

MYRADA

Rural Management Systems Series
Paper - 6

No.2, Service Road
Domlur Layout
BANGALORE 560 071. INDIA.
① : 5353166, 5354457, 5352028
Fax : 091 - 80 - 5350982
E-mail : myrada@blr.vsnl.net.in
Website : <http://www.myrada.org>

PIDOW - GULBARGA

PEOPLES' PARTICIPATION IN THE MANAGEMENT OF MINI WATERSHEDS

THE "P" IN PIDOW

19 Aug. 1988

19 Aug. 1989

INTRODUCTION :

PIDOW is a venture initiated by three partners - The Government, SDC and MYRADA. The role of MYRADA briefly described is to enable the people to become an effective fourth partner and in most programmes the dominant one.

MYRADA's focus therefore in PIDOW is on :-

- fostering the participation of people and the development of appropriate peoples' institutions so that they can mobilise, regenerate and manage the resources they require and the resources of the watershed in an effective and sustained manner;
- the landless and the marginal & small farmers so that their standard and quality of living rises above the poverty line and remains there; these groups, especially the landless do not find a place in many watershed development programmes which are land based;
- influencing Government departments involved in watershed development to work in an integrated way with a focus on a watershed and to accept peoples' participation as an integral factor in formulating and implementing policies and programmes.

The original project area demarcated in 1983 was spread over 27 villages and 36 Thandas and covered 4 watersheds, Dongergaon, Sonth, Jeevangi and Kamalapur; each watershed

covering about 10,000 acres. **The partners realised that people could never be able to participate and manage such large watersheds which extended way beyond the area they were familiar with.** To continue to operate over these major areas would reduce the project to another broadcast programme similar to an Integrated Rural Development Programme (IRDP) over watersheds which happened to be there. **To begin with, a change in focus was required to smaller watersheds.**

The first major shift in gear came in mid 1986, when as a result of a workshop with the Gulbarga staff it became clear that the programme as it was being implemented over an area covering 4 watersheds did not give any indications that the people were aware that they were involved in a watershed management programme. To enable people to participate effectively, the watershed had to be **small** enough so that :

- the people could **see** their watershed;
- it should be an area that they are relating with either through agriculture, grazing, forestry, etc.
- the extent of land assets and resources would not be too large for them to manage without continuing outside assistance, and
- the number of families involved would be small enough to enable them to function together; if the number of families was large (above 30) they would break-up into smaller socially functional and homogeneous groups managing various particular operations like credit, with an **apex group** supervising the overall functions of a watershed.

After a survey of the 4 watersheds it was decided to choose 3 mini watersheds which were not too large (between 600-800 acres), with 80-100 families in each watershed. The first step regarding the size of the watershed and the number of people who could be effectively involved was described in a working paper which was put together after a workshop in Gulbarga **in May 1986**; an extract of which is given below :

Quote :

"The watershed cannot be too large. Its size must depend on the "Capacity" of the people and their institutions to manage the operations required. This "Capacity" - skills and resources - will hopefully increase as a result of PIDOW's intervention. The existing "area definitions" of a watershed as guiding norms are of little help. For example, the PWD (Irrigation Department) describes the watershed in terms of river basins. The area extends over thousands of hectares which comprises the entire catchment area of a major river. Such an area concept cannot serve as the

basis of PIDOW's choice of a watershed. It is too large to achieve the major objectives of participation. The practice of Maharaja's and local rulers provides a useful example. They concentrated on minor basins and tanks which were administered by the village or panchayat. This is one reason why the people have developed their own institutions to manage a programme. They should not visit only large Government managed programmes which are high in technology and expertise but have a management pattern too costly and elaborate to be adopted and managed by the people.

The Watershed cannot be too small either. If it is, then the programme will be largely symbolic in nature. The functional institutions will be too small to achieve economic viability, the social like health and education which require political organisation for proper management too weak to exert pressure, the area inadequate to provide the major needs of energy, pasture and forestry. How large therefore, should the watershed be? One can be allowed to hazard a guess at this stage at the cost of inviting criticism of being arbitrary. **A watershed covering 600 - 800 acres with 80 to 100 farming families would be a possible start for PIDOW."**

Unquote.

The change in focus from a broadcast programme over 4 large watersheds to 3 mini watersheds was not easy. It called for a change in attitudes and in staff deployment. One mini watershed Manager was appointed to be entirely responsible for the programmes and staff in each of the three mini watersheds.

From October 1986 the PIDOW staff concentrated on assisting the people in the 3 mini watershed (a fourth - Harji - was added later), by 1989, work had extended to 12 mini watersheds. From October 1986 to July - August of 1987, however, the major thrust was given to agriculture, soil and water conservation and forestry. The infrastructure was put in place; but we realised that adequate attention was not given to the degree of peoples participation required for effective management.

