years. In practice, the budget releases are spread over 5 years, keeping the same number of installments.
- In rare cases, gaps are more than a year.

#### **2.10. Women Groups and Watershed Program**

##### **2.10.1. Women Groups & Main Activities:**

##### **Most Common Practices:**

##### *Different Groups....*

- ✓ DWACRA/ Sama Bhavana Groups were treated as SHGs. MDO, VAO and DRDA are main instruments to create various women groups – under DWACRA program.
- ✓ In 12 villages, new groups are also formed by PIA/ WDTs, during watershed program.
- ✓ Main objective of these groups is save money for credit purpose.
- ✓ The age of these groups ranges from one year to 5 years. All of them started with savings.

**Membership Profile:*****Land less and Less Land:***

- ✓ All groups are of women groups.
- ✓ Members of each group are selected according to the consensus of all the members.
- ✓ In majority of the cases, the groups could retain all members.
- ✓ Most often these groups are mixed groups in terms of caste composition. But they belong to one economic class (either land less families, labourers, families with small land holding).

Main Activities of Women Groups	
What Activity?	In how many villages
Savings & Loans	22
Only savings	4
Defunct Groups	2
Other than Savings & Credit	
As labourers in Watershed works	7
Nothing in particular	16
Participate in Government Development Programs	4
Income Generating Activities	1

**Special Practices:*****Local initiatives:***

- Anganvadi teacher also helped in generating awareness about DWACRA groups in one village.
- Sarpanch also facilitated the formation of groups in one village.
- Land less women encouraged to form a group for themselves.
- In limited number of cases, women left the group for various reasons – she left the village, too poor to save, could not repay the loan, disillusioned with lack of grants, etc.

**2. 10. 2. Relationship With Watershed Program:****Most Common Practices:*****In Decision Making Positions:***

- ✓ About 50% groups reported that one of their members is also a member in the watershed committee. The number of women in committee ranges from one to three. Not all of them are necessarily from DWACRA/ Sama Bhavana Groups.
- ✓ Though 50% of the group's representatives mentioned that they are participating in the meetings, it was evident that these members are not regular participants in the watershed committee meetings. Men members remarked that women do not participate regularly.
- ✓ In 12 cases the relationship is absent
- ✓ During planning stage, some members (In 13 watersheds) participated in transact walks and PRA exercises. They requested the male members to include budgets for SHGs (for revolving funds).

**At Program Level*****Fifty, fifty...***

- ✓ Women members indicated two types of benefits from watershed program, according to asset base they have.
- ✓ Their lands are treated – In 15 villages. They got employment opportunities – In 13 villages.
- ✓ They are asked to save money to get some grant from government. This is the only motivation for them to form the group. Members of such groups could not relate to watershed program at all.
- ✓ Direct involvement in natural resource management related activities (as SHG or UG) did not really take place.

***Mis "Matching Funds"...***

- ✓ In limited number of cases (about 9 villages) these members/ groups could get access to this fund. This amount ranged from Rs.10,000/- to Rs. 1,00,000.
- ✓ In 17 watersheds, groups did not receive revolving funds from watershed grants.
- ✓ Most of them do not have any plan for the members in terms of budget requirements. PIAs did not facilitate any needs analysis and budgeting exercise for these groups.

*What do women think about WDF?*

My wage, your fund....

- ✓ Since significant amount of “contribution” came from the wages of women, their concerns are important to understand
- ✓ About 60% of them aware of the WDF concept, as they contributed to it from their wages.
- ✓ They do not know complete details of the same – what the amount is, where is it kept, who maintains it, etc.
- ✓ Many of them know that this fund is supposed to be used for repairs/ maintenance of the structures.

Is my right, right? Perception of Women on WDF and Their Right over WDF.	
Know about WDF & Think that WDF helps them	In 3 villages
Know about WDF & Think that WDF does not help them	In 13 villages
Do not know about WDF and its benefits to them	In 11 villages

*Demanding their due share....*

- ✓ Some members requested committee members for plantation works, timely measurements & work opportunities (In 4 watersheds).
- ✓ Whenever they work as laborers in watershed works, the groups also discuss issues related to payments, measurements, etc. It may be noted that these groups were not involved as “groups” for undertaking watershed works. They work as individuals (not necessarily as DWACRA group members).

