

# Upscaling of Successful Experiences in the Mainstream Watershed Programme in India

## Mechanisms, Instruments and Policy Considerations

### *Authors*

**N.K. Sanghi, A. Ravindra, M.V. Ramachandrudu, K. Suresh – WASSAN**

**Rahul Sen – WDCU**

**S.P. Tucker, N.L. Narasimha Reddy, Shree Ravindranath, P. Narendra Babu – PLF**

**Crispino Lobo, Abraham Samuel – WOTR**

**K.V.Satyanarayana, V.K.Reddy, B.Renuka Rani, K.Sai Maheswari – MANAGE**



plf



**Upscaling of successful experiences in the  
mainstream watershed programme in India**  
*Mechanisms, Instruments and Policy Considerations*

**Published:** October 2005

**No. of Copies:** 2000

**Layout & Design:** T. Ravi

**Published by:**

***Watershed Development Coordination Unit (WDCU)***

C/o Embassy of Denmark  
11, Aurangzeb Road, New Delhi - 110 001  
Tel. +91 - 11 - 2301 0900, Email: delamb@um.dk, Website: www.wdcuindia.org

***Watershed Support Services and Activities Network (WASSAN)***

H.No. 12-13-452, Street No. 1, Tarnaka, Secunderabad - 500 017  
Tel. No. +91-(040)-27015295 / 6, Email: wassan@eth.net, Website: www.wassan.org

***Poverty Learning Foundation (PLF)***

# 12-5-149/6A, Vijayapuri Colony, Tarnaka, Secunderabad - 500 017  
Tel. No. +91- (040) 55176031 / 27017428, Email: info@plfg.org, Website: www.plfg.org

***Watershed Organization Trust (WOTR)***

"Paryavaran", Behind Market Yard, Ahmednagar - 414 001, Maharashtra  
Tel. No. +91-(0241) 2450188 / 2451460, Email: info@wotr.org, Website: www.wotr.org

***National Institute of Agricultural Extension Management (MANAGE)***

Rajendranagar, Hyderabad - 500 030, Andhra Pradesh  
Tel. No. +91-(040)-24016702, Email: info@manage.gov.in, Website: www.manage.gov.in

~~~~~

*Extracts from this book may be reproduced without permission but with proper acknowledgements to the authors and the publishers.*

*The publication of this report is a result of study jointly carried out by three anchor organizations namely Watershed Support Services and Activities Network (WASSAN), Poverty Learning Foundation (PLF) and Watershed Organization Trust (WOTR). Financial support and professional guidelines were provided by Watershed Development Cooperation Unit (WDCU), DANIDA's Watershed Development Programme (DANWADEP), New Delhi, India. Series of thematic working group meetings and national workshops were facilitated by National Institute of Agricultural Extension Management (MANAGE), Hyderabad, Andhra Pradesh. Details about the anchor organizations and the authors are given in Appendix 5.1 and 5.2.*

***The responsibility for the interpretations, opinions and views expressed in the present report rests with the authors and should not be attributed to DANIDA or any organization involved in the study.***

~~~~~

**Printed at:** Charitha Impressions, Azamabad Industrial Area, Hyderabad, +91 (040) 27678411

FOR PRIVATE CIRCULATION ONLY

# CONTENTS

Acknowledgements

Acronyms

<b>1. Introduction</b>	1
<b>2. Emerging scenario in the next generation watershed programmes</b>	5
<b>3. Recommendations for upscaling of successful experiences in the mainstream watershed programmes</b>	9
3.1. Criteria for selection and prioritization of blocks and villages	9
3.2. Management unit under watershed programmes	12
3.3. Duration of project and its phasing	12
3.4. Withdrawal strategy	14
3.5. Critical mechanisms and instruments for improving overall proper management	
- Participatory planning and implementation	15
- Participatory monitoring and evaluation	19
3.6. Strategy for enhancing sustainability of community based organizations	21
3.7. Organizational reform at different levels	32
3.8. Integrated approach for capacity building of different stakeholders	36
3.9. Sustainable development of natural resources	37
3.10. Formalization of users' right over common property resource	41
3.11. Sustainable development of livelihoods	43
3.12. Equity for resource poor families	48
3.13. Greater involvement of Non-government organizations (NGOs)	49
3.14. Reforms in financial management system	51

<b>4. Recommendations for pilot testing in mainstream watershed programmes</b>	59
4.1. Greater professionalism in overall management of watershed programme	59
4.2. Sustainable management of developed natural resource	60
4.3. Collective marketing of produce by CBOs	61
4.4. Convergence of different funding agencies and related schemes	62
4.5. Further decentralization in democratic decision-making processes	64
4.6. Greater involvement of Panchayat Raj Institutions (PRIs)	66
4.7. Mainstreaming of innovative activists engaged in natural resource development	68
4.8. Greater role for NABARD in watershed programme	68
4.9. Preparation of state specific process guideline	69
4.10. Policy consideration and legal support	70
<b>5. Appendix</b>	71
5.1. About the anchor organizations	71
5.2. About the authors	78
5.3. List of watershed projects analyzed under the study	83
5.4. List of publications on different themes under the study	86

## Acknowledgements

**T**he present paper is based upon detailed case studies of watershed projects funded by DANWADEP in three states namely Orissa, Karnataka and Madhya Pradesh as well as analysis of experiences under innovative watershed projects funded by various organizations like Government of India; Bilateral projects and NGOs. It synthesizes the lessons from studies on five themes/sub-themes under the assignment: (i) User rights, (ii) Capacity building, (iii) Equity for resource poor families, (iv) Participatory monitoring and evaluation systems, and (v) Withdrawal strategy/ post project sustainability. These themes were pursued by five anchor organizations associated with the study namely WASSAN, PLF, WOTR, MANAGE and WDCU (see Appendix 5.1 and 5.2 for details about the organizations and associated resource persons).

The authors convey their special thanks to WDCU, New Delhi for providing financial support as well as critical guidance at different stages of the study. Special thanks are due to representatives of various innovative organizations who shared their experiences in working group meetings as well as national workshops (as per proceedings of above meetings/workshops in Appendix 5.4). The authors acknowledge that the content of the paper has emerged out of consolidation of lessons learnt from case studies as well as experiences of innovative projects shared during thematic working group meetings as well as national workshops.

The responsibility for the interpretations, opinions and views expressed in the present report rests with the authors and should not be attributed to DANIDA or any organization involved in the study.

*... The authors*

## Acronyms

AG	=	Area Group
APPS	=	Anantha Paryavarana Parirakshana Samithi
APRLP	=	Andhra Pradesh Rural Livelihoods Project
BASIX	=	Bhartiya Samruddhi Investments and Consulting Services Ltd.
CAPART	=	Council for Advancement of People's Action and Rural Technology
CBO	=	Community Based Organization
CIG	=	Common Interest Group
CPR	=	Common Property Resource
DANIDA	=	Danish International Development Assistance
DANWADEP	=	Danida's Watershed Development Programme
DDS	=	Deccan Development Society
DFID	=	Department for International Development
ETK	=	Exogenous Technical Knowledge
FES	=	Foundation for Ecological Security
GMIS	=	Geographical Management Information Systems
GO	=	Government organization
GoI	=	Government of India
GP	=	Gram Panchayat
GS	=	Gram Sabha
ha	=	hectare
IC	=	Inter Cooperation
IFAD	=	International Fund for Agricultural Development
ISPWD-K	=	Indo-Swiss Participative Watershed Development – Karnataka
ITK	=	Indigenous Technical Knowledge
KAWAD	=	Karnataka Watershed Development
MFP	=	Minor Forest Produce
MIS	=	Management Information System
MoA	=	Ministry of Agriculture

MoRD	=	Ministry of Rural Development
MoU	=	Memorandum of Understanding
MYRADA	=	Mysore Resettlement and Development Agency
NABARD	=	National Bank for Agriculture and Rural Development
NFFWP	=	National Food For Work Programme
NGO	=	Non Government Organization
NRM	=	Natural Resource Management
PFA	=	Project Facilitation Agency
PIA	=	Project Implementation Agency
PIP	=	Project Implementation Plan
PRI	=	Panchayat Raj Institution
RIDF	=	Rural Infrastructure Development Fund
SAFAL	=	SAFAL Incorporation, Bangalore
SC/ST	=	Scheduled Caste / Scheduled Tribe
SDC	=	Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation
SGRY	=	Sampoorna Grameen Rozgar Yojana
SHGs	=	Self Help Groups
SMS	=	Subject Matter Specialist
SSR	=	Standard Schedule of Rates
UG	=	User Group
VDC	=	Village Development Committee
WA	=	Watershed Association
WC	=	Watershed Committee
WDC	=	Watershed Development Committee
WDF	=	Watershed Development Fund
WDT	=	Watershed Development Team







## Chapter - 1

### Introduction

**D**evelopment in rainfed areas has been receiving priority attention since about three decades. It continues to be critical not only for reducing regional imbalances on account of unprecedented development in irrigated areas but also for tapping of full potential in these areas. In this connection two strategic steps were taken during early seventies, namely (i) integration of pilot development projects with the dryland research projects in different states so that location specific technologies could be evolved, and (ii) adoption of watershed concept as a framework for development in rainfed areas so that sustainable results could be achieved. Subsequently, a series of follow-up initiatives were taken to promote the above approach by not only Government of India but also other funding agencies like World Bank, IFAD, bilateral project, NGO, etc. in different parts of the country.

In the initial two decades watershed based development showed promising performance mainly during the project period. The post project sustainability of interventions was however low in majority of cases. This was essentially due to

adoption of top-down approach in the highly complex, heterogeneous and risk prone areas.

Based on the above feedback, Government of India switched over to participatory approach in watershed programme on a large scale initially through Ministry of Rural Development (during 1994-95) and later through Ministry of Agriculture (during 2000). Similar approach was adopted by other funding agencies also in respective projects with shades of variations in operational modalities, physical contents, social concerns, etc.

Recent studies showed that while considerable improvement was made in the sustainability related aspects, the ultimate goal was still not achieved particularly in the mainstream watershed programmes funded by the government (Goel A.K., 2002). However, successful projects funded through other sources clearly showed that sustainable development under watershed programme could be achieved if sustainable community-based organizations were established at the village level and proper mechanisms as well as instruments were adopted for institutionalization of participatory approach in the above programmes. The successful projects further brought out that physical contents and social concerns under the watershed project should be enlarged in order to achieve meaningful involvement of all types of community members in the rainfed areas.

In order to understand these aspects more clearly, a comprehensive study was initiated in a wide range of watershed projects (Appendix 5.3) through financial assistance from DANIDA. The major objectives of the study are as follows:

- ❖ To consolidate the lessons learnt from DANIDA supported watershed projects and other innovative projects in India
- ❖ To evolve a common framework for integrating these lessons into the policy of mainstream watershed development projects in the country

The above assignment focused on the following five themes and sub-themes:

(i) user rights over common property resource; (ii) capacity building of all stakeholders; (iii) equity for resource poor families; (iv) participatory monitoring and evaluation system; and (v) post project sustainability of major interventions and growth processes. Main features of the methodology adopted under the above assignment are as follows:

- \* Desk study of available literature consisting of: (i) project documents, (ii) project completion reports, (iii) joint reviews, (iv) consultants' reports, (v) publications of success stories, (vi) presentations made by DANIDA advisors in the international workshop at Indore during 2003, etc
- \* Field visit to a limited number of representative villages (about 3-4 villages in each state) to get acquainted with ground reality
- \* Preparation of an analytical report related to thematic experience in the watershed projects funded by DANIDA
- \* Organization of thematic working group meetings with external resource persons having practical experience on innovative projects funded through other agencies
- \* Preparation of consolidated paper on respective themes based upon experiences of DANWADEP and other innovative projects indicated above
- \* Organization of thematic national workshops for arriving at a larger consensus on the findings and identify follow-up actions to be taken for upscaling of successful experiences
- \* Organization of a consolidated national workshop for all the above themes to discuss about policy issues and recommendations

Under the present study a wide range of papers and proceedings have been prepared on each theme (see Appendix 5.4 for further details). Some of these papers were printed (as hard copies) for limited circulation but all the papers,



proceedings along with original papers in the meetings / workshops have been consolidated in a CD-ROM for wider circulation.

Based upon above experiences, a series of recommendations are made in the present paper, which will help in upscaling of learnings in the mainstream watershed programme. Some of these recommendations are based upon a wide range of innovative projects and hence can be considered for large-scale adoption; other recommendations (which are nevertheless critical, but based on limited number of projects) may be considered for pilot testing for 1-2 years before upscaling on a large-scale.





## Chapter - 2

### Emerging scenario in the next generation watershed programmes

**D**uring the last decade, government funded watershed programmes (particularly under the Ministry of Rural Development) have concentrated on development of land and water resources including perennial biomass in common land. Since the above interventions are labour intensive, generation of employment is one of the most significant byproduct of the above effort. However under the changing scenario, a number of new agenda items and social concerns are gaining importance. On the physical front, watershed programme is also expected to deal with drinking water for human beings and livestock; development of livelihoods; enhancement of productivity in agriculture, horticulture, livestock and fisheries, proper management of developed natural resource; etc. Likewise on the social front, adequate attention is required on equity for resource poor families, empowerment of women, organization of community into sustainable institutional set-up not only at village level but also at block / district level, etc.

