

Study to pragmatically analyse the shortcomings of demand driven approach of IWMP for transforming the scheme to target oriented approach

Final Report: April, 2015

Sponsored by

Department of Land Resources, Ministry of Rural Development, Government of India

Prepared by

Institute for Resource Management and Economic Development, Delhi

[\(irmed7@gmail.com\)](mailto:irmed7@gmail.com)

Contents

| | Page No. |
|---|----------|
| Study team | (i) |
| Preface | (ii) |
| Acknowledgement | (iii) |
| Acronyms | (iv) |
| Executive Summary | (vi) |
| Chapter . 1 Introduction | 1 |
| Chapter . 2 Allocation of target area and fund to states and down below | 11 |
| Chapter - 3 Demand driven versus Target Oriented Approach | 14 |
| Chapter . 4 Appraisal of IWMP participatory approach in practice | 23 |
| Chapter . 5 Operational Aspects | 32 |
| Chapter . 6 Suggestions for better functioning of the programme | 50 |
| Annexure 1.1 Districtwise IWMP projects sanctioned upto 2012-13 | 57 |
| Annexure 1.2 Instruments of Observation | 71 |
| (I) Schedule for State Level Nodal Agency | |
| (II) Schedule for District Level Watershed Cell and Data Centre | |
| (III) Schedule for Project Implementing Agency (PIA) | |
| (IV) Schedule for Village Level Watershed Committee | |
| Annexure 1.3 Dates of visit of the Project Director and study team to the sample states along with the list of officials in the concerned states with whom the study team interacted during the course of visits to their states. | 91 |

Study Team

| | | |
|----------------------|---|---------------------|
| Prof. Kamta Prasad | : | Project Director |
| Shri D.Routray | : | Project Coordinator |
| Shri Yogendra Tiwari | : | Research Associate |
| Shri Pramod Kumar | : | Research Associate |
| Shri Virender Kumar | : | Research Associate |
| Shri Sumit Sharma | : | Computer Operator |
| Shri M.R.Ramabadran | : | Computer Operator |

PREFACE

This study on IWMP was entrusted to the Institute by the Department of Land Resources (DoLR), Ministry of Rural Development, Government of India as a follow up to the 28th Report of the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Rural Development. It was not an evaluation study of IWMP of a routine type. As its title suggests, the study focused on examining the basic approach of the programme. Being a policy oriented study in the water sector, it fell within the core area of the Institute's interest. A serious attempt was made by the Institute to collect the relevant facts and make their critical evaluation so as to suggest a more suitable institutional framework for IWMP.

The study had a smooth progress except for a few developments of force majeure type because of which there was some delay in submitting the report. The Department of Land Resources was always kept informed. The study had the benefit of receiving full cooperation from officers in all the five sample states. A draft report was submitted to DoLR on 12th January, 2015. Feedback from the DoLR was received by the Institute on 18th April, 2015. The draft report was revised in the light of the comments and suggestions of the DoLR.

IWMP is a well conceived programme for the benefit of people in rural areas. It needs to be strengthened further. A few critical bottlenecks related to its operational aspects have been identified and remedial measures suggested. I hope the authorities would find them useful and take necessary action for their implementation.

April 23, 2015
Director

Kamta Prasad
Project

Acknowledgement

On behalf of the Institute, I take this opportunity to offer my sincere thanks to the officials of the Department of Land Resources, specially Shri A.K.Gautam, the then Economic Adviser and Shri P.C.Meena, Under Secretary for entrusting the study to the Institute and for providing timely help and cooperation whenever needed. It is but due to their active cooperation that the study could be completed expeditiously.

My thanks are also due to all the officials of the SLNA in the concerned states, Project Directors/ Project Managers at the level of the districts, PIAs and officers at other levels for extending their helping hands to the study team during its visits to the sample states. A list of these functionaries is given under Annexure 1.3.

I shall be failing in my duty if I do not thank the staff associated with the project. Their names are given separately. They took great pains to go to the interior of the districts in adverse circumstances and collected the needed information. Some of them assisted me at the headquarters also in processing and analysis of data and preparing the draft report.

Kamta Prasad
Project Director

(iii)

Acronyms

| | |
|---------|---|
| AH | Animal Husbandry |
| APMC | Agricultural Produce Marketing Committee |
| BRGF | Backward Region Grant Fund |
| CBO | Community Based Organisation |
| CHS | Custom Hiring Centre |
| CMSA | Community Managed Sustainable Agriculture |
| CPR | Common Property Resources |
| DDP | Desert Development Programme |
| DoLR | Department of Land Resources |
| DPAP | Drought Prone Area Programme |
| DPR | Detailed Project Report |
| DRDA | District Rural Development Agency |
| DWDC | Watershed Cell cum Data Centre |
| EPA | Entry Point Activity |
| GIS | Geographical Information System |
| IWDP | Integrated Watershed Development Programme |
| IWMP | Integrated Watershed Management Programme |
| MGNREGA | Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Act |
| MGNREGS | Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme |
| NEDCAP | Non-conventional Energy Development Cooperation of Andhra Pradesh |
| NGO | Non-Government Organisation |
| NHM | National Horticulture Mission |
| NRAA | National Rainfed Area Authority |

| | |
|-------|--|
| NRLM | National Rural Livelihood Mission |
| NRM | Natural Resource Management |
| PIA | Project Implementing Agency |
| PPR | Preliminary Project Report |
| PRI | Panchayati Raj Institution |
| RD | Rural Development |
| RO | Reverse Osmosis |
| RWS | Rural Water Supply |
| SC | Scheduled Castes |
| SERP | Society for Elimination of Rural Poverty |
| SGRY | Sampoorn Grameen Rojgar Yojana |
| SGSY | SwarnaJayanti Gram Swarojgar Yojana |
| SHG | Self Help Group |
| SIRD | State Institute for Rural Development |
| SLNA | State Level Nodal Agency |
| SPSP | State Perspective and Strategic Plan |
| SSAAT | Society for Social Audit Accountability and Transparency |
| ST | Scheduled Tribes |
| UG | User Group |
| VO | Village Organisation |
| WA | Watershed Association |
| WC | Watershed Committee |
| WCDC | Watershed Cell and Data Centre |
| WDT | Watershed Development Team |

(v)

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

| | | |
|----|--|-----|
| 1 | Integrated Watershed Development Programme (IWMP) launched in February 2009 has several new features such as dedicated institutions with multidisciplinary professional support, flexibility in the project duration and differential cost norms for different types of areas | 1.1 |
| 2 | Entry Point Activities during preparatory phase is an important activity to establish rapport with the public | 1.1 |
| 3 | Report of the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Rural Development in its 28 th report indicated the need to review the existing demand driven approach of IWMP since this provides scope for shifting the deficiencies of the executing / implementing agencies to the beneficiaries | 1.3 |
| 4 | Study focus and objectives: (I) To pragmatically analyse the advantages and shortcomings of demand driven approach of IWMP vis-à-vis the target oriented approach (II) To explore the possibility as to how the target oriented approach could be made suitable and effective so as to reintroduce it (III) To give suggestions for improving the functioning of IWMP | 1.4 |
| 5 | Five states of Himachal Pradesh, Rajasthan, Meghalaya, Odisha and Andhra Pradesh representing different agro-climatic zones of the country and two districts from each state were allotted to the Institute for the study | 1.5 |
| 6 | 32 IWMP projects in operation from 2009-10 to 2013-14 were selected for the study | 1.5 |
| 7 | Data and information were collected from both secondary and primary sources | 1.6 |
| 8 | Four types of schedules were administered, one each at state, district, PIA and watershed levels | 1.7 |
| 9 | In addition, there was a list of key points for focus group discussion with stakeholders at various levels | 1.7 |
| 10 | Statewise targets under IWMP are indicated in the beginning based on certain criteria and within the framework of a 18 years statewise perspective plan prepared in 2009 | 2.1 |

| | | |
|----|---|-------|
| 11 | Allocation of target area to districts is also based on certain criteria | 2.2 |
| 12 | States prepare preliminary project report for area to be developed in a particular year as per allocation of target area | 2.3 |
| 13 | The procedure followed for release of central assistance to states has undergone changes. According to the latest procedure in vogue since June, 2012, funds are released in two installments of 60 and 40 percent based on certain conditions as given in Para 2.4, Page 12. | 2.4 |
| 14 | IWMP as currently operated, is a target oriented programme at higher levels, i.e., national, state and district level and demand driven at watershed level as indicated by the state and district level authorities | 3.1 |
| 15 | Both the target oriented as well as demand driven approaches have some advantages and disadvantages which are indicated in the text | 3.2 |
| 16 | As per the views of the state level officials, demand driven approach has the advantages of being more participatory, sustainable and equitable. It also provides greater flexibility in implementation. It ensures peoples participation and work is done as per needs of people | 3.3.2 |
| 17 | Demand driven approach has the disadvantages that demand creation and implementation are affected if conflicts arise within the community and also there is risk of fragmentation and inequitable distribution of benefits at times. One may also has to compromise with the technical requirements | 3.3.2 |
| 18 | As per views of the district level officials, demand driven approach has the advantage of people selecting the activities as per their needs, ownership and management of asset by community, involvement of villagers in planning and implementation as also creation of good quality of assets | 3.3.2 |
| 19 | Watershed level functionaries have also given several advantages of demand driven approach such as the work done is as per needs of the community through their involvement in planning and implementation. As such, the ownership and management of the asset created remains with the community | 3.3.2 |
| 20 | Only two watershed functionaries from Odisha perceived certain disadvantages of demand driven approach such as sometimes, technological knowhow is compromised to some extent as also more demand results in delay | 3.3.2 |
| 21 | According to state level replies, demand driven approach is preferred by Andhra Pradesh, Himachal Pradesh and Rajasthan and target oriented approach by none while Meghalaya and Odisha have preferred mixed approach (both demand driven and target oriented) | 3.4 |

(vii)

| | | |
|----|---|-------|
| 22 | All the ten district level officials have preferred demand driven approach | |
| 23 | As many as 26 out of 32 Micro Level watersheds functionaries gave their preference for demand driven approach under IWMP along with reasons for the same | 3.4 |
| 24 | There is considerable public participation in several aspects of watershed planning and development | 4.1.1 |
| 25 | Public involvement in IWMP has several advantages which have been mentioned by authorities at all levels | 4.1.2 |
| 26 | There was divided opinion at the state level whether public involvement caused delay and slow progress. But a majority of district level officers felt that it caused no delay | 4.1.3 |
| 27 | The proactive involvement of village panchayats in watershed development is one of the key features of this programme as highlighted by 28 out of 32 watershed functionaries | 4.2.1 |
| 28 | Involvement of PRI ensures several advantages as reported by watershed level functionaries | 4.2.2 |
| 29 | About 60% of the watershed functionaries were in favour of involving panchayats even though these are overloaded with other priorities | 4.2.2 |
| 30 | There is limited involvement of NGOs / VOs in IWMP in Himachal Pradesh, Odisha and Meghalaya while in Andhra Pradesh and to some extent in Rajasthan quite a few NGOs have been associated | 4.3 |
| 31 | Institutional framework at the grass root level as prescribed under Common Guidelines was found to exist at the state, district, PIA and watershed levels | 5.1 |
| 32 | In a number of states, considerable staff deficiency was found to exist at different levels within a state. This was mainly due to low level of payment coupled with insecurity of job resulting in frequent flight of contractual staff at watershed and higher levels | 5.2 |
| 33 | There was limited availability of labour for watershed work. This was due to seasonal work as well as low level of wages paid | 5.3 |
| 34 | Inadequate funding for watershed development work and also for other components such as livelihood, productivity enhancement and development of micro enterprises has been reported by many states | 5.4 |

| | | |
|----|---|----------|
| 35 | Overall utilization of funds under IWMP in the years from 2009-10 to 2013-14 was nearly 78 percent of the total funds received by 5 states. But there are marked interstate variations from 58.44 percent in Himachal Pradesh to 96.59 percent in Meghalaya | 5.5 |
| 36 | At the district level, utilization of funds varied from 96 percent in West Jaintia Hills of Meghalaya to 41 percent in Bilaspur district of Himachal Pradesh | 5.5 |
| 37 | Late receipt of funds was cited as a reason for under utilization of funds by the district officials | 5.5 |
| 38 | A number of watershed activities have been brought under convergence with similar activities of other departments with a view to enhance the scope of watershed activities resulting in coverage of more area under treatment while sharing the cost of the activity with other departments (viii) | 5.6 |
| 39 | In all the sample states, convergence of watershed programme with MGNREGS of the Department of Rural Development has been ensured. Besides, in Andhra Pradesh, Odisha and Rajasthan, convergence has been achieved with the programmes of other departments also | 5.6.1 |
| 40 | In the district of West Khasi Hills of Meghalaya and Shimla district of Himachal Pradesh, the programme of convergence was not given any priority | 5.6.1 |
| 41 | Several advantages have been perceived by the officials at the state, district and PIA levels through convergence of IWMP with the similar programmes of other departments | 5.6.2 |
| 42 | Demand driven approach has several advantages. It has some disadvantages also. But, it was not mentioned as a factor in slow progress by respondents in any state. The broad consensus among functionaries associated with the programme at all levels, state, district and watershed was that demand driven approach was more suitable for IWMP than target oriented approach. It should, therefore, continue in future also | . 6.1 |
| 43 | As far as possible, watershed projects should be taken up in areas where beneficiaries are more homogenous or less heterogeneous | 6.1 |
| 44 | Need for vigorous awareness generation campaigns in the beginning demonstrating the potential benefits of the proposed watershed project | 6.1 |

- 45 A target oriented approach in terms of fixing time limits for completion of activities should be introduced for different activities to be taken up in the second and third phases of the programme. Following targets are suggested 6.2
- | | | |
|------|--------------|---|
| i) | First phase | 1 year, extendable upto 6 months by SLNA |
| ii) | Second phase | 2 ½ years |
| iii) | Third phase | <u>1 year</u> |
| | Total | 4 ½ years extendable upto 5 years by SLNA |
| | | Further extendable upto 5 ½ years by DoLR |
- 46 Several suggestions for improvement offered by officers at state, district and PIA levels 6.3
- 47 With respect of grant, a third category for mountainous states/areas may be created 6.3
- 48 The level of per hectare funding should be raised substantially to neutralize the rise in cost of material and cost of labour etc. 6.3
- 49 DoLR should institute a mechanism under which per hectare norms of funding are regularly updated at every 3 years interval so as to neutralize the effect of rise in costs 6.3
- 50 Government may streamline the procedure for release of funds so that avoidable delays are minimised 6.3
- 51 Vacant positions should be filled at most within three months. A list of positions lying vacant for more than six months should be sent every month by the PIA to WCDC and WCDC may accordingly inform the SLNA when necessary 6.3
- 52 High quality of professional staff, on whom the success of the programme depends, should be paid appropriate competitive salary. If necessary, additional funds for this purpose may be earmarked 6.3
- 53 Wage rates to be paid to labour under IWMP should be revised upward taking into account the present cost of living and wages paid under MGNREGS 6.3
- 54 States may be asked to give more emphasis on capacity building activities. Target for training should be fixed in advance in such a manner that all concerned functionaries also get an opportunity for participating in the training programme considered useful for them . 6.3
- 55 Every effort should be made to ensure greater convergence of IWMP with other related programmes of the government. Regular monitoring of convergence and follow up should take place at both district and state levels 6.3

(x)

Chapter I

Introduction

1.1 Salient features of IWMP

There has been an increasing emphasis on development of watersheds in recent years in India. Many forest and non-forest areas are degraded and producing bio-mass far below their potential. Water harvesting structures help in storing water and providing adequate time for water to percolate into the ground thereby raising the level of ground water also. As a result, farming would improve and productivity of land would increase. Watershed development is regarded as useful to address problems of soil and water management of rainfed / degraded areas in the country. The objective is to increase the watershed retention capacity for rainwater by increasing infiltration, surface storage at specific locations, utilizing rainwater on site to reduce erosion and consequent sediment hazard and provide better crop and plant management so as to increase crop productivity and biomass production etc. Development of watersheds, therefore, helps to improve rural livelihoods through enhancing income and productivity in a sustained manner. The Department of Land Resources (DoLR), Ministry of Rural Development, Government of India, has been an important agency for launching schemes for development of watersheds for quite some time. The Department took a major initiative on February 26, 2009 when it started an Integrated Watershed Management Programme (IWMP) by integrating and consolidating its erstwhile programmes of DPAP, DDP and IWDP. Since then, this programme is being implemented as per Common Guidelines for Watershed Development Projects, 2008 (Revised Edition-2011).

IWMP is an all India programme which, as of April 2013, covered 550 districts as per details provided in **Annexure 1.1**. (The numbers might have changed since then, but structural features as described below would be more or less the same). Thus, almost the entire country has been covered under this programme. A glance at statistics as provided in Annexure 1.1 shows that the area covered per project has been more or less uniform in different states. But a great diversity across different states prevails with regard to number of IWMP projects sanctioned upto 2012-13. Maharashtra had 948 projects followed by Rajasthan with 749 projects and Andhra Pradesh 556. On the other hand, Sikkim had only 11 projects. Even among the major states, Punjab had as low as 45 projects, Haryana 60 and Bihar 64. Part of this huge differential lies in topographical and climatic conditions influencing the potential of this programme in terms of treatable areas in different states as well as different sizes of the states. Diversity, however, also prevails with respect to project density in districts covered under this programme. This is indicated by the average number of projects sanctioned per district covered under this programme in a state. Andhra Pradesh with about 43 projects per district has the highest penetration, followed by Maharashtra with about 29 projects and Rajasthan with 23 projects per district. At the bottom is Sikkim and Punjab with about 3 projects per covered district. J&K, Haryana, Jharkhand have around 4 to 5 per covered district. There was

greater diversity with respect to district wise achievements even within a state ranging from 67 projects in Satara district to 4 in Gadchiroli district in Maharashtra and from 86 projects in Anantpur district to 2 in Warangal district in Andhra Pradesh.

While launching the new integrated programme, a few new features were also added. These include dedicated institutions with multi-disciplinary professional support at State/District/Project levels to implement the programme, flexibility in the project duration (4 to 7 years) and differential cost norm of Rs.12,000/ha for the plains, Rs.15,000/ha for the hilly & difficult areas and up to Rs.15,000/ha for IAP Districts. Further, livelihood activities, production systems and micro-enterprises were also added to watershed programme, which hitherto consisted of conventional activities such as water harvesting, recharging of the ground water table and prevention of surface soil run off. These new activities were expected to increase utilization of the potential generated by watershed activities and provide livelihoods and enhanced income to families falling within the watershed area. Skill development through exposure visits and training to enterprising individuals as also to Self Help Groups (SHGs) became added advantages of IWMP, which has thus become a multidimensional programme. An idea of the varied range of activities undertaken can be had from the details provided in section 1.2 below. IWMP projects have thus most of the components that are needed for rural development and basic needs of villagers. In this way, a paradigm shift in the approach took place with the launching of IWMP.

The programme is spread over three phases namely, the Preparatory Phase (1 to 2 years), the Watershed Works Phase (2 to 3 years) and the Consolidation and Withdrawal Phase (1 to 2 years). Of these, watershed works phase is quite important as 75% of the total budget is earmarked for this purpose. This phase has 3 components (a) watershed development work, (b) livelihood activities for asset-less persons and (c) production system and micro-enterprises. The programme is implemented on a participatory basis with the active cooperation provided by village community. Institutional back up is available at centre, state, district and village levels. Rules and guidelines have been laid down by the Department of Land Resources for allocation of funds among states and for sanction of projects by the state governments. These are explained in Chapter 2.

Entry point activities (EPA) during preparatory phase is one of the instruments for the project officials to establish rapport with the villagers to gain their confidence. For this purpose, 4% of the total budget allocation has been earmarked under the programme. In every watershed area, these activities have to be carried out upon sanction of the project, but with the agreement of the villagers. The works selected under this head should be beneficial for the entire community. The Project Implementing Agency (PIA) at the local levels calls meeting of the villagers to get feedback as to what activities are important for them in order of priority and depending upon the availability of funds, works are selected. Different types of activities are carried out depending upon area specific needs of the villagers which vary across the states. Brief details of EPA and other activities in the five sample states are given below.

1.2 An Illustrative List of Activities Undertaken under IWMP

(i) Entry Point Activities (EPA)

Entry point activities are part of community mobilisation process, taken up as short term initiatives so as to establish rapport with the community as well as motivate them to involve themselves in the project.

Activities taken up under this component vary somewhat between states as different priorities were assigned by states to various types of activities based on the felt needs of the people of the area, as indicated by them. A few unique activities as different from the routine ones such as drinking water structures, solar street lights etc., benefitting the entire villages and undertaken in each state, are worth mentioning here.

In one of the watersheds (Wah Tyrshi & Wah Latang) of West Jaintia Hills district in Meghalaya, one suspension foot over-bridge was constructed on Wah Leteng Stream with an expenditure of Rs.14 lakhs. 6 villages benefitted from the bridge to cross the stream for their routine activity of doing cultivation. Before, it took 5 Kms. for the farmers to reach their fields. In some of the watersheds, Community Chairs for conduct of meetings / group discussions etc. were provided on demand by the villagers. This was apart from creating drinking water hubs (concrete check dams with washing place) in most watershed villages where water fetching by the females was from far off places, largely associated with the problem of commuting, due to hilly / difficult terrain of the state.

In Himachal Pradesh, vegetable cultivation was done by many a SHGs. Marketing was a problem for them at individual levels. Under Watershed Management programme, a number of vegetable collection and marketing Centres were opened at convenient locations and as such, marketing problems of SHGs were sorted out to a great extent.

In Odisha, several school bags to needy students were distributed in some of the schools of Kandhamal district. In a number of renovated and newly constructed village tanks, bathing platforms for villagers were built. In another village in Khordha district of Odisha, changing rooms for females were also constructed.

In Udaipur district of Rajasthan, burial grounds to perform last rights of the deceased were constructed on demand by the villagers. Earlier to this, they had to dispose off the dead body in the open after burning, thereby creating environmental problems. In this district, at places, cemented chairs near the places of worship were also built as part of EPA.

One of unique activities taken up under EPA in some of the watershed villages in Andhra Pradesh, was for supplying purified drinking water on sustainable basis. But, the response was not that good as it was associated with some nominal payment. Solar street lights under convergence with Non-conventional Energy Development

Corporation of Andhra Pradesh (NEDCAP) were also installed in several villages, in both Mahabubnagar and Chittoor districts. This is besides artificial insemination camps for cattle organised in several villages.

(ii) Skill improvement

The other activity undertaken during preparatory phase comprised of Institution and Capacity Building against which 5 % of the total watershed funds had been allocated. Basically, the capacity building training aimed at improving the working knowledge of the beneficiaries both at the individual as well as group levels so as to increase their productivity in their respective trades or vocations by following the improved practices. Many a times, the beneficiaries were taken on a ride to far off places (even outside the state). The skill improvement training was also imparted to staff involved in watershed development at various levels so that they were equipped to handle their work more efficiently. Many a occasions, skill development training was imparted by subject matter specialists available locally and when not available, by those hired from outside on honorary basis.

(iii) Watershed Development Works

Next activity pertains to watershed development works under which measures concerning land improvement, soil and water conservation, cost effective farming system etc. were taken up. The activities under this component varied between states as well as across watersheds even within a state and a district. For this activity, 56% of the total funds available under IWMP is earmarked. Works taken up under this category may be classified into (1) treatment of arable land, (2) treatment of non-arable land and (3) drainage line treatment

Under treatment of arable land, activities like contour bunding, bench terracing, peripheral bunding, crop demonstration, improvement of existing paddy fields, compost pits, agro-horticulture and agro-forestry etc. were taken up whereas under treatment of non-arable land, a limited number of activities, such as strip plantation, afforestation, improvement of natural forests / degraded and pasture lands, etc. were being planned. But, as of drainage line treatment, a number of activities as construction of farm ponds, check dams, head dams, diversion weirs, water harvesting structures, dug-out ponds etc. were targeted.

