

**SUSTAINABILITY OF COMMUNITY ASSETS AND
INSTITUTIONS CREATED UNDER THE PEOPLES'
PLANNING PROGRAMME IN KERALA: SELECTED
CASE STUDIES**

**N.D.Gopinathan Nair
P.Krishnakumar**

December 2001

Acknowledgements.

This study was funded by the Kerala Research Programme on Local Level Development [KRPLLD], Centre for Development Studies, Trivandrum. We are deeply indebted to Dr. K. N. Nair, Programme Co-coordinator of KRPLLD for entrusting this study to us and giving valuable guidance and encouragement at different stages of the of the study. We are equally grateful to Dr. P. R. Gopinathan Nair, Adviser, KRPLLD, whose guidance and suggestions were of immense help to us in the conduct of the study. We acknowledge with gratitude the help and assistance rendered by Mr. M. K. M. Pillai, our colleague in the study team, who carried bulk of the responsibilities for organizing and conducting the field surveys and without whose earnest and hard work this study would not have completed on time. We are also thankful to Mrs. Suma and Mrs. Suprabha for their assistance in the conduct of the field surveys, secretarial assistance in the processing of data and word-processing the report. We also acknowledge with thanks the help and co-operation extended to us by the Presidents and members of the concerned Block/Grama Panchayat Committees, Panchayat officials, members of the implementation committees and the beneficiaries of the projects and the local people.

N.D Gopinathan Nair

P. Krishnakumar

Contents

Chapter 1. Introduction

2. Projects

3. Participation

4. Summary and Conclusions

Annexure i. Participation Matrix

ii. Responses to Questionnaire

Appendix. List of Projects Included
In Sampling Frame

Chapter I

Introduction

Media reports and scattered evaluation studies have documented many cases of community development projects taken up in Kerala as well as many other states of the country in the past five year plans under the centralised planning system failing due to neglect, disuse or abandonment causing substantial wastages of public fund. One of the main causes of failure of these projects has been identified as the lack of involvement of the beneficiaries of these projects or the local people. Projects were conceived, formulated and implemented by the officials of government departments. Local people including the direct beneficiaries of the projects were neither involved in nor associated with the works of these projects. The democratic decentralisation of economic planning by the Government of Kerala in the first year of the Ninth Five Year Plan, 1997-98, has reversed the situation and removed a major hurdle in the sustainability of the community development projects implemented at the local levels. The most appealing slogan of the campaign for peoples' planning has been development from below with the active participation of the people at the local levels.

Participative development has been the proclaimed core implementation strategy of people's planning. Choices of local development projects are left to the local people. Projects are to be conceived, formulated, implemented and maintained by the local self governments (Panchayat Raj Institutions-PRIs) empowered under the Panchayat Raj Act. The role of the state government in local level development has been, primarily, reduced to that of a facilitator providing funds and guidance.

In participative development, projects are selected, executed and maintained by the beneficiaries of the project or the local people who have some stake in them. Those who build the project would, naturally, develop a sense of ownership over the project and a commitment to maintain and upkeep the project in their own self-interest. As participative development is the main strategy of people's planning, community or social development projects taken up under this programme would bring down the failure rate of such projects and improve their sustainability. The present study was taken up to test this hypothesis empirically by conducting a sample survey of the social development projects already implemented by the local self govt. institutions in Trivandrum district in the first 3 years of people's planning..

Initially, we intended to make a comparative study of the non-participative, departmentally implemented projects in the pre-Peoples' Plan period under various rural development programmers and the participative Peoples' Plan projects in order to assess how far participation is a decisive element in the sustainability of social development projects. But the field realities forced us to drop this objective. First, most of such comparable earlier projects, mainly roads, lift irrigation tanks and channels, which had become non-functional or gone into disuse have since been renovated utilizing the plan funds in the initial years of the Peoples' Plan. Secondly, no data to track the history of these projects, executed by various departmental agencies, were traceable in the Block or Grama Panchayat offices.

