

Participatory Process Monitoring



Measuring criteria for ranking of parameters related to critical themes under OTELP



Orissa Tribal Empowerment and Livelihood Project (OTELP)
 Programme Support Unit
 Bhubaneswar

Concept and Design
WASSAN, Hyderabad

Edited by
Deepak Mohanty, IFS, Programme Director, OTELP
Pravanjan Mohapatra, Programme Officer (PM&E), PSU

Printed with Technical Assistance from
Procurement Support Team (PST),
DFID

Cover Artwork
Anand Behera, Artist
Bhubaneswar

Printed by
Jyoti Graphics
Shaheed Nagar,
Bhubaneswar

CONTENTS

Sl. No.	Particulars	Page No.
1.	Guidelines for implementation of Participatory Process Monitoring	4
2.	<u>Measuring criteria for ranking of parameters related to critical themes</u>	
2.1	Institutional aspect	7
2.2	Organization of community.....	8
2.3	Project management.....	11
2.4	Participatory implementation & monitoring	14
2.5	Financial aspect.....	16
2.6	Capacity building of different stakeholders	19
2.7	Empowerment centered plan.....	20
3.	Score Consolidation Sheet	24
4.	Recommendations	27

1. Guidelines for Implementation of Participatory Process Monitoring *SAMIKHYA SAPTAHA*

(To be celebrated in last week of May and October every year in each
Micro Watershed)

Background

The Process Monitoring of various processes involved in the implementation of OTELP has been piloted during February 2008 based on which necessary modification has been incorporated in the parameters and approach of implementation. The process related parameters have been translated into Oriya for better understanding by the community members. The process monitoring shall be upscaled to all the Micro Watersheds under implementation in the Phase I operational areas. This shall be made in a campaign mode so as to make the communities aware about the importance of monitoring and enable them to re-look into the implementations made and experiences gathered. This will also stabilize the participatory monitoring and improve the effectiveness of the village level governance system while educating the people of the village regarding the objectives, methodology and expected outcomes of the project aimed at improving their livelihoods. This would not only empower the communities but also organize them to proceed further in the line of project design to achieve the desired results.

Activities

1. Designing and printing of the IEC material (Poster) for communicating the method of conducting the PPM.
2. Re-orientation of the Master Trainers, involved during the piloting process.
3. Orientation of the FNGO WDT Members and Community Mobilizers by the Master Trainers.
4. Implementation of the PPM in the Micro Watersheds.
5. Reporting

Methodology

STEP 1: Village Level Meeting

- Organize Village Level Meeting involving all the men and women of the village i.e. the members of the Village Level Social and Financial Audit Sub Committee/ Palli Sabha in each village within the micro watershed.
- Ask the members of the Village Level Sub Committee (VLSC) to sit separately from other members.
- Discuss the objective of the Participatory Process Monitoring and why it is important for them to review the progress made.
- Discuss the method of conducting the same in the village and the way the people of the village are to participate in the process monitoring.
- Ask the community members to identify the key informants (with at least 50% women representation) for the exercise representing all categories of people within the village.
- The group shall preferably be consisting of members other than the members of the VLSC.
- The key informant group and the members of the VLSC shall be part of the process till completion.

STEP 2: Focused Group Discussion with VLSC in presence of the key informant group

- Conduct separate meeting/ FGDs with the VLSC members and take the stock of the institutions (User Group/ SHG/ CIG/ VSS etc.) promoted in the village and the jobs assigned to them.
- Take the details of the activity planned, executed and funds spent by those groups.
- Take the case record of each activity from the FNGO (Second Copy) and VDC (Original Copy) and conduct FGD with the respective institutions.

STEP 3: Focused Group Discussion with the SHGs

- Conduct separate meeting with each SHGs existing within the village.
- Discuss on the process parameters for the SHGs in the schedule and ask them to speak about their status, based on the parameters.
- Check all the documents (meeting register, bank book, cash book, individual pass book, loan register, repayment register etc.) available with the SHG.
- Evaluate the internal loaning system of the SHG, management style etc.
- Evaluate the profitability of the micro enterprise/ IGA/ collective marketing effort taken up by the SHG (if applicable)
- Repeat the process for all the SHGs in the village.

STEP 4: Participatory Transact Walk with the UGs/ CIGs/ VSS

- Visit along with the members of the UG/ CIG/ VSS etc. (who have executed the activity) along with all records to the work site.
- Ask the members to explain how they have implemented the work.
- Check the maintenance of the case record to verify whether
 - ✓ all the fields/ pages in the case record are properly filled in
 - ✓ the muster rolls are properly maintained
 - ✓ the ITDA/ PSU monitoring visit page are duly filled in
 - ✓ the social audit page is filled in with all completeness
 - ✓ the reference of the material vouchers are kept properly
- Randomly verify the wage and materials payments with labourers and suppliers (if available).
- Ask the members regarding the quality of the work and how they are going to be benefited.
- Ask the members of the institution to evaluate them against the appropriate process parameters.
- Repeat the process for each activity implemented by the UGs/ CIGs/ VSS in the village.