The following significant changes are envisaged in the next generation watershed programme: (i) development of livelihoods, (ii) improvement in delivery system, (iii) facilitation of community based collective actions, (iv) greater attention towards social concerns, and (v) policy consideration and legal support. Further details about each of these aspects are given below:

**i) Development of livelihoods**

- ❖ Enhancement of productivity through community managed production system in agriculture, horticulture, livestock, fisheries, etc.
- ❖ Sustainable development of non-land based livelihoods (micro-enterprises)

**ii) Improvement in delivery mechanism**

- ❖ Institutional reform at national, state, district and project levels with adequate autonomy and accountability through greater involvement of professional staff in not only technological aspects but also in management and social aspects
- ❖ Further refinement in community based organizations as per the emerging needs
- ❖ Greater use of Information Technology (IT) not only at state and district levels but also at PIA and CBO levels

**iii) Community based collective actions**

- ❖ Social regulation against overexploitation of common property resources (ground water, biomass in common land, etc.)
- ❖ Collective marketing by community based organizations

#### **iv) Social concerns**

- ❖ Equity for resource poor families within the context of watershed programme
- ❖ Empowerment of women through mainstreaming of women SHGs and their federations

#### **v) Policy consideration and legal support**

- ❖ Formal allocation of usufruct right over common property resource
- ❖ De-encroachment of common lands occupied by unauthorized and ineligible persons
- ❖ Declaration of ground water as common property (for all families including landless) and declaration of usufruct rights over perennial biomass in common land (exclusively for user groups belonging to resource poor families)
- ❖ Modification of existing tenancy laws to legitimize concealed tenancy by bringing CBOs in between land owners and actual cultivators so that risk of losing the land is minimized and at the same time opportunities for cultivators is enhanced
- ❖ Modification in existing marketing laws to facilitate self / collective marketing by producers and their CBOs

Further details about these aspects are discussed in the following chapters.









## Chapter - 3

### Recommendations for upscaling of successful experiences in the mainstream watershed programmes

Primarily two ministries namely MoRD and MoA fund the mainstream watershed programmes in India. Besides this NABARD is also funding watershed programmes over a limited area in selected states. Upscaling of successful experiences in the above programmes begins with enabling provisions in the national guidelines. Keeping this in view, an attempt was made to understand main principles behind successful experiences and also identify replicable mechanisms and instruments as well as strategies and approaches for achieving the desired objectives over a wide range of situations. Specific recommendations emerging out of successful experiences are indicated below.

#### 3.1 Criteria for selection and prioritization of blocks and villages

At present criteria for selection of blocks, villages and micro-watersheds are applied mainly at two levels: (i) national level, which deals with selection of eligible blocks and (ii) district level, which deals with prioritization of villages

within the identified blocks as well as demarcation of micro-watersheds within the identified villages.

Selection of blocks at national level is made on the basis of concrete physical parameters (namely moisture index, extent of irrigation, etc.) and hence subjectivity is minimized in the selection process. However, the following two types of sub-optimal situations are emerging on a large scale with regard to selection and prioritization of villages at the district level.

- ❖ The limited number of micro-watersheds available in a particular year is thinly distributed in large number of eligible blocks within the district. In this process, each block (and hence each PIA) may receive only 1-2 micro-watersheds at a particular time. In this process specific village(s) are identified (for the allotted watersheds) on an adhoc basis leading to high degree of subjectivity.
- ❖ The allotted micro-watersheds are demarcated on topo-sheets of identified village(s). Very often only a part of the village(s) is included under the project for carrying out developmental works. This results in participation of only limited number of families within a particular village/ habitation.

## Recommendations

Efficiency in selection and prioritization of blocks and villages could be improved significantly by adopting the following steps at different levels.

### A. Action to be taken at national level

- ❖ Area under irrigation may be assessed by considering only canal as the source. Other sources namely wells, tanks, etc may not be

considered for this purpose due to high fluctuation in irrigated area under these sources

- ❖ Tribal blocks (particularly those which are outside the jurisdiction of ITDA) may also be included under the project even if rainfall is high. This is essential as poverty is high in these area in spite of availability of good natural resources and potential for growth is very high

### **B. Action to be taken at state level**

- ❖ The eligible blocks may be prioritized into high, medium and low categories based upon additional physical parameters namely depletion of groundwater, degradation of perennial biomass in common / forest department land, soil erosion intensity, extent of canal irrigation, etc
- ❖ A ten year perspective plan may be prepared regarding the sequence in which villages (within the eligible blocks) are to be developed through a ranking on 1-100 points scale (based upon physical as well as social parameters)

### **C. Action to be taken at district level**

- ❖ Based on the sequence of villages in the above perspective plan, tentative number and names of villages may be identified depending upon availability of fund,
- ❖ Afterwards actual villages can be finalized (out of the above list) based upon commitment of the community to adopt the proposed norms in the watershed guidelines. Preference may however be given to those villages where CBOs are functioning properly and also where community has already prepared the micro-level plan and also implementing a part of it through their own funds and through convergence with ongoing schemes



### 3.2 Management unit under watershed programmes

At present an area of 500 ha is considered as one management unit of micro-watershed. Each unit is usually located either within a part of one village or includes a part of adjoining village(s). This approach is creating physical and social inconveniences in participation of total community

#### Recommendations

- ❖ A sub-watershed of 5000 ha may be considered as a geo-hydrological unit at the block level
- ❖ Each village within the above sub-watershed may be considered as a management unit (rather than each micro-watershed of only 500 ha). This would help in involving the entire village community. Under this approach preparation of engineering design and estimate of various structures may be done by taking micro-watershed as a geo-hydrological unit but implementation of approved works may be done by taking village as a management unit.
- ❖ Under this approach, necessary changes may be made in the composition of CBOs (Watershed Committee may be replaced by Village Development Committee; Watershed Association may be replaced by Gram Sabha; general Gram sabha may be replaced by habitation sabha, etc.)

### 3.3 Duration of project and its phasing

At present, the project duration is of 5 years with two phases. The initial period of 1.0 to 1.5 years is treated as capacity building phase (in MoA guidelines) or as probation phase (in MoRD guidelines). During the capacity building/ probation phase major attention is given to (i) organization of community, (ii) capacity building of different stakeholders, and (iii) development of NRM and livelihoods on a limited scale. The remaining period is treated as 'main implementation

phase', which includes the following types of activities: (i) organization of other families, (ii) carrying out planning and implementation of the rest of the natural resources and livelihoods and (iii) participatory monitoring of physical progress, financial progress and processes. After this phase the project is closed abruptly without any follow-up support by the PIAs. As a result of this approach the capacity of CBOs in performing new roles during post project period is low resulting in unsustainability.

## Recommendations

- 1) The project duration should be extended to 7 years and project period divided into 3 distinct phases as per details given below:

Probation phase	-	2 years
Main implementation phase	-	3 years
Consolidation phase	-	2 years
<b>Total</b>	-	<b>7 years</b>

The duration of probation phase may be increased to 2 years. An additional period of 2 years should be provided for the consolidation phase after completion of developmental works. Main focus during consolidation phase should be on the following: (i) preparation of project completion report with details about status of each intervention, (ii) organization of leftover families into groups, federations, etc., (iii) improving the sustainability of various interventions under the project, (iv) utilization of common fund available with the CBOs in a sustainable manner, (v) addressing issues related to repair, maintenance and protection of CPR, (vi) building the capacity of CBOs to perform new roles during the post project period and (vi) facilitating linkages between CBOs and development departments including credit institutions.

The requirement of subject matter specialists (SMSs) would vary from phase to phase. The probation phase requires support from a limited type of SMSs with greater preference towards social science discipline. During the main implementation phase, greater preference may be given to technical SMSs belonging to need based disciplines. One SMS (social science) may be retained to provide the required continuity during the phase. If needed the services of some of the technological specialists may be obtained through outsourcing or part-time involvement under the project. The consolidation phase may however be managed essentially through SMSs having social science background. The technical support may be provided through outsourcing to experienced organizations.

The field experience in innovative projects clearly showed that the duration of seven years and addition of consolidation phase could be easily managed within the present financial provision for administration.

### **3.4 Withdrawal strategy**

The government funded watershed projects are closed abruptly after 5 years. During the project period secondary stakeholders play greater role in planning and implementation of project, which should actually be performed by the CBOs (since development fund is released directly to the CBOs). On the other hand components related to capacity building and community organization usually receive lesser attention from PIAs (even though the fund is allocated directly to them for these components). Due to this, CBOs do not develop full confidence and capacity in carrying out developmental activities even during the project period, which would be even less if new responsibilities are to be performed by them after the completion of project period.

## Recommendations

It is essential to design and apply appropriate withdrawal strategy by secondary stakeholders so that post project sustainability could be enhanced. This includes the following:

- ❖ Focusing on sustainable development of CBOs so that withdrawal of external agency would not affect their functioning
- ❖ Adoption of role transfer strategy from the early stages of the project by having a proper balance between 'hand holding' and 'hand leaving' approach for each major intervention at a time
- ❖ Systematically monitoring the sustainability of interventions and growth processes from the early stages itself.
- ❖ Separation of consolidation phase from main implementation phase. This would help in avoiding abrupt discontinuation of support services from PIAs. This also helps in giving due attention to issues related to sustainability of interventions such as building the capacity of community based organizations for carrying out new roles during post project period; etc.

### 3.5 Critical mechanisms and instruments for improving overall project management

#### (a) Participatory planning and implementation of watershed programmes

The existing guidelines of MoRD as well as MoA lay heavy emphasis on demand-driven planning and implementation of works by people. Adoption of indigenous technical knowledge and collection of contribution from participants are the two critical mechanisms already created in the guidelines to facilitate participatory planning and implementation processes.

Normally three types of stakeholders are involved in the above processes, namely WDT, WC and UG. In case of natural resource development most of the planning is 'WDT centric' and the implementation is 'WC centric'. The actual UGs occupy relatively lesser space. It is also observed that other components under watershed programmes (community organization, training, livelihood development, etc.) are implemented in an adhoc manner due to low attention towards systematic planning. This results in improper review and monitoring of these components.

## Recommendations

The following additional mechanisms and instruments may be provided in the project guidelines in order to achieve the desired results:

- 1) *Preparation of strategic plan at the block level:*** This plan may be prepared by each PIA for a cluster of villages identified under the project within a particular block. This is prepared for the entire project period. It does not contain detailed designs and estimates of the structures/ measures but focuses mainly on analysis of existing resources, problems and needs of the community. Based on this, strategies, approaches and responsibilities of various stakeholders are spelled out clearly. Special attention is paid to allocate need-based funds for different sub-components (within each component), which may vary from village to village. The commitment of community is also clearly spelled out with particular reference to their willingness to pay genuine contribution, adopt norms related to social regulation against overexploitation of CPR, equity for resource poor families, user rights over CPR, other mechanisms and instruments provided in the guidelines, etc.



**2) Preparation of annual action plan for all components under the project:**

Annual action plan may be prepared not only for natural resource development component but also for other components under the project (livelihood development,



community organization, training programme, etc). Based on approved action plans the funds under different components may be released to the concerned nodal points, i.e. PIA (for training programme and community organization) and WC (for development of natural resources and livelihoods)

**3) Mechanisms and instruments for improving the efficiency of participatory planning of NRM**

- ❖ Preparation of design and estimates of only those proposals which are given to WC in writing alongwith a part of the contribution by actual users
- ❖ Flexibility in ridge to valley approach particularly in cases where land owners in the upper area are not willing to participate in the programme at a particular stage
- ❖ Preferential adoption of indigenous technologies particularly for development of private land and water resources
- ❖ Creation of new SSRs for the Indigenous Technologies proposed by participants that are not yet included in it
- ❖ Approval of technological options which appear costlier but about which participants are convinced; e.g. stone bunding, land leveling, removal of boulders and bushes, soil harvesting structures in drainage course, etc. The above options should

be considered only if participants are willing to share atleast 50 percent of the cost. Adoption of such costly structures should be need-based but not as a rule

- ❖ Adoption of cost sharing approach for collection of contribution from actual users: Under this approach, the project funds are to be used after deducting the amount under contribution from the users. It is important to mention that the above approach is not intended to save money under the project but to enhance the stake of actual users and avoid deduction of contribution from the wages of labourers or other service providers. The amount saved under the project may later on be passed on to CBOs as a common fund for development of livelihoods, repair of community oriented structures, etc.
- ❖ Decentralization in approval of annual action plan: Under this set-up technical approval may be given by WDT at village level separately for each structure or measure at a time. Afterwards social approval may be given by watershed association/ gram sabha of overall proposals by all participants. The above proposal may be sent to the district level management unit only for financial cum administrative approval
- ❖ Preparation of a consolidated Project Implementation Plan (PIP) of all micro-watersheds at district level: The district level watershed management committee may approve this plan. It may include not only physical and financial proposals of all micro-watersheds but also the modalities for implementation, monitoring and evaluation of programme through participatory approach, etc.



#### **4) Mechanisms and instruments for improving the efficiency of participatory implementation process**

- ❖ Ban on use of machines under the project particularly for carrying out earthen works
- ❖ Preparation of design and estimate by using latest SSR so that it may motivate local labourers to participate in the programme fully
- ❖ Empowering labourers by organizing them in SHGs and by orienting them about latest SSR, simplified designs and estimates, etc.
- ❖ Simplifying the design and estimate of structures/ measures so that the labourers would clearly know amount due to them
- ❖ Painting of SSR and simplified abstract of design and estimate of each item on walls of the village in order to increase transparency in the transactions
- ❖ Equal sharing of wages by men and women even if payment is made on the basis of work output
- ❖ Implementation of works through SHGs (as a group) rather than nodal persons from WC or even from the UGs
- ❖ Starting the implementation process only after collection of advance contribution from actual users except in situations where concerned user is willing to work as a labourer
- ❖ Ban on deduction of contribution from the wages of labourers or out of payment to other service providers

#### **(b) Participatory monitoring and evaluation system (PM&E)**

PM&E is a crucial component of project management, which helps in improving the efficiency and effectiveness of project interventions. It helps in steering and

tracking the outputs, outcomes and impacts; and ensures that the right processes are followed. This in turn helps in ensuring sustainability of interventions and formation of social capital at local level. It provides feedback and learning for concurrent corrections and decision-making at various levels. An efficient PM&E system encompassing all aspects (outputs, quality of products, processes, outcomes, impacts, etc) with clearly defined responsibilities at different levels is a prerequisite for efficient project management. However, it is noticed that monitoring is presently limited to physical and financial progress with very little attention towards processes and impacts. It is also not designed as a framework for learning and decision support system for actors involved in project implementation.