Consequently the staff decided to reflect together on these programmes in the 3 mini watersheds (and the fourth which was added later) to analyse the degree of peoples participation, to identify the obstacles to attaining the degree of participation required and to arrive at guidelines and a strategy for the future programme.

This paper will not dwell on the criteria adopted to select the mini- watersheds, which were based on physical data, on the watershed development strategy of starting with watersheds on the upper reaches and working downwards, on the response of the people etc. **It focuses only on the dimension of peoples participation and is divided into five parts.**

The three mini watersheds selected in 1986 were :

Sl. No.	Name of the Watershed	Geographical Area	No. Of Families Involved In These Watersheds
1.	Wadigera MWS	400 hectares	70
2.	Bhagwan Tanda MWS	250 hectares	65
3.	Bandanakera MWS	375 hectares	104
4.	Harjee MWS (was added later in 1987)	342 hectares	107

In April 1988 there were 23 groups in these mini watersheds (Watershed Management Associations, Youth Clubs, Women's Groups, Landless Labour Association and Village Development Associations). The relevance and appropriateness of these groups as peoples institutions which are effective and viable for the management of the watershed will be discussed in Part IV.

In these four mini watersheds, MYRADA tried during 15 months from January 1987 :

- **to understand** the traditional systems adopted by the people utilising the resources in these MWSs to manage their lives **and** the resources of the MWSs.
- **to educate, motivate, organise and train the community** utilising the resources of a MWS to participate effectively in the integrated development and regeneration of their MWSs.
- **to reconcile** the demands for utilising lands in the watershed according to the topography which may clash with the short term needs of the people. (Refer RMS Paper - 5)
- **to reconcile** the ideology of MYRADA which is focused on the poor which may clash with the objective of the watershed approach where all the farmers (big and small) directly benefit, especially in the land development measures but also in land use; (Refer RMS Paper 5)

The staff decided to reflect on their experiences in community organization - of successes **and** failures. This decision led to a two day workshop at Gulbarga on the 23rd and 24th February 1988 facilitated by the Executive Director of MYRADA: participating were MYRADA Team at Gulbarga, the SDC Regional Representative, the field level staff drawn from the area and staff from Bangalore.

The workshop was informal and unstructured: but over the period of two days four sets of key questions were identified to guide the discussions. The first two sets of questions were addressed to **strengthen** and **clarify** the understanding of the concept of

participation - the crucial "P" in the "PIDOW" Project - and of what is required of MYRADA's staff to elicit such participation. The results of the reflection are given in parts I and II, of this paper. The remaining two sets of questions helped us identify the structural features of people's institutions for fostering effective participation of the people particularly in the development of MWSs. The results of our reflections are given in Parts III and IV.

No particular attention was given at this stage to evolve a strategy whereby all the Government Departments involved could work in an integrated way and also relate effectively with the peoples institution in planning and implementing a watershed programme. Up to this time plans were being made with each Department separately; peoples participation in planning only extended to expressing their choice of saplings and implementing some of the soil and water conservation programmes. The Credit Management Groups initiated by MYRADA, however, had begun to operate; a separate report on their working is available. People had also participated in establishing and maintaining forestry and fodder plots, but this was mainly in collaboration with MYRADA staff.

Certain questions however, were being asked by MYRADA staff:

1. How far can people's participation go in the PIDOW model where Government had a significant role to play in planning and implementing major programmes.
2. Can the degree of participation which MYRADA expects to be achieved within PIDOW. For example MYRADA has come to realise that while people must be involved in planning their watershed, in this stage the initiative will not be theirs. MYRADA feels that it should go further. For example when soil conservation measures are planned, the Department should be in a position to call for tenders and to revise and question the estimates besides actually supervising the work. No contractors should be permitted. Any profits made should go to build up the common fund of the Watershed Committee. This fund could partly be used for maintaining the structures constructed.

The people should also have the liberty to site these structures as well as to put up alternate appropriate and often traditional structures.

3. Further when farmers are motivated to build bunds on their fields and do so on their own, why should they not be compensated? Instead MYRADA finds that the Department comes in and constructs new bunds often with bulldozers because it has a target to achieve.

The queries raise several issues which will be discussed in another paper.

PART I

To assess the degree of peoples' participation in the programmes implemented over the past 18 months after the focus shifted to the mini watershed, the members of the workshop addressed themselves to the following queries :

- a. Did the people understand **why** the programmes were taken up?
- b. Did they participate in deciding **what** kind of programmes should be implemented?
- c. Did they participate in deciding **where** these programmes should be implemented?
- d. Did they participate in deciding **how many** programmes should be implemented?
- e. Did they participate in deciding **how** these programmes should be implemented?
- f. Did the people know the **estimate/cost** of the structures; if so, did they feel free to accept, change or reject them, or call for tenders?
- g. Were they involved in **implementing** the programme?
- h. Are they managing and **maintaining** the resources and assets created.