STEP 5: Farmers Field Visit/ Focused Group Discussion with the Farmers

- Organize a meeting with the farmers on whose field, the crop/ practice demonstration has been made.
- Ask them about their experience and how the new crop/ practice is going to benefit them.
- Ask them weather they are going to motivate other farmers in the village to adopt the demonstration.
- Ask them how many farmers have visited their field during the process.
- Always try to organize the meeting/ FGD in the farmers' field only if the demonstration is on field.
- Repeat the process for each category of demonstration.

STEP 6: Focused Group Discussion with the Households provided with Livestock Support (for demonstration purpose)

- Organize a meeting with the households to whom livestock has been provided for demonstration.
- Ask them about their experience and how the livestock is going to benefit them.
- Ask them whether they are going to motivate their neighboring households to opt this as a means of livelihood.
- Ask them how many households have visited their home for exposure.
- Always try to organize the meeting/ FGD in the beneficiary household in presence of the livestock demonstrated.
- Repeat the process for each category of livestock demonstrated.

STEP 7: Village Level Meeting

- Organize Village Level Meeting involving all the men and women of the village i.e. the members of the Village Level Social and Financial Audit Sub Committee/ Palli Sabha.
- Verify the clarity, cleanliness, completeness, regularity of the VLSCs in keeping the records by checking the records/ registers kept in the VLSC.
- Ask the key informant group and members of the Village Level Sub Committee (VLSC) to present their experience of Participatory Process Monitoring.
- Ask the key informant group and VLSC members to score the process related parameters in presence of the villagers.
- Try to triangulate the scores given by the above groups with the villagers to validate.
- Present the final score sheet to the villagers and provide a copy in the village for record.
- The process has to be conducted for each village within the Micro Watershed.

STEP 8: Meeting with VDC

- Organize the meeting with the VDC on completion of the above steps in each village within the MWS.
- Ask the members of the VDC to present the results for their respective villages (as the members of the VDC are also the members of their village).
- Submit a copy of the score sheet for each village within the MWS.
- Indicate the areas for improvement where the VDC must concentrate.

General Conditions

- The process shall be completed in a village in one day (except step 7).
- In all the steps the Key Informant Group and the VLSC members shall participate.
- The President and Secretary of the VDC must participate in the exercise for each village within the MWS.
- All steps shall be repeated for each group/ institution available within the village.
- The activities shall be conducted in the village like a campaign and at least one male and one female member from each household in the village shall participate in the process.
- Information regarding the activity shall be communicated to the people of the village at least two days prior to the date fixed for PPM.
- The steps shall be followed in a continuous manner without any break or jump.
- The facilitating team in any village shall consist of the Community Mobilizer of the respective MWS and any one WDT member irrespective of the subject.

2. Measuring criteria for ranking of parameters related to critical themes

2.1. Institutional Aspects

Sl. No.	Parameters and their measuring criteria	Ranking of parameters			
		Code (★)	Score Range	Actual score	
1.	<u>Village level sub-committee (VLSC)</u>				
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is no such committee at the village level. The committee exists only on paper. The committee is formed but generally non functional 	R	0-3		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The committee is formed but is playing roles in a limited manner. The committee does not have representatives from different stakeholders. The committee is able to deliver its role/responsibilities, but does not consider the concerns of the poor and women. Participatory process is not generally followed. 	Y	4-7		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A Village level Sub committee has been formed at micro watershed level. The committee is able to maintain and manage harmonious relationships with the other CBOs in the village. The committee is performing the expected roles in the participatory manner taking in to consideration concerns of women and poor. The committee has the representation of different stakeholders. 	G	8-10		
2.	<u>Village Development Association</u>				
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> VDA formed only for formality, not held meeting at all after first meeting, doesn't know its roles & responsibility 	R	0-3		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> VDA formed and meeting occasionally, knows its roles and responsibility to some extent, doesn't resolve inter village conflicts. 	Y	4-7		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> VDA duly formed and registered, meets regularly as per norm or as per requirement, approves selection of Office Bearers of VDC, takes leadership role in diffusing inter village conflicts, 	G	8-10		
3	<u>Micro-watershed level committee (VDC)</u>				
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The VDC was formed but not as a registered entity. The VDC has very less composition of women. VDC does not encourage formation of sub committees and holds all the powers with itself. Transparency is generally lacking in all the activities/dealings. 	R	0-3		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Though the VDC is formed and registered, the committee does not actively take the governance role. Although women composition is maintained, they do not play active role in decision making process. Though the prescribed meetings are conducted, decision making lies with the VDC. 	Y	4-7		

★ R = Red Y = Yellow G = Green

Sl. No.	Parameters and their measuring criteria	Ranking of parameters				
		Code (★)	Score Range	Actual score		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A VDC was formed. The committee apart from delivering the governance functions, is also able to maintain transparency in the delivering the responsibilities. The composition as regards the women is being maintained well. 	G	8-10			
4.	<u>VDC to play facilitation role whereas VLSC to carry out execution of works</u>					
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Role clarity is missing among the two entities. There is a mismatch between the expected roles and the roles executed by these committees. VDC holds the decision making authority in all the activities. 	R	0-3			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The roles are inter played by these committees. Although the roles are played by these committees, transparency is lacking in the actions. 	Y	4-7			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> VDC as well as VLSC as two distinct bodies exist in the village. The members have role clarity and deliver the responsibilities effectively. 	G	8-10			
5.	<u>Organization of new thematic groups and committees namely VSS, CIG, etc (besides SHG, UG, VDC).</u>					
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Group/committee formation is not given priority in the micro watershed. 	R	0-3			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Though such committees exist, they are non functional and interests are not recognized. The efforts to strengthen these groups are either limited or do not consider the concerns, strengths and limitations of the members. 	Y	4-7			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Various committees have been formed as per the identified interests/commonality between the members. These groups are able to function and deliver the responsibilities effectively. Preference was given to poor and women while forming the groups. 	G	8-10			