## Recommendations

The following specific provisions may be made in the national guidelines for improving the efficiency of monitoring and evaluation system:

- ❖ Action plans may be prepared as per 'log-frame' at district and watershed levels
- ❖ Set of indicators and baselines may be established on processes and products to facilitate comparison
- ❖ Due emphasis may be laid on capacity building regarding Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation (PM&E) for CBOs and project staff
- ❖ Specific funds may be allocated for monitoring at different levels
- ❖ A timeline may be prepared for monitoring and evaluation of activities as a part of the district level action plan (to be implemented by internal as well as external resource persons)

- ❖ Besides involving existing government institutions, a panel of resource organizations may be identified to carry out reviews and studies



- ❖ Provision may be created for Project Support Units at state and district levels with Subject Matters

Specialists in PM&E to facilitate proper monitoring of activities

- ❖ Provision of a social scientist may also be made for data collection and analysis at cluster/ block level

- ❖ Empowered committees may be constituted at state level to carry out critical monitoring of progress / processes and to address issues through administrative and policy support on concurrent basis

- ❖ Financial provision may be made for carrying out studies on emerging issues and concerns

- ❖ Self-monitoring system may be facilitated through CBOs

- ❖ MIS may be developed for data analysis and it may be linked with decision support system at district and state levels

- ❖ Flexibility may be provided in project design to incorporate learning and for making mid-course corrections

### **3.6 Strategy for enhancing sustainability of community based organizations**

Under the ongoing watershed programmes two types of groups (namely SHGs and UGs) and two types of management bodies (namely WA and WC) are being organized. Out of these, only SHGs are functioning properly beyond the project



period. Lack of sustainability of other CBOs both during and after the project period is a concern.

In the emerging watershed programme, a number of new developmental components and social concerns are considered: (i)

productivity enhancement in agriculture, horticulture, livestock, etc. (ii) management of project through a participative democratic process in place of representative democratic process, (iii) empowerment of vulnerable sections of the community including agricultural labourers, women, etc. This requires due attention towards organization of additional groups as well as additional management bodies.

## Recommendations

The following two specific steps may be taken: (a) improving the sustainability of existing CBOs to carry out earlier functions, and (b) organization of additional CBOs to carry out new functions. While taking the above steps the following guiding principles may be kept in view:

### (a) Improving the sustainability of existing CBOs

**(i) Self Help Groups:** Although many of these groups are functioning properly even beyond the project period, the following specific points may be considered for further improving the quality of these groups under the watershed programme:

- ❖ Organization of SHGs of not only women but also of men

- ❖ Involvement of majority of families of the village, particularly those belonging to the poorest of poor category, in the above SHGs
- ❖ Development of book writers at village level
- ❖ Periodical monitoring of SHGs regarding their maturity
- ❖ Follow-up nurturing of existing groups and organizing new groups at higher level, namely federation of SHGs at village level, resource center at cluster of village level, etc
- ❖ Mainstreaming of SHGs in the watershed programme by involving them not only in micro-enterprises but also in natural resource development, livelihood development, execution of various works, management of CPR, etc



**(ii) User Groups:** In the present context UGs refer to those groups which are associated with one or other community oriented asset/ common property resource, etc. The following specific suggestions are made for improving the functioning of the User groups:

- ❖ Improving the stakes of User Groups through the following
  - ❖ Adoption of demand-driven approach in planning of CPR
  - ❖ Collection of genuine contribution from actual users in advance (during the planning process)
  - ❖ Formal allocation of provisional user rights (during the planning process)
- ❖ Working out modalities for repair, maintenance and protection of CPRs (during the planning process)



- ❖ Adequate investment on capacity building of UGs as in the case of SHGs
- ❖ Advising UGs to either become SHGs (in case its members are homogeneous) or to join different SHGs (if their members are heterogeneous)
- ❖ Facilitating SHGs to become UGs particularly with respect to biomass in common land, fisheries in community tank, etc.
- ❖ Collection of user charges from members on regular basis

**(iii) Watershed Committee:** During the last decade the Watershed Committee (WC) played a crucial role in managing the watershed project at field level. It functioned properly during the project period, particularly for carrying out development of natural resources. However, it became non-functional during post project period in spite of having full access to Watershed Development Fund (WDF) collected from the community as contribution. Further, this committee could not focus on livelihood development component, particularly in situations where the available fund was to be used on revolving basis.

During the last 2-3 years the following initiatives were taken by various agencies for addressing the above problems.

- ❖ Replacing the WC with Gram Panchayat, as it is a constitutional body and hence the question of post project sustainability may not arise. This initiative was taken by MoRD through Hariyali guidelines



- ❖ Replacing the WC with federation of women SHGs. This federation was created essentially for enhancement of democratic decision-making process, empowerment of women, proper management of common fund, etc.
- ❖ Constituting a conventional type of Watershed Committee during initial period under the project. The committee consisted of representatives from not only women SHGs but also men SHGs besides a few representatives of farmers owning land in the project area. Towards later part of the project the committee is converted into a federation of women as well as men SHGs for carrying out proper management of fund in a democratic and transparent manner during post project period
- ❖ Constituting a conventional type of Watershed Committee during the project period with representatives from SHGs as well as UGs. At the end of the project period, this committee was converted into a federation of UGs for carrying out management of common property resources developed under the project. The financial transactions of UG members are however to be dealt in their respective SHGs

Keeping in view the successful experiences with innovative organizations, the following recommendations are made in order to improve the overall functioning of WC:

- ❖ Initially reconstitute the membership of existing WC by having representatives from not only women SHGs, but also men SHGs as well as from not only men UGs but also women UGs.
- ❖ Towards the end of the project, sub-divide the above committee into two types of federations i.e. federation of SHGs (of women



and men) for management of revolving fund, and federation of UGs (of men and women) for management of CPR

- ❖ In situations where funds are to be released to GP (e.g. under Hariyali guidelines); functional integration may be facilitated between GP and federation of SHGs (of women and men) at village level in such a way that GP may receive funds under the project but execution of works and development of livelihoods may be carried out through federation of SHGs

**(iv) Watershed Association:** Watershed Association should function as a decision-making body and WC as its executive body. Under the mainstream watershed programme, WA was not able to perform the above function due to various reasons including large size of membership; inherent conflict among members, difficulty in participation due to distant location of certain habitations, etc. Based upon successful experiences, the following suggestions are made.

- ❖ Organization of small size area groups (for about 100 ha each) in addition to the original WA for the entire micro-watershed. This should be done particularly in cases where all participants are residing in one large village
- ❖ Organization of habitation based associations (in addition to the original Watershed Association) particularly in cases where participants are spread over more than one habitation
- ❖ Organization of majority of members of the association into different SHGs so that they could develop harmony among themselves, articulate their views properly, carry out adequate preparation in smaller groups before coming for the meeting of WA, etc.



## **(b) Organization of new CBOs**

As indicated earlier, a number of new groups as well as management bodies are required for carrying out additional jobs, which are emerging under the changing scenario in watershed programme. The proposed new groups are broadly divided into the following four categories:



- 1) Self Help Groups (of men):** At present most of the SHGs are being organized with women members. This is partly because, until recently, men did not show sufficient interest in the SHG concept. However, at this stage men are also keen to get organized as SHGs if similar incentives are given to them. Thus adequate efforts should be made to organize men SHGs (besides women SHGs) under the watershed programme. Preference may however be given to organize men belonging to resource poor families. Such a step may help in not only meeting credit needs of the above families but also in improving sustainability of other CBOs
  
- 2) User groups (of women):** So far most of the user groups are organized with men members. This is partly because of the common notion that only men are interested in development of natural resources. It is now widely recognized that interest of women in development and management of natural resources (particularly regarding the development of biomass in common land) is much greater than men. Likewise they showed adequate interest in management of community oriented water resources particularly with respect to drinking water for human beings and livestock,

management of fisheries, etc. Hence adequate efforts may be made for organization of women UGs (besides men UGs) particularly with respect to development and management of common property resources

**3) Common Interest Groups (CIGs):** This is a generic name to include groups in which members have common interest around a particular economic activity. This may include livelihood groups, commodity groups, labour groups, etc. It is expected that all members in a particular group would be dealing with the same type of economic enterprise, even though they may be heterogonous with respect to socio-economic status. Preliminary experience showed that sustainability of CIGs would be enhanced if its members emerge out of different SHGs. In such cases CIGs may be involved mainly for carrying out technological transactions, procurement of inputs, marketing of produce, sorting out management related issues, etc. However, financial transactions on above aspects may be carried out by the members in their respective SHGs

These groups may eventually adopt community-managed production and marketing system with respect to specific commodities and enterprises. As the functioning of the above groups improves, they may be registered under producers company act. Wherever needed community-based entrepreneurs may also be encouraged for carrying out specific jobs in a professional manner. The selection of such entrepreneurs may however be in a transparent manner (open auction) and for one year at a time.

**4) Area groups:** It is now well recognized that the current size of Watershed Association (for an area of 500 ha) is too large for functioning in a coherent manner. Organizing small size area groups



(for about 100 ha each) would be useful in facilitating participative democracy in place of representative democracy (which is inadvertently happening through WC due to inefficient functioning of WA).



The following four types of new management bodies/ service bodies may be considered under watershed programme in order to meet the emerging needs.

- 1) Federation of SHGs:** This body consists of members from not only women SHGs but also men SHGs. To begin with, it may be organized at village level for sustainable development of livelihoods through the use of revolving fund. It may be formed wherever more than 50 percent of the families in a village are represented in one or other SHGs. Towards the end of the project this body would also manage the common fund available with the WC. Additional federation may however be organized of women SHGs, belonging to resource families so that their empowerment processes is not adversely affected
- 2) Federation of UGs:** This body consists of members from not only men UGs but also women UGs associated with common property resources. It may be organized wherever 8-10 UGs are functioning. This is needed where size of CPR is large and where there are multiple User Groups in each CPR so that it can help in conflict resolution, protection of natural resources, etc.



### **3) Community based resource persons:**

This refers to book writers for organization of SHGs as well as other CBOs and para workers for development of various enterprises namely livestock, horticulture, agriculture, etc. The above resource persons perform their functions on service charge basis against specific

outputs and hence play a crucial role particularly for facilitation of sustainability during post project period.

- 4) Community managed resource centre:** It is well known that external resource organizations are not able to provide desired level of follow up support to CBOs particularly after completion of project period. Hence it is essential to organize a community managed resource centre for each cluster of villages. These centres are to be governed by representatives of mature SHGs and to be used for providing need-based services to various CBOs in its operational area on payment of service charges. Experience shows that, with proper follow up support, the resource centres can become self-reliant within a period of about 5 years, at least with respect to their operational expenses.

### **c) Guiding principles**

Under the new generation watershed programmes a wide range of CBOs are to be organized in order to meet the emerging needs. Hence the risk of unsustainability of CBOs becomes high particularly in situation where professional facilitation is not proper. The following specific guiding principles may however be observed while organizing the proposed CBOs.

- ❖ Beginning may be made with organization of adult members of all the participating families in the village into women SHGs and men SHGs
- ❖ Afterwards other groups as well as management bodies may be organized by drawing members out of above SHGs
- ❖ Sequencing of above CBOs may be carried out in such a way that they are organized as and when the need arises. The following specific sequence may however be considered as a general guideline:

Step – I : - SHGs (of women as well as men)  
 - UGs (of men as well as women)  
 - Development of book writers and para workers

Step – II : - Area groups and Watershed Association  
 - Watershed Committee

Step – III : - CIGs (of one livelihood at a time)

Step - IV : - Federation of SHGs  
 - Federation of UGs

Step – V : - Community-managed resource center

Special care may be taken to see that organizing WC is not hastened. It may be constituted only after organizing sufficient number of SHGs and UGs and also after preparation of first year action plan for development of individual oriented natural resources (through SHGs) and of community-oriented natural resources (through UGs). The WC may be organized (after this stage) for consolidation of above action plans and also for taking follow-up actions related to approval of plan, release of funds, implementation of approved works, etc.





### 3.7 Organizational reform at different levels

In the existing guidelines, a reasonable provision was made for creation of new organizational set-up at PIA and community level. However no financial allocation was made for strengthening of existing organizations at other levels (namely block,

district, state and national levels). The monitoring and advisory committees constituted under the project at different levels have not been able to facilitate democratic–decentralization in decision-making process (a key requirement for adoption of participatory approach under watershed programme). The primary stakeholders (i.e. PIAs and CBOs) have hardly any say in the above committees due to inadequate representation and low level of empowerment. Likewise experienced resource organizations (particularly in the NGO sector) do not have any formal space for providing capacity building support to the stakeholders at different levels.

Put together, these aspects have resulted into a low level of delivery system, which is currently recognized as the most crucial gap in the whole programme. The ongoing experience in majority of bilateral as well as international bank funded watershed projects has however shown that a number of organizational reforms (as indicated below) must be considered, if successful experiences are to be upscaled in the mainstream watershed programme funded by the government.