(iv) Livelihood activities for asset-less persons

This activity aims at providing livelihood support to asset-less persons who may form into homogenous groups, known as Self Help Groups (SHGs) of 5 to 10 members each or who may avail assistance at individual level, to start micro production & enterprises of their own. At individual level, the assistance was limited to Rs.5000/- whereas in case of group, it was Rs.25000/-. In either case, the amount was one time. The activities generally pursued at individual level and group levels were, tailoring, carpentry, grocery, soap making, mud-hole block making, piggery, beauty parlour, photography, hair cutting saloon, shoe making, vegetable cultivation etc. In Khordha

district of Odisha, two hawkers, who were doing wage activity earlier, were brought under the purview of IWMP for livelihood activity. They were provided with an assistance of Rs.5,000/- each. With this money, they started selling eatables in moving trains and earning Rs.200-300 per day as against Rs.100 or so for about 8 months from wage activity in a year earlier. In a similar case in this district, one distress woman of Pitapali village having no source of income and living on beggary, was provided a sum of Rs.5000/- under Livelihood component of IWMP and with this amount she started purchasing and selling of eggs by moving from place to place. As per her report, she earned between Rs.100-150 a day and managed her living in a much better way.

1.3 Report of the Parliamentary Standing Committee

The Parliamentary Standing Committee on Rural Development in its 28th report has pointed out the need to review the existing demand driven approach of IWMP since this provides considerable scope for shifting the responsibilities of the executing/implementing organizations to the beneficiaries. In other words, there would not be any pre-determined targets. Further lower utilization of funds is often correlated with lower generation of demand. This also tends to hide administrative inefficiency and/or conceptual flaws in the programme, if any. The Parliamentary Standing Committee, therefore, recommended that a study of IWMP may be made to analyze the shortcomings of the demand driven approach and explore the feasibility of re-introducing the target oriented approach.

1.4 Study Focus and Objectives

As can be seen from the above, the study is concerned with examining the comparative strengths and weaknesses of the demand driven approach and target oriented approach. In other words, the focus of the study is on institutional aspects of IWMP. Other aspects are to be examined only to the extent to which these are found to have a bearing on the above aspect. It may also be noted that this is not an evaluation study of IWMP. In the light of the above, the objectives of the study are as below.

- i. To pragmatically analyze the advantages and shortcomings of the demand driven approach of IWMP vis-a-vis the target-oriented approach
- ii. To explore the possibility as to how the target oriented approach could be made suitable and effective so as to re-introduce it.
- iii. To give suggestions for improving the functioning of IWMP.

1.5 Methodology and Scope

The Department of Land Resources selected the following 5 states, one each from different regions of the country and two districts from each state for conducting the study. .

| Region | State | Best Performing Districts | Worst Performing Districts |
|---------------|--------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
|---------------|--------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|

| | | | |
|------------|------------------|---------------|-----------------|
| Northern | Himachal Pradesh | Shimla | Bilaspur |
| Western | Rajasthan | Udaipur | Dholpur |
| North-East | Meghalaya | Jaintia Hills | East Garo Hills |
| Eastern | Odisha | Kandhamal | Khordha |
| Southern | Andhra Pradesh | Chittor | Mahabubnagar |

During the course of the field study, in early June 2014 in Meghalaya, serious disturbances suddenly erupted in the district of East Garo Hills, the district under our sample. The militants belonging to the Garo National Liberation Army (GNLA) blew off the head of a 35 year old woman. The disturbances persisted for a few days. The entire state was in turmoil. Hence, it was not considered safe for our field team to work in this district during severe disturbances specially as the team had to go deep into the interior to conduct study of watersheds. The only logical option was to conduct the study in some other district having similar performance. Hence, in consultation with the State Director and C.E.O. SLNA, this district was replaced by West Khasi Hills. The Department of Land Resources was kept informed of this problem through our letter of June 06, 2014. No such problem arose in any other district. Moreover, as the old Jaintia Hills district was split into two districts of East and West, the SLNA Meghalaya selected West Jaintia Hills for the study. Thus in Meghalaya, the two sample districts studied were West Jaintia Hills and West Khasi Hills. The list of the ten districts actually studied is given below.

List of districts selected for study

| Region | State | Best Performing Districts | Worst Performing Districts |
|------------|------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|
| Northern | Himachal Pradesh | Shimla | Bilaspur |
| Western | Rajasthan | Udaipur | Dholpur |
| North-East | Meghalaya | West Jaintia Hills | West Khasi Hills |
| Eastern | Odisha | Kandhamal | Khordha |
| Southern | Andhra Pradesh | Chittor | Mahaboob Nagar |

The above sample of 5 states and of 2 districts in each selected state, one having best performance and another having worst performance was expected to help in capturing variations across states as well as within a state, so as to provide a diverse experience for deriving appropriate insights and lessons relevant for the study. Thereafter, at least two watershed projects under IWMP were selected in each district for an in depth study in accordance with the methodology described below. Care was taken to ensure that the selected projects had a long period in existence so that they could provide considerable experience for the study. To the extent possible, the selected projects were situated far from each other so as to capture diversity to the maximum possible extent.

After arriving in the selected districts, the study team collected an upto date list of ongoing projects taken up under IWMP between 2009-10 to 2013-14. It was observed

that those watershed projects which had been initiated during the first two years i.e., 2009-10 & 2010-11 had passed through preparatory phase and were under watershed phase. Such projects had the potential to provide experience for both the stages of the work. There was no IWMP project in any state which was running in the third phase. On the other hand, projects started during 2011-12 to 2012-13, were mostly under preparatory phase thereby providing limited experience. The projects started in the year 2013-14 had even more limited experience to offer. Hence, the projects started only in the first two years i.e., 2009-10 and 2010-11 were considered suitable for selection in the sample. It was also found that such projects in some of the selected districts were somewhat smaller in size. Hence, in such cases, in consultation with the district officials, a spot decision was taken to select more than 2 watersheds in these districts. In some of the districts, 3 watersheds were selected while in a few cases, 4 watersheds were selected. Thus, a total 32 watersheds in the place of the originally stipulated 20, were selected as per details given below.

Districtwise List of Watersheds covered under the study

| Name of the District | State | No. of Watershed Covered |
|----------------------|------------------|--------------------------|
| West Jaintia Hills | Meghalaya | 3 |
| West Khasi Hills | -do- | 2 |
| Bilaspur | Himachal Pradesh | 2 |
| Shimla | -do- | 3 |
| Kandhamal | Odisha | 4 |
| Khordha | -do- | 4 |
| Dholpur | Rajasthan | 4 |
| Udaipur | -do- | 3 |
| Mahabubnagar | Andhra Pradesh | 3 |
| Chittoor | -do- | 4 |
| Total | | 32 |

Thus, the study covered 32 watershed projects having varied level of performance with varied experiences under different agro. climatic and physical conditions representing various parts of the country. Such a sample is considered adequate for the purpose of this study. The complete list of the 32 watersheds. Is given below.

| |
|---|
| State wise Details of Micro Watersheds Covered Under the Study |
|---|

| S. No. | State | District | Block | Name of Panchayat/Village | Name of Micro Watershed |
|--------|------------------|------------------|------------------|---------------------------|---|
| 1 | Meghalaya | West Jaintia | Thadlaskien | Mukhla | Wah Leteng |
| 2 | Meghalaya | West Jaintia | Thadlaskien | Khliehtyrshi | Tyrshis Wahleteng |
| 3 | Meghalaya | West Jaintia | Thadlaskien | | Khieha Mynngi Watershed |
| 4 | Meghalaya | West Khasi Hills | Nongstoin | | Weinier Watershed |
| 5 | Meghalaya | West Khasi Hills | Nongstoin | | Umtynru Weisar Watershed |
| 6 | Himachal Pradesh | Bilaspur | Jhandutta | Barimian | Geharwin IWMP-2 |
| 7 | Himachal Pradesh | Shimla | Theog | Basa Theog | Basatheog |
| 8 | Himachal Pradesh | Shimla | Theog | Jais | Jais |
| 9 | Himachal Pradesh | Shimla | Basantpur | Basantpur | Basantpur |
| 10 | Himachal Pradesh | Bilaspur | Ghumarwin | Talyana | Tiun-Saruin(IWMP-3) |
| 11 | Odisha | Kandhamal | Phiringia | Taladandikia | Rushikulya W/A karandagada |
| 12 | Odisha | Kandhamal | Daringbadi | Badabanga | Bapujee Watershed |
| 13 | Odisha | Kandhamal | Daringbadi | Partamaha | Baskudi Partamola |
| 14 | Odisha | Kandhamal | Khanjuripada | Gudari | Dadpaju nalla |
| 15 | Odisha | Khordha | Khordha | Keranga | Rana nalla -5 |
| 16 | Odisha | Khordha | Khordha | Tangiapada | Rana nalla -3 |
| 17 | Odisha | Khordha | Jatni | Gangapada | Kajala Ganda nala-3 |
| 18 | Odisha | Khordha | Jatni | Haripur | Kadanda nall-6 |
| 19 | Rajasthan | Udaipur | Gogunda | Sayra | Baliya IWMP III |
| 20 | Rajasthan | Dholpur | Rajakheda | Mahadpura | Mahadpura Dalir |
| 21 | Rajasthan | Dholpur | Rajakheda | Kashimpur | Sundarpur |
| 22 | Rajasthan | Dholpur | Bari | Dhanara | Dhanora IWMP II |
| 23 | Rajasthan | Dholpur | Bari | Rupaspur | Ggaderpura IWMP-II |
| 24 | Rajasthan | Udaipur | Sarada | Katanwada | Sarada- IWMP-II |
| 25 | Rajasthan | Udaipur | Giwa | Paduna | Chalawada - IWMP-II |
| 26 | Telangana | Mahabubnagar | Midjil Mandal | Revally | Urkonda |
| 27 | Telangana | Mahabubnagar | Timajipet Mandal | Koduparthi | Kodu parthy |
| 28 | Telangana | Mahabubnagar | Kondurg Mandal | Kondurg | Kondurg |
| 29 | Andhra Pradesh | Chittoor | Penumery | Pulikallu | Pulikallu |
| 30 | Andhra Pradesh | Chittoor | S.R.Puram | Padmapuram | Padmapuram |
| 31 | Andhra Pradesh | Chittoor | Santhpuram | Kadapalli | Kadapalli Microwatershed/ Rallabuduguru project |
| 32 | Andhra Pradesh | Chittoor | Yerravaripalem | Bodevandlapalli | Bodevandlapalli Microwatershed/Ellamandha Project |

To sum up, the sample consisted of 5 states, 10 districts and 32 watersheds.

1.6 Sources of information

Data and information were collected from both secondary and primary sources. Information available from published sources including Government of India publications, guidelines and report of committees etc. as well as circulars and guidelines issued by sample states were reviewed. Evaluation reports of the IWMP as available for some states were also studied. Relevant documents concerning the project were accessed and examined. An analysis of the Common Guidelines for Watershed Development Projects, 2008 (Revised Edition-2011) was made. A complete district-wise list of watersheds upto the year 2012-13 as well as 28th Report of the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Rural Development of the Department of Land Resources were also obtained. Other published information was hardly available since IWMP came into being only 5 years ago. Hence, a greater part of the information needed for this purpose was collected from primary sources by getting feedback directly from stakeholders at different levels e.g. state, district, project and village. For this purpose, visits were made by the study team to the state and district headquarters, PIA offices and watershed project sites for discussion with officials and functionaries at different levels on the basis of the respective schedules as described below. Discussions were also held with project functionaries, members of the Watershed Committees, Self Help Groups, User Groups and beneficiaries. Discussions were held first with the state level officers, followed by district level officers and down below. This process helped in getting first hand information, not available otherwise.

1.7 Instruments of observation

In order to collect information from primary sources, the following schedules were developed and administered in person by members of the study team of this Institute. Discussions were also held at respective levels.

1. Schedule for State Level Nodal Agency (SLNA)
2. Schedule for District Level Watershed Cell and Data Centre (WCDC).
3. Schedule for Project Implementation Agency(PIA)
4. Schedule for Village Level Watershed Committee (WC)

In addition, there was a list of key Points for Focus Group Discussion with knowledgeable persons at the village level and key functionaries at the project level.

The type of questions asked veered round the terms of reference mentioned earlier namely finding out the advantages and shortcomings of the two institutional frameworks. Information with respect to elements of institutional capacity like IEC activities, training, institutional structure, monitoring mechanism, speed of decision making by the village panchayats, extent of empowerment at different levels, accountability, transparency, advantages and drawbacks of people's participation etc. were collected. Reasons for varying performance were looked into. Annexure 1.2 reproduces the schedules used for the study.

Apart from responses to the questionnaires, a good deal of information specially views were also obtained during discussion at all levels more particularly at the district and state levels. These discussions also helped to remove misunderstandings of a few questions by the respondents resulting in modification in their responses to the questionnaires in some cases. Such discussions at the state level were specially useful. Annexure 1.3 provides information on dates of visits to different states and list of officers (as provided under acknowledgement) with whom interactions were held. Thereafter, clarifications, wherever necessary, were obtained through telephonic exchanges and / or email messages.

1.8 Progress of the study

The study was supposed to commence from April, 2014. But notification of the General Election, 2014, came on 5th March, 2014. And the model code of conduct came into force with immediate effect. Election results were announced on May 16 and a new government came into being on 26th May, 2014. Because of this, it became difficult to get the support and cooperation of the state governments for the field visit for almost two months of April and May, 2014. By the end of that time, rainy season had come in the two states of Himachal Pradesh and Meghalaya which we had thought of visiting before the onset of the monsoon. This proved to be another contributory factor beyond our control which had the effect of delaying the progress of the field work as planned to take place specially as the places to be visited were deep in the interior of the districts. Another factor beyond our control was sudden eruption of violent disturbance in Garo Hills district of Meghalaya. This district had been allotted for field survey by the DoLR. The situation became critical while our field survey team was to be in that district. With the advice and guidance of the SLNA of Meghalaya, we had to suspend the field study in that district about which we informed the DoLR also. As per advice of the SLNA, another district namely West Khasi Hills was taken up. Meanwhile, time was lost. The last hurdle affecting progress, a quite serious one, that was faced was due to bifurcation of the state of Andhra Pradesh which had been allotted for the study by DoLR. It took several weeks before the administrative machinery in the two states of Andhra Pradesh and Telengana could be stabilized. Immediately thereafter, we rushed our field study team to these two states. The factors mentioned above, which were beyond our control, had the effect of slowing down its progress to some extent.

Chapter-2

Allocation of Target Area and Fund to States and Down Below

2.1 Allocation of target area to states

According to the information provided by DoLR to the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Rural Development for its 28th report, the erstwhile DPAP, DDP and IWDP were demand driven programmes as no state wise targets were specified for them. Central funds were released on receipt of complete claim proposals from respective states. No funds were released to a state in case no proposal complete in all respects was received. But, in the case of IWMP, ever since it came into being in February 2009 after the merger of DPAP, DDP and IWDP, state wise targets are indicated in the beginning based on the following criteria within the framework of a 18 years state wise perspective plan prepared in 2009 based on scientific data.

(i) Identified DPAP/DDP areas in the State as percentage of total DPAP and DDP area in the country.

(ii) Identified DPAP/DDP areas as percentage of total area of the State.

(iii) Total treatable wastelands in the State as percentage of total treatable. wastelands in the country.

(iv) Total SC/ST population of the State as percentage of total SC/ST population of the country.

(v) 10% mandatory allocation to North-Eastern States.

Thus, apart from the extent of wastelands in a state, other criteria are also taken into consideration for determination of the target area. The area sanctioned, therefore, may not be in proportion to extent of wastelands in the state.+

In order to cover all the states, a minimum tentative allocation of area following the above criteria is made in the beginning of the year which remains valid upto a certain date after which the programme is operated on `first-come-first-serve`basis. In view of this, the programme also becomes demand driven to some extent. As a result, the area sanctioned in a year becomes higher than the minimum target allocated in some states, as can be seen from the table below for the five sample states.

| S.No. | Name of the State | 2009-10 | | 2010-11 | |
|-------|-------------------|------------------|-------------------|------------------|-------------------|
| | | Target allocated | Target Sanctioned | Target allocated | Target sanctioned |
| 1 | Andhra Pradesh | 0.44 | 0.4734 | 0.693 | 0.7409 |
| 2 | Himachal Pradesh | 0.09 | 0.2038 | 0.138 | 0.238 |
| 3 | Odisha | 0.22 | 0.336 | NA | NA |
| 4 | Raiasthan | 0.8 | 0.9256 | 1.254 | 1.257 |
| 5 | Meghalaya | NA | NA | 0.046 | 0.052 |

NA . Not Applicable

Source: 28th Report of the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Rural Development, p.16.

2.2 Allocation of target area to districts and down below

Each state, in turn, decides the number of projects to be taken up in the state, their location and the area under each project. Selection of projects by states, is also based on certain criteria. These are moisture index/DPAP/DDP Block, percentage of net sown area that is un-irrigated/rain-fed, percentage of degraded land, productivity potential of the land, contiguity to another watershed that has already been developed/treated, cluster approach (more than one contiguous micro-watersheds), drinking water shortage, percentage of SC/ST population, incidence of seasonal or long term distress out-migration, percentage of small and marginal farmers, extent of deviation of actual wages of farm labour from declared minimum wages and depth of ground water table. Moreover, in order to take up new projects under IWMP, the States have to submit State Perspective and Strategic Plan (SPSP) approved by the SLNA. This is a long-term plan to develop all the treatable watersheds in the State, after excluding all untreatable areas (e.g. area under assured irrigation, area already treated under various watershed programmes etc.). Preparation of SPSP is a one-time exercise.

2.3 Preparation of preliminary project reports

Thereafter, States prepare project wise Preliminary Project Reports (PPRs) for project area to be developed in a particular year as per the allocation of target area by the Department of Land Resources, to States. The PPRs include GIS based maps indicating area already covered under watershed programmes of different departments, area proposed to be taken up under IWMP for a particular year and plan for covering balance treatable area. The PPRs, approved by the SLNA, are then presented by the State before the Steering Committee of the Government of India under the Chairmanship of Secretary (Land Resources) for appraisal & clearance. The Steering Committee has members from Planning Commission, National Rainfed Area Authority (NRAA), technical experts from different scientific institutions, voluntary organizations, related Departments of the Central and State Governments. Based on appraisal and clearance of Steering Committee, the projects are sanctioned by the States.

2.4 Release of central assistance

The procedure followed for release of central assistance to states has undergone changes. According to the earlier procedure laid down by DoLR, the release was made on the basis of specific proposals from SLNA. Central assistance for IWMP was released in 3 installments to SLNA. The 1st installment comprising of preparatory phase activities i.e., 20% of the central share was released straightaway upon sanction of the project by the SLNA. The projects were eligible for claiming the 2nd installment of 50% of central share on expenditure of 60% of the 1st installment. Similarly projects were eligible for 3rd installment of 30% of central share on proper certification of expenditure of 75% of the total funds released earlier. Experience with the above procedure showed that there were huge unspent balances lying with a number of SLNAs in different states. In order to tackle this problem and to ensure the availability of funds for smooth implementation of IWMP the operational guidelines for release of central assistance to states were revised in June, 2012.

According to the revised guidelines, which are in operation since June 2012, the central assistance is released in lump-sum to SLNA on the basis of annual plan of fund requirement furnished by it. This requirement should clearly indicate batch-wise and

phase-wise physical activities to be undertaken and corresponding financial requirement on quarterly basis. The funds are ordinarily released in two installments every year. The first installment is equivalent to 60% of the estimated annual fund requirement of SLNA including unspent balance available with it as on 1st April or from requirement for six months whichever is less. The next installment is to be released after utilization of 60% of the funds of 1st installment (including unspent balance) and submission of corresponding physical progress, utilization certificate, audited statement of accounts, for the preceding financial year, by the SLNA. Intra and inter-transfer of funds from one batch to another is allowed. In order to claim central assistance for works phase of a batch of projects, SLNA is required to submit evaluation report of preparatory phase of projects. Similarly, for claiming the central assistance for consolidation & withdrawal phase of a batch of projects, SLNA is required to submit the evaluation report of the works phase. These evaluation reports (consolidated and batch-wise) along with action taken report on the recommendations of the evaluator, are to be submitted before claim of balance 40% of annual requirement..

Chapter-3

Demand Driven Vs. Target Oriented Approach

3.1 Conceptual dimensions

In view of the observations of the Parliamentary Standing Committee in Para 2.4 of its report and subsequent terms of reference for this study communicated by the DoLR, the present study tried to seek views of the state and district level authorities of all the five sample states as to whether they regarded IWMP, as currently operated as a demand driven or target oriented programme. All of them held the view that IWMP as currently operated is a target oriented programme at higher levels i.e. national, state and district levels and, demand driven at watershed level. According to them, allocation of funds and targets for every state are fixed by the DoLR with respect to criteria spelled out in the previous chapter based on which an eighteen year state-wise perspective plan from 2009-10 onward has been prepared. Thereafter, the states fix targets for districts based on specified criteria also spelled out in the earlier chapter. Thereafter, the districts determine the location of watersheds based on specified criteria. Thus, it is top to bottom target oriented approach and not bottom to top demand driven approach.

Some element of demand driven approach, however, enters at this level also. As already mentioned in the previous chapter, in order to cover all the states, a minimum tentative allocation of area following well specified criteria is made in the beginning of the year which remains valid upto a certain date after which the programme is operated on first-cum-first-serve basis. It is only in this respect and to this extent that the programme may be viewed as demand driven at the higher level. This additionality, however, is ultimately dependent on performance at the watershed level where the activities to be taken up are planned from below. These are decided by the beneficiaries through a participatory approach. Thus, IWMP in a sense may be viewed as a mixture of both target oriented and demand driven approaches. But it may be treated as demand driven if the focus is on the watershed level since it is the activities at this level that determine the overall performance of IWMP even at the district, state and national level. Perhaps the Parliamentary Committee may be having this focus in its mind when it prepared its report. This aspect would have been more illuminating if it had been made explicit. If this interpretation is correct, then the suggestion to transform the programme from demand driven approach to target oriented one is essentially concerned with the functioning of the programme at the watershed level and not at higher levels. This is how the functionaries at the state, district, PIA and watershed levels also understood the context and gave their views accordingly. Replies from all of them were focused on approach at the watershed level and not at higher levels. Hence the contents of this chapter apply mainly to the functioning of IWMP at the watershed level.

3.2 Advantages and disadvantages of the two approaches

In view of the above, the relevant policy question for future is whether the programme at the watershed level should be demand driven or target oriented or a mixed one. Here, it is necessary to analyse the advantages and shortcomings of both the demand driven and target oriented approaches on an apriori basis as well as with regard to the view points of states which are the major stakeholders.

Target oriented approach has the advantage that it can cover all the states and all the areas in a state where the programme is needed in public interest. It imposes a certain responsibility on the concerned bureaucratic machinery to deliver the outcome and make it accountable for lapses, if any. There is pressure to complete the work and utilize funds in time and take necessary steps for the same. But the shortcoming is that the quality of the assets created under the programme cannot be ensured. The programme can not be effective at the grass root level if public is not fully involved in the process of decision making with respect to activities to be undertaken. This is one of the reasons why the earlier programmes of DPAP etc. did not have the desired impact in most of the places. Hence, an element of demand driven approach is advantageous to ensure quality and impact. But this approach too has some shortcomings. Firstly, as the Parliamentary Committee has pointed out, it may provide a cloak for bureaucratic inefficiency. Bureaucratic deficiencies can easily be shifted over to lack of or inadequacy of interest shown by the beneficiaries. As a result, the areas which need watershed management, may remain deprived of it. This amounts to sub-optimal utilization of resources. This aspect, therefore, was kept in view while making enquiries at watershed, district and state levels in all the states.

3.3 Views of functionaries on advantages and disadvantages

Opinion on advantages and disadvantages of the two approaches was obtained from government officials at the state, district levels and from people at the watershed level. These were obtained independently of each other for the purpose of cross checking. The views are mentioned below.