2.2. Organization of community

Sl. No.	Parameters and their measuring criteria	Ranking of parameters				
		Code (★)	Score Range	Actual score		
1.	<u>Organization of all adult members into SHGs (women and men)</u>					
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Formation of SHGs involving adults was not a priority. Some vulnerable members were left from formation. 	R	0-3			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Groups exist but generally to comply with the guidelines. Formed groups do not conduct regular meetings. 	Y	4-7			

★ R = Red Y = Yellow G = Green

Sl. No.	Parameters and their measuring criteria	Ranking of parameters				
		Code (*)	Score Range	Actual score		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Groups (SHGs both men and women) have been formed with all the adults in the village. There is no person left(especially poor) who does not belong to any group. Equal attention was paid to strengthen women groups taking their concerns in to consideration. 	G	8-10			
2.	<u>Drawing out members of other groups (CIG, UG, VDC, etc) out of above SHGs</u>					
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SHG formation was not carried out or even though the groups were formed they mostly to comply with guidelines. Since SHG was not given adequate attention drawing members does not arise. 	R	0-3			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Groups were formed but common interests were not recognized. Other groups were formed as a mandate and not with the intention of promoting enterprises. 	Y	4-7			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Members from the formed SHGs have been grouped in to other groups who share common interest and functions. In order to form such groups, apart from recognizing the common interest, their collective strengths have also been identified. 	G	8-10			
3.	<u>Organization of CBOs in different phases</u>					
	<u>3.1 Phase – I: SHG, UG, Para-worker</u>					
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Promotion and strengthening of groups (SHG, UG) and para workers is not considered as part of the process. The importance of their role that these groups and workers play in building institutions is not well conceived and hence not given priority. 	R	0-3			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Groups exist but the members do not have necessary skills to carry out functions. Para workers have been identified. But they do not posses necessary skills to carry out the functions effectively. 	Y	4-7			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Various groups have been formed and Para workers have been developed to carry out their functions. 	G	8-10			
	<u>3.2 Phase – II: VLSC, VDC-</u>					
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The VLSC functions in isolation. VDC does not maintain transparency. The conceptual clarity about strengthening CBOs phase wise is unclear. 	R	0-3			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> VDC, VLSC though are in place, the integration of these entities is not well understood and as a result there is no clarity about the roles/responsibilities. VDC generally holds the power with it and does not encourage participatory system. 	Y	4-7			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> VLSC at the village level and VDC at the micro watershed level have been functioning well. These committees together carried out development initiatives through various groups. The composition of VDC has taken care of the prescribed representation. 	G	8-10			

Sl. No.	Parameters and their measuring criteria	Ranking of parameters				
		Code (*)	Score Range	Actual score		
<u>3.3 Phase – III:</u> CIGs (as per need)						
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Such concept does not exist in the agenda of the program. Since the SHG concept is not well conceived, the formation of CIG did not take place. 	R	0-3			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Though CIGs have been formed the members are not clear about the purpose and role of such entity. The formation of such groups is only for a limited time and for a limited purpose. Once the purpose is served, they remain redundant. 	Y	4-7			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Various CIGs were in place. The CIGs have been carrying out functions related to the enterprises for which they have come together. 	G	8-10			
<u>3.4 Phase – IV:</u> Federation of SHGs						
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The concept of SHG formation is absent. As a result very few SHGs have been formed. Where ever these groups have been formed, their functions are limited to thrift and savings and not beyond. As a result the active groups could not e identified to be federated at cluster level. 	R	0-3			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Group formation was sporadic. Only few groups have been active in certain activities. SHGs are not well versed with the norms and procedures. As a result they cannot be brought under mature SHG category. 	Y	4-7			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All the SHGs are federated at the micro watershed level. The federation is able to extend the support to encourage as well as facilitate entrepreneurship among the groups. An executive committee has been formed with the members drawn from active SHGs 	G	8-10			
<u>3.5 Phase – V:</u> Community managed resource centre						
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Such center is absent as persons responsible for running such centers are not available. The usefulness of such an activity is not well conceived and or understood by the community. 	R	0-3			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Though the physical structure is present, this is not equipped with necessary persons and systems. There are systems, but the community is not aware of using it the way it could be used. 	Y	4-7			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A community managed resource center is set up. The center has basic facilities and persons are equipped with necessary skills and competence to provide support to the CBOs. The rules, procedures and norms are set up for proper functioning of this center. 	G	8-10			