- \* Strengthening of existing organizational set-up by providing an additional, full time Project Support Unit (PSU) at different levels. The number and type of professionals may vary at each level depending upon the need. The members of PSU may initially be hired and nurtured (for about 6 months) by an experienced management institution at the state level. Afterwards these units can be handed over to the concerned organizations at respective levels



- \* Creating a consortium of experienced resource organizations (consisting of GO as well as NGOs) at different levels for providing professional support (on cost basis)
- \* Reconstituting the existing monitoring and advisory committees at different levels (by providing adequate representation to the stakeholders from lower levels) so that they may take relevant management, administrative and policy related decisions
- \* Creating new (or involvement of existing) autonomous organizations particularly at state and district levels for management of watershed programme in a decentralized manner. Likewise providing need-based reforms in the existing organizations through decentralization in administrative-cum-financial powers

## Recommendations

Specific recommendations regarding organizational reforms at different levels are given below:

### (a) State level

- ❖ Creation of an autonomous watershed development mission (registered under society act) for providing administrative support to all types of watershed programmes funded through different sources. This committee may have at least 50 percent representation from concerned district heads, PIAs and CBOs
- ❖ Constitution of an empowered committee for review and monitoring of progress as well as processes; and for providing concurrent policy support to the projects through need-based government orders, office order, etc.



- ❖ Provision of a dedicated project support unit with SMSs in community organization, capacity building, gender, monitoring and evaluation, GMIS, etc.

- ❖ Facilitation of a consortium of resource organizations (in GO and NGO sectors) for providing professional services

to the project on cost basis. For institutionalization of above consortium, a small size secretariat may be supported out of project fund for initial 2-3 years. This unit may be located either with a state level management institution or with partners of the consortium (on rotation basis)

### **(b) District level**

- ❖ Constitution of an autonomous watershed development agency (registered under society act) for management of different types of watershed projects

- ❖ Constitution of a dedicated Project Support Unit with SMSs in not only technological subjects (engineering, agriculture, horticulture, fisheries, livestock, etc.) but also in community organization, capacity building, gender, monitoring, evaluation, GMIS, etc.

- ❖ Constitution of a management committee for approval of projects, review and monitoring of progress, overcoming management related constraints, etc. This committee should have at least 50 percent representation from CBOs and PIAs. One of the experienced NGO representatives may be designated as vice chairperson of the above committee.

- ❖ Establishment of an autonomous capacity building centre (managed by a consortium of experienced resource organizations in GO and

NGO sector) for meeting the capacity building needs of secondary stakeholders under the programme



### **(c) Block level**

- ❖ Constituting a dedicated Project Support Unit with SMS in livelihoods (agriculture, horticulture, livestock, micro-enterprises, etc), collective marketing, GMIS, etc. This unit may be established in addition to the earlier provision of full time WDTs (in engineering, social service, forestry, etc) at PIA level
- ❖ Establishing a community managed resource centre for building the capacity of primary stakeholders under the project and also for providing need-based services on cost basis

### **(d) Community level**

- ❖ Building a group of community based resource persons (consisting of book writers, para workers in livestock, horticulture, agriculture, engineering, etc) for providing services on cost basis (initially out of project fund and then by the community on tapering basis)
- ❖ Reforming the existing CBOs and organizing new CBOs under the programme as per details discussed already



### 3.8 Integrated approach for capacity building of different stakeholders

At present capacity building is the weakest link under the watershed programmes. Some efforts are being made for conducting various training programmes, which largely deals

with only technological aspects. Review and monitoring of capacity building activities is poor due to lack of systematic planning of this component. There is a tendency to start implementation phase in a hurried manner without adequate investment in capacity building. Likewise there is a tendency to close the project abruptly without preparing the community for post project responsibilities. Motivation level of different stakeholders is also low particularly for adoption of participatory processes (as it leads to empowerment at the lower level). Often there is no linkage between capacity building inputs at a particular time and the ongoing developmental activities under the project.

### Recommendations

Based upon successful experiences in watersheds studied under the assignment, the following strategic suggestions are made:

- ❖ Successful completion of probation phase may be made mandatory before entering into main implementation phase
- ❖ Comprehensive approach may be adopted for capacity building rather than carrying out training courses in isolation. This may include emphasis on community organization, networking among CBOs, information sharing in a transparent manner, development of job specific skills, etc.

- ❖ Awareness building and motivation of primary and secondary stakeholders may be enhanced through orientation courses; focused exposure visits to successful experiences, etc.
- ❖ Capacity building inputs at various levels may be linked with project cycle
- ❖ Training may be organized not only on technological aspects but also on management and social aspects
- ❖ Handholding approach may be adopted by experienced support organizations with repeated contacts between trainers and trainees
- ❖ Federation and networking of CBOs may be facilitated at higher levels (at block level, district level, etc.) for providing forward linkages
- ❖ Concurrent policy support may be provided through empowered project committee at state level



### 3.9 Sustainable development of natural resources

This component deals with private property resource as well as common property resource. Successful results were mostly obtained in the development of private property resource. This was essentially due to adoption of Indigenous technologies; collection of higher rate of contribution (preferably 20-40 percent) and flexibility in ridge to valley approach so that landowners could participate in the programme at their own pace.

Sustainability of common property resource developed under most projects was however low. Hence focused efforts need to be made to improve these resources



which include (i) physical measures namely, water harvesting structures and gully control structures, and (ii) biological measures i.e. perennial biomass in common land, etc. Main reasons behind unsustainability of above interventions are as follows: (i) Lack of formal allocation of user rights to the persons concerned, (ii) lack of proper functioning of user groups identified for this purpose, (iii) lack of proper provision for repair and maintenance (as well as for watch and ward) of the assets; (iv) lack of adequate efforts in developing stake of actual users (due to inadvertent top-down planning and low emphasis on users contribution), (v) less attention towards sustainable utilization of developed resource after implementation phase, etc.

## Recommendations

Recommendations emerging out of successful experiences on different types of common property resources are briefly indicated below.

**(i) *Development of biomass in common land:*** The following options were found to be promising for sustainable development of biomass in common land under watershed programme. Hence due attention may be paid to them while designing the above components.

- ❖ High priority to natural regeneration of existing biomass through social fencing, at least during the first 2-3 years. This period is meant mainly to stabilize the social fencing system and develop clarity about user rights in favour of resource poor families
- ❖ Investment on plantation of new trees (timber or MFP) only after successful facilitation of social fencing system

- ❖ Formal allocation of user rights in favour of resource poor families

- ❖ Addressing the issue of encroachment of common land through a combined effort involving revenue authorities, experienced

NGOs and respectable members of the community before investing the project fund on such lands



**(ii) Construction of community oriented water-harvesting structures:** The following approach may be considered in improving the sustainability of community-oriented water harvesting structures.

- ❖ Building the stake of the users concerned through (i) adoption of demand driven approach for deciding the location, type and size of structures, (ii) collection of atleast a part of the contribution in advance during planning phase (and collection of remaining contribution during implementation phase).
- ❖ Building upon Indigenous Technical Knowledge (ITK) and promoting a wide range of technological options for harvesting of water resource as per the preference of various users.
- ❖ Provision of good technical support in designing and execution of structures
- ❖ Adequate emphasis on structures, which provide drinking water for human beings and livestock.



**(iii) Construction of gully control structures:** The conventional approach of constructing a series of gully checks for preventing further bed erosion led to only partial success and that too for a short period. There was no clarity about ownership over the above asset and also mechanism for its repair and maintenance.

Best results were obtained where the following approach was adopted, hence this may be considered while designing the project in future.

- ❖ Construction of the structures that help in reclamation of gully course so that it becomes part of the main field. This is particularly relevant for the courses which are located in private land and also in upper areas where the gully course is in its initial stage
- ❖ Construction of indigenous structures (which are popularly called as soil harvesting structures) with an intention to convert part of the gully bed for cultivation of higher moisture requiring crops (rather than merely preventing the gully bed from further degradation). These structures are to be constructed at a limited number of locations where farmers are keen to cultivate the developed bed with annual crops. Such structures are to be located preferably on boundary lines of the fields of the farmers concerned. These measures are relevant for the gully courses passing through private holdings
- ❖ Allocation of usufruct rights over the drainage course to the farmers from whose fields the course is passing. This is particularly applicable in cases where the government owns the drainage course, which is passing through the private fields.



This approach may serve as an incentive for the farmers concerned to pay the required contribution for construction of such structures. In situations where gully course is passing through common land, user rights (over the asset) may be given to the identified user group members to whom the biomass in the adjoining common land is to be given so that they take interest in developing the gully course into productive asset.



### **3.10 Formalization of users' right over common property resource**

Since 1995, watershed projects in the country are being managed through participatory approach in which funds for development of natural resources are directly given to the community. Though several of these projects were completed there is no clarity about user rights over Common Property Resource (CPR) developed under the above projects even where users paid genuine contribution towards its development. Hence formal allocation of user rights is very critical for sustainability of Common Property Resource since it take several years to get full returns from such resources.

Review of various guidelines of watershed development programmes of Government of India shows that provision for user rights received only a rudimentary mention. While the guidelines lay the responsibilities of management of common resources on User Groups they do not make clear provisions for devolution of rights that these groups should in turn enjoy. This, as discussed above, is a sure route for unsustainable and ineffective devolution.



However, there are number of Constitutional and legislative provisions that enshrine the rights of the local people on natural resources. While all of them are applicable to either specific areas and/ or specific people, they demonstrate that the concept of local community management of natural resources is enshrined in the Constitutional and Administrative law in India. This includes the Constitutional provisions of 5<sup>th</sup> and 6<sup>th</sup> Schedule and legislative provisions of Panchayat (Extension to the Scheduled Areas) Act, 1996, Chotanagpur Tenancy Act, 1908, Santhal Pargana Tenancy Act and Van Panchayat Act, 1976.

## Recommendations

- ❖ A set of comprehensive actions may be taken by the government at national and state levels for devolving and decentralizing governance and administration of natural resources (particularly Common Property Resources) to the people.
- ❖ At the district level, the administrative instrument of MoU may be used for formal allocation of user rights to different stakeholders. For this purpose the user rights should be categorized into the following four types: (i) ownership right over the land resource (which need to be retained by the government); (ii) ownership right over the assets created through participatory approach (which could be given to gram panchayat); (iii) Management right over the CPR to be given either directly to the UG concerned (if the size of CPR is small and types of benefits belong to only one UG) or to a multiple users association (if the size of CPR is large or where multiple users are associated with each type of CPR); (iv) Usufruct

rights over CPR (to be given to actual UGs who are getting direct benefit and who contributed towards its development)



The details regarding collection of user charges and modality of sharing the benefits between different stakeholders may be spelled out in the above MoU in such a way that major benefits out of CPR goes in favour of UGs. Likewise modalities, for sustainable utilization and management of resources may be spelled out in such a way that major responsibilities rest with actual user groups.

### **3.11 Sustainable development of livelihoods**

The livelihoods can be grouped into two categories, namely non-land based livelihoods (which are also called as micro-enterprises) and (ii) land-based livelihoods (which include not only agriculture and horticulture but also livestock, sericulture, fisheries, etc.). In the past, much of the attention was paid towards non-land based livelihoods (by giving financial support for inputs as well as new infrastructure) so that new members could initiate these livelihoods.

Improving the productivity of existing land-based livelihoods (of participating families) did not receive much attention in the past. Sustainability of these livelihoods directly depends upon sustainable development of natural resources namely land, water, perennial biomass, etc. Hence under watershed programme, enhancement of productivity of above livelihoods is now getting greater attention so that it helps not only in better participation of the families concerned but also in achieving overall objectives of the programme. Practically all the innovative watershed projects (under the present study) included this as an important



objective of the programme. There are at least two strategic learnings on this aspect, which are briefly discussed below.

The first learning deals with refinement in the methodology for preparation of action plan for enhancement of productivity or income from livelihoods. Key aspects of this

methodology with respect to (i) technological design; (ii) institutional framework, and (iii) financial system are indicated below.

- (i) **Technological design:** This includes the following four main aspects: (i) integration of production, processing and marketing; (ii) emphasis on upscaling of success stories; (iii) focus on gap in adoption of technology; and (iv) use of successful farmer as a resource person/ consultant.
  
- (ii) **Institutional mechanism:** It includes the following seven main aspects: (i) organization of commodity groups by drawing the members concerned preferably out of SHGs; (ii) use of commodity groups for transactions related to production technology, procurement of input, marketing of produce, etc, but involvement of SHGs for carrying out financial transactions; (iii) initial consolidation of action plan of different participants at the SHG level; (iv) subsequent consolidation of action plan of different SHGs at its federation level; (v) consolidation of action plan of resource poor SHGs for funding under the project; (vi) consolidation of action plan of remaining SHGs for funding through bank; and (vii) overall coordination of program by federation of SHGs at village level.
  
- (iii) **Financial system:** It includes the following five main aspects: (i) provision of financial support only for filling of gaps in adoption of technology; (ii) release of fund by Project Director (for livelihood component) as a grant to the

federation of SHGs against the approved annual action plan; (iii) utilization of above fund by the federation of SHGs as a revolving loan through mature SHGs (as per the respective action plans); (iv) release of project fund to SHGs for only those members who belong to resource poor families; and (v) provision of financial support to remaining members of SHGs through linkage with banks and other credit institutions.