3.3.1 Target oriented approach:

There was no response from any state level official on advantages as well as disadvantages of the target oriented approach under IWMP. But the district level officials from Andhra Pradesh, Himachal Pradesh and Rajasthan have opined that target oriented approach helps in timely implementation of the project and attainment of the targets. Andhra Pradesh district officials have also mentioned that funds would be spent in the allocated manner. But, there was no response from Meghalaya and Odisha.

The disadvantages of target oriented approach mentioned by district level officials are as follows. Demand needs of people will not be addressed (Andhra Pradesh, Odisha), quality and usefulness of work not assured (Andhra Pradesh and Rajasthan), hard to execute the work without involvement of people (Rajasthan), sustainability of work without people involvement not assured (Rajasthan) and no provision for maintenance of assets (Rajasthan). There was no response from district officials of Meghalaya.

3.3.2 Demand driven approach

State level replies

Several advantages of demand driven approach have been mentioned by state level officers. This system ensures peoples participation in full (Rajasthan) and while from Andhra Pradesh, it is reported that for every component, action plans are prepared by the watershed committees and activities are grounded as per the plans resulting in effective implementation and active participation by the community. According to Himachal Pradesh SLNA, demand driven approach (i) is more participatory, sustainable and equitable, (ii) it ensures promotion of integrated and holistic development of area, (iii) facilitates focus on coordination and brings convergence within and among agriculture and wasteland development programme, (iv) facilitates proper size and selection of watersheds, (v) provides greater flexibility in implementation and (vi) facilitates smooth monitoring and evaluation process. There was no response from Meghalaya.

Odisha is the only state which has indicated the following disadvantages of demand driven approach.

- (i) Risk of fragmentation,
- (ii) Risk of inequitable distribution of benefits at time,
- (iii) One may have to compromise with technical requirements,
- (iv) The preparatory phase at time is not adequate for vision building
- (v) Demand creation and implementation affected if conflicts arise within the community and as such external monitoring becomes a difficult entity.

District level replies

The district level officers too have mentioned several advantages of demand driven approach, which are mentioned below.

Meghalaya

- (I) It allows rural people to fulfill their needs and requirements,
- (II) It brings enthusiasm and cooperation from people
- (III) It speeds up the process of implementation

Odisha

- (I) Fulfillment of requirements of the community
- (II) Changes the status of rural people through multifarious activities

Rajasthan

- (I) Useful work
- (II) Easy to execute

- (III) Maintenance assured

Andhra Pradesh

- (I) Ownership and management by community,
- (II) Emergence of need based programmes
- (III) Good impact
- (IV) Villagers involvement in planning and Implementation
- (V) Creation of good assets

The district level officials have also indicated some disadvantages under demand driven approach. It puts too much pressure on the PIA and creates misunderstanding among stakeholders (Meghalaya). It also provides scope for untimely release of funds apart from changing the mindset of some people (Odisha). Timely progress is not assured (Rajasthan). But district officials of Andhra Pradesh and Himachal Pradesh did not mention any disadvantage.

Thus, the authorities at both the state and district levels have greater awareness of the relative advantages of demand driven approach as compared to target oriented approach. Their views pertain to activities at the watershed level, which is the operational level.

Watershed level replies

Representatives of watersheds were also asked to give their views on advantages and disadvantages of both the approaches. Their responses are given below. There was no response from one watershed in Meghalaya.

Table 3.1

Advantages of demand driven approach under IWMP as perceived by watershed representatives

| State | Advantages | No. of responses |
|------------------|---|------------------|
| Meghalaya | Involvement of people in planning and implementation | 2 |
| | Work done as per needs of beneficiaries | 2 |
| Himachal Pradesh | Villagers were given opportunity to select their activities and technology | 5 |
| Odisha | Well organized watershed associations can complete the project in less time | 4 |
| | Public participation assured | 2 |
| | Increase in collection of WDF | 2 |
| Andhra Pradesh | Involvement of people in planning & Implementation | 3 |
| | Ownership and management by community | 4 |
| Rajasthan | Villagers choice of activities and technology taken into account. | 6 |
| | Work done as per needs of beneficiaries | 1 |
| All | | 31 |

A thematic analysis of the above responses is presented in the following table

Table 3.2

Advantages of demand driven approach under IWMP as perceived by watershed representatives

| Type of advantage | No of responses |
|--|-----------------|
| Villages/beneficiaries were given an opportunity to select their activities and technology | 11 |
| Public participation-Involvement of people in planning and implementation | 7 |
| Work done as per needs of beneficiaries | 3 |
| Ownership and management by community | 4 |
| Well organized watershed associations can complete the project in less time | 4 |
| Increase in collection of WDF | 2 |
| All | 31 |

As against these, very few of the watershed representatives (only 2 from Odisha) have mentioned shortcomings of demand driven approach as the following table would indicate. (These respondents had mentioned advantages also).

Table 3.3

Shortcomings of demand driven approach under IWMP as perceived by watershed representatives

| State | Shortcomings | No. of respondents |
|--------|---|--------------------|
| Odisha | Sometimes, technological knowhow is compromised to some extent. More demand also results in delay | 2 |

3.4 Preference between the two approaches

The authorities were also asked to indicate their choice between the two approaches. Their responses are given below.

State Level Responses

Preference for Demand Driven Approach . Andhra Pradesh, Himachal Pradesh and Rajasthan

Target Oriented Approach . None

Mixed Approach (Both Demand Driven and Target Oriented) . Meghalaya and Odisha

The reasons given by Meghalaya and Odisha for a mixed approach, as reproduced below, fail to make a convincing case for it. These do not provide any valid reason. These only indicate the manner in which targets should be fixed in a demand driven approach.

Meghalaya:

(a) The need/demand should be based as per the locality & the peoples requirement.

(b) Targets should be also incorporate into the plan of action at a Block level or District level based on the broader requirements at such levels.+

Odisha:

There may be mix of demands and targets. Activities may be standardized/ structured (with appropriate units and cost structures). Activities found to be matching to the geo-physical as well as socio economic demands of the watershed can be represented in its standard units so as to facilitate fixing year wise physical and financial targets (without compromising the varied demands across geographic regions) at the end of preparation phase.+

District Level Responses

Demand Driven Approach - All the 10 districts of 5 states have indicated their preference for this approach

Target Oriented Approach . None.

Thus , there is near unanimity among authorities at the state and district levels in favour of the existing demand driven approach at the watershed level. It is the beneficiaries who should decide the list of activities to be taken up at this level. But, as mentioned earlier, only the state level authorities in Meghalaya and Odisha have indicated the choice in favour of mixed approach, ie they want to retain the demand driven

approach, but would also like to supplement it with target oriented approach for reasons which are reproduced above.

Watershed level Responses

Representatives of watersheds also gave their views whether IWMP should be made target oriented or should remain demand driven at the watershed level, as it is now. Only a very few (6) were in favour of target oriented approach while a vast majority (26) of them were against it mainly on account of inferior quality of assets created (see table 3.5).

Table 3.4

Views of the watershed representatives in favour of making the IWMP programme target oriented

| State | Response | No. of rep. cases |
|----------------|---|--------------------------|
| Odisha | For timely and smooth completion of project | 4 |
| Andhra Pradesh | Funds will be spent as per the allocated plan | 2 |
| All | | 6 |

Table 3.5

Reasons given by watershed representatives as to why IWMP should not be target oriented

| State | Response | No. of rep. Cases |
|------------------|--|--------------------------|
| Meghalaya | Peoples voice will be ignored under target system demand driven approach is based on peoples choice and participatory approach gives better results | 3 2 |
| Himachal Pradesh | Good quality asset cannot be created problem at planning level peoples views are not taken into account | 3 1 1 |
| Odisha | Peoples participation will be less no provision for cluster approach | 2 2 |
| Andhra Pradesh | Bottom up approach is missing if target oriented, quality will suffer | 3 2 |
| Rajasthan | Targets are always not met quality will not be good under target peoples views will not be taken into account | 1 4 2 |
| All | | 26 |

In order to get a clear idea of their views in this respect, watershed representatives were also asked to specify as to which of the approaches, between demand driven and target oriented ones they would like to prefer. Their responses revealed that 30 out of the 32 interviewed indicated their preference for demand driven approach under IWMP. While the remaining 2 (both from Andhra Pradesh) did not give

any view in this respect. Out of the 30 respondents, 28 also indicated reasons for their preferences while 2 from Odisha did not give any reason. Reasons given by the 28 are given below.

Table 3.6

Reasons given by watershed representatives for preferring demand driven approach

| Reasons for Preferences by watersheds | No. of rep. cases |
|---|--------------------------|
| -Work done in participatory method and hence people come closer to each other | 10 |
| -Choice of technology by villagers | 5 |
| -Need based activities are undertaken | 5 |
| -Empowerment of women | 2 |
| -Income generation | 2 |
| -Better care of assets created | 2 |
| -Implementation becomes easier | 2 |
| Total | 28 |

3.5 Summing up

It can be seen from the above that there is a broad consensus among functionaries at different levels (state, district and watershed) that demand driven approach is more suitable for IWMP than target oriented approach. They have, therefore, clearly indicated their preference for a demand driven approach at the watershed level because it encourages beneficiaries to select their activities and technology, induces enthusiasm and cooperation from people, helps in creation of good quality assets, provides greater flexibility in implementation, facilitates proper size and selection of watersheds, help in maintenance of the assets created, promotes integrated and holistic development of the area, etc. Its disadvantages have been mentioned by very few respondents only i.e., from Odisha at the state level, Meghalaya, Odisha and Rajasthan at district level and only two watersheds from Odisha. The disadvantages include risk of inequitable distribution of benefits at some time, compromise with technical requirements, misunderstanding among stakeholders and other problems if there are conflicts within the community, timely progress not assured etc. Efforts, therefore, should be made to ensure that these disadvantages are minimized as far as possible. In view of the clear cut and repeated preference for demand driven approach by functionaries at all levels in all the sample states, it is worth considering whether it is appropriate to replace this approach by target oriented approach which has been preferred by none. A few respondents (very few) have indicated their preference for a mixed approach. We may examine this suggestion in the last chapter.

Chaper-4

Appraisal of IWMP Participatory Approach in Practice

In view of the overwhelming preference for demand driven approach indicated by the sample respondents, it is worth examining its suitability for satisfactory performance of IWMP. Demand driven approach, which implies a key role of public in planning and management of the programme at different levels, is operationalised through involvement of public directly as well as indirectly through their representative institutions such as panchayats as well as through NGOs. The Common Guidelines assigns a key role to them. According to it % involvement of primary stakeholders is at the centre of planning, budgeting, implementation, and management of watershed projects+(Para 11-IV). The underlying philosophy here is that the success of watershed projects depends on participation and cooperation of people of the concerned area. In view of this, several questions related to the above were asked to the respondents during the field survey in all the sample states. An attempt was made to find out the strengths and weaknesses of these institutional mechanisms based on actual experience of their functioning. Findings with respect to these are analysed below.

4.1 Peoples Participation in IWMP

4.1.1 Status of public participation in IWMP

Replies from state level officers indicated that there was no involvement of public in this programme at the state and district levels in any of the states. This was as expected. As per details provided in Chapter 2, the programme at higher levels is managed by bureaucracy without any involvement of public or their representatives. But it was reported that there was considerable involvement of public at the watershed level as per details given below.

In Meghalaya, the public was involved (through autonomous district councils) in planning awareness generation programme, group discussion and field surveys where as in Himachal Pradesh general public helped in the preparation of DPR after conduct of PRA exercise in consultation with UGs and SHGs including PRIs. Apart from this, watershed development works/activities were also executed by general public there.

In Odisha, the community was encouraged to participate in the situation analysis and prioritise areas/activities. The executive body (watershed committees), managed to execute envisaged activities through CBO (UGs, SHGs etc.)

In Rajasthan, the public was involved with PRA exercises with local residents of project areas for preparation of DPR. Members of watershed committee were also chosen in the Gramsabha. Social audits were being conducted in the project area with the help of the general public.

The reply from Andhra Pradesh indicated that the system adopted under IWMP was highly participatory. Watershed community was organized into user groups, self help groups, village organizations and watershed committees. These community based

organizations played a very vital role right from the delineation of watershed to preparation of DPR and implementation of watershed activities. In order to ensure transparency and quality, monitoring systems, such as social audit, were in place where the entire community was involved in evaluation of the watershed activities taken up in the village.

The district level officials have also mentioned about involvement of people in watershed development activities. Members of the public arranged awareness generation programmes for villagers to appraise about the objectives and perceived benefits of IWMP for the village community. After this, they helped in conduct of PRA in the village in order to assess the extent of participation among the community. They also helped in preparation of detailed project report (DPR) and based on this helped to draw action plan and get it approved at the Gramsabha meetings. Besides, they helped in the formation of village watershed committee, selection of user groups, formation of self help groups, and selection of beneficiaries. Apart from these, they also helped in the selection of NRM works, livelihood, EPA and other activities connected to watershed development besides extending help and cooperation for larger interest of the public.

4.1.2 Perceived usefulness of public participation

Based on actual experience, the usefulness of public participation in watershed development work has also been pointed out by respondents at all levels. The SLNA officials across the states indicated that the involvement of public in watershed planning and implementation was useful and in the right direction. All of them replied as **Yes** to this question. All the 10 district level watershed implementing agency officials also reported that the involvement of people in the programme was useful as indicated below.

Table 4.1 Usefulness of public involvement in IWMP

| Response | No of rep. cases responding |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Involvement is useful (Yes) | 10 |
| Not useful (No) | Nil |

Similarly, all the 22 PIAs contacted to elicit their views as based on their experience of involvement of people in the watershed planning and implementation, favored their continued involvement in planning and implementation of watershed projects. They perceived several advantages as given below .

Table 4.2 Perceived Advantages of public involvement in IWMP

| S.No. | Advantage as Perceived by PIAs | No of reporting |
|-------|--------------------------------|-----------------|
|-------|--------------------------------|-----------------|

| | | Cases |
|---|---|-------|
| 1 | Smooth execution and implementation in . transparent manner | 4 |
| 2 | More inclusive and the success rate will be more pronounced | 4 |
| 3 | People will select their activities | 5 |
| 4 | Transparency and creation of quality assets | 3 |
| 5 | Gives a feeling of ownership of assets | 4 |
| 6 | User group will derive the benefit from the assets | 2 |

Here, it may be of interest to mention that according to an evaluation of this programme in East Khasi Hills district of Meghalaya made by the State Institute of Rural Development (SIRD) Nongstoin, Meghalaya, the benefits were the highest from the watersheds where people's participation was high.†

4.1.3 Does public involvement cause delay and slow progress?

An apprehension is, however, often expressed that involvement of different sections of people in projects might cause some delay at times in terms of taking collective decisions owing to reasons such as lack or inadequacy of public interest or differences in the views of different interest groups. This might be true for watershed projects also. This aspect is closely linked to the observation of the Parliamentary Committee that public involvement may provide a cloak for bureaucratic inefficiency. In view of this, a serious attention was paid to this aspect. A question was asked to the concerned state level nodal officials to specify in terms of %yes+ or %no+ whether involvement of the general public caused delay in starting a project. The response to this question was divided among states. States like Meghalaya and Andhra Pradesh replied in negative (No) to this question while from the remaining states the response was positive (Yes) that it causes delay. There was a similarly mixed response from SLNA officials whether involvement of the public in watershed projects caused slow progress. While state officials of Meghalaya, Rajasthan and Andhra Pradesh did not feel that public involvement resulted in slow progress, their counterparts from Himachal Pradesh and Odisha felt otherwise i.e. the public involvement sometimes led to slow progress.

In order to probe this matter further, it was also enquired from district level officials whether the involvement of public resulted in delay in implementation and therefore slow progress. A majoring the district level respondents i.e., 7 out of 10 replied in negative to this query. According to them the involvement of public did not cause any delay in starting a project while 3 respondents (one each from Odisha, Rajasthan and Andhra Pradesh) were of the view that public involvement sometimes caused delay in starting a project owing to lack of unanimity among stakeholders on certain issues. The responses are given below.

Table 4.3 Does public involvement in IWMP cause delay?

| Response | No. of reporting cases |
|-----------------|------------------------|
| Causes no delay | 7 |
| Causes delay | 3 |

Views of the district level officials on whether involvement of people/public resulted in slower progress in implementation of watershed projects were also obtained. These too provide a mixed picture. A majority (7 out of 10), opined that the progress of watershed work did not tend to become slow due to the involvement of public in the process of implementation, while the remaining 3 (one each from Odisha, Rajasthan and Andhra Pradesh) had a different view that is public/people involvement sometimes resulted in slower progress due to frequent interferences from external sources and from within among stake holders or due to other reasons as might be the case. An extreme case was found in Begunia block of Khordha district in Odisha, Hence, 2 micro watersheds namely Mandkiniballinala (No.30102/01 & 20103/02) were preclosed owing to group rivalry among members having vested interest. There, even after sanction of the projects, the Committee could not be formed in a span of 1-2 years, for want of unanimity among community members. But similar exceptional cases of disharmony are found even in a bureaucratic set up. For example, in the Dholpur district of Rajasthan, much progress in watershed activities could not take place mainly due to non-recruitment of project level staff (WDT) owing to acute differences among recruitment committee members, chaired by the Collector of the District. It may be observed that a higher proportion of district level officers, who are nearer to the field situation than the state level officers, hold the view that the involvement of public does not cause delay or slow progress.

4.1.4 Conclusion

Summing up, one can say that there was considerable involvement of public in planning and implementation of watershed projects at the grassroots level. This is in accordance with Common Guidelines. Public were involved in awareness generation, preparation of DPR, conduct of PRA exercise, prioritization of areas and activities, conduct of social audit, delineation of watersheds, preparation of action plan and getting it approved by Gramsabha, selection of user groups, formation of self help groups and in implementation. Such involvement of the public was found to be useful by authorities at both district and state levels. But, according to a few of the respondents, their involvement sometimes resulted in delay in decision making and therefore slow progress. This happens specially when public is not homogeneous but consists of diverse interest groups. The remedy lies in taking up projects in areas where people are more homogenous or less heterogeneous. If the problem is due to inadequacy of interest then there is need for vigorous awareness campaigns in the beginning and making the programme attractive for public by demonstrating the project benefits.

4.2 Involvement of PRIs in IWMP

4.2.1 Status of involvement

India has a well laid system of Panchayati Raj Institutions (PRIs), which provide a constitutionally authorised forum for public participation in rural areas. There is, therefore, an increasing trend in the country to involve PRIs with development programmes in rural areas. The Common Guidelines has assigned specific responsibilities to PRIs from village to district levels with a view to secure their involvement in watershed development programmes. Attempt was, therefore, made to ascertain the actual involvement of village panchayats in watershed development activities in the 5 sample states.

PRIs were found to be actively involved in watershed development programme across the states. The proactive involvement of village panchayats in watershed development was one of the key features of this programme. It is by virtue of the fact that the Sarpanch / Mukhiya of the Panchayats are made defacto chairpersons of the watershed committees under whose leadership the DPR, Annual Action Plans etc. are prepared, selection of NRM work done, livelihood and micro-enterprising activities are promoted. PRIs are thus involved in this programme. Moreover, some of the elected members of the Panchayats were also members of the watershed committees. In fact, PRIs were the centres of activities around which decisions pertaining to watershed action plans moved. Details, as based on responses from state and district level implementing agency officials and representatives of watersheds are given below.

All the state level nodal officers of the 5 selected states indicated that they had made adequate provision for involvement of Panchayati Raj Institutions including Gramsabha, in the selection and implementation of watershed projects. According to them, PRIs perform several functions in watershed projects as detailed below.

In Meghalaya, village council / village darbars were involved in planning as well as implementation of the watershed projects but not in the selection of watersheds.

In Himachal Pradesh, PRIs were involved in prioritization of watershed planning, designing, implementation and execution.

In Odisha, watershed associations (WAs) which include members from PRI approve watershed activities, plan and monitor implementation of the programme.

In Rajasthan, Gramsabha was involved in the process of constitution of watershed committee, preparation of DPR, identification of EPA and monitoring the progress of the watershed projects as per provisions of the Common Guidelines.

In Andhra Pradesh, PR institutions and Gramsabha are involved in preparation of DPR by delineating micro-watershed villages. Sarpanch of the Gramsabha was made the Chairperson of watershed committee which passes resolutions of watershed interventions.

The role of Gramsabha in planning and implementation of watershed projects has also been highlighted by district level officers.

In Meghalaya, village darbars are actively involved right from the proposal stage and these work hand in hand with the watershed committee.

In Himachal Pradesh, Gramsabha approves DPR and Action Plan.

In Odisha, apart from approving DPR and Action Plan, Gramsabha also takes vital decisions on matters related to social audit.

In Andhra Pradesh, selection of NRM work as also selection of beneficiaries of different activities, is done by Gramsabha.

In Rajasthan, Gramsabha constitutes different types of committees and also undertakes social audit.

Similar views about the role of Panchayat were expressed by the officials of the implementing agencies at the district level.

In Meghalaya, village council (in place of Panchayat) was involved in the selection of beneficiaries, formation of watershed committee and assisted in monitoring and implementation of the programme.

In Himachal Pradesh, all works pertaining to watershed were being executed / implemented by the gram panchayat.

In Odisha, Panchayats were involved in counseling, supervision and review of watershed work.

In Rajasthan, apart from selection of activities, Panchayats particularly Sarpanch who is the Chairperson of watershed committee, also conducted social audit.

In Andhra Pradesh, Sarpanch being Chairperson of the watershed committee, conducted regular watershed meetings and oversaw / reviewed the progress of work.

Of the 32 watershed level representatives, as many as 28 respondents replied in positive about Involvement of PRI in watershed work. This included all the 22 representatives from Andhra Pradesh, Odisha, and Rajasthan and 6 from the other two states. However, respondents from West Khasi Hills district of Maghalaya reported that the autonomous district council (in place of PRI) did not have enough staff to help in the implementation of watershed projects. And 2 respondents from Bilaspur district of Himachal Pradesh also reported about non-involvement of PRIs in watershed activities as PRIs hardly gave time for this activity.

4.2.2 Usefulness of involving PRIs

It can be observed from the above that several activities related to watershed development programmes at the level of the village were initiated with the help and active cooperation of the village panchayats. But the moot question is whether and to what extent this involvement is regarded as useful. This was enquired into at the watershed level which is the cutting edge level in this programme.

Different advantages of involving PRIs in watershed programme were mentioned by the 28 watershed development representatives, a majority of whom were from Odisha, Rajasthan and Andhra Pradesh. The distribution of the respondents by their views is given below.

Table 4.4 Perceived advantages of involvement of PRIs in IWMP

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|---|
| - Better knowledge about local problems and needs | | | | 9 |
| - Give them a sense of ownership | | | | 2 |
| - Help in conflict resolution | | | | 5 |
| - Help in convergence | | | | 5 |
| - Better implementation | | | | 8 |
| - Help in preparation of DPR and calling Gram sabha meetings | | | | 4 |
| - Sustainable post project management | | | | 2 |

Note: Multiple responses.

But a major problem usually encountered with panchayats involvement is that their office bearers including the Secretaries, are overloaded with a number of activities because of which they may be sparing little time for watershed work. This aspect was thoroughly probed into to arrive at definite conclusion about the advantage of involving panchayat in IWMP. There were 28 (out of 32) respondents from watershed committees who were aware of this problem while the remaining 4 were not aware i.e. they did not think that panchayat office bearers were overlooked. The distribution of responses by states is given below.

4.5 Awareness about Panchayats being overloaded with other priorities

| State | Aware | Not aware |
|------------------|-------|-----------|
| Meghalaya | 3 | 2 |
| Himachal Pradesh | 5 | - |
| Odisha | 8 | - |
| Andhra Pradesh | 5 | 2 |
| Rajasthan | 7 | - |
| All | 28 | 4 |

Every policy measure has some advantages and some disadvantages. The crucial task is to weigh these advantages and disadvantages to find out which are more important. What is relevant here is the assessment of the stakeholders themselves. For this purpose, views of the representatives of watershed committee members were sought as to whether it would be wise to involve PRIs in watershed work even when they were over-loaded. The responses given below show that 19 of the above mentioned 28 respondents i.e. about two thirds felt that their services should still be availed of for watershed work. This was reported by all the 7 respondents from Rajasthan. As mentioned already, 4 respondents did not think this was a problem. Including them, the number of watershed committee representatives favouring involvement of PRIs becomes 23 or about 75% of all the respondents. The details are given below. Only 9 out of 32 (about one fourth) were against it.