2.3. Project Management

Sl. No.	Parameters and their measuring criteria	Ranking of parameters			
		Code (*)	Score Range	Actual score	
1.	<u>Proper sequencing of components and sub-components</u>				
	• Components are not in sequence	R	0-3		
	• Components are in sequence but without people's knowledge and involvement	Y	4-7		
	• Components are in sequence and with people's knowledge and involvement	G	8-10		
2.	<u>Capacity building inputs as per the sequence</u>				
	• CB is not carried out at all, or but not in time, not in sequence	R	0-3		
	• CB carried out in right time, but participation is low.	Y	4-7		
	• CB carried out to the right time, to the right people, in right sequence.	G	8-10		
3.	<u>Evaluation of performance and preparedness of CBO and FNGO towards end of CB phase</u>				
	• CB not taken up. CBOs are not formed.	R	0-3		
	• CB done but the evaluation/ utilization study not done.	Y	4-7		
	• Evaluation being taken place.	G	8-10		
4.	<u>Building accountability of different stakeholders through MoU between ITDA and FNGO and also between ITDA and CBO</u>				
	• No discussions. No MoU is being undergone.	R	0-3		
	• Discussed about but not entered into MoU. Entered but not in the beginning. MoU is one sided MoU.	Y	4-7		
	• MoU is agreeable to all parties. Several rounds of discussions taken place. All the parties are abide by MoU.	G	8-10		
5.	<u>Monitoring of output / outcome as per the sequence</u>				
	• No monitoring is being taken place	R	0-3		

* R = Red Y = Yellow G = Green

Sl. No.	Parameters and their measuring criteria	Ranking of parameters				
		Code (*)	Score Range	Actual score		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Monitoring taken place with too much delay, with very low participation of local people. Some what monitoring happened 	Y	4-7			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Monitoring in right sequence, with right people, 	G	8-10			
6.	<u>Repair and maintenance of user charges</u>					
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> User fee not at all collected, 	R	0-3			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Collected but not deposited, Collected but deducted from labour. 	Y	4-7			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> User fee collected from the users only, deposited with separate account, repairs are done, cost being met from this amount. 	G	8-10			
7.	<u>Preparation of Plan & Estimate for Implementation of activities</u>					
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Villagers/UG do not know about Plan & Estimate, only work as labourers , P/E is prepared by WDT as per their will and give approval 	R	0-3			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Villagers/UG some what know about Plan & Estimate, wait till P/E is approved and then start work, WDT prepares P/E with villagers and helps in getting approval while work in progress. 	Y	4-7			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Villagers/UG prepares Plan & Estimate themselves for small and simple works with help of WDT, start work with anticipation that P/E will be approved within reasonable time, exerts pressure on FNGO/ITDA for necessary approval before start of work. 	G	8-10			
8.	<u>High priority to adopt ITK</u>					
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not identified, identified but not adopted. 	R	0-3			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Adopted in some works only 	Y	4-7			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identified ITK, followed all steps and adopted ITK 	G	8-10			
9.	<u>Involving UG / SHG for execution of works</u>					
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> UG, SHG not formed, not aware, not used, used but on paper only. 	R	0-3			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> UG, SHG are used but following the same contract system, payments not made fully. Middlemen are seen. 	Y	4-7			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Execution of works by UG, SHG only. UG, SHG are rotated, trained. 	G	8-10			
10.	<u>Release of fund by VDC to VLSC against quarterly implementation plan (approved by the community at village level)</u>					
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not released so far, No timely releases. 	R	0-3			

Sl. No.	Parameters and their measuring criteria	Ranking of parameters				
		Code (*)	Score Range	Actual score		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Released but after lot of pleasing, 	Y	4-7			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Timely released and followed the action plan. 	G	8-10			
11.	<u>Painting of SSR and design / estimate on village walls</u>					
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No painting is done. Painted but not at public place 	R	0-3			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Painted but with low quality color, not in regional language, it is shade out. No updation is being done. 	Y	4-7			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Painted in public place, access to all, being updated time to time, visible and in local language. 	G	8-10			
12.	<u>Perspective plan for seven years besides annual action plan</u>					
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> People don't know about this. Known but not done, 	R	0-3			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Done but only on paper, no involvement of people or with the involvement of committee/WDT only 	Y	4-7			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Perspective plan done in participatory method, involving all stakeholders, 	G	8-10			
13.	<u>Decentralized approval of perspective and annual action plan</u>					
	13.1 <u>Social approval:</u> By the community at village and micro watershed level					
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Signatures are there, but those who signed don't know this. 	R	0-3			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not done, but written minutes. Signatures are taken as and when they are available. 	Y	4-7			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Approval is taken involving community and micro watershed level committee in a special/normal meeting. People know this, minutes are available. 	G	8-10			
	13.2 <u>Technical approval:</u> By WDT (upto Rs. 0.5 lakh) and by ITDA (upto Rs. 5.0 lakh)					
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> WDT is not allowed to execute the power to give tech, approval even for Rs.0.5 lakh., WDT is not aware of this. Therefore huge delay in sanctions. 	R	0-3			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ITDA sanctions are delay. To avoid delay in sanctions, WDT divided the works to below Rs.0.50 lakh and given sanctions. 	Y	4-7			

Sl. No.	Parameters and their measuring criteria	Ranking of parameters			
		Code (*)	Score Range	Actual score	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Procedures followed. Sanctions not delayed. 	G	8-10		
	13.3 <u>Administrative and financial approval</u> : By FNGO (upto Rs. 1.0 lakh) and by ITDA (beyond Rs. 1.0 lakhs)				
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> FNGO is not allowed to execute the power. 	R	0-3		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ITDA sanctions are delay. To avoid delay in sanctions, FNGO divided the works to below Rs.1.00 lakh and given sanctions. 	Y	4-7		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Procedures followed and ITDA is very cooperative. 	G	8-10		