The second strategic learning consists of a shift towards greater use of indigenous inputs and also towards community managed support system for providing various types of services and inputs. This may include community managed artificial insemination centre, community managed seed bank, community managed resource persons namely book writers, para workers, etc. Key features of the strategy for development of agriculture, horticulture, livestock, fisheries, etc. are briefly mentioned below

\* **Strategy for development of agriculture**

- ❖ Focus on organic farming (on a limited scale)
- ❖ Control of pest through non-pesticidal methods (on a large scale)
- ❖ Establishment of seed bank with federation of SHGs for production and marketing of improved varieties and hybrids (evolved under public sector)

\* **Strategy for development of horticulture**

- ❖ Plantation of orchard crops in new areas for improving water use efficiency
- ❖ Adoption of organic farming practices (on a large scale)



- ❖ Enhancing the area under vegetable crops (for improving water use efficiency as well as creating employment opportunity for women members)

#### \* **Strategy for development of livestock**

- ❖ Upgrading the breed of large ruminants through community managed artificial insemination as well as natural insemination units.
- ❖ Upgrading the breed of small ruminants through community managed natural insemination unit.
- ❖ Management of diseases of livestock through community managed livestock para-workers
- ❖ Improving the fodder base through cultivation of improved varieties of non- leguminous and leguminous fodder crops under irrigated condition
- ❖ Processing and collective marketing of produce

#### \* **Strategy for development of fisheries**

- ❖ Improving the sustainability of fishery cooperatives by organizing general body members into a number of small size SHGs and reconstituting the office bearers of executive committees by bringing representatives from mature SHGs
- ❖ Introducing composite fish-cum-prawn culture with different varieties of fish (suitable for different depths of pond water)
- ❖ Improving other technological inputs (through release of juveniles / fingerlings in situations where filling of water in pond is delayed; enhancement of standing water in the tank by desilting the bed area; local production of fingerlings in smaller ponds supported by borewell irrigation; management of disease and predators through appropriate

practices before filling of water in tank as well as during rainy season, etc.



- ❖ Collective marketing of fish to distant places by executive committee of the cooperative society; and also self-marketing of fish in local markets by women members of the cooperative society
- ❖ Development of mutual trust between executive committee and general body members through adoption of transparent systems in financial transactions
- ❖ Learning initial financial management system through adoption of SHG concept
- ❖ Learning improved financial management system through partnership with experienced lending organization

❖ **Overall strategy for enhancing the productivity of agriculture, horticulture, livestock, fisheries, etc**

- ❖ Use of inputs that are based upon locally available raw material and indigenous technical knowledge
- ❖ Provision of inputs and services through community managed institutional set-up
- ❖ Collective marketing of produce by community based organization not only for enhancing the overall income but also for facilitating need-based intensification and diversification of farming system
- ❖ Upscaling of successful experiences by using successful farmers as resource persons



- ❖ Focus on gap in adoption of technology (as compared to the full package) since many other components of technology are already adopted by the farmers
- ❖ Organization of trials and demonstrations on a small scale

(through grant from the project)

- ❖ Upscaling of successful experiences by federation of SHGs of women as well as men (through revolving fund under the project)
- ❖ Financial provision for support services in order to upscale successful experiences

### **3.12 Equity for resource poor families**

Equity for resource poor families is a critical concern under the watershed programme. The present experience in majority of mainstream watershed projects reveals that if left to the natural course, this aspect may show negative trend. Hence, a pro-active strategy is to be adopted and required interventions are to be made from the initial stage itself in order to address equity for resource poor families. In fact the huge investments under public sector for watershed development can be justified only when it addresses the above aspect. At present many of the processes regarding facilitation of equity for resource poor families are very weak. Based upon successful experiences in the watersheds studied under the assignment, a number of interventions are identified which can help in this regard:

- \* Sensitization and training of secondary stakeholders on participatory poverty assessment, vulnerability, gender, etc.



- \* Identification of resource poor families (with the help of community members) on the basis of poverty ranking criteria developed by the community members
- \* Allocation of exclusively budget for resource poor families
- \* Execution of works only through labourers without using machinery
- \* Organizing the poor (including labourers) into SHGs (of women as well as men) and their federation at village level
- \* Preferential allocation of bidding right (in the auction) over CPR in favour of women SHGs (and their federation) belonging to resource poor families
- \* Focus on livestock development as an integral part of watershed programme
- \* Focus on low cost water harvesting structures and also on structures which provide drinking water for human beings and livestock
- \* Development of private land allocated to resource poor families on preferential basis
- \* Development of drainage course after allocating usufruct rights over soil harvesting structures in favour of resource poor families



### **3.13 Greater involvement of Non-Government Organizations (NGOs)**

With the increasing emphasis on participatory approach, the role of NGOs has become critical particularly for organization of community into sustainable institutional set-up at village level, capacity building of different stakeholders in management and social aspects, facilitation of participatory processes related to overall management of the project, etc.



Keeping these in view a formal space was created for NGOs in the original guidelines of MoRD as well as MoA. But in the recent guidelines of MoRD (Hariyali), the role of NGOs was reduced considerably under the watershed programme.

However, involvement of NGOs received greater attention in majority of other watershed projects funded by various organizations such as foreign agencies; NGOs, NABARD, etc. Based upon successful experiences in the above projects following suggestions are made to enhance the involvement of NGOs at different levels:

- \* Involvement of NGOs in the project at three different levels in separate capacities namely: (i) as partner NGO at state level to design participatory processes in the process guidelines; (ii) as lead NGO at the district level to build capacity of PIAs on participatory processes and facilitate process monitoring system and (iii) as facilitating NGO at the project level to institutionalize processes at the CBO level
- \* Outsourcing of software components (i.e. organization of CBOs, capacity building on social and management aspects, etc) under the watershed programme to experienced NGOs on a turnkey basis
- \* Involving field NGOs to hire project staff on contractual basis (even for carrying out technical work at the field level) in order to get the staff with appropriate attitude to work in a participatory mode with the community
- \* Involving NGOs as a co-PIA alongwith the government PIA in order to provide them with a formal space for carrying out the above mentioned software activities
- \* Outsourcing of two out of the three proposed phases of the project (i.e. probation phase and consolidation phase) to the NGOs particularly in situations where the main implementation phase is proposed to be managed exclusively by a government PIA

Besides this, a large number of innovative NGOs established good models regarding sustainable development of natural resources in different parts of the country. Lack of sufficient funds is the main reason for limited coverage of area by them. There is a need to upscale such experiences in respective areas



so that significant impact could be created through this initiative. A separate channel of funding may therefore be created for this purpose so that desired type of administrative and management support could be provided to the participating NGOs.

### **3.14 Reforms in financial management system**

#### ***A. Financial norms***

At present the overall budget for a watershed unit is worked out on the basis of Rs. 6000 per ha (in case of watersheds funded by MoRD) and Rs. 4,500 per ha to Rs. 6,000 per ha depending upon the degree of slope (in case of watersheds funded by MoA). The above financial norms were evolved more than 5 years ago. Under the changing scenario a number of new components (development of non-land based livelihoods, productivity enhancement in agriculture, horticulture, livestock, fisheries, etc.) are being added and a special investment is envisaged for addressing issues related to equity for resource poor families within the context of watershed programme.

The existing budget in the mainstream watershed programme is adequate for implementation of only 50-60 percent of NRM works. Further, there is no provision for establishment of Project Support Units at district and state levels, involvement of external resource persons for monitoring and evaluation of projects, field studies, action research; technical support, etc.



## Recommendation

Based on the analysis of financial aspects in innovative watershed projects funded through bilateral agencies, World Bank, etc., and keeping in view the rate of inflation, it is recommended that the existing financial norms of Rs. 6000 per ha may be enhanced to Rs. 10,000 per ha.

### *B. Allocation of funds for major components*

The components and allocation of funds vary considerably in the watershed programmes of the two ministries. This variation is observed mainly in four components, namely: (i) community organization, (ii) training programme, (iii) development of natural resource and (iv) development of livelihood. The latest MoRD (Hariyali) guidelines reduced the financial allocation under community organization and training programme by 5 percent and added to the allocation under natural resource development. The MoA guidelines however retained sufficient fund under community organization and training components. Further, it separated the fund for livelihood development out of the overall allocation for natural resource development.

Both the guidelines, however, did not create any financial provision for administrative component at district and state levels as well as for monitoring, evaluation and thematic studies to be carried out by external resource persons/institutions.

## Recommendations



- ❖ The fund for the administrative component may be provided not only for CBOs and PIAs but also for creation of Project Support Units at block, district and state levels in order to improve overall delivery system under the project. Hence, allocation of budget under this head may be enhanced from 10 to 15 percent (Table-1)
- ❖ Sufficient fund for community organization, training programme and follow-up support services may be provided in view of the emerging scenario in the next generation watershed programme. Hence this component (which may be called as integrated capacity building component) may have at least 10 percent financial allocation (Table-1)
- ❖ A specific fund for the livelihood development component may be allocated under the project. This can be done by taking the required amount out of the overall fund for development of natural resource. The reduction in the allocation for natural resource development would later on be compensated in two ways: (i) the absolute amount under this component will not be reduced as overall financial allocation per hectare is likely to be enhanced from Rs. 6000 to Rs. 10000, and (ii) convergence of fund from other related schemes like NFFWP and RIDF at the field level
- ❖ A separate allocation of at least 20 percent fund for livelihood development may be created so that due attention could be paid to this component during regular planning, implementation and monitoring of the programmes (Table-1)

- ❖ A new allocation of 5 percent fund may be made for carrying out concurrent review, monitoring, evaluation and field studies by internal as well as external resource persons/ institutions. This is one of the most crucial aspects, which needs separate financial provision at different levels (Table-1)

**Table – 1: Existing and proposed allocation of fund for different components and sub-components under watershed programmes**

No.	Components/ sub-components	Financial allocation (%)		
		Existing		Proposed
		MoRD	MoA	
<b>A.</b>	<b>Administrative component</b>			
	❖ At community and PIA level	10.0	10.0	10.0
	❖ At district and state level	-	-	5.0
	<b>Sub-total (A)</b>	<b>10.0</b>	<b>10.0</b>	<b>15.0</b>
<b>B.</b>	<b>Development cum management components</b>			
	❖ Integrated capacity building	5.0	12.5	10.0
	❖ Development of natural resources	85.0	50.0	50.0
	❖ Development of livelihoods	-	27.5	20.0
	❖ Monitoring and evaluation	-	-	5.0
	<b>Sub-total (B)</b>	<b>90.0</b>	<b>90.0</b>	<b>85.0</b>
	<b>Total (A+B)</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>

### ***C. Decentralization in management of funds***

A major shift in the financial management system was made since 1995 after the adoption of common guidelines of MoRD. Two of the unique features of the above system are: (i) direct funding to the community for developmental component,

and (ii) implementation of programme through contributory approach. Although the above financial mechanisms were clearly mentioned in the project guidelines, the operational modalities at the field level are found to be quite inadequate. The following two types of situations are often observed particularly under the government funded watershed programme.



- ❖ Release of developmental fund by the district nodal agency to WC is done against completed works (rather than against approved annual action plan). This was the pattern followed in watershed programmes managed through the conventional top-down approach
- ❖ Implementation of works through nodal persons from local community and deduction of the contribution from the wages of labourers or other service providers. This modality is also similar to the earlier situation where works were implemented through contractors or piece-meal workers

## Recommendations

Several innovative experiences are available, which would help in improving the ongoing financial management system. This is now possible primarily due to increased social capital formation in rural areas through organization of SHGs (of women as well as men) and their federations. Main features of the proposed financial management system for the next generation watershed programme are indicated below:

- ❖ Improving the mechanism for release of fund at various levels as per the following details: (i) fund from centre/ state level to district level against annual allocation; (ii) from district level to WC level



against approved annual action plan, and (iii) from WC level to user groups/ labour groups against completion of works

- ❖ Reduction in the number of installments for release of funds (preferably one installment per year)
- ❖ Allocation of fund as per phase specific requirement (e.g. larger proportion of fund for management component as compared to developmental component during capacity building phase and consolidation phase)
- ❖ Re-allocation of fund for community organization as well as capacity building at different levels including the community based organizations
- ❖ Development of natural resource through higher contributory approach (20 to 40 percent as compared to 5 to 10 percent)
- ❖ Collection of genuine contribution from actual users (through payment of at least half of the expected amount in advance before preparation of design and estimate)
- ❖ Integration of cost sharing and corpus building approaches for collection of contribution. As per these approaches, the project invests its development fund only after deducing the proposed contribution from user(s) (i.e. cost sharing approach) and provides a separate common fund (for building the corpus) for development of livelihoods as well as repair and maintenance of community oriented structures/ measures
- ❖ Development of land-based and non-land based livelihoods through revolving fund to be handled by federation of SHGs (of women and men) at village level



- ❖ Outsourcing of services on critical aspects to experienced resource organizations under GO, NGO, etc. on turnkey basis. The funds for this purpose are to be taken out of the concerned development component



- ❖ Integration of alternate source of funding (e.g. bilateral agency, NGO, etc) in the mainstream watershed programme particularly for the capacity building phase and consolidation phase
- ❖ Adoption of voucher-based MIS for improving the efficiency of accounting system not only at district and PIA levels but also at CBO level





## Chapter - 4

### Recommendations for pilot testing in mainstream watershed programmes

#### 4.1 Greater professionalism in overall management of watershed programme

During the last decade, mainstream watershed programme concentrated mainly on development of land and water resources including perennial biomass in common land. However under the changing scenario, a number of new agenda items and also social concerns are becoming important part of the watershed programme. Many of the new objectives are undoubtedly interrelated, but they require support from a variety of specialists dealing not only with technological aspects but also management as well as social aspects. Field experiences in innovative watershed projects revealed that the following specific actions might be taken in order to achieve multiple objectives in a balanced manner:



- \* Adoption of the log frame tool for overall management of project in which proposed outputs and outcomes are in the centre stage. These outputs/ outcomes may be in conformity with multiple objectives of the project. Later, follow-up activities and inputs may be worked out accordingly
- \* Heavy focus on review, monitoring and evaluation system in line with expected outputs and outcomes (rather than monitoring of mere physical and financial progress)
- \* Outsourcing of specific jobs on turnkey basis to experienced organizations (in government and non government sector). This is crucial, as all types of SMSs cannot be hired on full time basis under the project. The service charges towards outsourcing may be paid out of the fund under the development component
- \* Improving the delivery mechanism at different levels (state, district, PIA, etc.) through autonomous institutional set-up at each level in order to enhance their responsiveness to the emerging needs
- \* Reforms in financial management system in order to make it user-friendly particularly at the community level

#### **4.2 Sustainable management of developed natural resource**

So far, major efforts focused on development of natural resources; and very little attention was paid towards management of developed natural resources. Most of the gains made in recharging of groundwater table are nullified because of indiscriminate digging of bore wells. Likewise perennial biomass in common land could not sustain in majority of the cases due to unauthorized grazing/ felling of trees. Social regulation against over-exploitation of CPR is the crucial requirement

for achieving sustainable management of developed natural resources (particularly the CPR). This requires greater commitment from the community in order to facilitate the above regulatory mechanism. Further, this effort needs to be supported with proper policy instruments in favour of resource poor families. Successful experiences on social regulatory mechanism regarding water resources are few in DANIDA funded watersheds and with other organizations that participated in working group meetings. However, based upon available information in other innovative watershed projects the following recommendations are made:

- \* Social regulation on digging of new bore wells in the watershed area
- \* Promotion of community oriented bore wells (exclusively for resource poor families and for only low water requiring crops)
- \* Ban on pumping of surface water collected at the water harvesting structures designed for recharging of groundwater
- \* Converting the traditional irrigation tanks into percolation tanks after making adequate provision for those families who do not own wells but who had access to irrigation water in its original command area through surface flow
- \* Regulated extraction of groundwater from bore wells in such a way that the owner of the bore well uses a part of the quantity allocated for him/ her and the rest of the water is shared (on nominal payment) with other families whose bore wells dried out

#### **4.3. Collective marketing of produce by CBOs**

In rainfed areas significant improvement in income from livelihoods would come not only from enhancement of productivity but also through collective marketing of produce.