Table: 4.6 Should the Panchayats be involved even if overloaded with other works?

| State | Responses | |
|------------------|-----------|----|
| | Yes | No |
| Meghalaya | - | 3 |
| Himachal Pradesh | 3 | 2 |
| Odisha | 4 | 4 |
| Andhra Pradesh | 5 | - |
| Rajasthan | 7 | - |
| All | 19 | 9 |

Instead of involving PRIs in watershed development work, 3 respondents from Himachal Pradesh felt that attempts should be made to find out reputed and willing NGOs to be involved in watershed development works. But, the moot question is about the availability of competent NGOs in specific areas. As will be indicated in the next section, authorities in Himachal Pradesh have not been able to identify so far competent NGO in any watershed area.

4.2.3 Conclusion

Thus, it is found that efforts have been made by authorities in all the 5 states to involve Panchayats in several activities related to planning and implementation of watershed projects. This involvement is regarded quite advantageous by the authorities. Benefits mentioned included better knowledge of panchayats about local problems and needs, better implementation, help in convergence, and conflict resolution etc. The authorities were, however, also aware that panchayats do not give sufficient time because they are overloaded with several other responsibilities. But, in their perception, the advantages outweigh this disadvantage. Hence, they would still like to involve panchayats notwithstanding that panchayats are overlooked.

4.3 Involvement of NGOs or VOs

Public participation also takes place through the involvement of non government organizations (NGOs) or Voluntary Organisations (VOs). Such participation has the advantage that the expertise available with VOs/NGOs becomes available to the implementing agencies. There is, therefore, an increasing trend towards associating VOs/NGOs in planning and implementation of grass root level programmes in rural areas. The Common Guidelines also provides for this. According to Para 35 of the Common Guidelines Voluntary Agencies (VOs) will have an important role in the programme and their services will be utilized substantially in the areas of awareness generation, capacity building, IEC and social audit among others. As far as direct involvement in the programme is concerned, Voluntary Agencies (VOs) with established credentials may be chosen as PIAs on the basis of detailed criteria as enumerated below.+

Hence, the viewpoints of state and district level officials on this aspect were obtained. The state level officials from Meghalaya stated that they were in the look out of VOs/NGOs to be associated in watershed development projects as PIA. To start with, 2 NGOs would be involved at the district level (one each at RiBhoi and West Khasi Hills). In Himachal Pradesh no NGO was working as there was lack of reputed and efficient NGO in the state. In Odisha, 3 NGOs were associated but no one was in the sample

districts. There were 16 NGOs working in watershed projects in Rajasthan and all of them were stationed at block level. In Andhra Pradesh, 64 NGOs were working as PIA covering almost all the districts in the state. Thus, there has been varied experience in this respect across different states. But, on the whole, barring Andhra Pradesh and Rajasthan to some extent, there was very little of NGOs involvement in IWMP.

Information collected from district level officials about involvement of NGO as PIA showed that In 3 out of the 10 selected districts, Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) were involved as the programme implementing agency (PIA). The district Udaipur of Rajasthan had engaged a NGO as PIA while in both the districts of Andhra Pradesh, a number of NGOs were reported to be involved as PIA. Their (NGOs) number was 10 in Mehboobnagar and 6 in Chittoor. It was reported that the agencies were working up to the satisfaction of the authorities.

The districts, where NGOs were not associated, have given several reasons of which the important one cited by both the districts of Meghalaya is that no qualified NGO specializing in watershed development that too in the area of natural resources management, was available. In Odisha, it was reported that due to government policy and adequate availability of government officials to serve as PIA, NGOs were not involved in watershed development programme. The desirability of involving voluntary organizations / NGOs is well established. But the real problems is one of availability of competent NGOs in the areas where watershed projects are implemented. Such a problem is encountered usually in other development programmes also.

Chapter-5

Operational Aspects

The success of IWMP in conserving natural resources and raising agricultural productivity depends crucially on better governance of watersheds. Whether it is target oriented or demand driven approach or a mix of the two is only one element of the governance process. There are several other elements which affect the level of efficiency. These need to be analysed in order to bring about lasting improvements. These elements are examined in this chapter.

5.1 The Institutional Framework

Necessary background information related to functioning of IWMP in every state was obtained at the outset. The review in every state by the study team used to start with an appraisal of institutional framework from state to the watershed level. It was found that the stipulated institutions as per the Common Guidelines 2008 (Revised 2011) were more or less in place in every state. At the grass root level, local people were involved in identification, planning and execution of works. Works to be taken up were finalized after discussion with the concerned members of the public. Village panchayats were also fully involved. Technical inputs and supervision were provided by WDT members and officers of the PIA. Works selected for study were found to exist. EPAs were undertaken in all projects to establish rapport with public and gain their confidence. Thereafter, sensitization and awareness programmes were organized at gram panchayat levels in the project area. People took part in PRA exercises. Similarly the designated agencies at the district and state levels like WCDC and SLNA etc. were in place and taking care of their responsibility. Hence, the details of their functioning by state which are mostly repetitive are not described. What is done is to discuss a few more important issues related to the operational aspects of the programme which came out prominently during interactions with different respondents in the five states. Such issues are discussed below.

5.2 Inadequacy and other staff related problems

Effective implementation of IWMP, whether it is target oriented or demand driven, requires competent staff at the state, district and watershed levels. Adequacy of competent and motivated staff is an important factor affecting the quality of performance of IWMP and the extent of utilization of financial resources. The Common Guidelines has also emphasized its role. It has indicated the type and number of staff along with their qualifications needed at PIA, district and state levels. For example, according to it, WDT, which is an integral part of PIA, should have at least four members, broadly with knowledge and experience in agriculture, soil science, water management, social mobilization and institutional building. At least one of the WDT members should be a woman+(Para 40). Similarly, staffing pattern of WCDC has also been spelled out (Para 30). In view of this, an attempt was made to ascertain the adequacy of staff at all the three levels on the basis of responses of authorities at the respective levels. We start

with, the cutting edge level of watersheds for which information was obtained from PIAs through responses to a PIA level schedule.

The staff to oversee implementation of watershed projects was reported to be adequate in the states of Meghalaya, Himachal Pradesh and Andhra Pradesh but in the remaining two states of Odisha and Rajasthan, it was not so. In Odisha, 3 out of 5 PIAs (two in Kandhamal and one in Khordha district) have reported about inadequacy of staff whereas from Rajasthan, all the PIAs with whom the survey team interacted reported about inadequacy of staff to oversee watershed work. The problem was acute in both the districts of Rajasthan. The total staff needed as indicated by all the 5 PIAs came to 30 of which Dholpur district alone accounted for 24 comprising of 6JEs, 17WDTs and 1LDC. This inadequacy might be a major factor behind the poor performance of IWMP in this district.

We now examine the question of adequacy of staff to oversee implementation of watershed projects as reported by the district level implementing agency officials. Staff in 8 out of the 10 sample districts was reported to be inadequate for the purpose. It was considered adequate in only two districts of Himachal Pradesh. The staff deficiency (both technical and non technical) as indicated by district officials varied between the districts. The deficiency in both the districts of Meghalaya was 8 (3 technical and 5 non technical), in Odisha it was 13 of which 9 for Khordha district including 3 PIAs. The deficiency as indicated in both the districts of Rajasthan was 8 each comprising of both technical and non-technical staff. Dholpur district did not have even a regular Project Manager for a long time to head the district unit of IWMP. The deficiency in Mehboobnagar district of Andhra Pradesh was 10 (4 technical & 6 non technical) while it was 15 (12 technical and 2 non-technical) in Chittoor district. These deficiencies might be a factor in relative poor performance of Khordha district in Odisha, Dholpur district in Rajasthan and Mehboobnagar district in Andhra Pradesh.

Inadequacy of staff to oversee implementation of watershed projects has been reported even at the state level by the respective officials. Himachal Pradesh was reported to be short of one hydrologist at the headquarter. There were three vacancies at the state level in Meghalaya when the study team visited the state in early June, 2014 as reported by the SLNA officials in Shillong. These might have been filled in by now as the interview process had already been completed. The SLNA of Rajasthan required 20 non technical staff followed by Andhra Pradesh 8 (5 technical and 3 non technical). In Odisha, however, the state level staff to oversee the implementation of watershed activities was adequate as reported by SLNA officials.

The above findings are summarized in the table below.

Table 5.1 Adequacy of staff

| States | State Level | District Level | Project Level |
|------------------|--------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|
| Meghalaya | Inadequate | Inadequate | Adequate |
| Himachal Pradesh | Inadequate | Adequate | Adequate |
| Odisha | Adequate | Inadequate | Inadequate |
| Rajasthan | Inadequate | Inadequate | Inadequate |
| Andhra Pradesh | Inadequate | Inadequate | Adequate |

Thus, there is no state where staff has been reported to be adequate at all the three levels, state, district and project. The position looks like worst in Rajasthan. As pointed out in the section 5.5 inadequacy of staff, more particularly technical staff has been one of the major factors in under utilization of funds.

Himachal Pradesh appears to be placed in a better position. But here, another problem, though of a different type, was observed by the study team. According to the Common Guidelines, Watershed Secretaries should be full time employees paid from watershed funds. They should be independent paid functionaries distinct and separate from Panchayat Secretaries (Para 46). But, in Himachal Pradesh, there happened to be a deviation from this. Here, Panchayat Secretaries were designated as Secretaries of Watershed Committees. It was understood that this was done through a resolution passed by the department and approved by the government. As reported by some of the PIAs, Panchayat Secretaries, being tied up with a variety of activities, spared little time (rather no time) for watershed development work. The study team also observed this while visiting watersheds in Shimla and Bilaspur districts. The concerned secretaries were requested to be available for interaction with the study team. But no one among them turned up for interaction at the designated place as promised. On enquiry, it was explained that many of them kept themselves busy with their regular departmental works. As understood, this was not the only occasion that they were not available for watershed related work but on several such occasions it became difficult to trace them when necessary. In this context, the staff adequacy in Himachal Pradesh at the project level appears somewhat illusory. This might be a reason why the extent of utilization of fund in Himachal Pradesh position as reported in the next section is as low as 58.44 percent. This figure is the lowest among all the five states.

While the Common Guidelines has specified qualifications and technical knowhow of the staff, the administrative implications of the same in terms of appropriate salary level and recruitment policies have not been specified. This is left to the state governments which are yet to evolve satisfactory policies in this respect. This has resulted in a few operational problems which have nothing to do with whether the programme is based on demand driven or target oriented approach. Staff dissatisfaction was found to be widespread because of uncertain future due to contractual nature of service as well as low payment compared to their qualification and experience.

As a result, flight of staff among WDTs and at other levels was quite frequent. This was particularly with respect to staff of engineering and agricultural background. These persons tend to migrate frequently. Inadequacy of experienced professionals is thus a major handicap. It merits very serious consideration on the part of authorities. Respondents also complained that even the prescribed labour rates in some states are lower than those in MGNREGS because of which it is not easy to get labour on time needed for completion of work. This matter too needs attention at policy formulation level.

Another staff related issue is concerned with the salary paid to Watershed Secretaries. In Dholpur district of Rajasthan, Watershed Secretaries were paid at a varied rate

starting from as little as Rs 1200 to Rs 3000 per month. For example, in the Gadarpur Micro watershed of Rupaspur panchayat under Bari block of this district, the Watershed Secretary was paid only Rs.1200 per month and that too only for the period when there was work in the field. In rainy season, there was no work and hence he was not paid for those months. With this meager amount and even with Rs 3000 a month, it was hard to get qualified and dedicated persons as Secretaries. Hence, the need as voiced by most of the Secretaries, supported by the villagers and also PIAs, was to make upward revision in the monthly emoluments to at least Rs.5000 a month and in any case should not be less than the payment made to an unskilled labour under MGNREGA. In many other states, Secretaries were paid at the rate of a Rs 5000 a month. Additional financial resources required for upward revision in the rate can be met through undertaking more work so as to ensure increased availability of funds under the administrative head.

As regards recruitment of contractual staff at various levels to oversee watershed planning and implementation work, the sample states had adopted two types of policies. In 3 states, namely Andhra Pradesh, Meghalaya and Rajasthan, the department directly recruited project and other level staff through the process of test / interview on contractual basis which can be renewed from time to time based on their performance and need in the watershed projects. But the 2 states of Odisha and Himachal Pradesh had adopted the policy of hiring of staff through placement agencies both at the project as well as higher levels, in which case, the staff had to forego 20% of the monthly emoluments that went to the manpower supplying agency. This practice goes against the interest of the staff in the sense that they actually get only 80% of what they are entitled to. One time payment to the outsourcing agency can be well understood and justified as charges for the services provided by the agency but deducting 20% from the total payment due every month is nothing but simply exploitation of staff. Such a practice results in dissatisfaction among staff and induces them to migrate elsewhere.

5.3 Availability of labour component for watershed work

Apart from inadequacy of staff, inadequate availability of labour has been another problem in implementation of IWMP. It slows down the pace of work and utilization of fund. It is not easy to get labour for watershed works in Himachal Pradesh, due to horticulture activities for which much higher wages are paid to workers. Further, watershed work is not round the year since earthen works are not taken up during rainy season. The average working days are around 30 to 45 in a year whereas under MGNREGS, it is more and the work is also spread over a somewhat longer period. These may be the reasons why people in Himachal Pradesh were reported to be not much interested in watershed activities. In Rajasthan, Odisha as also Andhra Pradesh, reports of labour scarcity for watershed work were received during the course of interaction with the functionaries of watersheds, PIAs and district level officers in all these states. However, in Meghalaya labour problem was not that acute as compared to other states because of the availability of female labour. But, here also, there was a tendency among labourers to prefer MGNREGS because

payment was higher under it, being around Rs.165.00 a day compared to an average of Rs.135-145 a day, under watershed works. Payment of wages under watershed is based on measurement i.e., volume of work (cu.m) and not on hours of working as is the case under MGNREGS. While use of machine under MGNREGS is strictly prohibited, this is not so under watershed work. Use of machine reduces the wage earnings of workers since it reduces the requirement of manual labour. Thus, in Chittoor district of Andhra Pradesh, payment to labour for earth work excavation in hard soil with an initial lead of 10 mtrs and initial lift of 2 mtrs for silt trap, inlet, outlet and inlet outlet channel for 1 cu.m was Rs.126.65 against only Rs.37.60 when machine was used for excavation of pond under the same (lead) condition. Such ground level situations need to be kept in view while fixing wage rates for works under IWMP.

5.4 Adequacy of funds for various watershed activities

Adequacy of fund for carrying out specific activities is an important determinant of quality of work as well as its progress and impact. If funds are not adequate, then outcome cannot be satisfactory. Hence an attempt was made to collect this vital information from the stakeholders at different levels. There are three major expenditure heads for which funds under watershed programme are sanctioned. These are

- a) Institution and capacity building
- b) Livelihood generation for asset less persons and
- c) Productivity enhancement/development of micro enterprises

As there are separate norms for each category, information on adequacy was collected under each of these categories.

Table 5.2 Replies from the state level officials on adequacy of funds No. of Rep. cases

| | |
|--|-------------------|
| | Adequacy of funds |
|--|-------------------|

| Activity / Expenditure Heads | Meghalaya | | Himachal Pradesh | | Odisha | | Rajasthan | | Andhra Pradesh | |
|--|-----------|----|------------------|----|--------|----|-----------|----|----------------|----|
| | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | No |
| 1) Institution and capacity Building | 1 | - | 1 | - | - | 1 | 1 | - | 1 | - |
| 2) Livelihood for assetless persons | 1 | - | 1 | - | 1 | - | 1 | - | - | 1 |
| 3) Productivity Enhancement and Development of micro enterprises | 1 | - | 1 | - | - | 1 | 1 | - | - | 1 |

Table 5.3 Replies from district level officials on adequacy of funds No. of Rep. cases

No of rep. cases

| Activity / Expenditure Heads | Adequacy of funds | | | | | | | | | |
|---|-------------------|----|------------------|----|--------|----|-----------|----|----------------|----|
| | Meghalaya | | Himachal Pradesh | | Odisha | | Rajasthan | | Andhra Pradesh | |
| | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | No |
| 1) Institution and capacity Building | 2 | - | 2 | - | 2 | - | 1 | 1 | 2 | - |
| 2) Livelihood for assetless Persons | - | 2 | 2 | - | - | 2 | 2 | - | 2 | - |
| 3) Productivity Enhancement/ Development of micro enterprises | - | 2 | 2 | - | - | 2 | 2 | - | 2 | - |

The replies received from state officials were not always compatible with the responses given by the district level officials in a number of states. For example, in Meghalaya grants are adequate for all the three activities as pointed out by state officials against the district officials remark that the funds are adequate only for Institution and Capacity Building activity. It may be possible that the fund position at the state level as a whole is comfortable but when it comes down to the district level, there may be inter district

variations in the availability due to variations in the quantum of work being undertaken at the district level. It may also be due to the fact that the district officials are in more direct and frequent contact with the situation at the project level. However, the replies from Himachal Pradesh and Rajasthan coincide with each other i.e., districts and the states. In Odisha, the responses as given by the district and state level officials are different when compared with the information on Institution and Capacity Building and Livelihood Activities for assetless persons. In Andhra Pradesh the fund is adequate only for Institution and Capacity Building as reported by both the sets of respondents (district and state) while for the two remaining activities, the fund adequacy is differently reported by officials at different levels.

It is seen from the above that the number of respondents reporting inadequacy of fund increases as one moves down from the state to the district and then to the watershed level. It is the lower level authorities who are directly concerned with operational aspects. Their views, therefore, would have higher weightage. The fact that several of them have reported inadequacy of fund should be taken note of by the policy makers. Their reports about inadequacy are consistent with the suggestions made for raising the cost norms which are brought out in Chapter 6.

The study team during its visit to the sample districts was given to understand that funds available for watershed activities particularly for NRM component is not enough to ensure good quality of work. As rightly pointed out by the district level officials of Meghalaya and Odisha, with 56% of the total funds available for watershed development component i.e. Rs.8400.00 and Rs.6700.00 (calculated on the basis of Rs.15000.00 and Rs.12000.00 per hectare norm respectively), is hard to expect better quality of assets.

5.5 Extent of utilization of funds under IWMP.

The extent of utilization of fund is an important indicator of the performance of IWMP. The Parliamentary Committee too had laid great stress on this. Information on this was, therefore, collected at both state and district levels. We first take up state level figures. Funds released in a particular year if not spent/partially spent in that year, is carried forward to the next financial year resulting in accumulation of funds over years.

5.5.1. State wise analysis

Receipt of funds under IWMP

The receipt of funds for all the five states taken together was Rs.2,52,368.6469 lakhs during 2009-10 to 2013-14 against an utilization of Rs 1,95,742.6947 lakhs, during the same period, showing an overall utilization of about 78 percent. The state of Rajasthan received the highest proportion of funds (about 44 percent) at the aggregate level. Its share in the total expenditure was about 43 percent. However, in the year 2013-14, the state did not receive any fund for undertaking watershed work under IWMP. Andhra Pradesh was the second highest recipient (27.2%) of funds (Rs 68,650.98 lakh) under

IWMP followed by Odisha Rs.41,036.452 (16.2%) and Himachal Pradesh at Rs.20682.7 Lakh (8.2%). The receipt of the least fund under IWMP was by Meghalaya. At the aggregate level, it was Rs.10127.0249 lakh ranging from as little as Rs.270 lakh during 2009-10 to Rs.3822.1131 lakh in 2012-13. Year wise receipt of funds under IWMP by the 5 states is given below

Table 5.4 State wise and year wise receipt of funds under IWMP

(Rs in lakh)

| Year | 2009-10 | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 | 2013-14 | Total |
|------------------|----------|----------|-----------|------------|------------|-------------|
| Meghalaya | 270 | 1098 | 1429.5 | 3822.1131 | 3507.4118 | 10127.0249 |
| Himachal Pradesh | 6058.5 | 7245.4 | 1594.3 | 284.9 | 5499.6 | 20682.7 |
| Odisha | 2419.05 | 7942.01 | 5855.294 | 9618.708 | 15201.39 | 41036.452 |
| Rajasthan | 41645.98 | 40372.5 | 23581.29 | 6271.72 | - | 111871.49 |
| Andhra Pradesh | 2821.98 | 12386.75 | 18093.58 | 14821.75 | 20526.92 | 68650.98 |
| All | 53215.51 | 69044.66 | 50553.964 | 34819.1911 | 44735.3218 | 252368.6469 |

Utilization of fund

Figures on how much of the amount received was utilized in different years are provided in table 5.5 below. For analytical purposes, it is, however, more important to have data on percentage utilization of funds. The two tables below provide the respective information.

Table 5.5 State wise and year wise utilization of funds under IWMP

(Rs.in lakh)

| Year | 2009-10 | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 | 2013-14 | Total |
|------------------|-----------|------------|------------|------------|------------|-------------|
| Meghalaya | 245.1010 | 963.1437 | 1197.2833 | 1163.8742 | 6009.4515 | 9578.8537 |
| Himachal Pradesh | 0.85 | 287.71 | 1727.6 | 3752.4 | 6319.3 | 12087.86 |
| Odisha | 29.14 | 1708.73 | 3925.531 | 8753.12 | 16346.31 | 30762.831 |
| Rajasthan | 32076.85 | 32190.57 | 17605.25 | 2324.47 | - | 84197.14 |
| Andhra Pradesh | 68.94 | 844.92 | 7979.4 | 20724.3 | 29498.45 | 59116.01 |
| All | 32420.881 | 35995.0737 | 32435.0643 | 36718.1642 | 58173.5115 | 195742.6947 |

Table 5.6 State wise and Year wise percentage utilization of funds under IWMP

(In Percent)

| State/Year | 2009-10 | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 | 2013-14 | Total |
|------------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|-------|
| Meghalaya | 90.78 | 87.72 | 83.76 | 30.45 | 171.34 | 94.59 |
| Himachal Pradesh | 0.014 | 3.97 | 108.36 | 1317.09 | 114.90 | 58.44 |
| Odisha | 1.20 | 21.52 | 67.04 | 91.00 | 107.53 | 74.96 |
| Rajasthan | 77.02 | 79.73 | 74.66 | 37.02 | - | 75.26 |

| | | | | | | |
|----------------|-------|-------|-------|--------|--------|-------|
| Andhra Pradesh | 2.44 | 6.82 | 44.10 | 139.82 | 143.71 | 86.11 |
| All | 68.66 | 57.72 | 62.73 | 95.56 | 132.14 | 77.56 |

The utilization of funds varied between states depending upon availability of infrastructure, climate conditions, topography, manpower etc. to oversee the process of implementation. IWMP is a need based programme for villages. The scope was better in hilly and dry areas having low irrigation potential and at the same time with inadequate avenues for income generation for assetless households. In Meghalaya, the utilization of funds was much better and ahead of other states. It had utilized nearly 95 percent of the total fund received by it between 2009-10 to 2013-14. At the other extreme, Himachal Pradesh utilized only 58 percent of the funds at the aggregate level ranging between 0.014 in 2009-10 to a very large proportion of 1317 percent in 2012-13. This was due to accumulation of unutilized/partially utilized funds between 2009-10 to 2012-13. In Himachal Pradesh, accumulated receipt of funds between 2009-10 to 2012-13 was to the tune of Rs 15183.1 lakhs against the accumulated expenditure of Rs 5768.56 lakhs. This was nearly 38 percent of the gross receipt during these 4 years. After Meghalaya, it is Andhra Pradesh where somewhat impressive amount was utilized, to the extent of over 86 percent. This is followed by Odisha and Rajasthan each utilizing about 75 percent of funds at the state level.