2.4. Participatory implementation & monitoring

Sl. No.	Parameters and their measuring criteria	Ranking of parameters			
		Code (*)	Score Range	Actual score	
1.	<u>Operation of bank accounts and fund flow at community level</u>				
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The community doesn't know about the bank accounts. They are not allowed to look into. They are not kept with the community. 	R	0-3		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The books of accounts are being maintained by WDT/Secretary. They are kept with WDT/Secretary. 	Y	4-7		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All the bank accounts are being operated by community. The books of accounts are with the Community Representatives. The books are made available for public verification. 	G	8-10		
2.	<u>Management of funds related to contribution, revolving loan and food for work</u>				
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> People don't know about this. Since the works are being taken up on a contract basis, the contribution is collected by the contractor/middlemen. Revolving loan didn't go for poor. FFW rice also sold out by the contractor/middle person. FFW rice reached the poor hardly any. 	R	0-3		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Management funds are also being controlled by the Chairperson only. No accounts are available to public. Accounts are not maintained. Revolving loan is withheld. No repayment made. FFW rice given but not as entitled. 	Y	4-7		

* R = Red Y = Yellow G = Green

Sl. No.	Parameters and their measuring criteria	Ranking of parameters				
		Code (*)	Score Range	Actual score		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Contributions made by the users. Deposited in separate account. Management also is by the committee. Revolving loan is under control of CBO. Revolving loan is under circulation /rotation. Repayments are prompt. FFW rice benefited to the right and real beneficiary. 	G	8-10			
3.	<u>Management of participatory processes at community level</u>					
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Community is not encouraged. They stopped from participation. 	R	0-3			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Community is made participated at few unimportant events only. Community participated for sake only but no active participation. 	Y	4-7			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In all stages and events participatory process is being followed. The participation is real participation. 	G	8-10			
4.	<u>Flexibility during implementation phase</u>					
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No flexibility. It avoided people's needs 	R	0-3			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Flexible, but not addressed the local needs. 	Y	4-7			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Implementation as per majority community's needs, fitted into local context. It benefited more the local community as it is flexible. 	G	8-10			
5.	<u>Mechanism for building accountability among different stakeholders</u>					
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nobody is accountable for community. No mechanism /system are built to make accountable to community. 	R	0-3			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All such systems are written, discussed. But not followed. 	Y	4-7			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All such systems/mechanisms are discussed, accepted, written and followed. 	G	8-10			
6.	<u>Mechanism for repair and maintenance of community oriented structures / measures</u>					
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No mechanism is discussed. Committees are formed but not taken the responsibility. 	R	0-3			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some structures only are under maintenance. People are interested but don't know how to maintain. 	Y	4-7			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Committee/User groups are formed and the assets are under timely maintenance. 	G	8-10			

2.5. Financial aspects

Sl. No.	Parameters and their measuring criteria	Ranking of parameters			
		Code (*)	Score Range	Actual score	
1.	<u>Decentralization in fund flow (from VDC to VLSC)</u>				
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Community members/ Committee members are not aware of fund flows. The funds are directly spent by FNGO. The FNGO “dictates” the process of using funds. 	R	0-3		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The leaders of the VDC are more active in financial aspects. The common members/ VLSC members do not have much role in fund flows/ utilization. The FNGO and VDC members discuss on the issues related to funds and manage the funds/ records. 	Y	4-7		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The VDC and VLSC members are trained on financial aspects. The FNGO facilitates the meetings related to fund flows/ expenditure. Decisions are taken on the basis of project needs. Records/ minutes are maintained at VDC/ VLSC level. The accounts are also displayed at common place of the village. 	G	8-10		
2.	<u>Collection of contribution in advance</u>				
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is no concept of contribution from the community. The FNGO did not make any efforts to communicate this point with the communities. The community is not aware about the contribution and who is making contribution. FNGO deducts the wages from the laborers and projects that as contribution in the records. 	R	0-3		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The contribution is not contributed in advance. The farmers/ laborers both sacrificed their wages for the contribution. FNGO did not explain the need for genuine contribution from actual users. 	Y	4-7		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> FNGO spent considerable time to explain the concept of genuine contribution. Though there were initial disagreements, the community finally agreed to make genuine contributions in advance. The share of contribution differed from person to person. Appropriate records were also maintained to account for the genuine contribution from actual users. 	G	8-10		
3.	<u>Revolving fund for livelihood development</u>				
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The revolving fund concept is not there. The available fund under revolving fund was equally shared among all members of SHG/ CIG. This money was not returned. 	R	0-3		