The watershed programme provides a unique opportunity to institutionalize the concept of collective marketing, since developmental efforts are carried over a concentrated area, community is organized into sustainable institutional set-up; common fund is available with the community as part of the project intervention, etc. Based upon successful experiences on collective marketing by CBOs,

the following specific recommendations are made:

- \* Organize the community into SHGs and CIGs of not only women members but also men members
- \* Federate the SHGs not only at village level but also at cluster of village level
- \* Involve the SHG federation in collective marketing of produce, which includes farm level processing, grading, packing, storage, transport, etc.
- \* Reform the state marketing laws in favour of alternative marketing system
- \* Create alternative auction platform based upon Dutch system of auction (as being currently practiced by SAFAL at Bangalore)
- \* Develop infrastructure facilities at various levels to carry out collective processing, storage, etc

#### **4.4. Convergence of different funding agencies and related schemes**

At present different departments, which have similar objectives, are implementing a number of inter-related schemes/ projects. It includes schemes, which deal with development of natural resource e.g. National Food for Work Programme, National Employment Guarantee Act (by Government of India); Rural Infrastructure Development Fund (by NABARD); etc. It also includes other schemes, which deal with development of livelihoods namely SGRY (by Ministry

of Rural Development); development of Horticulture and Agriculture (by Ministry of Agriculture); development of livestock including fisheries (by concerned ministries), etc.



In addition to this, there are number of watershed development projects which are funded by different agencies: (i) foreign agency (namely World Bank, DFID, DANIDA, Indo-German, SDC-IC), (ii) CAPART, (iii) NABARD, (iv) NGOs, etc.

Convergence of inter-related schemes/ projects is very crucial under watershed programme as it helps in filling the gaps in development. This approach is also expected to help in improving the efficiency of inter-related schemes since these schemes (after convergence) would be implemented in situations where sufficient investment on natural resource development and community organization has already taken place under watershed programme.

However, at the ground level the convergence concept did not show successful results due to the following reasons:

- \* The development departments and local legislators, district level PRIs, etc do not prefer to integrate several schemes at one place as it deprives other villages of adequate share of funds/ opportunities
- \* The inter-related schemes (even if converged in the same village) become a burden on the watershed staff (PIA and WC) since there is no provision for hiring additional staff or paying extra remuneration even to the existing staff under the watershed programme
- \* The guidelines of the inter-related schemes are usually not based on participatory processes (such as direct funding to the CBO, contributory approach, bottom-up planning, ITK, etc.) Hence inclusion of such schemes

creates confusion among the CBOs and eventually leads to deterioration in the quality of even the watershed project

- ❖ The watershed projects funded by other sources are not expected to be implemented in one place in order to avoid duplication

It is therefore essential to adopt the following strategy for facilitating proper convergence of inter-related schemes:

- ❖ The inter-related schemes should be converged with the ongoing watershed programme only if required provision under administrative component is made and if implementation of works is to be carried out as per the participatory mechanisms under the watershed guidelines
- ❖ The foreign funding agencies (dealing with the watershed programme) should be involved to fill the gaps in the mainstream programme either by associating themselves with the missing components or by implementing separate phases of the project like probation phase, consolidation phase, etc.

#### **4.5. Further decentralization in democratic decision-making processes**

Direct funding to the community (under the watershed programme) is considered as a most significant mechanism for decentralization of decision-making process. This shifts the focus from government departments at block/ district levels to the community based organizations (CBOs) at village level. As discussed earlier four types of CBOs are organized to manage the watershed programme, namely SHGs, UGs, WA and WC. The UGs are expected to plan and execute developmental works whereas WA and WC are expected to provide management support in natural resources development. In reality however, UGs are playing a very insignificant role in planning and implementation of works. Likewise WA is playing a very passive role in the decision making process. Most of the planning, implementation and decision-making responsibilities are centralized around WC.



This inadvertently resulted into a representative democracy in place of a participatory democracy envisaged in the project design. Over centralization of responsibilities and funds resulted in unhealthy feelings among other village level institutions particularly the Gram Panchayat.



Thus further decentralization of management system is crucial so that participatory democratic processes could be properly facilitated. Based upon successful experiences the following recommendations are made:

- 1) A strategic change may be made in the role of watershed committee where it may receive funds but actual execution of works is to be carried out by either the UGs concerned (who gave the proposals) or by SHGs of labourers (who are willing to execute the works). The release of fund to the above groups may be done on weekly basis either against the completed works (in case of UGs) or as advances at least for the first installment (in case of SHGs). UGs/SHGs may be in the center stage of planning and execution so that proper supervision of works as well as timely payment to the labourers and other service providers could be achieved. (It may incidentally be mentioned here that such a decentralization in release of funds was not a requirement in the conventional type of contractor-based implementation system since contractor paid the labourers as per market rate, (out of one's own source but later claimed from the project as per latest SSR)
- 2) Each WA (for 500 ha) may be sub-divided into about 5 area groups (of about 100 ha each). At least 50 percent members of each area may be organized in different SHGs so that their participation in the meetings of area groups and WA becomes effective and decision-making process improves

#### **4.6. Greater involvement of Panchayat Raj Institutions (PRIs)**

Hariyali guidelines of MoRD (2003) brought PRI in the centre stage of watershed programme by making it a project management unit (at district level), a project implementation unit (at block level) and an executive body (at village level). Under these guidelines, role of CBOs and also of NGOs is marginalized as compared to the earlier guidelines by MoRD (Common guidelines, 1995).

The maximum impact of above change is at the village level where executive function is centralized with gram panchayat (which is often based at a cluster of villages level) as compared to the earlier set-up of WC (which was often based at a village level). Though gram panchayat is a constitutional body; it does not presently have adequate capacity to facilitate participatory processes under watershed programme. Most of the works by PRI are executed through contractors without taking any contribution from actual beneficiaries. The decision making process of GP is not democratic in a true sense as it is often dominated by one political party. The account keeping system with the GP is also inadequate, as it is presently managed by a departmental representative rather than a local member chosen by the community.

There is however a need to integrate both GP and CBOs with proper role clarity in such a way that strengths of both organizations are harmoniously utilized. The GP should play the role of governance (which was earlier played by district level departments) and planning whereas implementation responsibility is taken by CBOs with further decentralization from WC to UG/SHG (as discussed earlier).

In this context the following specific roles and responsibilities should be performed by Gram Panchayat. These suggestions are largely based upon the proposed design of World Bank funded watershed project in Uttaranchal state and the ongoing design of tank development project in Karnataka state and

Government of India guidelines on rehabilitation of indigenous tanks in different states.



- \* Developmental fund under the project should be first released to GP (in place of WC). The Gram Panchayat later would allocate the above fund to different villages/ habitations under its jurisdiction based upon the extent of area/ population in each case
- \* The villages concerned should organize SHGs and UGs and form separate village development committees (by having representatives from respective SHGs and UGs). The above members of VDC should be chosen in open meetings of village/ habitation sabha. The above VDCs should facilitate planning and execution of works through SHGs and UGs
- \* The VDC formed through the above process should be designated as special sub-committee of Gram Panchayat in order to give it more formal status (as being attempted through a legislative 'act' in Karnataka with regard to tank users committee). The members of VDC should choose two office bearers (one as the chairperson and the other as member secretary) out of its executive members
- \* The sarpanch and ward member should however act as president/vice president respectively of the village based sabha with an understanding that decision making process will be facilitated by village sabha and executive function performed by VDC
- \* In villages where jurisdiction of GP and village are same, a separate VDC should still be formed to carry out the execution function. It should be formed in the GS as discussed earlier.
- \* Taking into consideration the workload of account maintenance with the Secretary of GP, it would be useful to appoint a separate accountant for the

watershed programme by each VDC. This person should preferably be identified from the village(s) concerned.

#### **4.7. Mainstreaming of innovative 'activists' engaged in natural resources development**

At present a number of innovative activists like Shri. Rajendra Singh (Tarun Bharath Sangh, Rajasthan), Shri. Premjibhai Patel (Vruksha Prem, Gujarat) are actively engaged in promoting sustainable development of natural resources in the country. They are able to facilitate bottom-up development process through higher rate of contribution from the community (i.e. more than 50 percent contribution for development of even community oriented water resources). There is a need to build upon these initiatives through a separate channel of funding in such a way that enthusiasm and creativity of such activists are not adversely affected.

#### **4.8. Greater role for NABARD in watershed programme**

Since the last decade, NABARD is playing a significant role in development of natural resource through multiple source of funding. It began with funding from GTZ/Kfw in Maharashtra, which is now being upscaled in different parts of the country. Based upon this success, Government of India created a separate channel of funding for NABARD known as watershed development fund (WDF), which is to be used as loan to the state government. Simultaneously, NABARD is developing natural resources through another channel of fund called as Rural Infrastructure Development Fund (RIDF). This fund is being used for an innovative project on development of assigned lands of resource poor families (RPF) in Andhra Pradesh. There is a need to consolidate the lessons learnt out of above experiences so that successful experiences through this fund could be upscaled properly.

A number of interventions related to natural resources development showed viability even from commercial viewpoint. NABARD should consider upscaling these interventions through soft loan to SHGs in different parts of the country particularly in areas where these initiatives succeeded in earlier watershed programme.



#### **4.9. Preparation of state specific process guidelines**

At present different states are at different levels with regard to management of watershed programme – some are still in the first generation watershed programme while others are ready to move to third generation watershed programme. Different states vary considerably in their experience regarding development of CBOs particularly SHGs and their federations. The existing guidelines at the national level is too broad / general which is not able to build upon local strengths and requirements unless suitably modified / elaborated. Besides this participatory processes and operational modalities could not be described in detail in the national guidelines due to limitation of space.

The initial experience shows that state specific process guidelines are helpful in making the best use of local situation. These guidelines should however be made within the overall framework of the national guidelines. The proposed process guidelines should focus on the following aspects.

- \* Detailed operational modalities for carrying out various tasks on the basis of field experiences in innovative projects
- \* Appropriate strategy for development of community based organizations, keeping in view the changing scenario under watershed programme
- \* Institutional reforms even at other levels based upon available financial resource in respective states as well as through convergence with related schemes / projects

- \* Reallocation of available fund as per the local need
- \* Concurrent policy support through empowered committee at state level

#### **4.10. Policy consideration and legal support**

At the field level a number of legal issues are faced in the ongoing watershed programme. This is resulting in low sustainability of the developmental outputs. Some of the major aspects for which legal provisions are needed are as follows.

- \* Formal allocation of user rights over common property resource developed under the programme
- \* De-encroachment of common land (whenever it is occupied by non-eligible families) and regularization of above land (wherever earlier developmental work was initiated by resource poor families at their own cost) so that further investment could be made under the project on such lands
- \* Enabling policies for facilitation of social regulation against overexploitation of common property resources so that it would lead to sustainable utilization of developed natural resources. It would be helpful if new water resources developed under the programme could be declared as a common property resource (in which every family has equal right); and likewise new perennial biomass developed on common land declared as the property of only those UGs which belong to resource poor families (preferably women SHGs belong to resource poor families)
- \* Addressing the issue of concealed tenancy in private land by bringing CBOs between the landowner and land cultivators so that risk of losing the land by owner is minimized and opportunity for willing farmers to cultivate the land is enhanced.
- \* Modification in existing marketing laws to facilitate self/ collective marketing by producers and their CBOs





## Appendix - 5

### 5.1 About Anchor Organizations



#### **Watershed Development Coordination Unit (WDCU)**

C/o Embassy of Denmark

11, Aurangzeb Road, New Delhi - 110 001

Tel. +91 - 11 - 2301 0900, Fax. +91 - 11 - 2379 2019 / 2379 2891

Email: delamb@um.dk

**Watershed Development Coordination Unit (WDCU)** of Danida's Watershed Development Programme (DANWADEP) in India was established in New Delhi in March 1994. The need for the WDCU was felt for two reasons:

- \* Project Level - An increasing workload with a growing number of projects and their innovative aspects requiring frequent interaction and monitoring with concerned partners
- \* Sub sector policy level - Based on good working relationship with the Ministry of Agriculture and Cooperation and other donors, possibilities exist for sharing experiences and facilitating joint learning

The WDCU plays the role of an anchor institution that facilitates knowledge management and operational efficiency within the overall DANWADEP programme. DANWADEP is an interesting example of an innovative watershed development initiative that combines local community ownership and multi-stakeholder partnerships at various levels. All of this however works within the macro context of State accountability to providing poor people, especially women within the communities, opportunities for growth and development.