It must be mentioned that all these questions which in a way lead to an ideal pattern of peoples' participation were not raised in 1986 and 1987; some were and others emerged from reflections on experiences during this period.

Due to pressure on time, the group decided to reflect only on programmes in two major areas, namely :

- Soil and Water Conservation,
- Forestry and Horticulture

In both these programmes Government Departments had a major role to play; this was part of the PI DOW agreement.

A. SOIL AND WATER CONSERVATION MEASURES :

The programmes selected were nala bunds, field/contour bunds and gully checks.

- a. Did the people understand why these programmes were being taken up?

It was agreed that most of the people in the MWSs had a good understanding of the need for these programmes, mainly because these programmes were not new to the area. Nala bunds and gully checks had been constructed in the nearby areas. However, the people were not motivated enough to draw or make a rough model of their watershed in order to see how the various aspects were inter-related.

- b. Did the people participate in deciding what kind of nala bunds, field/contour bunds and gully checks should be taken up?

Other than in one MWS, where the people influenced the Government to change the field bunds from earthen bunds to boulder bunds since boulders were available in plenty in the surrounding area, the peoples' participation has been low. In one MWS, earthen bunds have been constructed, though in the fields there are plenty of boulders which could have been used. The Government's main problem in encouraging boulder bunds wherever feasible is the absence of a system for paying wages for boulder bunds, yet when left to the people, they worked out a system themselves.

- c. Did the people participate in deciding how many bunds, checks should be made and the extent of land which should be bunded?

In the I Phase the Government demarcated the MWS, drew up land- ownership and land use maps along with details of alternative land use. It also decided how many structures were necessary for conserving water and soil. It was not clear whether these plans made under PIDOW were based on a total and comprehensive plan for a watershed and the requirements for conserving soil and water or on a project by project approach. For eg: in one watershed the Government proposed to put in 45 gully checks under PIDOW, while a survey revealed that totally over 100 gully checks have been constructed under various projects. A total plan of the mini watershed is required which the people should be involved in developing and implementing.

- d. Did the people participate in deciding where the nala bunds, contour bunds and gully checks should be established?

Largely the answer was yes. The fact that most of the bunds are along ownership boundaries and not along contours is one proof of this. Whether this should be the case will be discussed in the soil and water conservation policy paper. But more exciting is how the peoples' groups lobbied with its members when the site for constructing nala-bunds was owned by one or two of its members. In Wadigera MWS for example, two nala-bunds have been constructed. The site of one nala-bund belonged to a farmer from Banjara colony; a hamlet 2 kms. away from

Wadigera village. He initially refused to give consent for constructing the nala-bund on his land. The Wadigera MWS group had several discussions with the farmer and arrived at a suitable figure for compensation for the land which the farmer had to forego. It mobilised 50% of the amount from its own resources and requested MYRADA/SDC to provide financial support for the rest. The site for the second nala-bund was privately owned; the Wadigera group obtained the content of this farmer without any compensation.

In Bhagwan Thanda one nala-bund was constructed. The land belonged to a small farmer owning 2.5 acres of land. Initially the person refused to give consent for constructing a nala-bund; repeated discussions between the group and the farmer led to an innovative system of compensation. The group members decided to give 200 kgs of Jowar every season to the farmer.

- e. Did the people participate in deciding how the nala-bunds and gully checks should be constructed?

The Government Departments decided on :

- What material was to be used, where it was to be purchased and from whom (though there was an exception as mentioned earlier).
- The structural design of these nala-bunds and gully checks.
- the wages to be paid.
- The mode of construction; either through contractors or by direct supervision.

It is true that in some areas like structural design, the people do not have adequate expertise; but they should be allowed to call on such expertise from other sources.

- f. Were the people aware of the estimate/cost of these structures? If they were, did they feel free to change them.

The short answer is no. The estimate/cost was not made known to the people. The group felt that not only should these estimates have been made public, but the people should be free to decide whether the cost could be cut down and how; they should be able to call for tenders.

- g. Did the people participate in the management of operation? The various operations include :-

- marking the layout;

- purchasing and managing **materials** whenever contractors were not involved in the construction;
- organising and managing **labour** where labour contractors are not involved in the construction;
- **managing** contractors whenever they are involved;
- monitoring the achievements quantitatively and qualitatively.

The people participated chiefly by providing labour and in one instance in providing and managing labour. While in Wadigera, Bandanakere and Harjee the people provided labour to a contractor, in Bhagwan Thanda the men and women's group came together and took up the labour contract for construction of nala-bunds. In Bandankera MWS, inspite of the fact that the market rate for wages was higher than the Government's wage rate, the people opted to work of the construction of soil and water conservation structures in their own mini watershed. In all the MWSs the involvement of the people in constructing the structures led to the increase in the financial resource base of the groups in the MWSs. **In all the MWSs the people contributed part of their wages to the group fund.** The highest contribution was in Harjee MWS where the people decided to contribute **20% of their earnings to the group fund.** These were the positive features. On the other hand the **peoples' participation in management** of all the other operations was low. In the 3 mini-watersheds the associations have recovered over 90% of loans provided for agriculture; this amount has gone into the common fund of the groups.