There are no known evaluation studies available on the sustainability of participative development projects in Kerala. There are quite a few studies on some well-publicized participative projects like Sukhomaji of Hariyana, Pani Panchayat of Maharashtra, Appiko of Karnataka, Sardar Sarovar of Gujarat etc. But, the environments of these projects, sponsored or executed by Non-Government Organisations are basically different from that of state sponsored Peoples' Plan projects of Kerala. Experiences of participative projects in other countries are extensively documented in a number of study reports. [1]

Objectives of the study

1. To assess the sustainability of the assets and institutions created under the community projects taken up under people's planning programme, in given normal conditions with or without continued financial assistance from the plan fund depending on the nature of the project.
2. To assess the role of people's participation as a critical factor in the success of these projects
3. To identify and analyze the reasons for failure, in the cases of projects that failed.
4. To examine how far peoples' planning has helped to improve the level of peoples' participation, quality, cost effectiveness and benefit delivery system of the community projects taken up under the programme.

Definition of concepts

1. Social or Community projects are defined as those designed to provide services or resources to persons, households or community and are distinct from physical engineering projects that are designed to alter the physical and technical infrastructure of a society. In Peoples' Planning, we have to make a clear distinction between the community projects and the individual beneficiary projects (which, incidentally, consumed a major share of the outlays of the first 3 years' annual plans of most of the Panchayats covered by this study). For the purpose of this study we have defined community projects as projects meant for the benefit of the community or a group of people and the assets of which are collectively owned by the community represented by, in the context of decentralized planning, the concerned beneficiaries' Committee or local self government institution, as distinct from Individual Beneficiary projects in which benefits accrue to individuals and the assets created are also owned by them. Although we have used this definition as a rule of thumb, the distinction is not sharp. There are projects under which outright grants have been given to co-operative societies. Assets created under these projects are owned by the Society which are often closed shops

and unlike in the case of functional societies or groups created under Peoples' Planning, the Panchayat has no control over them. However, taking these societies as collective bodies and not as an individual we have considered these projects as community projects and included in this study.

2. Sustainability of a project, in its usual sense, means its enduringness for its estimated lifetime yielding the benefits or fulfilling its objectives envisaged in the original project document. For the purpose of this study which has a reference period much shorter than the expected life of many community projects implemented under people's planning programme sustainability is defined as short-term sustainability of more than the first one year of the life of the project with or without continued aid or subsidy from the Panchayat, depending on the nature of the project.

Measuring the level of participation in participative development poses conceptual as well as practical problems. The term participation eludes any universally acceptable definition. Participation in a project activity could be interpreted as anything between mere association or passive physical attendance in the initial deliberative session and taking the helm of project activities. For the purpose of this study we have used the term

‘participation’ both in its broad sense as mere association and in its real sense as ‘active’ participation. We have taken participation as active if the participant has raised any issues, suggestion or criticism in the meetings which deliberated on the project or served as a member of any committee or group associated with the activities of the project, eg, Task Force, Ward Development Council, Implementation Committee, Monitoring Committee etc, With a view to getting a realistic picture of the levels of participation, we have excluded the chairpersons and conveners of implementation committees of the projects and ward members from our sample frame, which in most cases is very small. By and large we have gone by the words of the respondents in assessing their participation level.

Methodology

1. Selection of samples

The study was conducted on a sample survey basis and confined to Trivandrum District. The number of community projects implemented by the PRI of the district runs into many hundreds. A large number of them were projects for construction of roads, bridges, culverts and buildings for schools, offices, hospitals, shopping complexes, auditoria etc which have comparatively longer life spans.

Sustainability of these kinds of permanent projects without any active participation by the people is taken for granted. These types of projects were first eliminated from the sampling frame. Then there were a large number of low- investment projects which if included in the sampling frame make it unwieldy. So we eliminated all community projects costing below Rs. 2 lakhs in Grama Panchayats, Rs. 3 lakhs in Block Panchayat and Municipalities and Rs. 5 lakhs in District Panchayat. A list of projects involving outlays from plan fund above these cut off level was compiled from the annual plan documents of the PRIs of the district for the first 3 years of people's planning, 1997-98 to 1999-2000, available with the State Planning Board, Trivandrum. Total number of such projects, prima face found eligible to be included in the sampling frame was 163. (vide appendix)

The first round of field survey was done in March-May 2001 to ascertain the present status of these projects and to collect the project reports and other relevant documents relating to these projects from the concerned Panchayat officers. Out of the 163 projects many were abandoned or not started. Exact status of many projects could not be ascertained because neither the new Panchayat Committees nor the new Panchayat staffs were much aware of the projects implemented earlier

Number of completed or partially completed projects was only around 45. These projects were classified into 5 categories and samples were selected from each of these categories as given in table 1.1 below.