* R = Red Y = Yellow G = Green

Sl. No.	Parameters and their measuring criteria	Ranking of parameters				
		Code (*)	Score Range	Actual score		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The revolving fund is given to one or two SHG/ CIGs. They are circulating among themselves. But there are no records to how this fund is utilized. The fund is not given to any particular/ deserving applicant. 	Y	4-7			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The revolving fund is given to SHGs/ members based on action plans of members of SHGs. The money is being circulated from one group to another. The purpose and target group are specifically decided based on specific criteria. 	G	8-10			
4.	<u>Convergence of funds from other schemes through village level action plan</u>					
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Other departments did not play any role in the village. FNGO also did not make any efforts to interact with line departments. 	R	0-3			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Line departments provided certain services as per the request of FNGO. There are one time events. There is only one department that took interest as a result of FNGO's efforts. 	Y	4-7			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Convergence plan is prepared by FNGO after a detailed discussion with community (VDC/ VLSC). The members of VDC took lead to contact line departments and presented their plans to them. Some departments committed their support to the action plans of VDC on a long term basis. 	G	8-10			
5.	<u>Adoption of cost sharing approach for collection of contribution</u>					
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The entire cost of the project was paid by the project. There is no contribution and cost sharing by actual users. 	R	0-3			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All cost sharing activities received low attention in the action plan. Limited number of activities was preferred by farmers under this category. 	Y	4-7			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The action was developed based on the preference of community members. Activities that require investments by communities were decided after a long discussion with community's preferences. About 40% of activities that directly benefit individuals/ that were demanded by individuals came under this category. 	G	8-10			
6.	<u>Provision of subsidized food for work and building the corpus out of above sale</u>					
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The food security related issues were not discussed. The FNGO managed to get some ration in the village for about two months. The corpus details are not known to the communities. 	R	0-3			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The subsidized food was given to rich families and the poorer families got little support. The purpose of the corpus fund generated out of the sale of this fund is not clear to the community. 	Y	4-7			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The right target group was identified for the subsidized food and systems were developed to sale and create corpus fund. A special committee is constituted for this purpose. 	G	8-10			

Sl. No.	Parameters and their measuring criteria	Ranking of parameters			
		Code (*)	Score Range	Actual score	
7.	<u>Payment to labourers as per latest SSR and equal wages to men and women</u>				
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The wage rates are not clear to the laborers. Women got lower wages. Wage was deducted in the name of contribution. 	R	0-3		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Payments were as per SSR. The women and men got equal wages. But women got low opportunities compared to men. 	Y	4-7		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Women and men got equal wage opportunities. SSR system was used to make payments. There was no deduction of wages. 	G	8-10		
8.	<u>Financial auditing of account by the sub-committee of VDC before release of subsequent installments</u>				
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No one knows about auditing of the finances. 	R	0-3		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> FNGO and leaders of VDC conducted audits. The members do not know about the audit. There is no link between audit and fund releases. 	Y	4-7		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Audit was conducted by separate internal sub committee, apart from the statutory external audit. The funds were based on the completion of both internal and external audits. 	G	8-10		
9	<u>MPR & Monthly monitoring Formats</u>				
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Villagers/ VLSC do not know about these formats, CM/WDT fill up those formats to meet programme mandate, all columns are not filled up and have no correlation to previous figures. 	R	0-3		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Villagers/VLSC know that there are such formats, VDC secretary/CM fill up the formats with knowledge of villagers/VLSC, all columns are filled up but no correlation to previous figures. 	Y	4-7		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Villagers/VLSC are well aware of these formats and understand it, they themselves fill it up with help of VDC secretary/CM, all columns are filled up and have correct correlation to previous figures. 	G	8-10		

2.6. Capacity building of different stakeholders

Sl. No.	Parameters and their measuring criteria	Ranking of parameters			
		Code (★)	Score Range	Actual score	
1.	<u>Identification of participants for different types of training courses</u>				
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> NO efforts were made by FNGO in this regard. 	R	0-3		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Only village leaders were identified as target groups. 	Y	4-7		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Depending on the project needs, various target groups were identified. Women and disadvantaged groups were given priority. 	G	8-10		
2.	<u>Organization of courses as per the expected role and responsibility (technical, project management, social)</u>				
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is no plan for capacity building inputs. There is no training or CB inputs at community level. 	R	0-3		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Only limited number of training programs was organized for the leaders of VDC. The training programs focused on orientation of the project. 	Y	4-7		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> An action plan for CB inputs was developed. Several types of CB inputs were provided to all sections of the villages/ leaders. Women members got special attention in this process. 	G	8-10		
3.	<u>Separation of capacity building phase from main implementation phase</u>				
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Works were given priority first. There was no separate phase for capacity building. 	R	0-3		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CB phase was limited to only three months. Training programs dominated this phase. There was no opportunity for experiential learning. 	Y	4-7		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The time period for CB inputs was dedicated to communication campaigns, training/ exposure visits. A small part of the project was also implemented to give opportunities for learning by doing. 	G	8-10		
4.	<u>Organization of courses through handholding approach</u>				
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No hand holding support is provided. 	R	0-3		

★ R = Red Y = Yellow G = Green

Sl. No.	Parameters and their measuring criteria	Ranking of parameters				
		Code (*)	Score Range	Actual score		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support is limited to only training programs and exposure visits. The WDT was available for any support. But WDT could not attend to all learning needs during the implementation of the project. 	Y	4-7			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Special teams were identified to provide hand holding support as a follow up of training programs. Project Management Cycle was used as the basis for providing training and hand holding support. Community based resource persons were identified and trained as providers of support services. 	G	8-10			