Though given by SDC/Government as a grant, the groups decided to convert it into a loan.

- h. Are the people participating in the **maintenance** of nala-bunds, gully checks and contour bunds?
- In the case of nala-bunds the farmer(s) who contributed the land or whose land was adjacent remove the silt periodically at their own cost and apply it to their fields.
 - With regard to gully checks a detailed survey needs to be carried out to clarify how many gully checks have been constructed, how many are functional, and why and how were they repaired etc. In Harji MWS the people utilised their own resources to repair some of the gully checks which were damaged.

- With regard to contour/field bunds, a survey is required to assess how far the people are participating in the maintenance of these bunds; it is however too early to arrive at an assessment.

To summarise; with regard to the soil and water conservation programmes the group agreed that :

- i. People have a good understanding of why nala-bunds, contour bunds and gully checks were essential; but need to develop a better understanding of how the soil and water conservation structures fit into the overall approach to watershed development.
- ii. People's participation in deciding what soil and water conservation structures need to be taken up and how they should be implemented needs to be strengthened.
- iii. People's participation of operations involved in construction of nala-bunds, contour bunds and gully checks needs to increase.
- iv. It is too early to assess people's participation in maintenance of assets which have been created.

B. FORESTRY AND HORTICULTURE :

The group proceeded to assess the degree of people's participation in forestry based programmes. The projects discussed were, block plantations, agro-forestry, natural regeneration and avenue planting. The same questions raised to assess the people's participation in soil and water conservation programme served to guide the reflection. A summary of the conclusions is given below:

- i. The group felt that people need to develop a better understanding of why the forestry and horticulture based projects are being taken up. To many it is a source of fuel/fodder. But only a few have understood the importance of forestry and horticulture programmes for protecting the upper reaches, slopes and wastelands of the MWSs.
- ii. People's participation in deciding on whose lands the programmes should be taken up varied. In some MWS the families came forward to take up agro-forestry; while in others, MYRADA staff selected the families who owned lands which required treatment but later motivated the group to get involved in the programme. For eg. MYRADA selected the area for block plantation in BhagwanTanda; the criteria, for choice of the area were that land was on the upper reaches, that it was lying unused and that it was

over-grazed and eroded. This land however, was owned privately; the Bhagwantanda group later entered into a dialogue with the farmer to work out contribution of the income to group funds and to discuss the mode of sharing of employment which will be generated between the members.

The forest Department's policy not to take up block plantations on private lands in watersheds in the future even if they are located in vulnerable areas and are lying barren will have to be reconsidered or alternate arrangements will have to be made.

- iii. The degree of people's participation in deciding what trees to plant under the forestry and horticulture projects was high in the case of agro-forestry/ horticulture and bund-planting projects but needs to be strengthened in the case of block plantations and avenue plantations where the decisions were taken largely by the Forest Department.
- iv. The degree of people's participation in deciding how the programmes should be implemented and in the actual management of operations was good in the case of agro- forestry/horticulture and bund-planting but low in the case of block plantation where decisions were taken by MYRADA or the Forest Department. Thus for example, though boulders were available in plenty in Wadigera MWS, the saplings under avenue plantation were protected by wooden guards according to the policy of the forest department.
- v. The degree of people's participation in maintenance was average to high in the case of agro-forestry, horticulture, bund planting and avenue planting. The Wadigera, Bandankere and Kalamandargi Associations appointed a person for watering and weeding of avenue plantations and paid him/her from the resources raised by these groups. On the other hand the natural regeneration project is poorly maintained by the Wadigera group. In two MWSs where block plantation Projects have been taken up, the participation of the people in maintenance needs to improve.

Conclusion (PART I)

Recommendations to strengthen participation of the people in planning, implementing and monitoring activities in a watershed:

- a. An approach on the need to reverse the trend towards ecological imbalance in MWS needs to be evolved with the people through discussion, meetings, exposures, participative action programmes and visuals.
- b. People need to develop **appropriate institutions** which will foster **effective** participation of the people in the development of MWSs. What we mean by "effective participation" and "appropriate participation" and "appropriate institutions" in the content of PI DOW are dealt with in detail in Parts - III and IV.
- c. These institutions should be encouraged to develop a model for watershed management using locally available resources to depict their **vision and plan** for the development of their MWS. This plan would be discussed by these peoples institutions with the relevant Government Departments, MYRADA and others and modified **where required**; thus a **MWS plan would emerge which the people can relate to and manage.**
- d. **Ideally**, the group should be given the administrative and financial backing to :
 - i. **Actually** evolve their plans.
 - ii. **Decide how** to execute the MWS plan evolved by themselves.