**2. 11. Maintenance**

**Most Common Practices:**

*I take care of my bund...*

- ✓ No specific practices are evolved for maintenance of assets created during the program in majority of the villages (In 16 villages).
- ✓ General untold practice of looking after works in one’s own fields is widely seen. This was feasible, particularly in case of works on private lands (bunds) (In 9 villages).
- ✓ Many committees are not taking any decision on this aspect – complain the users.
- ✓ In 8 watersheds, users strongly felt that committee has to take the responsibility of repairs/ maintenance.

*Details of Damages...*

- ✓ In majority of cases, there are no major damages.
- ✓ In case of earthen bunds, farmers are expected to repair damages (informal understanding).
- ✓ In case of small repairs (bunds on private lands), farmers repaired on their own in 4 watersheds. So far there is no financial support for repairing of the structures/ bunds.
- ✓ In one case committee repaired a check dam.
- ✓ In general, there is some confusion about the responsibility of repairs. Farmers expect committee to repair, while committee members expect farmers to repair on their own.

**Special Practices:**

- Users think that PIA takes care of all maintenance related aspects.
- Committee takes commitment from users for maintenance of the assets created.

**2. 13. PIA Profiles**

**Most Common Practices:**

*NGOs and GOs*

- ✓ Majority of PIAs are NGO PIAs (17 out of 20 PIAs).
- ✓ In some cases, two NGOs acted as PIAs in partnership (3 Joint PIAs in 17 PIAs)

*Previous Experience of PIAs:*

- ✓ In case of 5 PIAs, details of previous experience are not available. Leaders of some of these PIAs do not live/ work nearer to the project area. WDTs of these PIAs are not familiar with PIA's history and previous experiences.
- ✓ 8 PIAs do not have any previous experience in developmental sector, particularly rural development.
- ✓ Only 6 PIAs have previous experience of community mobilization. These PIAs have expertise and experience in the fields of thrift and credit, child labour, health, agriculture & environment, empowerment of dalit/ women communities, etc.

*Registration:*

- ✓ Registration is relevant only in case of 17 NGO PIAs. For 3 GO PIAs it is not relevant.
- ✓ Only 7 NGO PIAs are registered before the launching of watershed program (In 1994).
- ✓ Only these 7 NGOs have previous experience. Of these 7 PIAs, one PIA does not have community mobilization experience, but worked on scientific research/ action research.
- ✓ 4 PIAs are registered after the project is launched. 4 PIAs are registered before 1994, but they are dormant.

✓ One may infer that new NGOs (registered after 1994) developed partnership with dormant NGOs that were registered earlier (before 1994), to meet the official requirement (if any – 3 years of registration period).

Registered	Experience of Community Mobilization		Data Not Available (NA)
	Yes	No ##	
Before 1994	7 PIAs	4 PIAs	Nil
After 1994	Nil	4 PIAs	Nil
NA *	Nil	Nil	5 PIAs

- \* Includes 3 GO PIAs.
- ## Partnership PIAs fall into this category.

*Previous Relationship between watershed village and PIAs:*

- ✓ In most of the cases, there is no relationship (In case of 14 PIAs).
- ✓ Only in case of 3 PIAs, there is some kind previous relationship between PIA and watershed village.
- ✓ In case of 3 PIAs, this data is not available. Since these PIAs do not have any previous experience, one can infer that these PIAs also do not have any previous relationship with watershed villages.

*Convergence of other programs:*

- ✓ There is no serious effort by PIAs on convergence of the developmental programs, apart from compulsory programs like Janma bhoomi, etc.
- ✓ Only limited number of established NGO PIAs is facilitating convergence of other programs (child labour, IPM, environmental education, agriculture, etc). The funds for these programs are mobilized by the PIAs from some other sources (not from watershed/ project).
- ✓ New and PIAs with partnership do not really have any activities that promote convergence.

*Issues at NGO PIA Level:*

Administration Budget:

- PIAs receive only grants related to overheads of PIA and WC.
- There is some rigidity in terms of line items and maximum allowable amounts under each line item. This system takes away the autonomy of PIAs and reduces them into mere "implementer", rather than an agent for development.