Inter year variations in percentage utilization figures are quite revealing. These show that there was practically no utilization in the first year in Himachal Pradesh, Odisha and Andhra Pradesh. The situation improved somewhat in the second year in Odisha, but continued to remain bleak in the other two states. It is only from the third year i.e. 2011-12 that the activities started picking up and came to full swing by the fourth year. This finding is expected since it takes time to create new institutions and develop the necessary infrastructure whenever a new activity, along with several novel features (as was the case with IWMP) is introduced. It was this dismal performance of the initial years in several states which was witnessed by the Parliamentary Committee when it expressed concerns about the programme. But, it does not seem appropriate to attribute the dismal picture to demand driven approach. As our data show, the utilization was quite high in Meghalaya and Rajasthan even during the initial years and became high subsequently in all states except Himachal Pradesh even though all of them have been following demand driven approach. The only state in which the activities have not picked up to the full extent is Himachal Pradesh. But, as was pointed out by the Director of IWMP in this state, people of Himachal Pradesh are not interested in this programme. They find alternative options more lucrative.

5.5.2 District wise analysis

Following the allocation of funds to the states, the SLNA releases funds to districts for carrying out watershed development activities ensuring that a major portion of the funds allocated / carried forward from previous years, is spent on watershed related activities. During the years between 2009-10 to 2013-14, a total of Rs.23620.48014 lakh had been

received by all the 10 districts, of which Rs.17025.95308 lakh was utilized during this period. This is about 72 percent of the total receipt.

Details of receipt and utilization of funds in various years by districts are given below in tables 5.6 and 5.7 respectively while those of percentage utilization are given in table 5.8.

Table 5.7 District wise and year wise receipt of funds under IWMP

(Rs in lakh)

| Name or District/Year | 2009-10 | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 | 2013-14 | All |
|-----------------------|----------|------------|------------|------------|------------|-------------|
| West Jaintia Hills | 45 | 213 | 324 | 880.98 | 657.05 | 2040.03 |
| West Khasi Hills | 45 | 216 | 351.15 | 833.78711 | - | 1445.93711 |
| Shimla | - | - | 980.15 | 1069.58 | - | 2049.73 |
| Bilaspur | 7.33 | 234.831 | 416.054 | - | - | 658.215 |
| Khordha | 118.56 | 312.61 | 104.91 | - | 220.68 | 756.76 |
| Kandhamal | 170.424 | 845.50902 | 1137.45952 | 1448.8646 | 1532.15636 | 5134.4135 |
| Dholpur | 61.249 | 261.54351 | 125.3134 | 190.44862 | - | 638.55453 |
| Udaipur | 112.63 | 451.68 | 531.75 | 703.6 | 640.01 | 2439.67 |
| Mahbubnagar | 464.20 | 64.61 | 142.73 | 1367.89 | - | 2039.47 |
| Chittoor | 264.4 | 1121.17 | 1896.39 | 1402.02 | 1751.72 | 6417.7 |
| All | 1290.793 | 3720.95353 | 6009.90692 | 7817.17033 | 4801.61636 | 23620.48014 |

Table 5.8 District wise and year wise utilization of funds under IWMP

(Rs in lakh)

| Name of District / Year | 2009-10 | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 | 2013-14 | All |
|-------------------------|-----------|------------|-----------|------------|------------|-------------|
| West Jaintia Hills | 40.5 | 196.2 | 272.6 | 230 | 1225.6 | 1965.1 |
| West Khasi Hills | 45 | 216 | 267.81 | 220.2375 | - | 749.0475 |
| Shimla | - | - | 539.39 | 750.48 | - | 1289.87 |
| Bilaspur | - | 32.72 | 89.599 | 152.377 | - | 277.696 |
| Khordha | - | 62.72 | 78.17 | 163.03015 | 203.2867 | 507.20685 |
| Kandhamal | 0.69674 | 397.19772 | 392.76688 | 984.36644 | 1269.37956 | 3044.40734 |
| Dholpur | - | 333.16317 | 90.12222 | - | - | 423.28539 |
| Udaipur | 3.58 | 94.47 | 237.95 | 673.86 | 1070.35 | 2080.21 |
| Mahbubnagar | 37.94 | 142.69 | 219.28 | 1398.33 | - | 1798.24 |
| Chittoor | 8.34 | 55.64 | 504.29 | 2215.62 | 2610 | 5393.89 |
| All | 136.05674 | 1530.80089 | 2691.9781 | 6788.50109 | 6378.61626 | 17025.95308 |

Table 5.9 District wise and year wise percentage utilization of funds under IWMP

(In percent)

| Name of District/ Year | 2009-10 | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 | 2013-14 | All |
|---------------------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|-------|
| West Jaintia Hills | 90 | 92.11 | 53.27 | 28.74 | 186.53 | 96.33 |
| West Khasi Hills | 100 | 100 | 79.11 | 26.41 | - | 51.8 |
| Shimla | - | - | 55.03 | 70.16 | - | 62.93 |
| Bilaspur | - | 13.93 | 21.53 | - | - | 42.19 |
| Khordha | - | 20.06 | 74.83 | - | 92.12 | 67.02 |
| Kandhamal | 0.41 | 46.98 | 34.53 | 67.94 | 82.85 | 59.29 |
| Dholpur | - | 127.38 | 71.92 | - | - | 66.29 |
| Udaipur | 3.18 | 20.91 | 44.75 | 95.77 | 163.23 | 85.27 |
| Mahabubnagar | 8.17 | 220.89 | 153.6 | 102.22 | - | 88.17 |
| Chittoor | 3.38 | 4.96 | 26.59 | 158.03 | 149 | 84.05 |
| All | 10.54 | 41.14 | 44.79 | 86.84 | 132.84 | 72.08 |

The position at the district level is such that, in 4 districts, i.e. West Jaintia Hills of Meghalaya, Udaipur district of Rajasthan and both the districts of Andhra Pradesh, the utilization of funds was much above the average at the aggregate level for the total of 5 years. It was 96.33 percent in West Jaintia Hills district, 88.17 percent in Mahabubnagar, 85.27 percent in Udaipur district and 84.05 percent in Chittoor district.

Data shows that the fund availability was irregular across years and between districts. In some of the districts although funds were received but there was no utilization such as in the district of Bilaspur, Khordha, and Dholpur. But, in Shimla district, for major portion of the reference period (3 out of 5 years), i.e., 2009-10, 2010-11 and 2013-14, funds were not received and hence no utilization was reported. Hence, there was no watershed activity in this district during 2009-10 & 2010-11. In the year 2013-14 no fund was received in West Khasi Hills, Bilaspur and Dholpur and as such no achievement under watershed activity took place in these districts. On the other hand, no funds were received by Bilaspur and Khordha districts during 2012-13, but utilization of funds was reported and met from unspent amount of previous years.

The yearwise variations in percentage utilization of fund more or less follow the trends in the respective states discussed earlier. What is interesting is the marked difference in percentage of utilization of funds between two districts of the same state. For example, the percentage is 51.8 in West Khasi Hills district as against 96.33 in West Jaintia Hills district both belonging to Meghalaya. Similarly, the percentage was 66.29 in Dholpur district while it was 85.27 in Udaipur district of the same state of Rajasthan. And it was

42.19 in Bilaspur as against 62.93 in Shimla district of Himachal Pradesh. But such differences are marginal in the other two states of Odisha and Andhra Pradesh. In Odisha for example, districtwise percentage variation in the utilization of funds was only about 8%, whereas it was only 4 percent in Andhra Pradesh

The district level officials, during the course of interaction, were asked to specify the reasons for under utilization of the funds that they had received in different years under reference, for undertaking watershed development work in their districts. The district officials from both the districts of Meghalaya and from Udaipur district of Rajasthan reported that the under utilization was due to the late receipt of funds i.e., at the fag end of the financial years. This resulted in accumulation of funds over years. The variation in the level of utilization was also due to not having enough technical inputs on the part of technical staff. The district officials of Odisha provided reasons such as non posting of WDTs, shortage of labour, inadequate manpower at project and higher levels and natural calamities. It is significant to note that the officials in general did not mention demand driven approach as a reason. Non cooperation from village community / PRI was, however, reported only from Mahbubnagar. Thus the assumption that the demand driven approach provides a cloak for official inefficiency is not supported by the evidence collected during this study.

5.6 Convergence of watershed programme with other related programmes

There are quite a few similar or related programmes sponsored by central and state governments, by different departments, which run simultaneously in rural areas for upliftment of the poor. Very often, these overlap to varying extents. Hence, convergence of IWMP with other related programmes is considered to be of much help in raising its effectiveness. It optimizes efforts through inter-sectoral and inter-programme coordination. There are several other benefits which would be explained later on.

Realizing the importance of convergence in watershed development programme, the Government of India has suggested for its adoption under IWMP. The Common Guidelines has also suggested its adoption. According to it, %eleventh Five Year Plan offers an opportunity to converge and harmonize resources of different schemes and programmes specially those under Bharat Nirman and other flagship schemes with watershed projects. Mandatory preparation of district level plans will be in a position to enable convergence and synergies at the grass-root level. The DPR may elaborate gaps to be filled or watershed activities to be taken up out of BRGF, MGNREGS, artificial ground water recharging, renovation and repairs of tanks, water bodies and any other available sources. Marketing and value addition is also possible under the revised APMC Act. Efforts should be made to converge all relevant schemes at project level)-(Para 77). The Technical Committee on Watershed Programmes in India (Parthasarathy Committee) in its report in January, 2006 had also proposed a framework for convergence of watershed development programmes with allied programmes of the government. It is, of course, not easy to bring about convergence since different departments and even officers of different projects in the same department have a long well entrenched tendency of working independently of each other. Convergence, however, calls for mutual cooperation and adjustment. Hence, it is likely to be a time taking process which can be expedited if there is continuing push from above with respect to all the concerned departments.

5.6.1 Status of Convergence

An effort was made to find out the extent to which there was convergence of IWMP with other related programmes and the perceived benefits thereof in the sample states.

Feedback on this aspect was obtained from officers at the state, district and PIA levels. The work of convergence under IWMP was assigned to PIAs, the key persons under the programme, who are authorized to coordinate with other programmes and departments so as to bring about convergence of watershed activities with other related programmes. The study team during its visits to sample states came across a number of works/structures of line departments completed through the programme of convergence such as plantation, horticulture, water harvesting structures etc. In states like Andhra Pradesh, Odisha, Meghalaya, Himachal Pradesh and Rajasthan, a good amount of works had been done under convergence with various departments.

In all, 22 PIAs gave their views on this subject. As reported by both PIAs from West Jaintia Hills district of Meghalaya, they had been able to tie up the watershed programme under IWMP only with the MGNREGS programme of Rural Development Department whereas in West Khasi Hills district, even this had not been possible as reported by the lone PIA with whom the study team interacted on this aspect. Thus, much remained to be done in this state with respect to convergence. In Himachal Pradesh, 3 PIAs were contacted (1 from Bilaspur and 2 from Shimla). The lone PIA from Bilaspur district was reported to have achieved convergence of watershed programme with that of MGNREGS of Rural Development Department while his counterparts from Shimla district replied in the negative to this aspect. Thus, in this state also, not much has been achieved. In the case of Odisha, as per the report of all the 6 PIAs, convergence had been made possible with a number of programmes or departments such as not only with MGNREGS, but also with National Horticulture Mission (NHM), Agriculture, Tribal welfare etc. This can be regarded quite satisfactory. In Rajasthan, 4 PIAs were contacted. As per their reports, the convergence of watershed programme had been possible with MGNREGS, NHM, Animal Husbandry, BRGF, SGRY, SGSY and Agriculture. It is noteworthy that some of the programmes belonged to other departments. In Andhra Pradesh, 6 PIAs were contacted to give their views about convergence of watershed programme with related programmes of government. As per their report, apart from MGNREGS of the same i.e. Rural Development Department, a number of schemes of other departments such as Animal Husbandry, Fishery, NEDCAP, Agriculture, Forestry, Sericulture, SSAATT, NGO, Satellite (MIS) etc. had been included under convergence with watershed programme. Field observation indicated that Andhra Pradesh was quite ahead of other states in this respect. Hence, further details about this state are provided subsequently in section 5.6.4.

It is evident from the above that convergence with MGNREGS has been ensured in most of the sample districts. This is because both the programmes are under the same Ministry of Rural Development. But, in some states like Andhra Pradesh, Odisha and Rajasthan convergence with the programmes of other departments such as Agriculture, Animal Husbandry, Fishery, Forestry, etc. has also taken place. But still a vast potential remains untouched more particularly in Meghalaya and Himachal Pradesh where very little progress has been made in this respect. Sustained efforts are needed to cover additional grounds irrespective of the fact whether the programme is target oriented or demand driven.

5.6.2 Perceived benefits for convergence

Several advantages of convergence of watershed development programmes with other related programmes were mentioned by district level officials of Meghalaya, Himachal

Pradesh, Odisha, Rajasthan and Andhra Pradesh. The officials of West Jaintia Hills district of Meghalaya reported that it would increase the development potential of the area and provide more employment opportunities to the people. According to district officials from both the districts of Himachal Pradesh, convergence increases availability of labour component and leads to creation of additional assets. From Odisha, it is said that the programme of convergence results in enhancement of cultivable area, higher productivity, and increased plantation. It also helps in better socio-economic upliftment of rural people owing to increased employment. From Rajasthan, it is reported that earthen works are undertaken from MGNREGS thereby reducing the financial burden of the watershed projects. It is also told that people are benefitted due to DPR. In Andhra Pradesh, it is reported that the convergence programme under watershed brings in more number of beneficiaries and cover more areas as IWMP funds will not cater to the needs in full as per demand generated in watershed villages. It also helps in increased horticulture plantation while utilizing subsidy from agriculture and NEDCAP departments and at the same time, utilization of technical inputs from Animal Husbandry Department is ensured. Under convergence in Chittoor district, horticulture plantation was developed in 8,488 acres of land covering 5,870 farmers by utilizing Rs 12.14 crores from MGNREGS fund.

Similar as well as some additional benefits of convergence of watershed programme with other programmes have been pointed out by state level implementing agency officials of all the 5 states also. The report from Meghalaya says that through convergence, higher level of investment was made possible which resulted in coverage of more area. The report from Himachal Pradesh spoke in terms of improvement in the quality of assets created due to higher doses of investment besides facilitating sustainability of the programme in the long run. Similarly, the state level officials of Odisha regarded this as an effective treatment of watershed area. The state officials from Rajasthan mentioned that it helped in the gap filling in the treatment of project area. The report from Andhra Pradesh specifically mentioned that the programme benefitted to the tune of Rs.74.08 crores in the state as a whole towards dry land horticulture through funds provided by MGNREGS.

5.6.3 Conclusion

Summing up, one can say that convergence has already been in operation under IWMP. This is quite laudable since it is a difficult task in Indian context where a strong sense of departmentalism prevails in the administrative framework. The progress made by different states are at different levels. While Andhra Pradesh has made much progress, Meghalaya and Himachal Pradesh are at the initial state. It is note worthy that authorities at all levels in all the states are aware of the specific benefits derived from this strategy. This augurs well for the future. It may also be observed that the close association of panchayats in planning and implementation of IWMP tends to favour convergence since there is an increasing tendency in India to involve panchayats for different programmes of different departments in rural areas. Panchayats are tending to be depository of different programmes running within their jurisdiction. Given this context, demand driven approach, in which panchayats play a pivotal role, has a certain advantage.

5.6.4 Convergence in Andhra Pradesh

Convergence plans in Andhra Pradesh were part of DPRs for saturation of watershed area and meeting the demand of financial and technical support by involving functionaries

of Departments of Agriculture, Animal Husbandry, Forestry, Horticulture, MGNREGS, Society for Elimination of Rural Poverty (SERP) etc. Necessary software provisions were given to capture support from convergence in the DPR module.

With respect to entry point activities, IWMP collaborated with the Department of Animal Husbandry for conducting Animal & Sheep health camps and fertility camps, with Rural Water Supply for extension of water pipe lines & setting up Reverse Osmosis (Water purifying) Plants for safe drinking water and with NEDCAP for solar street lights etc. Other EPA activities like cattle troughs, tent house, sheds for school children etc. were also taken up under IWMP.

A convergence policy with MGNREGS for holistic treatment of the watershed was evolved and being implemented in the state. This helped in avoiding the duplication in work and treating the entire watershed in a saturation mode. Further, it brought synergy between the two programmes and resulted in creation of durable assets and improved the productivity of the land ultimately benefitting the people of rural areas.

In accordance with the policy, clear cut responsibilities of IWMP & MGNREGS staff and fund utilizations were laid down as below.

| With MGNREGS FUND | | IWMP Fund | |
|---|--|--|--|
| With MGNREGS Staff | With IWMP staff | With IWMP staff | |
| Land Development & soil moisture conservation works jungle clearance, Boulders removal, Stone bund, trench cum bund, terracing on hill slopes, slip application, compost pil etc. | Dry land horticulture & fodder development works like fodder plots, fodder nurseries, silo pits, Raising of silvi pasture etc. | Drainage Line treatment works | Staggered trenches, Water absorption trench. Live checks, Sunken pits, loose boulders, Rock fill dams etc. |
| | | Water Harvesting structure | Mini Percolation tanks, Percolation tanks, check dams, Farm ponds, Gabions, Sub surface dams, Repairs to existing water harvesting structures etc. |
| | | Afforestation works | Block plantation, Barren hill afforestation, Avenue, Bund plantation, |
| | | Common property resource development works | back yard plantation seed dibbling, Trenches, Fire tracing, plantation, Cattle Proof trench etc. |

As a result of convergence with MGNREGS, Rs.74.08 crores had been spent since 2011 to 2013 for undertaking land development works, dry land horticulture and raising fodder crops in IWMP watershed villages.

In order to contribute to the development of the agriculture dependent households in watershed villages, IWMP in Andhra Pradesh evolved convergence strategies with Society of Elimination of Rural Poverty (SERP) for upscaling community managed sustainable agriculture practices and with the Department of Agriculture for value addition support. Activities such as non pesticide management along with comprehensive soil fertility management activities viz., NPM shops consisting of all biological extracts, NADEP compost pits, household nutrition security models, custom hiring centres etc., were taken up in convergence with Community Managed Sustainable Agriculture (CMSA) wing of Society of Elimination of Rural Poverty (SERP).

Details of convergence in Agricultural activities

(Rs. in lakh)

| Activity | No. of Units | Total cost | IWMP RF | Agril Dept 50% subsidy | Beneficiary share |
|----------------------------------|--------------|---------------|---------------|------------------------|-------------------|
| Farm Mechanization | 42 | 112.20 | 33.65 | 56.10 | 22.45 |
| Implement Service Stations (ISS) | 59 | 148.27 | 44.48 | 74.23 | 29.56 |
| Custom Hiring Centres (CHC) | 33 | 304.30 | 91.29 | 154.15 | 58.86 |
| Mini SMSRI | 2 | 11.17 | 3.35 | 5.58 | 2.24 |
| Total | 136 | 575.94 | 202.77 | 290.06 | 113.11 |

In convergence with CMSA wing, 955 NPM shops, 1381 NADEP compost pits, 222 mini Custom hiring centres, 14531 kitchen garden units and various other activities were taken up.

In the following table, various activities carried out under IWMP in convergence with Agriculture department are presented

| Sl. No | Activity | Present guidelines of Agril Dept | Convergence arrangement for IWMP |
|--------|---------------------------------|---|--|
| 1 | Farm Mechanization | Farm machinery & equipment to the Individual farmers are supplied on 50% subsidy of max Rs.45000/- per farmer whichever is less | IWMP staff identifies interested UG members of the watersheds in getting implements on 50% subsidy from Agril. Dept. Out of the balance 50%, 30% shall be met from IWMP as RF through VOs and 20% shall be paid by the Farmers |
| 2 | Implement Service Station (ISS) | @ one per village/Gram Panchayat to Group/SHG is allowed to those who are having the tractor, 50% subsidy is given on unit cost of Rs.2.0 lakh | VO/SHG/UG of MWS village shall be identified for Implement service station. Out of the balance 50%, 30% shall be met from IWMP as RF through VOs and 20% shall be paid by the farmers |
| 3 | Custom Hiring Centres (CHC) | 50% subsidy is given per each crop specific CHC by the Agril Dept under RKVY (paddy, groundnut, cotton, tobacco and sugarcane etc. to the farmer groups (50% subsidy, 50% bank loan/beneficiary contribution) | Crop specific custom hiring centres can be established one for each IWMP project (cluster of MWS). Out of the balance 50%, 30% shall be met from IWMP as RF through VOs and 20% shall be paid by the farmers |
| 4 | MINI SMSRI | 50% subsidy is allowed on unit cost on package of machinery consisting of Power tiller, Paddy Transplanter and Nursery trays with Rs.2.0- lakhs subsidy | Out of 50% beneficiary contribution, 30% can be met from IWMP as RF and 20% as farmer share |
| 5 | Individual High cost Machinery | 50% or max of Rs.1.0 lakh subsidy is Allowed | Out of 50% beneficiary contribution, 30% can be met from IWMP as RF and 20% as farmer share |
| 6 | Vermi Hatcheries | 50% subsidy is given on unit cost of Rs.2.0 Lakhs | Out of 50% beneficiary contribution, 30% can be met from IWMP as RF and 20% as farmer share |
| 7 | Vermi Compost Units | 50% subsidy is allowed for establishing Vermicompost units on unit cost of Rs.0.50 Lakhs | Out of 50% beneficiary contribution, 30% can be met from IWMP as RF and 20% as farmer share |
| 8 | Palambadi | ICM practices are made familiarized through intensive trainings to farmers | Agril. Department shall explore the possibility of taking up Palambadi in watershed villages with critical inputs from IWMP funds |
| 9 | Bhoo Chetna | Deficiency of micronutrients of soils are analysed, supplemented with micronutrients on 50% subsidy in 1/3 rd villages of each Mandal | Agril. Department shall explore the possibility of taking up Bhoo Bharati in all IWMP watershed villages |
| 10 | Soil sample Analysis | Mandal wise Soil fertility maps are available.10 samples per GP are collected and analysed | Agril. Department shall cover all IWMP villages for collection and analysis of soil samples. Soil samples collected in IWMP WS villages can be analysed including for micro nutrients at STLs on priority. The Mandal fertility maps can be shared |

| | | | |
|----|--------------------------------|--|--|
| | | | with IWMP staff, joint campaigns on indiscriminate use of fertilizers can be conducted in WS villages |
| 11 | Seed Village Programme | Foundation seed is supplied on 50% subsidy to selected farmers and promote seed multiplication within the village either through internal transfer or buy back arrangement by NGOs | Explore the possibility of Buy back arrangement through selected VOs/WSCs by giving financial assistance through RF |
| 12 | Supply of Gypsum | Gypsum is being supplied to farmers on 50% subsidy and IWMP villages will also be covered | The UG members can be mobilized for getting these inputs in coordination with Agril dept staff. The selected farmers in WS village can be given Preference |
| 13 | Supply of Zinc Sulphate | Zinc sulphate is being supplied to farmers on 50% subsidy and all IWMP villages will also be covered | |
| 14 | Supply of Sprinklers | Sprinklers are supplied to farmers on 50% subsidy | IWMP staff identify farmers (UG) to get maximum benefit out of the subsidy schemes as per Agril Dept guidelines |
| 15 | Supply of Drip for field crops | Drip for field / fodder crops is supplied to farmers on 50% subsidy | |
| 16 | Water carrying pipes | Water carrying pipes are supplied to farmers on 50% subsidy | |
| 17 | Training to User Groups | Agril. Department is covering 1/3 rd villages in each Mandal with the assistance of DAATC and ARS | IWMP villages are given priority in identifying villages for imparting trainings. DWAs shall involve the scientists of DUMAs and ARS and Agril Dept officers in conduct training |

SLNA signed a MoU with SERP to work out the action plans, opening the new accounts, getting administrative sanctions for implementing the action plans, placing requisition for required fund releases etc.