They may decide :

- Whether to go in for Labour contract or not.
- Who should be the beneficiaries of various projects.
- To whom to give the contract.
- Whether the financial support should be a grant or loan or a mixture of both and should it vary depending on the economic status of the family.

- iii. **Evolve and implement** systems to maintain the created assets of the MWS.

This pattern will take time to develop; to begin with the three partners need to gain confidence in this new approach. But, what is immediately possible is to evolve **systems where** no project in MWS is planned or **executed without** the participation and sanction of the people's institutions in the MWSs.

PART II

The questions guiding this discussion were :

1. What do we mean by the phrase "effective participation of the people" in the context of MWSs?
2. What is required to each staff member involved in PIDOW to foster such participation?

The Rural Management System Paper - 5, served as a basis for the discussion.

The group came to a common understanding that "effective participation of people" which is **not symbolic but which is institutionalised, innovative and self-sustaining**. Thus in the context of PIDOW, participation of people by organising themselves as labour or as contractors for executing soil and water conservation structures is symbolic and adhoc; this can be a good entry point for mobilising people, but is not adequate; while participative action of the people living in a watershed which progresses towards building up peoples capacity, resources and institutions leading to effective and sustained management of the MWSs by the people themselves is an appropriate example of peoples participation.

Effective participation therefore requires :

- that in every programme the people mobilise atleast **part** of the resources from themselves and plan, manage and monitor **all** the programmes and resources of the MWSs.
- that people manage common assets of the MWSs for eg., grazing lands, water sources, forestry on upper reaches of the watershed, even on lands belonging to the Government, nala- bunds, gully checks, etc; those assets should be managed in a manner where rights and responsibilities are shared by all the people utilising the resources of the MWSs.
- that the people evolve and implement innovative systems for managing resources and see their way through emerging incompatibilities in community participation.

What is expected of our staff at Gulbarga to foster such participation? The group felt that each one, as well as the group has:

- to be **committed** to the people and communicate this commitment through their behaviour, approach and interaction with the people.

- to be professional in their approach to the development **and** able to transfer this professionalism to the people and their institutions.
- to be **innovative** - **entrepreneurs** in development capable of identifying, organising and building up appropriate institutions of the people which can develop and manage the resources and in turn foster entrepreneurship among the people.
- to cultivate a **participatory** approach and a supportive role in every programme.

What is required to cope with the diverse demands of the above tasks? The group felt that :

- **adequate time** is required with the people and their institutions.
 - proper attitudes, skills and knowledge to relate with people and gain their confidence.
 - To develop a good understanding of people and the traditional and existing systems for managing resources of the MWSs. In a situation of scarce resources which is "normal" to them, they have managed to survive all these years; much can be learned from these experiences from which new institutions can be gradually developed which are more participatory, equitable and geared to **monitoring** the quality of resources in the watershed and not **exploiting** them.
-

PART III :

Structural Features of People's Institutions :

The discussion was based on the experience gained and not the concepts treated in RMS Paper - 5.

What should be the structural features of people's institutions in a mini-watershed which would promote effective participation of its members? **Can we organise** people's institutions with the required structural features for facilitating effective participation by all **and reconcile** the structural incompatibilities which are emerging?

Reflecting on the experiences the group felt that to foster effective participation, people's institutions, irrespective of what they manage, need to be **socially viable**. The members need to be able to work together as a group; they should be able to function in a group where collective efforts of its members towards the goals of the institution are more effective than the sum of individual efforts of its members. To be socially viable the group needs to be :

- Small in size; an ideal of 15-20 members and a maximum of 30 members. A group larger than 30 members finds it difficult to function. True, there may be a few large groups which are homogeneous and where the members are aware of their responsibilities, but in general, participation of each member in such groups is restricted. Some members are shy or diffident and can talk and function only in small groups. This is a feature that is common in all our seminars or workshops where ten or twelve is the maximum number allowed in a group. Where a small group meets not only to discuss issues but to **mobilise, manage** and **monitor** common resources, it is even more imperative for every member to participate and to do so effectively which means more than being present. The dynamics of the groups functioning should **encourage** each and every member to talk and decide without inhibition or fear; in a large group this is difficult if not impossible. Size is therefore a structural feature which has to be given importance.
- Homogeneous in composition i.e., they should be composed of people with similar interests. Similarity in economic status may be essential in groups involved in management of **scarce inputs** - like credit; while it may not be essential for groups involved in management of common resources, for eg., sanitation, drinking water, roads, etc.
- **Fully participative** where decisions are not delegated to representatives but where all the members gather to arrive at any decision; where the thrust of non-formal education is on helping the silent observers in the group to participate effectively.
- **Voluntary**

1. Where common values like mutual support, care for family, self restraint, small family norms, etc., are established and sanctions accepted by all. Many of these values operated in traditional society, but have been diluted or lost.
2. Where rules and regulations of the group are evolved, observed and changed by the members themselves. This encourages the emergence of values, rules and regulations which are **appropriate** to the activities of the group, which help to establish better living systems for its members and enables them to cope with the continuously changing demands of the environment.
 - Non-political; where decisions are taken by the members on the merits of the issues and not due to the influence of party politics.