As part of the general management system and an extended arm of the Royal Danish Embassy, WDCU directly and indirectly works to ensure that all stakeholders of DANWADEP at Central, State and project levels are benefited by programme activities. The Government of Denmark provides the financial resources for WDCU, which is headed by a Programme Coordinator and staffed with subject matter specialist as Advisers. When required, WDCU contracts short-term consultants, for specific specialized tasks.

Over the years, the tasks allocated to the WDCU have evolved and its activities have changed accordingly. First, the WDCU continues to assist existing project management in all activities from the development of participatory annual action plans; review of regular progress reports; project cycle support; regular technical support to the projects; policy dialogue and the establishment of linkage with other donors and government institutions working in the area of watershed development. In addition, facilitating training and workshops continues to be major activities of the WDCU. Finally, WDCU is also responsible for documenting and disseminating DANWADEP project experiences and learning and advocate for their institutionalization in the State and Nation watershed development programmes.





**Poverty Learning Foundation (PLF)**

# 12-5-149/6A, Vijayapuri Colony, Tarnaka,

Secunderabad - 500 017

Tel. No. (040) 55176031 / 27017428

Email: [info@plfg.org](mailto:info@plfg.org), Website: [www.plfg.org](http://www.plfg.org)

**Poverty Learning Foundation (PLF)** registered as a non-profit Trust in 2004. The basic mandate of the PLF is to impact policies and practices towards deepening poverty focus of development programmes. Our search is to find options for dealing with concerns in poverty reduction and humanitarian action; and to influence current thinking and approaches among Government, Civil Society Organizations and private sector.

PLF is involved in harnessing the best of development knowledge to inspire and inform policy and practice which lead to the reduction of poverty. It supports efforts of the government, people, donors and civil society institutions through policy-oriented research, learning and innovation, and capacity-building initiatives in the areas of poverty and governance.

PLF has continually endeavoured to guide development policies and practices that meets changing aspirations of the people. It provides technical assistance and advisory services to those organizations involved in poverty reduction. It is continually engaged in learning through working in the following areas: Action against Poverty, Poverty Governance, Rural Livelihoods, and Change management.

PLF has multi-disciplinary faculty of 15, which is augmented by a small group of professionals and extended network, who could be either practitioners or academics from India. They are constant source of new experiences, ideas and world views for PLF. In the last one and half years PLF has generated knowledge base and partnerships needed to bring focus on next generation issues in poverty



reduction, watershed management, micro-finance programmes, rural livelihoods and participatory water management. In all these areas PLF's main focus has been on organizational, managerial and policy aspects. Further information on PLF activities can be obtained from: [www.plfg.org](http://www.plfg.org)



**Watershed Organization Trust (WOTR)**

“Paryavaran”, Behind Market Yard, Ahmednagar - 414 001,  
Maharashtra

Tel. No. +91-(0241) 2450188 / 2451460

Email: [info@wotr.org](mailto:info@wotr.org), Website: [www.wotr.org](http://www.wotr.org)

**Watershed Organisation Trust (WOTR)** was set up to undertake and promote large-scale watershed development and rural development in December 1993. While it is the Capacity Building and support agency for the Indo-German Watershed Development Programme (IGWDP), Maharashtra, a large-scale bilaterally - aided Program, it also manages and implements other large-scale programmes supported by other donors (national and international). WOTR operates in 3 states - Maharashtra, Andhra Pradesh and Madhya Pradesh.

WOTR has pioneered the concept and practice of capacity building as a “stand alone” component, which is a prelude to, as well as an integral component of ongoing participatory watershed development interventions. It implements and directly supports 98 NGOs facilitating watershed treatments in over 264,000 ha. (2,640 sq.km) involving a population of more than 3,50,000 in 25 districts of Maharashtra and one district in Andhra Pradesh.

As part of its mandate, WOTR, to date, has provided training support to over 1,09,000 people (villagers, civil society agencies and Govt. functionaries) from across 22 states in India as well as from several other countries. It also has large-scale women's empowerment and development programmes involving over 3,000 SHGs (more than 42,500 women). A micro-finance initiative begun by WOTR has

now been taken over by its sister organisation, Sampada Trust. In addition to these services, WOTR also undertakes development of IT- based solutions for project and programme management and coordination. Further information on WOTR's activities can be obtained from: [www.wotr.org](http://www.wotr.org)



### **National Institute of Agricultural Extension Management**

**(MANAGE)**

Rajendranagar, Hyderabad - 500 030, Andhra Pradesh,

Tel. No. +91-(040)-24016702

Email: [info@manage.gov.in](mailto:info@manage.gov.in), Website: [www.manage.gov.in](http://www.manage.gov.in)

**National Institute of Agricultural Extension Management**, popularly known as **MANAGE**, is an apex national institute set up in 1987 as an autonomous society under the Ministry of Agriculture, Government of India. MANAGE is the Indian response to the challenges of management in a rapidly growing agricultural sector. As a management institute, MANAGE has a mandate to assist the State Governments, the Government of India and other public sector organizations in effective management of their agricultural extension and other agricultural management systems. MANAGE is a nodal institute for conducting International Programmes and organizing study visits for foreign delegates in the above areas.

Within the overall mandate, MANAGE facilitates the acquisition of managerial and technical skills by Extension Officers, Managers, Scientists and Administrators in all sectors of Agricultural economy to enable them to provide most effective support and services to Farmers and Fishermen for practicing Sustainable Agriculture. Further information on MANAGE's activities can be obtained from [www.manage.gov.in](http://www.manage.gov.in)



### **Watershed Support Services and Activities Network (WASSAN)**

H. No. 12-13-452, Street No. 1, Tarnaka,

Secunderabad - 500 017,

Andhra Pradesh

Tel. No. +91-(040)-27015295 / 6, Fax. No. 27018581

Email: wassan@eth.net

Website: www.wassan.org

**WASSAN** as a network based support organization has a wider arena of action and is dynamic in catering the demands of the large scale development programmes being implemented in the state and its attending policy concerns, demands from organizations and various level of stakeholders in the field. While playing the role of advocacy platform it is focussing on the field needs, policy space and procedural systems. Above all its role as facilitator of capacities and institutional development is evolving with clarity and purpose.

WASSAN emerged as a network of NGOs in Andhra Pradesh with the initiative of Centre for World Solidarity (www.cwsy.org) in 1995. The principle concern of the network was to find ways of grounding the program and providing an interface with the government for the NGOs. Network meetings were initiated for this purpose. The team anchoring the network also started dialogue with district administration in various districts to initiate collaboration. WASSAN Action Study Project was taken up as a network initiative to work with three NGOs in six watersheds to innovative on the participatory processes of community organization, planning and implementation of watershed programme. This was a tripartite agreement with the Commissioner, Rural Development, AP Academy of Rural Development and Centre for World Solidarity – WASSAN. Dr. Vijay Bhai Kochar anchored this process initially.

Realising the intricacies and magnitude of the efforts required, the need was felt to have a full-pledged support team to serve the agenda. WASSAN thus emerged

as an independent non-profit, network based support organisation and was registered as a Public Trust in 1999 with Sri. B.N. Yugandhar as the Managing Trustee. WASSAN retained the network character and the role of the network was also mandated in the Trust deed. The Annual network meetings have further gained significance and are continuing to be a major advocacy platform and an interface with the government officials.

Since then, WASSAN has grown in strength with several opportunities and partnerships opening up with NGOs, their networks and government programs. WASSAN is further strengthened with the opening up of partnership with community-based organizations since 2003. These partnerships with the Mandal Mahila Samakhyas (Federation of Self-Help groups) opened up larger ground for learning. Work with NRM based cooperatives and PRIs started in 2004. The study on wages issues and the Annual Network Meeting opened up the collaboration with the Agriculture labour Unions.

Strengthening the work with CBOs – Mandal Mahila Samakhyas and NRM based cooperatives, and initiating stronger partnerships with Panchayat Raj Institutions, Institutionalising livelihoods based NRM agenda within the operational framework of these institutions, strengthening their capacities and mainstreaming this agenda are presently WASSAN's nodes of action. With consistency in enriching partnerships and networking opportunities WASSAN is poised well to realize its vision. Further information on WASSAN's activities can be obtained from [www.wassan.org](http://www.wassan.org)

## 5.2 About the authors

### *Watershed Support Services and Activities Network (WASSAN)*



**N.K. Sanghi** is presently the Adviser of WASSAN. He has longstanding contribution to the fields of development and extension services. He has been consistently working for improving the quality of involvement of the NGOs associated with watershed programme in Andhra Pradesh. Facilitation of policy reforms, development of appropriate approaches for NRM and watershed programs and steering the field studies for understanding the processes under the ongoing watershed programmes are core to his functional area. Before retirement he had served as Director (NRM), National Institute of Agricultural Extension Management (MANAGE), Hyderabad, Andhra Pradesh. Also worked as member of the working groups responsible for preparation of operational manuals for watershed programme funded by Ministry of Rural Development, Government of India as well as for formulation of revised guidelines for watershed programme funded by Ministry of Agriculture (NWDPR), Government of India.



**A. Ravindra Babu** is Director and Secretary of WASSAN. He is a development economist specialising in the area of community based natural resources management. Design of large scale programs, strategies, capacity building, institutional and other support systems for sustainable rainfed agriculture and natural resources management is a main area of focus. Impact assessment, public policy related to watershed development, water resources management and poverty related issues are the thrust areas of his action research



**M.V. Ramachandrudu** is Director of WASSAN responsible for policy advocacy and research. He is a civil engineer and environmental planner. His experiences with NGO sector (about 16 years) are largely in the fields of capacity building, policy advocacy, project management/ facilitation and documentation. In his work with NGOs, he is associated with several large scale natural resource management and development projects such as watershed projects. He is currently anchoring Understanding Processes in Watershed Projects in India, a study supported by India Canada Environment Facility. Earlier he anchored several such studies sponsored by Government of Andhra Pradesh



**K. Suresh** is Director, Resource Centre, WASSAN. Basically a post graduate in Agriculture he has working experience with both GOs and NGOs. Presently his area of focus is production of communication material in various media for different stakeholders and for different purposes.

### **Poverty Learning Foundation (PLF)**



**S.P. Tucker** a member of the Indian Administrative Service, currently serving as Principal Secretary, Irrigation and Commissioner, CADA, Government of Andhra Pradesh. He has been instrumental in conceiving and implementing bi-lateral projects like Andhra Pradesh Rural Livelihood Programme (APRLP) that influenced the development process at large giving impetus to the NRM based livelihood initiatives in addressing the poverty concerns in the state. He is involved in facilitating learning and changes in policy and practices of rural development in Andhra Pradesh that include scaling up of women self help groups, SHG-Bank linkage programme and watershed management.



**N.L. Narasimha Reddy** a Development Anthropologist, currently serving as Chief Executive Officer of Poverty Learning Foundation, Hyderabad. He has published two books on NGO-Government Collaboration and a series of operational manuals for implementation of Andhra Pradesh Rural Livelihoods Programme (APRLP). He is associated in various strategic learning and poverty governance issues in the state for over 20 years. He may be contacted at the following address: [nr\\_consult@yahoo.com](mailto:nr_consult@yahoo.com)



**Shree Ravindranath** has been involved in leading and coordinating policy advocacy for the theme “Users Rights” under the umbrella initiative of Policy Advocacy for Watershed Programmes. She has over three years experience working in the development sector on issues related to enterprises and community based organizations. She has a Post Graduate Diploma from the Indian Institute of Forest Management, and has studied at the Institute of Social Studies, Netherlands. She is currently leading a team at Intellectap, a development consultancy headquartered at Mumbai. Her present areas of interest are consultancy and advocacy in micro-finance, rural enterprise and institutional development. She may be contacted at the following address: [shreeravindranath@gmail.com](mailto:shreeravindranath@gmail.com)



**P. Narender Babu** is a water resources engineering specialist with over a decade of experience in rural development in general and watershed based development in particular. His focus is mostly on facilitating demystification of technology and adoption of indigenous and appropriate alternate technologies. He associated himself with a wide range of actors from grassroots level to policy level contributing to planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of programmes. He was holding the key area of capacity building during his association with Andhra Pradesh Rural Livelihoods Programme (APRLP) in the recent past.

He is presently with Poverty Learning Foundation (PLF) as Theme Leader (Water Resources). He may be contacted at the following address: pallanarendra@rediffmail.com, pallanarendra@hotmail.com

### ***Watershed Organization Trust (WOTR)***



**Crispino Lobo** is the Managing Trustee of WOTR. He joined Fr. Hermann Bacher, the founder of the Indo-German Watershed Development Programme (IGWDP) and was the Programme Coordinator upto 2001. The author of several articles and 2 books, one published by the World Bank and the other under print, his interests lie in matters of institutional development, capacity building, human resource development, systems and pedagogical innovations and the politics of development.