2.7 Empowerment centered plan

Sl. No.	Parameters and their measuring criteria	Ranking of parameters				
		Code (*)	Score Range	Actual score		
1.	<u>Collection and analysis of secondary data</u>					
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The secondary data was not available for the given village/ block. There were no previous surveys conducted for the region on the given themes. 	R	0-3			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The collection and analysis of secondary data was given out as a contract to resource organization. They produced a report without much involvement of local communities/ FNGO. 	Y	4-7			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The FNGO and resource organization did a joint exercise for collecting secondary data. They prepared a report using this data, which was useful in conducting the primary survey. 	G	8-10			
2.	<u>Reconnaissance survey of micro-watershed area</u>					
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No survey was conducted. FNGO's previous experience was used as basis for making broad generalized conclusions. 	R	0-3			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A survey was conducted without much involvement of communities. The purpose of the report was not very clear to the FNGO team. 	Y	4-7			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Based on the insights from the report based on secondary sources, a methodology for reconnaissance survey was decided by the resource organization and FNGO. Using several participatory methodologies, survey was completed. 	G	8-10			

* R = Red Y = Yellow G = Green

Sl. No.	Parameters and their measuring criteria	Ranking of parameters			
		Code (*)	Score Range	Actual score	
3.	<u>Rapport building with the community</u>				
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> FNGO made little efforts to develop rapport with the community. Only leaders of VDC are known to FNGO staff. 	R	0-3		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The FNGO/staff made series of attempts to meet communities and developed rapport with the communities. 	Y	4-7		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The FNGO/staff made series of attempts to meet communities and developed rapport with the communities. Special focus was given on disadvantageous groups and women of the village. Existing institutions and their members were approached during this phase. 	G	8-10		
4.	<u>Orientation of community about land record (as per ROR)</u>				
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Works were directly implemented with out any orientation program and verification of land records. Community is not aware of provisions made in the project related to land issues. 	R	0-3		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> An orientation program on Land Issues was organized. Land records were verified and issues were identified. There were several conflicts within the community. Revenue department also did not cooperate with the FNGO. The land related issues received only cursory support in action plan. 	Y	4-7		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Special Orientation programs were organized in a systematic and continuous manner. Special surveys were conducted to identify land related issues. Issues were categorised as per the nature of action and shared with Revenue/ Forest Department. A joint exercise was initiated to address the land issues. 	G	8-10		
5.	<u>Participatory exercises and household wise survey</u>				
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There was no survey conducted for collecting house hold details. FNGO generated report based on its previous reports. 	R	0-3		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A report was generated based on participatory household surveys. Largely men participated in the surveys. 	Y	4-7		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Men and women of families participated in the survey. Participatory situation analysis was developed by Resource Organization and FNGO. 	G	8-10		
6.	<u>Participatory exercises and area wise survey</u>				
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No survey was conducted by the FNGO. The data was generated without actual field work. 	R	0-3		

Sl. No.	Parameters and their measuring criteria	Ranking of parameters				
		Code (*)	Score Range	Actual score		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The entire village was taken as a unit and no sub watersheds/ areas were identified for action planning. Site/ area specific plans were not developed. VDC leaders participated in the surveys. 	Y	4-7			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Village was divided into several sub watersheds and action plans were developed for each sub watershed. Local persons, who belong to that selected area participated in that surveys and contributed to the action plans. 	G	8-10			
7.	<u>Preparation of design and estimates along with the trained village level workers</u>					
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Designs and estimates are prepared by the FNGO/WDT. The community level functionaries were not part of this exercise. 	R	0-3			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Village leaders participated in the designing process of the works, by sharing the cost of materials. There was no community level worker, who participated in this process. FNGO dominated this process. 	Y	4-7			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> FNGO conducted several training programs to village level community worker on technical aspects of the project. This person helped in designing of works/ activities and estimates. The VDC members also contributed to this process along with FNGO. 	G	8-10			
8.	<u>Village level approval for the base plan</u>					
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Community members were not informed about the action plans. They came to know about project, only when the works were initiated in the village. 	R	0-3			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Only VDC members came to know about contents of action plans. They also did not approve the action plan. They were asked to sign on the resolution (approval) indicating their approval. FNGO played a major role in getting the notional consent from the community leaders. 	Y	4-7			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Action plan was discussed in each hamlet/ sub watershed. After taking consent from the respective user groups/ groups, the final action plan was presented by VDC at grama sabha. FNGO facilitated this meeting. Community members contributed to the process of decision making and approval of action plan. 	G	8-10			
9.	<u>Consolidation of micro watershed level plan, estimate and budgets</u>					
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Only one plan was prepared for the entire village. There were not plans for each sub watersheds. There was no need to consolidate the action plan. 	R	0-3			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Action plans were consolidated for each sub watershed. These were compiled by WDT and VDC leaders. Community members are not involved in the process. 	Y	4-7			

Sl. No.	Parameters and their measuring criteria	Ranking of parameters				
		Code (*)	Score Range	Actual score		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> User group members/ VLSC/ VDC members and Community Level Technical Worker put together the action plan after the approval of action plan by the grama sabha. FNGO helped to put together this action plan. 	G	8-10			
10.	<u>Prioritization of proposals and working out convergence plan</u>					
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Priority was given to activities that benefit village leaders and those persons who are in good records of FNGO. Certain hamlets did not get any support/ space in the action plans. 	R	0-3			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Priority was given to NRM activities. Land related revenue issues got little support in the action plans. Convergence plans got little attention. 	Y	4-7			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Priority was given to those activities that address the entitlements and livelihoods of poor and women. NRM activities received attention in places where the resources are fairly in degraded condition. Convergence plans received attention as the community members identified activities under this category and presented them to the line departments. 	G	8-10			
11.	<u>Preparation of the final plan document</u>					
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The final plan document was prepared by FNGO with out/ minimum consultations with communities. Limited number of leaders participated in this process. 	R	0-3			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Community members joined the process of final action plan and FNGO provided major inputs into this process. 	Y	4-7			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The final approved action plan is converted into a document and summary statements were displayed at the common place in the village. Copies of the final plan were available at various places/groups in the village. 	G	8-10			