The credit management concept which underlies the principles of community organisation has been explained in an earlier paper which may be referred to for further clarification.

But on the other hand the group realised that watershed development requires that **all** the people utilising the resources of the MWSs should be involved in managing these resources through appropriate institutions. This is where the incompatibilities emerged. The effort to reconcile them led the group towards identifying specific roles for various types of groups and associations.

The Watershed Management Associations for example, should include **all** members living in a watershed and with lands in the watershed; this Association should manage the following resources.

- a. Land : Land Development : Agricultural lands and waste lands whether owned by Government or private farmers, contour/field bunds, nala bunds, gully checks.

Land Use : Land for grazing, fodder, forestry, agriculture, horticulture.
- b. Water :
 - management of surface water
 - management of ground water
 - management of recharge
- c. Other natural resources :
 - management of trees/fuel

- management of dung
 - management of farm and human wastes.
- d. Livestock :
- working towards a balance between livestock population and grazing/fodder availability.
- e. Social infrastructure like drinking water, wells, public sanitation etc.

All the families are involved; however there are several categories of people in these Watershed Management Associations; for eg :

- i. people staying inside the mini-watersheds and with land inside the mini-watershed. These people utilise and manage all the resources of the MWSs listed above.
- ii. people staying inside the MWS with lands outside the MWS; these people utilise and manage all the resources of the MWS other than those which are privately owned.
- iii. landless people staying inside the MWS. These people utilise all the resources of the watershed except agricultural lands on which they may be hired as labour.
- iv. people staying outside the MWS and with lands inside the mini-watershed. These people normally do not utilise or manage the common resources of the MWS.

If we followed the principle of involving all these categories of people each association would be :

- **LARGE** - an average of 90 families.
- **HETEROGENEOUS** - would consist of people from different cultural backgrounds (lambanis and non-lambanis) economic status, interest groups, political parties etc.
- **NON-PARTICIPATIVE** - decision making will have to be delegated to a small number of members who would represent the others. Further, as it will include people who are staying 3-4 kms., away from the MWS, it is difficult for all the members to come together.
- Vulnerable to party politics and to political interference.

HOW DO WE RECONCILE THE FOUR MAJOR FEATURES OF SOCIETY VIABLE AND FUNCTIONAL PEOPLE'S INSTITUTIONS WHICH FOSTER EFFECTIVE PARTICIPATION NAMELY SMALL, HOMOGENEOUS, FULLY PARTICIPATIVE AND NON-POLITICAL WITH THE WATERSHED DEVELOPMENT APPROACH WHICH

REQUIRES WATERSHED MANAGEMENT ASSOCIATIONS WHICH OFTEN TEND TO BE LARGE, NON-PARTICIPATIVE AND POLITICAL.

After reflection the group felt that:

- a. As a first step several **SMALL** groups, may be formed with a maximum of 30 members, which are **homogeneous** (people from the same cultural or economic status or interest group), **FULLY PARTICIPATIVE** (not with a representative but with a collective system of decision making), Voluntary and non-political may be formed.
- b. Non-formal education programmes would be strengthened to help the weaker members in each of these sub-groups to participate **fully** and effectively.
- c. Time and effort should be given to educating these sub-groups on ecology and the need for watershed development and to help these sub-groups to develop the skills and knowledge - technical and managerial - required for the development and management of MWSs. This would ensure that all the sub-groups are working towards the same goal.
- d. Each sub-group should be encouraged to nominate representatives to the Watershed Management Committee which would consist of a maximum of 15 people. The number of representatives each sub-group could nominate may be proportional to the number of members in the sub-groups. To ensure that these representatives do not start controlling the resources of the watershed the group felt that :
 - i. No decision would be taken in the WMA committee without prior discussions in the sub-group.
 - ii. The decisions of the sub-groups on activities of the watershed may be forwarded through the representatives to the WMA committee. These recommendations of the sub-groups may form the basis of the decisions taken, in the Watershed Management Committee.
 - iii. The representatives from the sub-groups to the WMC may be rotated every six months.