**Abraham Samuel** is currently a freelance development worker involved in design and application of capacity building, project management and participatory research. He worked as a Faculty in the Department of Sociology, JMI, New Delhi, and as development and research professional with different organisations. He was associated with Watershed Organisation Trust as senior staff and has to his credit different articles published in journals.

### ***National Institute of Agricultural Extension Management (MANAGE)***



**K.V. Satyanarayana** is a Post Graduate in Commerce. Joined Indian Administrative Services in 1982 and allotted to Manipur - Tripura Cadre. He has served as Sub-division Officer; Project Director, District Rural Development Agency in two districts; Director, Food and Civil Supplies, Animal Husbandry, Tribal Welfare Departments; District Magistrate and Collector before going on inter-state deputation to Andhra Pradesh where he has served as Joint Secretary (Agri. & Coop.). He also worked as Commissioner, Municipal Corporation, Visakhapatnam and also as Vice Chairman, Vizag Urban Development Authority. He served as Sr. Regional Manager, Food Corporation of India, A.P. on central deputation between 1996-99. Held various positions as Commissioner, Health, Rural Development, Tribal Welfare; Chief Executive Officer, Tripura Tribal Areas Autonomous District Council between 1999 to 2003 and Principal Secretary, Finance and Chief Electoral Officer, Tripura till he joined as Director General, MANAGE on 05th August 2004. Having served for long time in Agriculture and Welfare departments has a keen interest in the primary sector.





**Dr. V K Reddy** has MA and Ph D in Sociology. He has worked for 15 years in National Institute of Rural Development, Hyderabad as faculty members. During this period he was involved in research and training, training programmes for trainers in the areas related to Human Resource Development for Rural Development. He is working in MANAGE since the last decade as faculty member and presently is the Deputy Director. His work area includes Natural Resources management, Training of Trainers for NRM, Human Resource Management/ Human Resource Development, handling sessions on community organization / group approach. He conducted studies on Village Level Organisations, Training Institutes, Evaluation of Trainings and Trainings for Rural Development. His work resulted in publication of two books and several study reports and articles.



**B. Renuka Rani** is working as Research Associate in MANAGE since 1996. She is coordinating information and communication technology (ICT) project for farm women of Ranga Reddy district, Andhra Pradesh in 10 SHG federations and also organizing series of training programmes for field functionaries, farmwomen group leaders of Andhra Pradesh on New dimensions of agriculture. Prior to joining MANAGE, served as Instructor for three years in middle level training centre (ICDS Supervisors training centre) in Sri Venkateswara University, Tirupati. The nature of job includes organizing training programmes for field level functionaries on community development and conducting field studies, report preparation, organizing workshops, seminars, etc. She may be contacted at the following address: [brenuka@manage.gov.in](mailto:brenuka@manage.gov.in), [ranibomma@rediffmail.com](mailto:ranibomma@rediffmail.com)



**K. Sai Maheswari** joined MANAGE in 1994. She is coordinating the activities of participatory watershed programme in Manchal mandal, Ranga Reddy district. Actively involved in planning, development and implementation of watersheds at the field level. The works include creating awareness, facilitation; capacity building of all the stakeholders; liaison with DPAP, district level officers and farmers and other developmental schemes / programmes. Also she concentrates on mobilization and motivation of women beneficiaries in the watershed and works for the equity of poor and women and sharing experiences in these areas in several training programmes of various organizations. She has worked as Sericulture-cum-Zoology lecturer in Viswodaya Government Degree College, Nellore and also has worked Watershed Development Team member in Manchal watershed project in November 1995. She may be contacted at the following address: [kmaheshwari@manage.gov.in](mailto:kmaheshwari@manage.gov.in)

### Watershed Development and Coordination Unit (WDCU)



**Rahul Sen** is working as Danida Adviser (Institutionalisation and Documentation) with Danida's Watershed Development Programme (DANWADEP) in India. After completing his M. Phil in Anthropology from University of Delhi he has worked with various development agencies including community based NGOs, support and network NGOs, donor / bilateral agencies and private consultancy company. His main areas of specialization are decentralized governance, micro-level planning and participatory development approaches in natural resource management; Also had experience in working in community health development and integrated community development projects. He has worked in various capacities with a number of projects, importantly in the formulation of an integrated community health development project of the tribal communities of south Tripura; on the issue of utilization of water by rural communities in four different water stress zones of the country (drought affected area of Kalahandi, Orissa; flood and waterlogging affected areas of Saryu Par Plain, Uttar Pradesh; arid areas in Jodhpur and Indira Gandhi Canal Command Area, Rajasthan; mountain areas in Garhwal, Uttar Pradesh); in the integrated community health development project, specially of women and children of district Faizabad, Uttar Pradesh; in formation of women self help groups and income generation programmes in district Ambedkarnagar, Uttar Pradesh; in a Gram Panchayat micro-level development planning project in district Sultanpur, Uttar Pradesh; in a project evaluating the NGO initiatives in promoting women participation in the Panchayati Raj Institutions; in a participatory integrated water resources management project in districts Lalitpur and Banda, Uttar Pradesh (funded by the Royal Netherlands Embassy) and in watershed development programme being implemented in States of Karnataka, Tamil Nadu, Orissa and Madhya Pradesh (funded by Danida). He has been responsible for extensively documenting all these projects. Along with this, he has also been involved with a number of advocacy and public campaigns, especially in issues related to community participation in governance, forestry, workers rights, environment and health and participatory natural resource management.

### 5.3 List of watershed projects analyzed under the study

#### A) Type of theme: User's right

No.	Source of fund	Type of PIA	Name of PIA	Location of watershed	
				State	District
1.	<b>Government of India</b>				
	* MoRD	GO	* MANAGE	Andhra Pradesh	Ranga Reddy
2.	<b>Bilateral projects</b>				
	* GTZ / kwf	NGO	* WOTR	Maharashtra	Ahmednagar
	* DANIDA	GO + NGO	* DANWADEP	Orissa, Madhya Pradesh and Karnataka	Many districts
3.	<b>NGO</b>	NGO	* Pani Panchayat	Maharashtra	Pune
		NGO	* APPS	Andhra Pradesh	Ananthapur
		NGO	* FES	Andhra Pradesh	Chittoor

#### B) Type of theme: Capacity building

No.	Source of fund	Type of PIA	Name of PIA	Location of watershed	
				State	District
1.	<b>Bilateral projects</b>				
	* DANIDA	GO + NGO	* DANWADEP	Orissa, Madhya Pradesh and Karnataka	Many districts
	* DFID	GO + NGO	* APRLP	Andhra Pradesh	Many districts
	* GTZ / kwf	NGO	* WOTR	Maharashtra	Ahmednagar
2.	<b>NGO</b>	NGO	* MYRADA	Andhra Pradesh	Ananthapur
		-do-	-do-	Karnataka	?

**C) Type of theme: Equity**

No.	Source of fund	Type of PIA	Name of PIA	Location of watershed	
				State	District
1.	<b>Government of India</b>				
	* MoRD	NGO	* OUTREACH	Andhra Pradesh	Chittoor
2.	<b>Bilateral projects</b>				
	* DANIDA	GO + NGO	* DANWADEP	Orissa, Madhya Pradesh and Karnataka	Many districts
	* DFID	GO + NGO	* APRLP	Andhra Pradesh	Many districts
	* GTZ / kwf	NGO	* IGWDP-K	Maharashtra	Many districts
3.	<b>NGO</b>				
		NGO	* DDS	Andhra Pradesh	Medak
		-do-	* KRUSHI	Andhra Pradesh	Chittoor
		-do-	* MYRADA	Andhra Pradesh	Ananthapur
	-do-	* APPS	Andhra Pradesh	Ananthapur	

**D) Type of theme: Participatory monitoring and evaluation systems**

No.	Source of fund	Type of PIA	Name of PIA	Location of watershed	
				State	District
1.	<b>Bilateral projects</b>				
	* DANIDA	GO + NGO	* Department of Agriculture	Orissa, Madhya Pradesh and Karnataka	Many districts
	* SDC-IC	NGO	* MYRADA, SAMUHA, PRAWARDA	Karnataka	Gulbarga, Raichur, Bidar
	* GTZ/kwf (WOTR)	NGO	* NGO	Many NGOs	Many districts
	* DFID (APRLP)	GO, NGO	* Govt. Department, Many NGOs	Andhra Pradesh	Many districts

**E) Type of theme: Withdrawal strategy/ Post project sustainability**

No.	Source of fund	Type of PIA	Name of PIA	Location of watershed	
				State	District
<b>A.</b>	<b>Government of India</b>				
	* MORD	GO	* DPAP	Andhra Pradesh	Ranga Reddy
		GO	* Others	Andhra Pradesh	Many districts
		Society with GO	* MANAGE	Andhra Pradesh	Ranga Reddy
	NGO	* OUTREACH	Andhra Pradesh	Chittoor	
<b>B.</b>	<b>Bilateral projects</b>				
	* DANIDA	GO	* DoA	Orissa	Koraput
		-do-	* DoA	Madhya Pradesh	Ratlam
		-do-	* DoA	Karnataka	Bijapur
	* SDC (IPSWD-K)	NGO	* SAMUHA	Karnataka	Raichur
		-do-	* MYRADA	Karnataka	Gulbarga
		-do-	* PRAWARDA	Karnataka	Bidar
	* DFID (KAWAD)	GO	* Department of watershed	Karnataka	Bijapur
		PRI	* Zilla Parishad	Karnataka	Bellary
		NGO	* MYRADA	Karnataka	Chitradurga
	* DFID (APRLP)	GO	* Many GOs	Andhra Pradesh	5 districts
		NGO	* Many NGOs	Andhra Pradesh	Many districts
	* GTZ / kwf	NGO	* -do-	Maharashtra	Many districts
		-do-	* -do-	Andhra Pradesh	-do-
<b>C.</b>	<b>NGO</b>				
		NGO	* DDS	Andhra Pradesh	Medak
		-do-	* RWDP / KRUSHI	Andhra Pradesh	Chittoor
		-do-	* RDT	Andhra Pradesh	Ananthapur
		-do-	* CREDS / CHAITANYA	Andhra Pradesh	Ananthapur
	-do-	* MYRADA	Karnataka	Gulbarga	

## 5.4 List of publications on different themes under the study

### **Theme – A : User's right**

- \* Policy issues for users rights within watershed projects - The DANWADEP experiences in India – Shree Ravindranath
- \* Users Rights in Watershed Development: Policy Issues - Shree Ravindranath
- \* Step by Step Process Document for User Rights on Common Property Resources in Watershed Development Project
- \* Policy Issues in User Rights in Watershed Development - Shree Ravindranath
- \* Proceedings of the Meeting of the Working Group on User's Rights, 21-22, September 2004, MANAGE, Hyderabad
- \* Proceedings of the National Workshop on User's Rights for Common Property Resources under Watershed Programme, 22-23, November 2004, MANAGE, Hyderabad

### **Theme – B : Capacity building**

- \* Experiences of DANWADEP: Changing Frontiers of Capacity Building in Watershed Programmes - N.L. Narasimha Reddy & P.Narendra Babu
- \* A synthesis report on Capacity Building component in watershed programmes - P. Narendra Babu
- \* Capacity building in watershed development programmes - a strategy paper- P. Narendra Babu

**Theme – C : Equity for resource poor families**

- \* Vulnerability Reduction in watershed programmes - Lessons from DANIDA's watershed development programme (DANWADEP) - N.L. Narasimha Reddy
- \* Vulnerability Reduction in watershed programmes - A synthesis report on experiences in India - N.L. Narasimha Reddy
- \* A step-by-step guide to integrating vulnerability reduction approaches in watershed programmes - N.L. Narasimha Reddy

**Theme – D : Participatory monitoring and evaluation systems**

- \* Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation Systems in Watershed Development- Consolidation of Learnings from DANWADEP and Other Projects - Crispino Lobo and Abraham Samuel
- \* Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation Systems in DANIDA-supported Watershed Projects in India - Crispino Lobo and Abraham Samuel
- \* Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation Systems - Case studies of Applied tools - Crispino Lobo and Abraham Samuel
- \* Proceedings of working group meeting on PMES at MANAGE, Hyderabad, November 29-30, 2004

**Theme – E : Withdrawal strategy / Post project sustainability**

- \* Post project sustainability - a case study of Indo-DANIDA watershed project in Orissa, Karnataka and Madhya Pradesh - N.K. Sanghi, A. Ravindra & M.V. Ramchandrudu
- \* Post project sustainability - a synthesis of learning - N.K. Sanghi, A. Ravindra & M.V. Ramchandrudu

- \* Proceedings of the Working Group meeting on Withdrawal strategy under watershed programme - December 14-16, 2004 at MANAGE, Hyderabad
- \* Proceedings of the National Workshop on Sustainable Development under watershed programme - February 2-4, 2005 at MANAGE, Hyderabad

### **Emerging Policy Issues**

- \* Upscaling of successful experiences from watershed projects in India - Mechanisms, instruments and policy considerations
  - ❖ WASSAN - N.K. Sanghi, A. Ravindra, M.V. Ramchandrudu,
  - ❖ PLF- S.P. Tucker, N.L. Narasimha Reddy, P. Narendra Babu and Shree Ravindranath
  - ❖ WOTR - Crispino Lobo & Abraham Samuel
  - ❖ WDCU - Palle C. Andersen, Rahul Sen and Kasturi Basu
- \* Minutes of the First Working Group Meeting on “Understanding the process of policy change in the context of participatory natural resource management, April 4, 2005 at MANAGE, Hyderabad
- \* Proceedings of the Second Working group meeting on Policy advocacy under watershed programme, April 6-7, 2005 at MANAGE, Hyderabad
- \* Proceedings of the National Workshop on Emerging Policy Issues under watershed programmes, May 5-7, 2005 at Gurgaon, New Delhi

