

Working Group on

WATERSHED
DEVELOPMENT AND
RURAL LIVELIHOODS

PARTICIPANTS

- K.Sridhar, APMAS
- Sanjay Joshi, FES
- B.Sadasiva, Dhan Foundation
- M.Ashok Kumar, Chetana Organic Farmers Association
- Rajendar, Chetana Organic Farmers Association
- Neeta Hardikar, Anandi
- Mr.Lakshmikantham, AF-RDT
- MV Ramachandrudu, WASSAN
- M.Bhakthar Vali, WASSAN
- Abraham Samuel, SOPPECOM

- Common guidelines provide ample space for innovations and effective management of natural resources especially as part of watershed development. Sufficient resources were also allocated in the 11th FYP. However, as MTR highlighted there are quite a few operational gaps and issues.
- This group agrees with the observations made in the MTR of 11th FYP. In additions to these observations, the following concerns are identified.

Concern # 1: Institutions – Larger level

- National level apex body / nodal agencies
- Functioning of SLNA
- Functioning of DWDU
- Functioning of Govt PIAs

Recommendations

- Establish missions at national, state and district level with professional staff
- Separate institutions for Governance, execution and support services at all levels
- Dedicated department for Watershed
- Professional Support Services to be within credible and capable Voluntary organisations
- Additional resources for above functions from Central Government.

Concern # 2

- Vibrant and active Institutions at different levels (Habitation, village, Panchayat and cluster/Project)

Recommendations

- Provide additional facilitation support for institution development
- Institutional arrangements need to be redrafted in the state specific process guidelines.

Concern # 3

- Procedures for NGO accreditation
- Reluctance of SLNAs to partner with NGOs as PIAs

Recommendations

- National level agency (such as NRAA, DoLR) in collaboration with national level NGO forum/network take up the mandate

Concern # 4

- Absence of strategy for covering the entire treatable area within the stipulated timeframes
- Scarcity of professionally qualified HR

Recommendations

- Nurture large number of small capable NGOs
- Professional and para professional cadre building through formal educational systems
- Dedicated department for watershed programme with qualified staff

Issue # 5

- Data gaps at various levels
 - Data available and the field realities

Recommendations

- Synchronisation of Data bases -
Information/data, technology
(Remote sensing, modern),
Community managed
- Revisiting data bases at meta level in
the face of climate change.

Concern # 6

- Arbitrary changes of existing policies (PE and LH fund has been cut to 15% from 23%), Admin fund to PIA from 10% to 8%
- No explicit strategy for inclusion of women and marginalised in access to and control over the resource

Concern # 6

- Unregulated use of developed resources
- Exclusion of forest, livestock, fisheries and tanks in watersheds
- Farming system approach at practical level
- Contradicting policies from different departments

Recommendations

- Develop a mechanism to support states for state specific operational guideline
- Large scale pilots at agro-ecological sub zones to demonstrate innovative projects to address the concerns with in NGO sector with clear funding support

Recommendations.....

- fund allocation to those watersheds where population of small, marginal and sub marginal farmers and landless is substantial.
- SLNA periodically conducts critical review of all GOs and Circulars issued by different departments to harmonise
- NRAA conducts studies on variety of themes including prevalent policies

Concern # 7

- Are Watershed programmes ready for Climate Change
- Unregulated use of developed resources
- Exclusion of forest, livestock, fisheries and tanks in watersheds

Concerns.....

- Farming system approach at practical level
- Contradicting policies from different departments

Recommendations

- Redesign the content of watershed in the light of Climate Change (Such as bio mass based, tree based)

Concern # 8

- Convergence with NREGS, NRLM, NFSM and others

Recommendations

- Credible capable agencies need to be identified and engaged for providing institutional support on village level integrated planning process.
- Village Plan as an instrument for convergence.
- Shift from project to programme

Concern # 9

- Shrinking space for NGOs in the whole programme
- CAPART window for WSD is dysfunctional

Recommendations

- **Voluntary Sector Based Watershed Support Systems**
- Special Stream of CB Support Systems in Voluntary Sector
- Large Scale Pilots by Voluntary Organizations/ Research Institutes
- Support for Creating Independent Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning Systems
- Policy of Partnerships with Voluntary Organizations
- Special Window for Small NGOs

Concern # 10

- **Livelihoods:** Absence of appropriate design and holistic approach with regard to Livelihoods with in watershed context
- Formation of LRCs at cluster of projects and district level

Recommendations

- LRCs should be within the capable NGO sector
- Creation of employability capabilities to the work force available as an additional programme which runs parallel to Watershed Programme. *Can NRLM address this concern?*

THANK YOU