The Role of the Watershed Management Association :

The Watershed Management Association (WMA) would :

- a. Create awareness among the sub-groups on the importance of ecological balance of the watershed as an ecological unit which needs to be properly managed.
- b. Co-ordinate and integrate the efforts of all the sub-groups; so that all the sub-groups work towards the same goal, namely the integrated development and management of the resources of the MWSs.
- c. Work out systems to ensure that common resources and assets like nala-bunds, gully checks, grazing lands, drinking water resources etc., are managed by the sub-groups in a manner where **rights and responsibilities are shared appropriately.**
- d. Provide the necessary support to the weaker members of each group to develop and participate effectively.
- e. Co-ordinate, lobby and bargain with the Government, contractors, financial institutions, Mandal Panchayats, MYRADA (as long as we are there) and other interest groups so as to **mobilise, plan and manage programmes offered by these institutions** for watershed development **and** for the development of weaker sections.
- f. Network with other WMAs and institutions involved in similar programmes so as to help the sub-groups to develop appropriate skills etc.

The Role of the Sub-Groups :

The sub-groups will be formed on the basis of resources to be managed eg., credit, seed, etc. Their role will be to evolve an appropriate system for managing this particular resource. Once this group begins to operate effectively to manage this resource, it can be motivated to become in the mini-watershed.

Its role in this area will in some respects be similar to that of the WMA. The sub-groups would :

- a. Meet regularly and evolve their rules, regulations, sanctions, behaviour patterns, etc., accept and develop values required to support this system; foster savings and thrift etc.
- b. Create an awareness among its members on the importance of ecological balance - the watershed as an ecological unit - which needs to be properly managed.

- c. Participate in the creation and management of common resources of the MWS.
- d. Select beneficiaries for various projects of the MWSs; keeping in mind the preference for the poor and women.
- e. Evolve a strategy for resolving some of the incompatibilities mentioned earlier.
- f. Ensure that through each activity implemented by the sub- group, the groups financial and managerial resource base increases.
- g. Lobby with the big farmers on whose lands investment needs to be made for land development/land use measures so that the sub-group benefits through these programmes to the maximum extent possible. Lobby with Government and credit institutions for programmes especially meant for the poor.
- h. Focus on nurturing habits and values like savings, discipline, mutual respect, concern, etc., and help to reduce alcoholism, smoking, dowry and wasteful spending on social functions etc.
- i. Support issues in favour of the poor where their rights are affected.

PART IV : ANALYSIS OF THE GROUPS IN THE PIDOW MINI WATERSHEDS

Various types of groups have emerged in the 4 mini watersheds of the first phase. Based on the model evolved in the previous section for organising the community, do we need to assist the people to re-organise these groups? If so what changes need to be brought about?

To answer these questions the workshop :

- analysed the status of people utilising resources of each mini watershed.
- studied the composition of existing groups in these MWSs.
- suggested a strategy for the future.

The discussions are summarised below :

Mini Watershed <u>Wadigera</u>		Breakdown Of Groups In Village/Tandas Utilising The Resources Of The MWS		Group Recommendations For The Next Phase	
		No. Of Groups Across Composition			
2.3.	No. Of families with land <u>inside</u> the MWS from Kamlapur village 4 kms. Away from Wadigera (these families belong to different communities)	4	2. Basavantanda group living outside the MWS is open to all 7 families of whom 5 have land inside the MWS.	3.	As there are only 4 families from Kamlapur village with land inside the MWS; it was felt that they need not be organised into a separate sub-group and be represented in the WMC. Besides they were all big farmers with
2.4.	Total No. Of families staying outside the MWS	18	3. Kamlapur womens' group is open to all women in the village, 4 of whom have land inside the MWS.		
3.0.	Total no. Of families utilising the resources of the MWS (1.4+2.4)	70			
	<u>Note :</u> There are totally 9 families in Banjara Colony, 7 families in Basavantanda and over 900 families in Kamlapur village.				

Mini Watershed <u>Bandankera</u>		Breakdown Of Groups In Village/Tandas Utilising The Resources Of The MWS							Group Recommendations For The Next Phase	
		No. Of Groups Across Composition								
1.0. <u>Families living in the MWS</u>		Name of Vill./Tanda	Open to all men with lands in the MWS	Open to all women with lands in the MWS	Open to all men from the Vill.	Open to all women from the vill.	Open to Youth from the Vill.	Open to labourers from the Vill.	Total	1. The Hodihola mens' and womens' groups should be encouraged to extend membership to the landless family in the Tanda. 2. The Kalamandargi group which is open to all men from families with land inside the MWS may be reorganised into 2 - 3 socially functional sub-groups 3. A watershed mangement committee consisting of a maximum of 15 members from the sub-groups listed below may be organised.
1.1. No. Of families with land inside the MWS.										
- from Bandankera	26									
- from Hodihola	13									
- Total	39	Band-ankere	0	0	1	1	0	0	2	
1.2. No. Of families with land outside the MWS	0	Hodi-hola	1	1	0	0	0	0	2	
1.3. No. Of landless families (from Hodihola village)	1	Kala-mand-argi	1	1	1	1	0	1	5	
1.4. Total no. Of families living inside the MWS (all families belong to Lambani community)	40	Dong-ergaon	0	0	0	1	1	0	2	
		Gutti Tanda	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	
		Total	2	2	3	3	1	1	12	
		<u>Note :</u> The Kalamandargi group which is open to all with land inside the MWS is not socially functional. There are approximately 59 members on an average only 26 attend the meetings.								
2.0. <u>Families staying outside with land inside the MWS</u>										
2.1. No. Of families with land inside the MWS from Kalamandargi	59									
		<u>Watershed Management Committee</u> ↓								
		Bandan- kera	Bandan- kera	Hodihola Mens'	Kalaman- dargi					