Convergence with Animal Husbandry department resulted in interventions which were grouped under two categories i.e., (1) Community based activities and (2) Individual based activities. Some of the community based activities taken up were:

1. Animal health camps
2. Infertility camps
3. Sheep & goat health camps
4. Breed development

Some of the activities targeting individuals were:

1. Feed to milch animals during last 100 days of pregnancy to promote healthy fetal growth and increase the milk productivity in post calving period.
2. Feed to cross breed and graded calves to promote fast growth and early maturity.
3. Mineral mixture to all the breedable milk animals to check the micro nutrient deficiency and to improve reproductive health.
4. Breeding Rams and Bucks to small ruminant rearers to prevent inbreeding.
5. Back yard poultry units consisting 10 birds to SC, ST etc.

All the individual based activities are provided on 50% subsidy.

In the table below, the progress of the activities taken up by IWMP in convergence with animal Husbandry department are represented.

| Progress since April, 2011 – March, 2014 | |
|---|---------------------------------|
| Activity | Achievement (in numbers) |
| Animal Health Camps | 3015 |
| Animal Fertility Camps | 1017 |
| Sheep Health Camps | 1521 |
| Trevlees | 1081 |
| Feed supply of Pregnant Animals | 1104 |
| Mineral Mixture supply to Milch Animals | 6404 |
| Breeding Rams supplied | 326 |
| No. of Back Yard Poultry Birds supplied | 13550 |

Source: Achieving outcomes collaboratively and efficiently: convergence strategy of IWMP in Andhra Pradesh; office of the SLNA, Government of Andhra Pradesh, Hyderabad.

Chapter -6

Suggestions for Better Functioning of IWMP

6.1 Should demand driven approach continue or be abandoned altogether?

A principal objective of the present study was to evaluate the relative advantages and disadvantages of the demand driven and target oriented approaches with respect to IWMP so as to explore the possibility of reintroducing target oriented approach. As explained in Chapter 3, Section 3.1, the issue at stake is the approach to be adopted at the watershed level. It is at this level that the demand driven approach prevails. This is how the functionaries at the state, district, PIA and watershed levels also understood the context and gave their views accordingly. This is also the most crucial level for the functioning as well as impact of the programme. Moreover, it is the activities at this level that determine the overall performance of IWMP even at the district, state, and national levels.

The advantages and disadvantages of both the approaches on an apriori basis as well as on actual experience basis in 5 sample states as articulated by functionaries at all levels from watershed to state have been elaborated in Chapter-3. These are summed up as below.

Demand Driven Approach

Advantages

- (I) It provides scope for people to fulfill their needs and requirements through selecting their activities and technology.
- (II) Assurance about the usefulness and quality of the assets created resulting in better impact.
- (III) It facilitates effective implementation, monitoring and evaluation because the self interest of beneficiaries is involved.
- (IV) It provides better scope for convergence with other related programmes.
- (V) Assured maintenance because of involvement of beneficiaries and ownership of assets by them.
- (VI) It brings enthusiasm and cooperation from people.

Disadvanges

- (i) It may provide a cloak for bureaucratic inefficiency.
- (ii) Areas that need watershed programme may remain deprived of it.
- (iii) No pressure to complete the work and utilize funds in time.
- (iv) There may be compromise with technical requirements.
- (v) Problems, specially delay arise, if conflicts arise within the community.
- (vi) Risk of inequitable distribution of benefits at times.

Target Oriented Approach

Advantages

- (i) It may cover all the states and areas in a state where the programme is needed in public interest.
- (ii) There is pressure to complete the work and utilize funds in time.
- (iii) It imposes a certain responsibility on the concerned bureaucratic machinery to deliver the outcome and make it accountable for lapses, if any.

Disadvantages

- (i) Quality and usefulness of assets created can not be ensured.
- (ii) Lesser impact.
- (iii) Demand needs of people may not be addressed.
- (iv) Hard to execute the work in a satisfactory manner, without the involvement of people.
- (v) Sustainability of work without people involvement cannot be assured.

Demand driven approach was not mentioned as a factor in slow progress by respondents in any state. Factors mentioned included inadequacy of staff, difficulties in getting labour etc. Moreover, as already noted in Chapter 3, there was a broad consensus among functionaries associated with this programme at all levels, state, district and watershed, that demand driven approach was more suitable for IWMP than target oriented approach. They have, therefore, clearly indicated their preference for the same. That members of the watershed committee would prefer this alternative is quite understandable. It gives them certain powers and privileges which they would like to preserve. But, the surprising finding was that even the officers at all levels have indicated their preference for demand driven approach. Was it because it provided a cloak for their inefficiency so that the responsibility for bureaucratic deficiencies could be easily shifted over to inadequacy of interest shown or time given by the public for this work? Given the importance of the issue, this aspect was carefully examined by asking several questions to officers at different levels. As already explained in Chapter 4, their replies indicated that they had no complaint against public or their representative institutions of panchayats. Even the SLNA officials across the states indicated that the involvement of public in IWMP was useful and in the right direction. But, after further probing, it was found that some of the respondents (not all) felt that the involvement of public sometimes resulted in delay in decision making and, therefore, slow progress. This happens specially when public is not homogenous but consists of diverse interest groups. But, in that case, such problems arise with respect to target oriented approach also. Moreover, in reply to a question (Table 4.4) five representatives of watersheds have mentioned that panchayats help in conflict resolution.

Another problem related to involvement of panchayats in IWMP is that their office bearers including the secretaries are overloaded with a number of activities because of which they may be sparing little time for watershed work. Most of the watershed representatives agreed with this problem. This might be a cause for delay in decision making and slow progress. The reason for this seems to lie in the fact that there is no pressure to complete the work and utilize funds in time. Notwithstanding the above, a majority of watershed representatives felt that the services of panchayats should still be availed of for watershed work. In other words, the advantages of involving panchayats were rated higher and more weighty than the disadvantages. It is thus

obvious that authorities preference for demand driven approach is not a cloak for hiding their inefficiency. It is for genuine reasons which augur well for the programme.

In view of the above findings, it does not seem appropriate to abandon the demand driven approach altogether. There are some problems, but abandoning would amount to throwing the baby with the bath water. The problem of conflicts within the community arises specially when public is not homogeneous but consists of diverse interest groups. The remedy lies in taking up projects in areas where beneficiaries are more homogenous or less heterogeneous in both social and economic sense. If the problem is due to inadequacy of interest, then there is need for vigorous awareness generation campaigns in the beginning and making the programme attractive for public by demonstrating the project benefits. Exposure visits to successful projects elsewhere would be quite useful. Inadequacy of proper technical and administrative support during the implementation of watershed works tends to reduce people's interest substantially. This has been a major problem in IWMP in all the sample states. Vacancies persist for months. Staff is not satisfied. Works get unduly delayed. As a result, people also lose interest. Moreover, some target orientation is also needed as per details indicated below.

6.2 Introducing a mixture of both demand driven and target oriented approach

A major shortcoming of the IWMP guidelines relates to absence of any pressure on government functionaries as well as on public representatives involved with the programme to complete the work and utilize the funds in time. Flexibility in the timeline i.e., project duration is a distinguishing feature of IWMP. Some flexibility is always desirable to take care of unusual problems or unforeseen situations. But, too much of it may not be desirable since this tends to encourage sloth and laziness. People tend to postpone taking decisions or accomplishing the tasks in the allotted time. These, therefore, tend to linger on. Even staff vacancies continue to exist for months. In the case of IWMP, flexibility for the preparatory phase extends from 1 to 2 years, for watershed works it extends from 2 to 3 years and for the last phase from 1 to 2 years. As a result, for the project as a whole, the period of completion can extend from 4 to 7 years. As was observed during our field survey, none of the 32 watershed projects studied were nearing completion even though more than 5 years was over. All of these were still in the second phase. It seems as if 4 years duration is treated as 7 years duration or even more. This is the direct result of too much flexibility. It is, therefore, suggested that the project duration may be of 4 and half years only with provision for extension upto 6 months to be given by SLNA for its first phase, which is the most critical phase in which public participation plays a key role. Target for this phase should be one year to be extendable by SLNA upto six months depending upon specific cases. Such extensions along with justification should be reported to DoLR. After this, the phase of execution of works starts in which the technical staff has a major role. Absence of a fixed target for completion of work may lead to laxity on their part. Hence a fixed target should be laid. Experience of working of the programme so far indicates that the norm of minimum 2 years presently stipulated in the Common Guidelines may not be adequate. It may be changed to 2 years and 6 months. A further one year seems adequate for the 3rd phase. Thus the project should have a target of completion within 4 and half to 5 years. Further extension upto 6 months depending upon location specific situations may be sanctioned by DoLR after receiving adequate justification from SLNA. If more time is taken in some phase then the extra time can be compensated in the other phase so as to ensure the completion of the project in 5 and half years, in any case. This is how the target oriented approach may be introduced in

the programme. It should also have a positive effect on filling up of staff vacancies and more speedy progress.

Following targets, therefore, are suggested

| | | |
|-----|--------------|--|
| iv) | First phase | 1 year, extendable upto 6 months by SLNA |
| v) | Second phase | 2 ½ years |
| vi) | Third phase | <u>1 year</u> |
| | Total | 4 ½ years extendable upto 5 years by SLNA Further extendable upto 5 ½ years by DoLR |

To conclude this portion, a mixture of both demand driven and target oriented approaches is needed in IWMP.

In order to facilitate attainment of targets, several aspects of the programme need to be toned up. These are discussed in the next section.

6.3 Other Suggestions

The study team considered it prudent to invite suggestions for better functioning of IWMP in future from officers involved directly in its management from grass root to the state level. There were 22 PIAs to whom this question was asked. Their views are important as they were involved in the process right from the beginning of the programme. Suggestions also came from district and state level officers concerned with monitoring watershed projects. The following table gives a list of all the suggestions. The most frequently offered suggestions pertain to increase in the present cost norm and timely release of fund. Maximum number of suggestions (9) came from PIAs of Odisha. Similarly, the officials at all the levels (PIA, district and state) of Meghalaya, advocated for enhancement in the per hectare cost norm. This was followed by the suggestion for giving more emphasis on capacity building activities for functional staff. It came from officers at all the three levels of Andhra Pradesh.

| Sl. No. | Suggestions offered | Responses from | | |
|---------|---|-------------------------|----------------------------|-----------------|
| | | PIAs | District officers | State officers |
| i) | Strengthening of office facilities like office accommodation, logistics support like peon, night waterman etc. at PIA level | Odisha | Meghalaya, Odisha | Andhra Pradesh |
| ii) | Provision of vehicle | Meghalaya, Odisha | | |
| iii) | Enhancement in the present cost norm to Rs 25000.00 | Meghalaya, H.P., Odisha | Meghalaya, Andhra Pradesh | Meghalaya, H.P. |
| iv) | Provision for more funds in contingency head of PIA | Odisha | | |
| v) | Enhancement in the salary of project staff | Odisha | Odisha | |
| vi) | Enhancement in seed money for livelihood activities | Odisha | | |
| vii) | Timely release of fund | Meghalaya, H.P., Odisha | Meghalaya, H.P., Rajasthan | |
| viii) | Placement of permanent engineering staff | Odisha | Rajasthan | |
| ix) | Deployment of more technical and non-technical staff | Odisha | Odisha | |
| x) | Good H.R. measures to retain efficient and Experienced staff | | | Odisha |
| xi) | Vacant positions at different levels should be filled immediately | Rajasthan | Andhra Pradesh | Andhra Pradesh |
| xii) | One position for accountant is needed at every PIA office | Rajasthan | | |
| xiii) | Record maintaining process should be easy at watershed committee level | Rajasthan | | |
| xiv) | SHG activities should be handed over to National Rural Livelihood Mission (NRLM/RGAVP) for better results | Rajasthan | | |
| xv) | More emphasis on capacity building activities for functional staff | Andhra Pradesh | Andhra Pradesh | Andhra Pradesh |
| xvi) | Planning from below | | Andhra Pradesh | |
| xvii) | Reduce unnecessary delays on the part of Watershed committees | | Andhra Pradesh | |
| xviii) | Convergence with other programmes | | | Odisha |

As mentioned earlier, one of the most frequently offered suggestion was to enhance the present cost norm to Rs.25,000. This suggestion was made at all the levels, PIA, district and state. Inadequacy of fund greatly affects proper and effective implementation of works. Meghalaya made a case for it in view of the difficult terrain of the state apart from increase in cost of materials and labour since 2009 while Himachal Pradesh justified it on the ground of substantial rise in material cost due to banning of mining activities. Labour cost was also reported to have gone up. Besides, it was also a mountainous state. It may be said that the rates are higher for the hilly states by Rs.3000 per hectare i.e. Rs.15000 per hectare for hilly areas as compared to Rs.12000 per hectare for other areas (Para 69 of the Common Guidelines). But the Himalayan terrain is certainly more tough and difficult than ordinary hilly areas as found in say Odisha. Hence, Meghalaya and Himachal Pradesh, have a good case for a still higher amount. This can be done if there is a third category of mountainous states or areas within a state as per need.

There are a few more suggestions having a bearing on the scale of funding. Odisha has also suggested the need for providing more funds under contingency head

of PIA. Need for vehicle at PIA level was articulated for better supervision and monitoring by Meghalaya and Odisha while need for several other infrastructural support for better functioning of PIA office was articulated by several respondents. Such demands can be taken care of if the scale of funding is raised.

The present scale of funding is in force from April, 2009. Since then cost of material and labour has gone up significantly. All India figures of price indices indicate that the price level has gone up by 75 percent from 2009 to 2014. This amounts to a substantial erosion in the real value funds provided to watershed projects. It is not possible to maintain quality of assets under such circumstances. The scope of the work is bound to be reduced. As a result, public would not get the proclaimed benefits. This would have another adverse effect of lowering their morale and interest. In order to neutralize the effect of price rise, the figure of Rs.12,000 need to be raised to Rs.21,000 and that of Rs.15,000 to Rs.26,000. State functionaries are, therefore, fully justified in making a case for rise in the level of funding. It is, therefore, suggested that the level of per hectare funding should be raised substantially to take care of rise in cost of material and cost of labour etc. Further DoLR should institute a mechanism under which per hectare norms of funding are regularly updated at the interval of 3 years so as to neutralize the effect of rise in costs.

Late release of fund was reported to be another major reason for lower utilization of funds. Hence, it was not surprising that timely release of fund was emphasized by four of the five sample states. In this connection, the district level functionaries of Himachal Pradesh suggested that release on the basis of year-wise allocation should be made directly to the Watershed Committee. It may be mentioned in this context that the need for timely release of fund was also underlined in the Monitoring and Evaluation Reports of watershed development projects of Meghalaya Batch III, as in the case of South Garo Hills district by North Eastern Hill University, Tura Campus, of Ri Bhoi district by ICAR Research Complex for NEH Region, Umiam, Meghalaya, of East Khasi Hills district by State institute of Rural Development (SIRD), Nongstoin, Meghalaya. It is suggested that government may streamline the procedure for release of funds so that avoidable delays are avoided.

As highlighted in Chapter 5, a major problem faced by implementing agencies relates to inadequacy of staff which has been reported by several states. This is the major reason behind under utilization of fund, slow progress and less interest by beneficiaries. It also affects the quality of assets created. Several inter-related suggestions have been made by the officials at different levels to deal with this problem. According to Andhra Pradesh and Rajasthan, vacant positions should be filled immediately at most within three months. But it is not easy to do so due to several factors such as absence of permanent positions etc. Odisha and Rajasthan, therefore, have made a suggestion for placement of permanent engineering staff and deployment of more technical and non-technical staff. Odisha has also suggested the need for good H.R. measures to retain experienced and efficient staff as well as enhancement in the salary of project staff. These are useful suggestions and deserve to be considered seriously by the appropriate authorities. We may add by saying

that this matter requires serious consideration by higher authorities if the programme is to make an impact in future. A list of positions being vacant for more than six months should be sent monthly by PIA through WCDC to SLNA along with its proposal to fill up the vacancies.

The concerned states should also look into the problem of rapid turnover of staff highlighted elsewhere so that migration of dedicated and good quality of staff comes down to some extent. There can be two possibilities. One that they can be paid an attractive amount or secondly that they can be promised engagement for a longer period even after watershed projects are completed. While the second option is far from reach owing to the nature of the activity that no one knows how long the scheme will continue, the other option can be tried. High quality professional staff, on which much of the success of the programme depends, have to be paid appropriate competitive salary. If necessary, additional funds for this purpose may be earmarked.

As mentioned in Chapter 5, inadequate supply of labour in certain states has been another factor hindering progress. This implies that the wage rates paid to labour under IWMP are not attractive enough. It is, therefore, suggested that the wage rates may be revised taking into account the present cost of living and wages paid under MGNREGS.

Andhra Pradesh suggestion regarding giving more emphasis on capacity building activities for functional staff should be taken note of. This requires more attention to capacity building and strengthening of training infrastructure. Preference may be given to local training agencies so that boarding and lodging related problems for female participants (members of female SHG) are minimized. Services of local Veterinary Doctors for livestock related activity, Block Development Officer for livelihood activities, government sponsored vocational training centres etc. should be made use of for the above purposes failing which competent and willing non-government organizations (NGOs) / Voluntary Organizations (VOs) working in the field of socio-economic, community and entrepreneurial development, may be looked out and kept in the panel. Target for training should be fixed in advance in such a manner that all the concerned functionaries get an opportunity for participating in the training programme considered useful for them, as early as possible.

Finally every effort should be made to ensure greater convergence of IWMP with other related programmes of the government. The lead in this respect should be taken by the state government. State level functionaries of different departments should issue order to their district officers to participate fully and enthusiastically in convergence. Formation of a district level convergence committee will be of much help. Regular monitoring of convergence and follow up should take place at both district and state levels.

Annexure 1.1
District-wise IWMP projects sanctioned upto 2012-13

| Sl. No. | State | District | No. of projects sanctioned | Area in lakh ha. |
|---------|--------------------|-----------------|----------------------------|------------------|
| 1 | Maharashtra | Ahmednagar | 22 | 0.97 |
| 2 | | Akola | 12 | 0.52 |
| 3 | | Amravati | 29 | 1.23 |
| 4 | | Aurangabad | 21 | 1.10 |
| 5 | | Beed | 54 | 2.31 |
| 6 | | Bhandra | 12 | 0.61 |
| 7 | | Buldhana | 38 | 1.65 |
| 8 | | Chandrapur | 25 | 1.02 |
| 9 | | Dhule | 22 | 0.86 |
| 10 | | Gadchiroli | 4 | 0.20 |
| 11 | | Gondia | 14 | 0.61 |
| 12 | | Hingoli | 29 | 1.26 |
| 13 | | Jalana | 34 | 1.50 |
| 14 | | Jalgaon | 31 | 1.26 |
| 15 | | Nanded | 49 | 2.20 |
| 16 | | Kolhapur | 37 | 1.49 |
| 17 | | Latur | 30 | 1.20 |
| 18 | | Nagpur | 22 | 0.90 |
| 19 | | Nandurbar | 18 | 0.77 |
| 20 | | Nashik | 29 | 1.24 |
| 21 | | Osmanabad | 38 | 1.69 |
| 22 | | Parbhani | 25 | 1.01 |
| 23 | | Pune | 31 | 1.45 |
| 24 | | Raigad | 39 | 1.35 |
| 25 | | Ratnagiri | 46 | 1.90 |
| 26 | | Sangli | 32 | 1.36 |
| 27 | | Satara | 67 | 2.71 |
| 28 | | Sindhudurg | 20 | 0.90 |
| 29 | | Sholapur | 44 | 2.07 |
| 30 | | Thane | 14 | 0.59 |
| 31 | | Washim | 10 | 0.43 |
| 32 | | Wardha | 23 | 1.08 |
| 33 | | Yavatmal | 27 | 1.22 |
| | | Total | 948 | 40.67 |
| 34 | Karnataka | Bagal Kote | 12 | 0.52 |
| 35 | | Bangalore Rural | 9 | 0.42 |
| 36 | | Belgaum | 23 | 0.85 |
| 37 | | Bellary | 18 | 0.68 |
| 38 | | Bidar | 15 | 0.86 |

| | | | | |
|----|----------------|-----------------|------------|--------------|
| 39 | | Bijapur | 17 | 0.71 |
| 40 | | Chamrajnagar | 12 | 0.64 |
| 41 | | Chikballapur | 15 | 0.66 |
| 42 | | Chikmagalur | 10 | 0.52 |
| 43 | | Chitradurga | 20 | 0.90 |
| 44 | | Dakshina Kannda | 10 | 0.45 |
| 45 | | Davengere | 15 | 0.76 |
| 46 | | Dharwad | 15 | 0.61 |
| 47 | | Gadag | 14 | 0.72 |
| 48 | | Gurbarga | 24 | 1.10 |
| 49 | | Hassan | 18 | 0.73 |
| 50 | | Haveri | 17 | 0.76 |
| 51 | | Kolar | 16 | 0.75 |
| 52 | | Koppal | 15 | 0.72 |
| 53 | | Mandya | 14 | 0.61 |
| 54 | | Kodagu | 4 | 0.19 |
| 55 | | Mysore | 15 | 0.77 |
| 56 | | Raichur | 15 | 0.70 |
| 57 | | Ramnagar | 10 | 0.48 |
| 58 | | Shimoga | 21 | 0.76 |
| 59 | | Tumkur | 28 | 1.10 |
| 60 | | Udupi | 6 | 0.27 |
| 61 | | Uttar Kannada | 15 | 0.61 |
| 62 | | Yadgir | 7 | 0.34 |
| | | Total | 430 | 19.19 |
| 63 | Gujarat | Ahmedabad | 18 | 0.90 |
| 64 | | Amreli | 21 | 0.98 |
| 65 | | Anand | 15 | 0.69 |
| 66 | | Banaskantha | 23 | 1.20 |
| 67 | | Bharuch | 17 | 0.77 |
| 68 | | Bhavnagar | 20 | 1.03 |
| 69 | | Dahod | 17 | 0.88 |
| 70 | | Dangs | 15 | 0.81 |
| 71 | | Gandhinagar | 12 | 0.58 |
| 72 | | Jamnagar | 23 | 1.20 |
| 73 | | Junagadh | 21 | 1.10 |
| 74 | | Kuchchh | 41 | 2.19 |
| 75 | | Kheda | 14 | 0.65 |
| 76 | | Mehsana | 14 | 0.79 |
| 77 | | Narmada | 16 | 0.82 |
| 78 | | Navsari | 16 | 0.75 |
| 79 | | Panchmahal | 18 | 0.90 |
| 80 | | Patan | 21 | 1.14 |
| 81 | | Porbandar | 17 | 0.86 |
| 82 | | Rajkoit | 24 | 1.13 |

| | | | | |
|-----|------------------|---------------------|------------|--------------|
| 83 | | Sabarkantha | 23 | 1.44 |
| 84 | | Surat | 14 | 0.66 |
| 85 | | Surendranagar | 22 | 1.09 |
| 86 | | Tapi | 13 | 0.64 |
| 87 | | Vadodara | 20 | 0.91 |
| 88 | | Valsad | 14 | 0.69 |
| | | Total | 489 | 24.52 |
| 89 | Jharkhand | Bokaro | 4 | 0.22 |
| 90 | | Chatra | 4 | 0.23 |
| 91 | | East Singhbhum | 4 | 0.20 |
| 92 | | Garhwa | 5 | 0.21 |
| 93 | | Gumla | 4 | 0.24 |
| 94 | | Saraikela Kharsawan | 4 | 0.22 |
| 95 | | Girid | 9 | 0.44 |
| 96 | | Jamtara | 4 | 0.20 |
| 97 | | Koderma | 4 | 0.20 |
| 98 | | Latehar | 7 | 0.39 |
| 99 | | Deoghar | 4 | 0.21 |
| 100 | | Dumka | 3 | 0.17 |
| 101 | | Godda | 5 | 0.26 |
| 102 | | West Singhbhum | 11 | 0.61 |
| 103 | | Ranchi | 13 | 0.72 |
| 104 | | Hazaribagh | 6 | 0.30 |
| 105 | | Sahebganj | 2 | 0.10 |
| 106 | | Pakur | 4 | 0.21 |
| 107 | | Palamu | 4 | 0.19 |
| 108 | | Ramgarh | 4 | 0.21 |
| 109 | | Lohardaga | 3 | 0.16 |
| 110 | | Dhanbad | 3 | 0.16 |
| 111 | | Siumdega | 3 | 0.16 |
| 112 | | Khunti | 3 | 0.19 |
| | | Total | 117 | 6.20 |
| 113 | Haryana | Bhiwani | 6 | 0.24 |
| 114 | | Hissar | 7 | 0.25 |
| 115 | | Mahendra Garh | 7 | 0.28 |
| 116 | | Rewari | 6 | 0.25 |
| 117 | | Ambala | 7 | 0.26 |
| 118 | | Panchkula | 7 | 0.26 |
| 119 | | Yamuna Nagar | 7 | 0.25 |
| 120 | | Gurgaon | 3 | 0.11 |
| 121 | | Mewat | 2 | 0.09 |
| 122 | | Palwal | 2 | 0.11 |
| 123 | | Sonipat | 1 | 0.06 |
| 124 | | Jhajjar | 3 | 0.15 |
| 125 | | Rohtak | 2 | 0.10 |