Budgets for training & community organization:

- Budgets for this should go to PIAs, as per Guidelines. But these budgets are centralized at district level.
- PIA has to make an application to DPAP, if it intends organize any training program.
- DPAP takes its own time in approving this plan. Some times they are not approved. DPAP itself organizes these programs.
- PIAs complain that these programs are not adequate and are of poor quality. As a result PIAs are unable to provide adequate inputs to committees and groups.
- The details of total expenditure for training and Community organization per watershed are not available at PIA/ Committee level.

Separate Training Inputs to Women:	
Training Programs for	In how many villages?
Only Men	10
Men and Women	18
Only Women	0

*Issues related to GO PIAs:*

Apparently similar norms for administration grants are followed for GO PIAs also. But these details are difficult to obtain.

Some of the practices that are observed with GO PIAs are —

- Incomplete WDTs for most of the project period.
- No separate office for the project.
- Details of expenditure (for Administration) of main department and project team are not clear at local level.

**2.14. Details of Training Programs:**

A detailed exercise of compiling data related to training inputs of each watershed is done. Summery tables are prepared from this

Number of Training Programs per Watershed								
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Number of Watersheds	1	1	9	5	5	3	2	2

exercise and are presented here. The following is the analysis on training inputs.

**Most Common Practices:**

*Outreach:*

- ✓ All watersheds received training programs, except one watershed.
- ✓ All watersheds (except 2) received minimum of two training programs in the span of the project period.
- ✓ Only two watersheds received maximum number of training programs (7) so far.
- ✓ No training program is specially targeted for women.
- ✓ In 10 watersheds, only men participated in training programs. In 18 watersheds, both men and women participated in training programs.

*Training Program Vs Workshops:*

- ✓ Of the total 94 programs organized in the selected watersheds, 54 programs are organized/ hosted by PD, DPAP/ MDT/ Collector. In remaining programs, PIAs organized.
- ✓ Many of these programs are not “training programs” per se. They are workshops, awareness camps, exposure visits, meetings of chief minister/ other ministers.
- ✓ Such programs can only motivate community but do not help in building their skills/ knowledge base.
- ✓ There is an overlap between training programs and workshops/ exposure visits.
- ✓ Details of “resource persons” are not available with PIA/ committees. They only remembered popular personalities like Anna Saheb Hazare, Chief Minister, etc.
- ✓ These are some common events in the state/ district where all functionaries from all most all watersheds participated. Since they are counted in each watershed, actual number of training programs could be less at district for the selected watershed.

- ✓ The methodologies are generally lectures by popular personalities and government officers. They are not necessarily participatory in nature.
- ✓ Hyderabad & Nalgonda are most common venues. Other places like PIA head quarters/ KVK Gaddipally are also used as venues.
- ✓ Size of group in program could be anything between 18 members to 30,000 persons.

### **3. Broad Inferences from the Analysis**

#### ***Category 1: Institution Building Processes***

##### **Community Level :**

- ⇒ The program gained considerable importance and popularity among the communities.
- ⇒ Committee members gained significant role in the program – as managers, planners, implementers & organizers.
- ⇒ Committees are able to provide leadership to the program at the village level, though this leadership is limited to small group within the committee.
- ⇒ Leaders (Sarpanch) in the village took initiative to constitute watershed committees, bring awareness, etc.
- ⇒ “Quick Fix” processes are widely in practice in promoting “people’s institutions”.
- ⇒ Such “Weak Institutions” may collapse once the program is completed.
- ⇒ Notional groups of users are created in majority of watersheds, whose functionality is not well defined. They shared the responsibility of implementing works in their own lands, in all most all watersheds.
- ⇒ Efforts are made to integrate existing groups of women (DWACRA) in limited number of group. Much needs to be done to integrate women in the program.
- ⇒ “Layers” of participation is seen during various stages of planning exercise. Farmers (mostly men, occasionally women) joined hands with committees & WDTs in transact walks, surveys, etc. Later committee and WDTs made decisions (regarding interventions, etc). Final shape is given by WDT.
- ⇒ Benefits of the program are mainly in terms of employment opportunities for women and poor.
- ⇒ For landed families and farmers with wells, the benefits are more visible.

##### **PIA Level :**

- ⇒ PIA profile indicates that program is in the hands of less experienced organizations.
- ⇒ Limited number of PIAs promoted groups and convergence of activities.
- ⇒ WDTs/ MDTs/ PIAs dominated the planning process and made it a Top Down Affaire.