Mini Watershed <u>Bandankera</u>		Breakdown Of Groups In Village/Tandas Utilising The Resources Of The MWS	Group Recommendations For The Next Phase
		No. Of Groups Across Composition	
village, 3 kms from Bandankera, (families belong to different communities)			Mens Group/ Sub-Group Womens' Group Group Sub-group
2.2. No. Of families from Dongergaon village, Bandankera (families belong to different communities)	4		<u>Note :</u> 1. The members from Kalamandargi, Gutti Tanda and Dongergao with <u>no land</u> inside the MWS do not utilise the resources of the MWS significantly;hence
2.3. No. Of families with land inside the MWS from Gutti Tanda located 2.5 kms away from Bhagwantanda	1		it was felt that the groups open to the entire village need not be represented in the WMC.
2.4. Total No. Of families staying outside the MWS with land inside the MWS.	64		2. As there are only 4 families from Dongergaon with land inside the MWS and one from Gutti Tanda; it was felt that they need not be organised into two
3.0. Total No. Of families utilising resources of the MWS (1.4+2.4)	104	1. There are totallly over 170 families in Kalamandargi village, 55 families in Gutti Tanda and over 600 families in Dongergaon.	separate sub-groups and represented in the MWS. They could join one of the sub-groups represented in the WMC.

Mini Watershed - <u>Bhagwantanda</u>		Breakdown Of Groups In Village/Tandas Utilising The Resources Of The MWS	Group Recommendations For The Next Phase
1.0. <u>Families living in the MWS</u>		There are two groups in the MWS :	
1.1.	No. Of families with land inside the MWS (9 of whom are big farmers)	52	<p>- One group open to men from all the 52 families with land inside the MWS. This group is not socially functional. There are two groups which are emerging on their own; one group of 10 members and the other of 42.</p> <p>- One group open mainly to women from families with land inside the MWS. (Around 25 women are members of this group).</p> <p>1. The mens' group is open to all members with land inside the MWS, may be reorganised into two socially functional groups.</p> <p>2. The landless families may be organised into a mixed group (men and women).</p> <p>3. One more womens' group may be organised consisting of families with land in the MWS who are not members of the existing group.</p> <p>4. A watershed management committee consisting of a maximum of 15 members may be organised as follows :</p>
1.2.	No. Of families with land outside the MWS.	0	
1.3.	No. Of landless families	13	
1.4.	Total no. Of families living inside the MWS (all families belong to the Lambani community)	65	
2.0.	No. Of families living outside with lands inside the MWS.	0	
3.0.	Total No. Of families utilising the resources of the MWS (1.4+2.4)	65	

Mini Watershed - <u>Bhagwantanda</u>	Breakdown Of Groups In Village/Tandas Utilising The Resources Of The MWS	Group Recommendations For The Next Phase															
		<p style="text-align: center;"><u>WATERSHED MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE</u></p> <p style="text-align: center;">↓</p> <table border="0" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 20%;">Bhagwan tanda</td> <td style="width: 20%;">Bhagwan tanda</td> <td style="width: 20%;">Bhagwan tanda</td> <td style="width: 20%;">Bhagwan tanda</td> <td style="width: 20%;">Bhagwan tanda</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Sub- group</td> <td>Mens' sub- group</td> <td>womens' sub- group</td> <td>womens' sub- group</td> <td>landless mixed sub- group</td> </tr> <tr> <td>No.1 open to men with land in the MWS</td> <td>No.2.</td> <td>No.1</td> <td>No.2</td> <td></td> </tr> </table> <p>The number and composition of representatives from each sub-group may be proportionate to the size and composition of the sub-group.</p>	Bhagwan tanda	Bhagwan tanda	Bhagwan tanda	Bhagwan tanda	Bhagwan tanda	Sub- group	Mens' sub- group	womens' sub- group	womens' sub- group	landless mixed sub- group	No.1 open to men with land in the MWS	No.2.	No.1	No.2	
Bhagwan tanda	Bhagwan tanda	Bhagwan tanda	Bhagwan tanda	Bhagwan tanda													
Sub- group	Mens' sub- group	womens' sub- group	womens' sub- group	landless mixed sub- group													
No.1 open to men with land in the MWS	No.2.	No.1	No.2														