| | | | | |
|-----|----------------------|-------------------|------------|-------------|
| | | Total | 80 | 2.41 |
| 126 | Chhattishgarh | Rajnandgaon | 11 | 0.46 |
| 127 | | Dantewada | 4 | 0.14 |
| 128 | | Sukma | 3 | 0.08 |
| 129 | | Kondagaon | 5 | 0.24 |
| 130 | | Surajpur | 3 | 0.15 |
| 131 | | Balrampur | 8 | 0.32 |
| 132 | | Gariyaband | 5 | 0.23 |
| 133 | | Balodabazar | 6 | 0.26 |
| 134 | | Mungeli | 3 | 0.12 |
| 135 | | Bastar | 10 | 0.46 |
| 136 | | Bilaspur | 6 | 0.29 |
| 137 | | Balod | 7 | 0.32 |
| 138 | | Durg | 4 | 0.21 |
| 139 | | Bemetara | 2 | 0.10 |
| 140 | | Dhamtari | 5 | 0.22 |
| 141 | | Mahasamund | 17 | 0.67 |
| 142 | | Koria | 10 | 0.40 |
| 143 | | Raigarh | 17 | 0.90 |
| 144 | | Bijapur | 2 | 0.05 |
| 145 | | Kabirdham | 7 | 0.41 |
| 146 | | Kanker | 16 | 0.57 |
| 147 | | Janjir Champa | 15 | 0.60 |
| 148 | | Raipur | 4 | 0.18 |
| 149 | | Korba | 10 | 0.40 |
| 150 | | Surguja | 7 | 0.31 |
| 151 | | Jashpur | 20 | 1.03 |
| 152 | | Naryanpur | 1 | 0.05 |
| | | Total | 208 | 9.19 |
| 153 | West Bengal | Purulia | 20 | 0.87 |
| 154 | | Jalpaiguri | 10 | 0.45 |
| 155 | | Birbhum | 7 | 0.31 |
| 156 | | Burdwan | 1 | 0.04 |
| 157 | | Pachim Medinipur | 21 | 0.88 |
| 158 | | North 24 Parganas | 4 | 0.19 |
| 159 | | South 24 Parganas | 12 | 0.50 |
| 160 | | Cooch Behar | 10 | 0.49 |
| 161 | | Darjeeling | 13 | 0.51 |
| 162 | | Bankura | 21 | 0.84 |
| | | Total | 119 | 5.07 |
| 163 | J & K | Anantnag | 8 | 0.34 |
| 164 | | Bandipora | 3 | 0.12 |
| 165 | | Budgam | 4 | 0.22 |
| 166 | | Ganndbal | 2 | 0.07 |
| 167 | | Jammu | 4 | 0.22 |

| | | | | |
|-----|--------------------------|---------------------|------------|-------------|
| 168 | | Kathua | 5 | 0.23 |
| 169 | | Kulgam | 4 | 0.18 |
| 170 | | Kupwaras | 5 | 0.22 |
| 171 | | Leh | 3 | 0.13 |
| 172 | | Poonch | 4 | 0.20 |
| 173 | | Pulwama | 3 | 0.13 |
| 174 | | Kishtwar | 3 | 0.13 |
| 175 | | Ramban | 3 | 0.13 |
| 176 | | Rajouri | 4 | 0.16 |
| 177 | | Reasi | 4 | 0.14 |
| 178 | | Shopian | 4 | 0.17 |
| 179 | | Srinagar | 1 | 0.06 |
| 180 | | Udhampur | 4 | 0.16 |
| 181 | | Kargil | 3 | 0.12 |
| 182 | | Baramulla | 5 | 0.21 |
| 183 | | Doda | 4 | 0.16 |
| 184 | | Samba | 4 | 0.18 |
| | | Total | 84 | 3.69 |
| 185 | Bihar | Aurangabad | 7 | 0.31 |
| 186 | | Banka | 10 | 0.48 |
| 187 | | Gaya | 12 | 0.60 |
| 188 | | Jamul | 14 | 0.70 |
| 189 | | Rohtas | 7 | 0.32 |
| 190 | | Nawada | 7 | 0.36 |
| 191 | | Kaimur | 5 | 0.24 |
| 192 | | Munger | 2 | 0.10 |
| | | Total | 64 | 3.12 |
| 193 | Arunachal Pradesh | Anjaw | 1 | 0.05 |
| 194 | | Changlang | 1 | 0.04 |
| 195 | | East Kameng | 10 | 0.27 |
| 196 | | East Saing | 4 | 0.12 |
| 197 | | Kurung Kumey | 17 | 0.60 |
| 198 | | Lohit | 3 | 0.17 |
| 199 | | Lower Dibang Valley | 5 | 0.14 |
| 200 | | Papum Pare | 11 | 0.28 |
| 201 | | Upeer Subansiri | 31 | 1.11 |
| 202 | | Lower Subansiri | 8 | 0.10 |
| 203 | | West Siang | 14 | 0.41 |
| 204 | | Tawang | 1 | 0.03 |
| 205 | | Tirap | 2 | 0.05 |
| 206 | | West Kameng | 4 | 0.09 |
| 207 | | Dibang Valley | 3 | 0.08 |
| 208 | | Upper Siang | 1 | 0.02 |
| | | Total | 114 | 3.57 |

| | | | | |
|-----|------------------|--------------------|------------|--------------|
| 209 | Assam | Baksa | 8 | 0.29 |
| 210 | | Barpeta | 11 | 0.48 |
| 211 | | Bongaigaon | 5 | 0.22 |
| 212 | | Cachar | 13 | 0.55 |
| 213 | | Chirang | 8 | 0.30 |
| 214 | | Darrang | 9 | 0.40 |
| 215 | | Dhemaji | 9 | 0.37 |
| 216 | | Dhubri | 16 | 0.62 |
| 217 | | Dibrugarh | 8 | 0.35 |
| 218 | | Goalpara | 9 | 0.36 |
| 219 | | Hailakandi | 6 | 0.21 |
| 220 | | Jorhat | 10 | 0.44 |
| 221 | | Kamrup | 7 | 0.28 |
| 222 | | Kamrup Metro | 10 | 0.40 |
| 223 | | Karbi Anglong | 29 | 1.07 |
| 224 | | Karimganj | 11 | 0.49 |
| 225 | | Kokrajhar | 15 | 0.57 |
| 226 | | Lakhimpur | 10 | 0.46 |
| 227 | | Marigaon | 7 | 0.29 |
| 228 | | Nagaon | 15 | 0.67 |
| 229 | | Nalbari | 6 | 0.28 |
| 230 | | North Cachar Hills | 4 | 0.18 |
| 231 | | Sivsagar | 11 | 0.50 |
| 232 | | Sonitpur | 14 | 0.60 |
| 233 | | Tinsukia | 7 | 0.33 |
| 234 | | Udalgiri | 9 | 0.37 |
| 235 | | Golaghat | 13 | 0.56 |
| | | Total | 280 | 11.67 |
| 236 | Manipur | Bishnupur | 4 | 0.13 |
| 237 | | Chandel | 10 | 0.53 |
| 238 | | Churachandpur | 13 | 0.70 |
| 239 | | Imphal East | 6 | 0.17 |
| 240 | | Imphal West | 3 | 0.15 |
| 241 | | Senapati | 11 | 0.61 |
| 242 | | Tamenglong | 11 | 0.57 |
| 243 | | Thoubal | 4 | 0.21 |
| 244 | | Ukrul | 13 | 0.60 |
| | | Total | 75 | 3.68 |
| 245 | Meghalaya | East Garo Hills | 10 | 0.18 |
| 246 | | East Khasi Hills | 13 | 0.21 |
| 247 | | Jaintia Hills | 9 | 0.31 |
| 248 | | Ri Bhoi | 8 | 0.16 |
| 249 | | South Garo Hills | 9 | 0.15 |
| 250 | | West Garo Hills | 13 | 0.22 |
| 251 | | West Khasi Hills | 11 | 0.36 |

| | | | | |
|-----|-----------------|----------------|-----------|-------------|
| | | Total | 73 | 1.58 |
| 252 | Mizoram | Aizwal | 19 | 0.64 |
| 253 | | Champi | 5 | 0.20 |
| 254 | | Kolasib | 4 | 0.13 |
| 255 | | Lawngtalai | 12 | 0.51 |
| 256 | | Lunglei | 12 | 0.60 |
| 257 | | Mamit | 4 | 0.18 |
| 258 | | Saiha | 4 | 0.15 |
| 259 | | Serchip | 4 | 0.19 |
| | | Total | 64 | 2.60 |
| 260 | Nagaland | Dimapur | 7 | 0.29 |
| 261 | | Khiphire | 6 | 0.30 |
| 262 | | Kohima | 7 | 0.31 |
| 263 | | Longleng | 5 | 0.24 |
| 264 | | Mokokchung | 8 | 0.38 |
| 265 | | Mon | 8 | 0.31 |
| 266 | | Peren | 5 | 0.24 |
| 267 | | Phek | 8 | 0.33 |
| 268 | | Tuensang | 8 | 0.34 |
| 269 | | Wokha | 8 | 0.36 |
| 270 | | Zunheboto | 8 | 0.33 |
| | | Total | 78 | 3.44 |
| 271 | Sikkim | East District | 4 | 0.17 |
| 272 | | North District | 1 | 0.07 |
| 273 | | South District | 4 | 0.14 |
| 274 | | West District | 2 | 0.13 |
| | | Total | 11 | 0.50 |
| 275 | Tripura | Dhalai | 7 | 0.13 |
| 276 | | North Tripura | 11 | 0.25 |
| 277 | | South Tripura | 11 | 0.25 |
| 278 | | West Tripura | 14 | 0.37 |
| 279 | | Gomati | 2 | 0.06 |
| 280 | | Khowai | 1 | 0.02 |
| 281 | | Sipahijala | 1 | 0.01 |
| 282 | | Unakoti | 1 | 0.01 |
| | | Total | 48 | 1.13 |
| 283 | Odisha | Anugul | 6 | 0.32 |
| 284 | | Balangir | 10 | 0.50 |
| 285 | | Baleshwar | 3 | 0.15 |
| 286 | | Bargarh | 10 | 0.55 |
| 287 | | Baudh | 6 | 0.30 |
| 288 | | Cuttack | 6 | 0.34 |
| 289 | | Deogarh | 7 | 0.40 |
| 290 | | Dhenkanal | 5 | 0.27 |
| 291 | | Gajapati | 7 | 0.38 |

| | | | | |
|-----|------------------|--------------|------------|--------------|
| 292 | | Ganjam | 7 | 0.41 |
| 293 | | Jajapur | 5 | 0.28 |
| 294 | | Jharsuguda | 5 | 0.30 |
| 295 | | Kalahandi | 12 | 0.57 |
| 296 | | Kandhmal | 18 | 0.92 |
| 297 | | Keonjhar | 12 | 0.71 |
| 298 | | Khordha | 4 | 0.23 |
| 299 | | Koraput | 11 | 0.62 |
| 300 | | Mayurbhanj | 16 | 0.96 |
| 301 | | Nabarangapur | 11 | 0.61 |
| 302 | | Nayagarh | 10 | 0.57 |
| 303 | | Nuapada | 16 | 0.78 |
| 304 | | Rayagada | 12 | 0.70 |
| 305 | | Sambalpur | 9 | 0.49 |
| 306 | | Sonapur | 4 | 0.22 |
| 307 | | Sundargarh | 15 | 0.83 |
| 308 | | Malkangiri | 7 | 0.34 |
| | | Total | 234 | 12.78 |
| | Rajasthan | | | |
| 309 | | Ajmer | 23 | 1.37 |
| 310 | | Alwar | 26 | 1.31 |
| 311 | | Banswara | 8 | 0.41 |
| 312 | | Baran | 33 | 1.97 |
| 313 | | Barmer | 51 | 3.14 |
| 314 | | Baratpur | 28 | 1.60 |
| 315 | | Bhilwara | 20 | 1.07 |
| 316 | | Bikaner | 35 | 2.32 |
| 317 | | Bundi | 21 | 1.18 |
| 318 | | Chittaurgarh | 22 | 1.08 |
| 319 | | Churu | 26 | 1.42 |
| 320 | | Dausa | 9 | 0.58 |
| 321 | | Dholpur | 8 | 0.36 |
| 322 | | Dungarpur | 19 | 1.05 |
| 323 | | Hanumangarh | 27 | 1.66 |
| 324 | | Jaipur | 34 | 1.90 |
| 325 | | Jaisalmer | 39 | 2.67 |
| 326 | | Jalore | 21 | 1.41 |
| 327 | | Jhalawar | 30 | 1.74 |
| 328 | | Jhunjhunu | 15 | 0.82 |
| 329 | | Jodhpur | 52 | 2.49 |
| 330 | | Karauli | 22 | 1.32 |
| 331 | | Kota | 10 | 1.00 |
| 332 | | Nagaur | 33 | 1.78 |
| 333 | | Pali | 22 | 1.14 |
| 334 | | Pratapgarh | 12 | 0.66 |

| | | | | |
|-----|-------------------------|----------------|------------|--------------|
| 335 | | Rajsmand | 16 | 0.85 |
| 336 | | Sawai Madhopur | 12 | 0.60 |
| 337 | | Sikar | 19 | 1.02 |
| 338 | | Sirohi | 15 | 0.82 |
| 339 | | Tonk | 13 | 0.71 |
| 340 | | Udaipur | 19 | 0.86 |
| | | Total | 749 | 42.31 |
| 341 | Andhra Pradesh | Adilabad | 39 | 1.37 |
| 342 | | Anantpur | 86 | 3.55 |
| 343 | | Chittoor | 58 | 2.39 |
| 344 | | Kadapa | 38 | 1.64 |
| 345 | | East Godavari | 0 | 0.00 |
| 346 | | Guntur | 0 | 0.00 |
| 347 | | Hyderabad | 0 | 0.00 |
| 348 | | Karimnagar | 0 | 0.00 |
| 349 | | Khammam | 10 | 0.46 |
| 350 | | Krishna | 0 | 0.00 |
| 351 | | Kurnool | 59 | 2.66 |
| 352 | | Mahabubnagar | 80 | 3.39 |
| 353 | | Medak | 31 | 1.40 |
| 354 | | Nalgonda | 44 | 1.81 |
| 355 | | Nellore | 0 | 0.00 |
| 356 | | Nizamabad | 0 | 0.00 |
| 357 | | Prakasam | 62 | 2.80 |
| 358 | | Ranga Reddy | 33 | 1.43 |
| 359 | | Sirikakulam | 14 | 0.61 |
| 360 | | Visakhapatnam | 0 | 0.00 |
| 361 | | Vizianagaram | 0 | 0.00 |
| 362 | | Warangal | 2 | 0.10 |
| 363 | | West Godavari | 0 | 0.00 |
| | | Total | 556 | 23.60 |
| 364 | Himachal Pradesh | Bilaspur | 8 | 0.23 |
| 365 | | Chamba | 14 | 0.90 |
| 366 | | Hamirpur | 4 | 0.19 |
| 367 | | Kangra | 17 | 0.93 |
| 368 | | Kinnaur | 8 | 0.24 |
| 369 | | Kullu | 9 | 0.63 |
| 370 | | Lahaul Spiti | 10 | 0.50 |
| 371 | | Mandi | 11 | 0.71 |
| 372 | | Shimla | 27 | 1.17 |
| 373 | | Sirmour | 7 | 0.43 |
| 374 | | Solan | 8 | 0.55 |
| 375 | | Una | 8 | 0.42 |

| | | | | |
|-----|----------------------|--------------------|------------|-------------|
| | | Total | 131 | 6.90 |
| 376 | Kerala | Alappuzha | 3 | 0.20 |
| 377 | | Ernakulam | 3 | 0.15 |
| 378 | | Idukki | 11 | 0.61 |
| 379 | | Kannur | 5 | 0.35 |
| 380 | | Kasargod | 6 | 0.33 |
| 381 | | Kollam | 3 | 0.17 |
| 382 | | Kottayam | 3 | 0.17 |
| 383 | | Kozhikiode | 2 | 0.11 |
| 384 | | Malapuram | 6 | 0.29 |
| 385 | | Palakkad | 6 | 0.27 |
| 386 | | Pathanamthitta | 2 | 0.16 |
| 387 | | Thiruvananthapuram | 3 | 0.21 |
| 388 | | Thissur | 3 | 0.16 |
| 389 | | Wayanad | 5 | 0.21 |
| | | Total | 61 | 3.40 |
| 390 | MadhyaPradesh | Alirajpur | 4 | 0.21 |
| 391 | | Anuppur | 8 | 0.43 |
| 392 | | Ashoknagar | 4 | 0.18 |
| 393 | | Balaghat | 3 | 0.20 |
| 394 | | Barwani | 7 | 0.46 |
| 395 | | Betul | 9 | 0.47 |
| 396 | | Bhind | 4 | 0.22 |
| 397 | | Bhopal | 10 | 0.53 |
| 398 | | Burhanpur | 6 | 0.33 |
| 399 | | Chhattarpur | 17 | 0.94 |
| 400 | | Chhindwara | 12 | 0.71 |
| 401 | | Damoh | 12 | 0.65 |
| 402 | | Datia | 8 | 0.51 |
| 403 | | Dewas | 8 | 0.45 |
| 404 | | Dhar | 8 | 0.44 |
| 405 | | Dindori | 4 | 0.20 |
| 406 | | Guna | 7 | 0.40 |
| 407 | | Gwalior | 7 | 0.34 |
| 408 | | Harda | 4 | 0.22 |
| 409 | | Hoshangabad | 3 | 0.15 |
| 410 | | Indore | 8 | 0.44 |
| 411 | | Jabalpur | 8 | 0.51 |
| 412 | | Jhabua | 8 | 0.40 |
| 413 | | Katni | 7 | 0.41 |
| 414 | | Khandwa | 8 | 0.46 |
| 415 | | Khargone | 11 | 0.62 |
| 416 | | Mandla | 6 | 0.40 |
| 417 | | Mandsaur | 7 | 0.37 |
| 418 | | Morena | 7 | 0.45 |

| | | | | |
|-----|---------------|------------------|------------|--------------|
| 419 | | Narasinghpur | 4 | 0.21 |
| 420 | | Neemuch | 6 | 0.35 |
| 421 | | Panna | 11 | 0.62 |
| 422 | | Raisen | 4 | 0.20 |
| 423 | | Rajgarh | 6 | 0.37 |
| 424 | | Ratlam | 8 | 0.49 |
| 425 | | Rewa | 8 | 0.43 |
| 426 | | Sagar | 24 | 1.58 |
| 427 | | Satna | 6 | 0.30 |
| 428 | | Sehore | 8 | 0.41 |
| 429 | | Seoni | 2 | 0.20 |
| 430 | | Shahdol | 4 | 0.20 |
| 431 | | Shajapur | 4 | 0.25 |
| 432 | | Sheopur | 4 | 0.21 |
| 433 | | Shivpuri | 6 | 0.31 |
| 434 | | Sidhi | 4 | 0.20 |
| 435 | | Singrauli | 4 | 0.20 |
| 436 | | Tikamgarh | 16 | 0.76 |
| 437 | | Ujjain | 8 | 0.44 |
| 438 | | Umaria | 3 | 0.21 |
| 439 | | Vidisha | 8 | 0.43 |
| | | Total | 363 | 20.45 |
| 440 | Pubjab | Amritsar | 0 | 0.00 |
| 441 | | Barnala | 0 | 0.00 |
| 442 | | Bathinda | 0 | 0.00 |
| 443 | | Faridkot | 2 | 0.08 |
| 444 | | Fazilka | 1 | 0.04 |
| 445 | | Fatehgarh Sahib | 0 | 0.00 |
| 446 | | Firozpur | 0 | 0.00 |
| 447 | | Gurdaspur | 2 | 0.08 |
| 448 | | Hoshiarpur | 15 | 0.81 |
| 449 | | Jalandhar | 2 | 0.05 |
| 450 | | Kapurthala | 1 | 0.05 |
| 451 | | Ludhiana | 3 | 0.10 |
| 452 | | Mansa | 0 | 0.00 |
| 453 | | Moga | 0 | 0.00 |
| 454 | | Mohali | 2 | 0.13 |
| 455 | | Muktsar | 0 | 0.00 |
| 456 | | Nawan shahar | 4 | 0.14 |
| 457 | | Patiala | 2 | 0.08 |
| 458 | | Pathankot | 4 | 0.15 |
| 459 | | Rupnagar (Ropar) | 5 | 0.24 |
| 460 | | Sangrur | 0 | 0.00 |
| 461 | | Tarn taran | 2 | 0.08 |
| | | Total | 45 | 2.02 |

| | | | | |
|-----|----------------------|-----------------|------------|--------------|
| 462 | Tamil Nadu | Ariyalur | 1 | 0.05 |
| 463 | | Chennai | 0 | 0.00 |
| 464 | | Coimbatore | 7 | 0.34 |
| 465 | | Cuddalore | 7 | 0.29 |
| 466 | | Dharmapuri | 10 | 0.50 |
| 467 | | Dindigul | 11 | 0.59 |
| 468 | | Erode | 3 | 0.14 |
| 469 | | Kancheepuram | 7 | 0.35 |
| 470 | | Kanyakumari | 0 | 0.00 |
| 471 | | Karur | 6 | 0.29 |
| 472 | | Krishnagiri | 10 | 0.52 |
| 473 | | Madurai | 4 | 0.20 |
| 474 | | Nagapattinam | 0 | 0.00 |
| 475 | | Namakkal | 10 | 0.44 |
| 476 | | Perambalur | 8 | 0.41 |
| 477 | | Pudukkottai | 9 | 0.37 |
| 478 | | Ramanathapuram | 11 | 0.61 |
| 479 | | Salem | 13 | 0.63 |
| 480 | | Sivagangai | 10 | 0.48 |
| 481 | | Thanjavur | 0 | 0.00 |
| 482 | | The Nilgiris | 0 | 0.00 |
| 483 | | Theni | 8 | 0.30 |
| 484 | | Thoothukudi | 9 | 0.55 |
| 485 | | Tiruppur | 0 | 0.00 |
| 486 | | Tiruvallur | 6 | 0.30 |
| 487 | | Tiruvarur | 0 | 0.00 |
| 488 | | Tiruchirappalli | 10 | 0.58 |
| 489 | | Tirunelveli | 7 | 0.36 |
| 490 | | Tiruvannamalai | 7 | 0.37 |
| 491 | | Vellore | 9 | 0.40 |
| 492 | | Villupuram | 8 | 0.42 |
| 493 | | Virudhunagar | 11 | 0.53 |
| | | Total | 200 | 10.03 |
| 494 | Uttar Pradesh | Agra | 6 | 0.22 |
| 495 | | Aligarh | 6 | 0.31 |
| 496 | | Allahabad | 7 | 0.29 |
| 497 | | Ambedkarnagar | 6 | 0.30 |
| 498 | | Auriya | 4 | 0.23 |
| 499 | | Azamgarh | 6 | 0.34 |
| 500 | | Baghpat | 5 | 0.22 |
| 501 | | Bahraich | 7 | 0.31 |
| 502 | | Ballia | 7 | 0.38 |
| 503 | | Balrampur | 6 | 0.30 |
| 504 | | Banda | 17 | 0.89 |
| 505 | | Barabanki | 7 | 0.33 |