##### **DPAP Level :**

- ⇒ DPAP promoted/ developed various support systems like communications, planning formats, training programs, etc. Unfortunately, these are not adequate. Some of the support systems are underutilized by PIAs.
- ⇒ Fund releases are creating problems in limited number of cases, particularly EAS funded projects.

#### ***Category 2: Systems & Practices at Program Level :***

- ⇒ Centralization of processes at committee and PIA levels is observed.
- ⇒ Lack of transparency and trust is prevalent among committee, users and SHGs.
- ⇒ Common villager had peripheral role in decision-making processes.
- ⇒ Participation of local community is tapering with time and with the progress of the project.
- ⇒ Technical considerations for delineating watersheds is not strictly followed in majority of cases.
- ⇒ Planning methodologies have limited space for common men/ women in the village.
- ⇒ Certain works (interventions) like bunding, check dams, gully checks gained significant place in watershed treatment options. Community widely demanded these programs.
- ⇒ In certain types of interventions (Kuntalu & Horticulture) and limited number of villages, genuine contribution came from farmers. The usual form of contribution is in labour.
- ⇒ Individual farmers in limited number of cases are maintaining works on private lands. Committees evolved innovative systems/ arrangements for maintenance of structures/ assets, in some villages.

- ⇒ Various systems of organising works are in place – Though farmers worked in their own lands in majority of watersheds, contractor type of system is not uncommon. The contractor could be from the village, generally from the committee (chairman/ president/ secretary).
- ⇒ Data collection systems for monitoring and impact assessment need further refinement. Certain details (E.g: population coverage of population for each intervention, etc) need be included in these systems.
- ⇒ There is scope for developing systematic record keeping and methods of financial transactions at committee level.
- ⇒ Deductions from payments to farmers are the most common practice to mobilize contribution. In some cases, contribution is deducted from labourers. Initial process of genuine contribution could not be sustained over a period of time.
- ⇒ Diversity of interventions is higher with NGO PIAs compared to GO PIAs.
- ⇒ 25% of budget is spent on Common Property Resources (mainly water resources and tree plantation on public land). But there is weak/ no institutional support to these activities.
- ⇒ Wherever EPA is implemented, significant community action could be seen, including genuine contributions
- ⇒ Rules and regulations on the use of WDF are yet to be developed.
- ⇒ Systems for maintenance are not yet conceived.

### ***Category 3: Capacity Building***

- ⇒ Centralization of processes – decision making & funds is hindering the capacity building process of various stakeholders.
- ⇒ Limited number of PIAs organized additional training programs for the community members, bringing in their own expertise/ experience
- ⇒ Capacities building inputs to WDTs/ PIAs and watershed communities are less than adequate.
- ⇒ These groups are not really prepared during program period, as strong local groups, which can manage their own programs.
- ⇒ Community members learned various aspects of program, from their own experience.
- ⇒ Support systems are not in place in terms of decentralization of resources, favorable policies, etc.

### **3. Strategies for Capacity Building & Communications:**

- ⇒ Capacity Building Strategy is suggested which emphasizes decentralization of resources and initiatives.
- ⇒ Long-term strategy proposes PIAs and WDTs as main actors for building the capacities of primary stakeholders. PIA/ WDTs are expected get inputs such as “TOT” during early phases of the program.
- ⇒ Short-term strategy proposes the role of Resource Centres to augment the training inputs to PIA/ WDTs and community members.
- ⇒ District Capacity Building Centres (DCBC) are expected to play critical role to support various initiatives of DPAP in strengthening the program.
- ⇒ Communications Strategy suggests a need to promote professionalism and consolidate earlier initiatives and experiences.
- ⇒ Other support systems (field level support, role models, etc) that are directly related to capacity building inputs are proposed to make the process integrated.
- ⇒ Appropriate procedures for developing action plans for training, communications inputs at PIA level and Resource Centre level are suggested. This system helps to decentralize the inputs/ resources and still maintain the quality.

### **Need for Institutionalization:**

- ⇒ Inventory of “Other Factors That Promote Participation” is presented. A need to work on these factors is discussed, to strengthen capacity building strategies.
- ⇒ Need for institutionalization of collaborative arrangements between capacity building inputs and project management stream is discussed.