3. Score Consolidation Sheet

Sl. No.	Measuring Criteria	Score/ Color Code (R/Y/G)				Recom mendati on Code
		V1	V2	V3	Avera ge	
2.1	Institutional Aspects					
2.1.1	Village level sub-committee (VLSC					
2.1.2	Village Development Association					
2.1.3	Micro-watershed level committee (VDC)					
2.1.4	VDC to play facilitation role whereas VLSC to carry out execution of works					
2.1.5	Organization of new thematic groups and committees namely VSS, CIG, etc (besides SHG, UG, VDC)					
2.2	Organization of community					
2.2.1	Organization of all adult members into SHGs (women and men)					
2.2.2	Drawing out members of other groups (CIG, UG, VDC, etc) out of above SHGs					
2.2.3	Organization of CBOs in different phases					
2.2.3.1	Phase – I: SHG, UG, Para-worker					
2.2.3.2	Phase – II: VLSC, VDC					
2.2.3.3	Phase – III: CIGs (as per need)					
2.2.3.4	Phase – IV: Federation of SHGs					
2.2.3.5	Phase – V: Community managed resource centre					
2.3	Project Management					
2.3.1	Proper sequencing of components and sub-components					
2.3.2	Capacity building inputs as per the sequence					
2.3.3	Evaluation of performance and preparedness of CBO and FNGO towards end of CB phase					
2.3.4	Building accountability of different stakeholders through MoU between ITDA and FNGO and also between ITDA and CBO					
2.3.5	Monitoring of output / outcome as per the sequence					

2.3.6	Repair and maintenance of user charges					
2.3.7	Preparation of Plan & Estimate for Implementation of activities					
2.3.8	High priority to adopt ITK					
2.3.9	Involving UG / SHG for execution of works					
2.3.10	Release of fund by VDC to VLSC against quarterly implementation plan (approved by the community at village level)					
2.3.11	Painting of SSR and design / estimate on village walls					
2.3.12	Perspective plan for seven years besides annual action plan					
2.3.13	Decentralized approval of perspective and annual action plan					
2.3.13.1	Social approval: By the community at village and micro watershed level					
2.3.13.2	Technical approval: By WDT (upto Rs. 0.5 lakh) and by ITDA (upto Rs. 5.0 lakh)					
2.3.13.3	Administrative and financial approval: By FNGO (upto Rs. 1.0 lakh) and by ITDA (beyond Rs. 1.0 lakhs)					
2.4	Participatory implementation & monitoring					
2.4.1	Operation of bank accounts and fund flow at community level					
2.4.2	Management of funds related to contribution, revolving loan and food for work					
2.4.3	Management of participatory processes at community level					
2.4.4	Flexibility during implementation phase					
2.4.5	Mechanism for building accountability among different stakeholders					
2.4.6	Mechanism for repair and maintenance of community oriented structures / measures					
2.5	Financial aspects					
2.5.1	Decentralization in fund flow (from VDC to VLSC)					
2.5.2	Collection of contribution in advance					
2.5.3	Revolving fund for livelihood development					

2.5.4	Convergence of funds from other schemes through village level action plan					
2.5.5	Adoption of cost sharing approach for collection of contribution					
2.5.6	Provision of subsidized food for work and building the corpus out of above sale					
2.5.7	Payment to labourers as per latest SSR and equal wages to men and women					
2.5.8	Financial auditing of account by the sub-committee of VDC before release of subsequent installments					
2.5.9	MPR & Monthly monitoring Formats					
2.6	Capacity building of different stakeholders					
2.6.1	Identification of participants for different types of training courses					
2.6.2	Organization of courses as per the expected role and responsibility (technical, project management, social)					
2.6.3	Separation of capacity building phase from main implementation phase					
2.6.4	Organization of courses through handholding approach					
2.7	Empowerment centered plan					
2.7.1	Collection and analysis of secondary data					
2.7.2	Reconnaissance survey of micro-watershed area					
2.7.3	Rapport building with the community					
2.7.4	Orientation of community about land record (as per ROR)					
2.7.5	Participatory exercises and household wise survey					
2.7.6	Participatory exercises and area wise survey					
2.7.7	Preparation of design and estimates along with the trained village level workers					
2.7.8	Village level approval for the base plan					
2.7.9	Consolidation of micro watershed level plan, estimate and budgets					
2.7.10	Prioritization of proposals and working out convergence plan					
2.7.11	Preparation of the final plan document					

4. Recommendations

Code No.	Recommendation

Code No.	Recommendation

Communication

Programme Support Unit

2nd Floor, TDCC Building,

Bhoi Nagar, Bhubaneswar – 22

Phone: 0674 2542709, 2547854, 2547535

Telefax: 0674 2541772

Email: support@otelp.org, Website: www.otelp.org