| | | | | |
|-----|--|---------------------|----|------|
| 506 | | Bareilly | 5 | 0.25 |
| 507 | | Basti | 6 | 0.27 |
| 508 | | Bhim Nagar | 0 | 0.00 |
| 509 | | Bijnor | 6 | 0.31 |
| 510 | | Budaun | 7 | 0.28 |
| 511 | | Bulandshaher | 7 | 0.32 |
| 512 | | Chandauli | 1 | 0.05 |
| 513 | | Chitrakoot | 14 | 0.77 |
| 514 | | CSJM Nagar | 3 | 0.15 |
| 515 | | Deoria | 7 | 0.33 |
| 516 | | Etah | 6 | 0.30 |
| 517 | | Etawah | 6 | 0.27 |
| 518 | | Faizabad | 5 | 0.26 |
| 519 | | Farukkabad | 4 | 0.21 |
| 520 | | Fatehpur | 6 | 0.30 |
| 521 | | Fiorozabad | 5 | 0.26 |
| 522 | | Gautam Buddha Nagar | 0 | 0.00 |
| 523 | | Ghaziabad | 0 | 0.00 |
| 524 | | Ghazipur | 6 | 0.32 |
| 825 | | Gonda | 8 | 0.42 |
| 526 | | Gorakhpur | 6 | 0.28 |
| 527 | | Hamirpur | 22 | 1.10 |
| 528 | | Hardoi | 6 | 0.31 |
| 529 | | Hathras | 5 | 0.21 |
| 530 | | Jalaun | 22 | 1.11 |
| 531 | | Jaumpur | 8 | 0.39 |
| 532 | | Jhansi | 19 | 1.03 |
| 533 | | JP Nagar | 5 | 0.23 |
| 534 | | Kannauj | 5 | 0.26 |
| 535 | | Kanpur Dehat | 2 | 0.10 |
| 536 | | Kanpur Nagar | 8 | 0.37 |
| 537 | | Kaushambi | 5 | 0.28 |
| 538 | | Lakhimpur Kheri | 7 | 0.34 |
| 539 | | Kushi Nagar | 6 | 0.34 |
| 540 | | Lalitpur | 22 | 1.05 |
| 541 | | Lucknow | 6 | 0.26 |
| 542 | | Mahoba | 23 | 1.17 |
| 543 | | Maharajganj | 6 | 0.31 |
| 544 | | Mainpuri | 5 | 0.25 |
| 545 | | Mathura | 4 | 0.20 |
| 546 | | Mau | 5 | 0.25 |
| 547 | | Meerut | 1 | 0.05 |
| 548 | | Mirzapur | 9 | 0.49 |
| 549 | | Moradabad | 4 | 0.21 |

| | | | | |
|-----|--------------------|--------------------|------------|--------------|
| 550 | | Muzaffarnagar | 1 | 0.07 |
| 551 | | Panchsheel Nagar | 2 | 0.11 |
| 552 | | Pilibhit | 5 | 0.28 |
| 553 | | Pratapgarh | 7 | 0.31 |
| 554 | | Rae Bareli | 8 | 0.42 |
| 555 | | Rampur | 4 | 0.23 |
| 556 | | Saharanpur | 2 | 0.12 |
| 557 | | Sant Kabir Nagar | 7 | 0.29 |
| 558 | | Sant Ravidas Nagar | 4 | 0.20 |
| 559 | | Shahjahanpur | 6 | 0.30 |
| 560 | | Shrawasti | 5 | 0.23 |
| 561 | | Siddharthnagar | 5 | 0.25 |
| 562 | | Sitapur | 7 | 0.34 |
| 563 | | Sonbhadra | 8 | 0.38 |
| 564 | | Sultanpur | 7 | 0.36 |
| 565 | | Unnao | 7 | 0.40 |
| 566 | | Varanasi | 5 | 0.22 |
| | | Total | 487 | 24.26 |
| 567 | Uttarakhand | Almora | 8 | 0.40 |
| 568 | | Bageshwar | 5 | 0.26 |
| 569 | | Chamoli | 3 | 0.13 |
| 570 | | Champawat | 4 | 0.22 |
| 571 | | Dehradun | 3 | 0.16 |
| 572 | | Haridwar | 6 | 0.30 |
| 573 | | Nainital | 4 | 0.22 |
| 574 | | Pauri | 7 | 0.36 |
| 575 | | Pithoragarh | 3 | 0.15 |
| 576 | | Rudraprayag | 2 | 0.12 |
| 577 | | Tehri | 8 | 0.41 |
| 578 | | US Nagar | 7 | 0.39 |
| 579 | | Uttarkashi | 5 | 0.29 |
| | | Total | 65 | 3.42 |

Source: Department of Land Resources, Government of India

9. Name 3 best performing districts in order of rank?
 - {a}
 - {b}
 - {c}
10. Reasons for best performance
 - {a}
 - {b}
 - {c}
11. Name 3 worst performing districts?
 - {a}
 - {b}
 - {c}
12. Reasons for worst performance
 - {a}
 - {b}
 - {c}
13. What are the reasons for inter district variations?

14. Who decides on the number of watersheds to be taken up in the state and in a district?
 - State level:
 - District level:
15. What is the basis of making a decision?
 - (i) State level:
 - (ii) District level:
16. Has people any role in the above decision making?
 - (i) State level:
 - (ii) District level:
17. In all, how many project implementing agencies (PIA) are there in your state?

- 39 If utilization is less than amount received, give reasons.
- 40 Of the total watersheds taken up so far, how many are under
 {a} Preparatory Phase _____ {b} Watershed phase work _____ {c}
 Consolidation and withdrawal phase _____
- 41 How frequently the SLNA meets?
- 42 How useful is the meeting {a} Very useful, {b} Useful to some extent, {c} Not at all useful
- 43 Is there any mechanism at state level for redressal of grievances among stakeholders
- | | |
|-----|----|
| Yes | No |
|-----|----|
- 44 If no, is there a need for such a system?
- | | |
|-----|----|
| Yes | No |
|-----|----|
- 45 If yes to Q37, is it effective?
- | | |
|-----|----|
| Yes | No |
|-----|----|
- 46 Do you have requisite number of staff to oversee entire work relating to watershed development at the headquarter level?
- | | |
|-----|----|
| Yes | No |
|-----|----|
- 47 If no, how many?
 (a) Technical staff is needed
 (b) Non-Technical staff is needed
- 48 Who does the monitoring (1) only Government (ii) people representative
- State level
 District level
 Watershed level
- 49 In case of delay in getting feedback, what action is taken?
- 50 Is fund adequate for following activities?
- | | | |
|---|-----|----|
| a. Institution and capacity building | Yes | No |
| b. If no, what should be the likely increase _____ percent | | |
| c. Livelihood / Orientation for asset less | Yes | No |
| d. If no, what should be the likely increase _____ percent | | |
| e. Productivity enhancement / development of Micro enterprises | Yes | No |
| f. If no, what should be the likely increase _____ percent | | |

- 51 Do you get funds from central government in time?
Yes No
- 52 If no, how much delay in getting the share of central government (months)

- 53 What suggestions you would like to give for better performance of the watershed development programme?
- 54 Is there any convergence between other programmes of the government?
 (a) MGNREGA Yes No
 (b) BADF Yes No
- 55 If yes to (a) and / or (b) as above, what is the additional benefit you derive? Specify
- 56 If no to (a) and / or (b), should it be linked to the above programme?
Yes No
- 57 If yes, what benefit you perceive? Specify
- 58 Are you satisfied with the present institutional arrangements at state, district and project levels?
(a) Satisfied (b) Not satisfied
- Please give reasons, for your response?
- 59 Is the present system?
 (a) Demand Driven
 Or
 (b) Target oriented
- 60 If Demand Driven, please mention its?
 (a) Advantages:
 and
 (b) Disadvantages:
- 61 If Target Oriented, please mention its?
 (a) Advantages:
 and
 (b) Disadvantages:
- 62 What do you feel should be the right approach in this direction? Please tick-mark
 (a) Demand Driven
 (b) Target Oriented

(ii) **Schedule for District Level Watershed Cell and Data Centre**

1. Name of the district:
2. Name of state:
3. Name of the Department implementing the programme:
4. Is there any other department involved in watershed development in the district?
Yes No
5. If yes, name the department:
(a) Yearwise area under watershed in the state (hectare)

| | 2009-10 | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 |
|--------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| 2013-14 | | | | |
| Total area | | | | |
| Public land | | | | |
| Private land | | | | |
| Both | | | | |
6. Yearwise no. of watersheds taken up in the last 5 years on public and private land

| | 2009-10 | 2010-11 | 2011-12 |
|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| 2012-13 | | 2013-14 | Total |
7. Reasons for yearwise variation in the number, if any.
8. Who decides on the number and selection of watersheds to be taken up in the district?
9. What is the basis of taking a decision?
10. Is public/people involved in the process of development of watershed projects?
Yes No
11. If yes, in what manner?
12. Is their involvement useful? Yes No
13. Does peoples involvement result in delay in starting a project?
Yes No
14. Does the peoples involvement result in slower progress in implementation?
Yes No
15. Are farmers willing to contribute user charges?

Yes No

16. Does the acquisition of land create any legal problem?

Yes No

17. If yes, does it result in delay in implementation?

Yes No

18. What happens if one of the farmers is not willing to part with his/her land for the project?

19. In all, how many project implementing agencies (PIAs) are there in your district?

20. How many of them are from

- (i) Parent department
- (ii) Line department
- (iii) Other department
- (iv) Non-government agencies

21. If non-government agencies are not associated, what are the reasons?

22. Do you recommend their involvement? Yes No

23. If yes, why?

24. If no, why?

25. Do you have a system of annual target? Yes No

26. Who assigns you the target?

27. Give figures of financial targets and achievements during the last five years(Rs.)?

| 2009-10 | | 2010-11 | | 2011-12 | | 2012-13 | | 2013-14 | |
|---------|---|---------|---|---------|---|---------|---|---------|---|
| T | A | T | A | T | A | T | A | T | A |
| | | | | | | | | | |

T-Target

A-Achivement

28. What steps are taken when target are not met?

29. Do you have adequate staff to oversee the entire process of watershed development?

Yes No

30. If no, how many (i) Technical staff needed

(ii) Non-technical staff needed.

31. Do you also undertake IEC activities? Yes No

32. If no, who undertakes these activities?

33. Do you have other mode to reach people? Yes No

34. If yes, what are these?

35. How is Gramsabha involved in the process?

36. What role panchayat play?

37. Do you appreciate the involvement PRIs in the programme?

Yes No

38. Who makes selection of PIA?

39. On what basis?

40. Do you see any scope for improvement in the procedure?

Yes No

41. If yes, what suggestions you make?

42. Yearwise receipt and utilization of fund for watershed projects (Rs.)

| Year | Receipt | Utilisation |
|---------|---------|-------------|
| 2009-10 | | |
| 2010-11 | | |
| 2011-12 | | |
| 2012-13 | | |

43. If utilization in a particular year is less than amount received, give reasons.

44. Of total watersheds taken up so far, how many are under

(i) Preparatory phase

(ii) Watershed work phase

(iii) Consolidation and withdrawal phase

45. Is there a Committee at district level to oversee development of watershed work?

Yes No

46. If yes, how frequently the Committee meets?

47. How useful is the meeting?

a) Very useful b) Useful to some extent c) Not at all useful

48. Is there any mechanism at the district level for redressal of grievances among stakeholders?

Yes No

49. If no, is there a need for such a system?

Yes No

50. If yes to Q45, is it effective?

Yes No

51. Who does the monitoring? Is it

(a) Peoples representative

(b) Department officials

52. In case of delay in getting feedback from sources down below, what action is taken?

53. Is fund adequate for

(I) Institution and capacity building? Yes No

(II) Livelihood / orientation for asset less? Yes No

(III) Productivity enhancement / development of micro enterprises
Yes No

54. Do you get fund from state government in time?

Yes No

55. If no, how much delay (in months)

56. What suggestions you would like to give for better performance of watershed development programme?

57. Is there any convergence between other programmes of the government?

| | | |
|-------------|-----|----|
| (a) MGNREGA | Yes | No |
|-------------|-----|----|

| | | |
|----------|-----|----|
| (b) BADF | Yes | No |
|----------|-----|----|

58. If yes to (a) and or (b) what additional benefit you derive?

59. If no to (a) and (b), should it be linked to the above programme?

| | |
|-----|----|
| Yes | No |
|-----|----|

60. If yes, what benefit you perceive?

61. Are you satisfied with the present institutional arrangements at district and project levels?

| | |
|---------------|-------------------|
| (a) Satisfied | (b) Not satisfied |
|---------------|-------------------|

Please give reasons, for your response?

62. Is the present system?

(a) Demand Driven

Or

(b) Target oriented

63. If Demand Driven, please mention its?

(a) Advantages:

and

(b) Disadvantages:

64. If Target Oriented, please mention its?

(a) Advantages:

and
(b)Disadvantages:

65. What do you feel should be the right approach in this direction? Please tick-mark

(a)Demand Driven
(b)Target Oriented

(iii) Schedule for Project Implementing Agency (PIA)

1. Name of state:
2. Name of the district:
3. Name of village / Panchayat where watershed is located.
4. Name of the department / agency implementing the project
5. Is it (I) parent department
(II) line department
(III) Other department
(IV) Non-governmental agency
6. Do you have adequate staff to oversee implementation of watershed projects?
Yes No
7. If no, number of staff needed? (No)
8. For what purpose?
9. How many watersheds you are handling (No)
10. Are these in the same district Yes No
11. In what ways you are involved in the project?
 - (a) Help in preparation of watershed development plans by panchayats
Yes No
 - (b) Help Panchayat in conducting PRA exercise in the area
Yes No
 - (c) Organise training of the village community Yes No
 - (d) Supervise watershed development activities Yes No
 - (e) Inspect and authenticate project account Yes No
 - (f) Set up institutional arrangement for post project operation and maintenance of the assets created.
Yes
No
 - (g) Other activities, if any? (specify) Yes No

12. Have you got any role in the preparation of action plan?
Yes No
13. If yes, what role you play?
14. Who submits the action plan for approval to WCDC / DRDA?
15. Who sends periodical progress report to WCDC?
16. What is the frequency?
17. In case of delay, what action is taken?
18. Who arranges for physical, financial and social audit?
19. Who select Watershed Development Team (WDT)?
20. Do you also help in mobilization of additional financial resources from other departments?
Yes No
22. If yes, from which department?
- | | | |
|--|-----|----|
| (I) MGNREGA | Yes | No |
| (II) BRGF | Yes | No |
| (III) SGRY | Yes | No |
| (IV) National Horticulture Mission | Yes | No |
| (V) Tribal Welfare Scheme | Yes | No |
| (VI) Artificial Ground Water Recharge | Yes | No |
| (VII) Greening India | Yes | No |
| (VIII) Other departments (specify) | Yes | No |
| (IX) Non-governmental sources(specify) | Yes | No |
23. Do you favour peoples participation in planning and implementation of watershed projects?
Yes No
24. If yes, what advantages you foresee?
25. If no, what are the reasons?
26. Any suggestion you would like to give for better functioning watershed projects.

(iv) **Schedule for Village Level Watershed Committee**

1. Name of the watershed:
2. Name of Panchayat(s):
3. Name of Block:
4. Name of District:
5. Name of State:
6. No. of cluster Villages covered under the watershed:
7. Total treatable area under watershed (Hect):
(a) Private land (b) Community land
8. (a) No. of user groups:
(b) No. of individual beneficiary

(c) No. of beneficiary under SHG
9. No. of BPL:
10. No. of APL:
11. No. of women:
12. No. of land less:
13. How was the process of formation of watershed started? Who took the initiative?

(a) Villagers (b) Block/Panchayat functionaries (c) District officials [d]Others [specify]
14. Who organized the awareness generation campaigns?
(a) Local Volunteers
(b) Block/Panchayat functionaries
(c) District officials

(d)Others [specify]
15. Who took the initiative for finalizing the activities to be undertaken?
(a)

(b)

(c)

(d)
16. How much time was taken in finalizing the list of activities to be undertaken?
a) Quickly
b) Not much time
c) Some time
d) Too much time
17. How many SHGs are there in your watershed?

18. What activities are pursued by SHGs in the watershed?
19. What is the status of your watershed?
 (a) Preparatory phase
 (b) Watershed work phase
 (c) Consolidation and withdrawal.
20. Do you know that the erstwhile programme of DPAP, DDP and IWDP of the department of Land Resources were implemented based on annual targets fixed by government?
 Yes No
21. If yes, was the system acceptable to villagers
 Yes No
22. If yes, what were the advantages of such a system?
23. If no, what were the shortcomings?
24. Do you also know that all the three programmes got merged into a single unified programme in February, 2009 named as IWMP?
 Yes No
25. Do you know that after the merger, the approach was changed from target to demand driven based on public participation
 Yes No
26. If yes, what are the advantages of this demand driven approach?

27. Do you find any shortcoming in this approach?
Yes No

28. If yes, specify

29. Are you in favour of making the programme target oriented?
Yes No

(a) If yes, what are the reasons?

(b) If no, what are the reasons?

30. As per present arrangement, PRIs play a greater role in the development of watershed programme. Do you feel that their involvement in the management of watershed is a welcome measure?
Yes No

31. If yes, what advantages you foresee?

32. If no, what are the problems?
33. Do you know that panchayats are overloaded with a variety of activities and as such they find little time to devote for watershed work?
- | | |
|-----|----|
| Yes | No |
|-----|----|
34. If yes, would it be a wise step to involve them in watershed work?
- | | |
|-----|----|
| Yes | No |
|-----|----|
35. If no, what other options are available so that PRIs play the role of facilitators while the watershed work can be taken up by some other agencies?
36. Given two options (a) supply side management by government through a system of quarterly / annual targets or (b) People's demand generated through IEC activities undertaken by government, which one you would like to favour and why?
- (a) Option favoured
- (b) Reasons
37. How useful is the Watershed Development Team?
- (a) Very useful
- (b) Useful to some extent
- (c) Not at all useful
38. (a) If useful, in what ways? Please explain.

39. If not useful, why? Give reasons?
40. What can be done to ensure their active participation?
41. Do you know about the published Guidelines for formation of watershed development projects?
- | | | |
|--|-----|----|
| | Yes | No |
|--|-----|----|
42. If yes, have you got the copy?
- | | | |
|--|-----|----|
| | Yes | No |
|--|-----|----|
43. If yes, name the agency from whom you got the copy?
44. Besides, any other published materials in vernacular supplied to villagers?
- | | | |
|--|-----|----|
| | Yes | No |
|--|-----|----|
45. Was there any session involving villagers to explain details of how to materialize formation of a watershed?
- | | | |
|--|-----|----|
| | Yes | No |
|--|-----|----|
46. If yes, who arranged such an event?
47. When was the watershed committee formed?
- (i) Before operationalisation of the project
- (ii) After operationalisation of the project?
48. Total No. of members in the Managing Committee of watershed?
- Of them how many BPL
- How many APL
- How many are women
- How many tenant farmers
49. How Committee members are selected / elected?
- (a) Through secret ballot
- (b) Through nomination
- (c) Any other (specify)
50. Who presides over the process of selection / election?
- {i} Block / Panchayat officials

{ii} District / State officials

51. Is there any grievance redressal mechanism in place to sort out disputes among villagers?

Yes

No

Capacity Development

52. Was there any capacity building orientation / programme for villagers organized by Government or other agency?

Yes

No

53. If yes, no. of users participated?

2013-14 _____ 2012-13 _____ 2011-12 _____ 2010-11 _____

2009-10 _____

54. If not government, which agency organized this programme? _____

55. Was there any skill development programme for SHG members?

Yes

No

56. Which agency organized this? {Name} _____

57. Was there any such programme for Committee Members

Yes

No

58. If yes, was it useful?

Yes

No

59. At what level? _____

60. If no to Q. 58, what additional aspects it should cover?

Annexure 1.3

Dates of visit of the Project Director and study team to the sample states

| State | Place | Date | Purpose |
|------------------|--|--------------------|---|
| Himachal Pradesh | Shimla | 30/5/14 to 1/6/14 | Holding of discussion with SLNA |
| Himachal Pradesh | Shimla, Bilaspur & Other places | 23/6/14 to 30/6/14 | Holding of discussion & canvassing of schedules |
| Meghalaya | Shillong, districts and other places | 4/6/14 to 12/6/14 | Holding of discussion with SLNA & canvassing of schedules |
| Odisha | Bhubaneswar, sample districts and other places | 8/7/14 to 19/7/14 | Holding of discussion with SLNA & canvassing of schedules |
| Rajasthan | Jaipur, sample districts and other places | 5/8/14 to 14/8/14 | Holding of discussion with SLNA & canvassing of schedules |
| Andhra Pradesh | Hyderabad, sample districts and other places | 20/8/14 to 28/8/14 | Holding of discussion with SLNA & canvassing of schedules |

List of officials in the concerned states with whom the study team interacted

Odisha

Mrs.Sujata Kartikeyan, Director-Cum-CEO, Odisha Watershed Development Mission (OWDM)

Shri Sanjeev Bohidar Asstt. Project Manager, Odisha Watershed Development Mission (OWDM)

Subhendu Kumar Das, Project Director, District Khordha (Odisha)

Shri Biswaranjan Sethi, Asstt. Project Director, District Khordha (Odisha)

Shri K.C.Behera, ASCD & PIA, Khordha district (Odisha)

Shri S.N.Nayak, Project Director, District Kandhamal (Odisha)

Shri Pradipta Kumar Samantaray, PIA, District Kandhamal (Odisha)

Meghalaya

Shri D.Langstich, Director & CEO, Watershed and Wasteland Development Agency, +Shillong

Shri D.Shallam, Divisional Soil & Water Conservation Officer, West Jaintia Hills, Jowai

Shri D.K.Khonglah, Divisional Soil & Water Conservation Officer, Shillong

Shri D.Warbah, Divisional Soil & Water Conservation Officer, West Khasi Hills

Shri Jashua Lakiang, Assistant Soil & Water Conservation Officer, West Khasi Hills

Shri E.Laloo PIA, West Jaintia Hills

Shri O.Khardewsaw, Assistant Soil & Water Conservation Officer, West Jaintia Hills

Shri K.S.Pale, ASWCO, Shillong

Himachal Pradesh

Shri I.S.Chauhan, Director, SLNA, SWDA, Shimla

Shri Rajesh Dhiman, Project Director, DWDA,, Shimla

Shri R.S.Chandel, Project Director, DWDA, Bilaspur

Rajasthan

Shri Kala Director SLNA, Jaipur

Shri V.L.Meena, Addl. Director, SLNA, Jaipur

Shri Barupal, Superintending Engineer, WS, Jaipur

Shri Madan Chhazer, Project Manager, WCDC, Udaipur.

Shri Manoj Purbgola, Executive Engineer, WCDC, Dholpur

Shri M.A. Bapna, Executive Engineer, WCDC, Udaipur

Shri Rajiv Gautam, AE, WCDC, Dholpur

Andhra Pradesh

Dr.C.Suvarna, Spl. Commissioner-cum-SLNA, Watersheds, Hyderabad

Mrs.Kalpana, Coordinator, Office of the SLNA, Hyderabad

Shri Gopichand, Project Director, Chittoor district, Andhra Pradesh

Shri Nagaraju, Addl. Project Director, Chittoor district, Andhra Pradesh

Shri Samuel, Asstt. Project Director, Mahbhubnagar district, Andhra Pradesh

Shri J.P.Wasley, Jt. Director, WS, Government of Teleganga