Table 1.1

Category	No. of projects Completed/partially completed	No. of samples selected
1. Agriculture production	2	2
2. Irrigation	14	5
3. Industrial production	14	6
4. Supply of drinking water	6	3
5. Welfare projects	9	4
Total	45	20

Number of sample projects were selected from each category is not strictly in proportion to the total number of project in that category. Another criteria followed was that not more than one project should be selected from one Panchayat. No project could be selected from any of

the four Municipalities of the district as none of them satisfied our criteria. None of the 9 projects taken up by Trivandrum District Panchayat was selected as all of them, still incomplete, are implemented departmentally without any public participation. Projects taken up by Panchayats which have since been merged with city corporation are not included in the sample. List of sample projects so selected for detailed study is given in Table 1.2

Table 1.2

1.Agriculture production

1.Mushroom cultivation – Athiyannur B.P

2.Paddycultivation Kollayil G.P

2.Irrigation 3.Vaikkottukonamkulam – Kadakkavur.G.P

4.Chavarcode Ela-Navaikkulam G.P

5.Chooryode lift irrigation-Parassala. B.P

6.Kavukulam lift irrigation – Parassala G.P

7. Kadaikkulam –Vizhinjam G.P

3.Industrial production

8.Coir society-Chirayinkeezhu B.P

9.Readymade garments – Karumkulam.G.P

10.Mini-industrial estate Kazhakkootam B.P

11. Electronic choke units-Kilimanoor B.P.

12. Handloom society - Pallichal G.P

13. Reed- based industries –Vellanad G.P

4. Supply of drinking water

14. Pezhumkamukal –Vamanapuram G.P

15. Chevalakkonam –Pazhayakunnummel

16. Panchikkala –Poovar G.P

5 Welfare

17. Computer centre – Karakulam G.P

18. Kunnathukulam – Kudappanakunnu G.P

19. Labour Bank – Kunnathukal G.P

20. Women Self –Help Groups– Venganur G.P

These 20 projects were studied in detail by conducting repeated rounds of field surveys in June- October 2001. Bulk of the information was collected through discussions with the presidents and members of the Block/Grama Panchayat committees Panchayat officials, concerned implementation officers of agriculture and industries departments, conveners, chairpersons and members of implementation committees, beneficiaries of the projects, local people and other key informants selected at random accessibility, A semi-structured questionnaire was

used to collect information on participation, and assessment of the projects by the sample beneficiaries.

Results and findings of the study are presented in chapter 2 and the summary and conclusions in chapter 3. A project-wise participation matrix showing the levels of participation of the beneficiaries at each activity stage of the project is given in Annexure I. Responses of the sample beneficiaries to structured questions in the questionnaire-based survey are given in Annexure II.

Chapter 2.

PROJECTS.

2.1.Mushroom Cultivation

(Athiyannur Block Panchayat)

This is a project for setting up of an industrial production unit for the cultivation of mushroom and spawn taken up by Athiyannur Block Panchayat in its annual plan for 1997.98. The project with an aggregate outlay of Rs.14.08 lakhs was to be implemented in 3 years. Thirty young unemployed S.C women in the age group of 18 to 35 with an educational qualification of SSLC and above, living within the Block area were to be selected as the beneficiaries of the project. The project was approved by the DPC in June 1998. According to the approved project report, the unit in its full stream would produce 32000 packets of spawn valued at Rs. 4.8 lakhs and 14200 Kg of mushroom valued at Rs. 5.68 lakhs annually and earn a net profit of Rs. 5.48 lakhs ,excluding the profit to be earned from the food produces proposed to be produced. All these estimates have turned out to be unrealistic and highly exaggerated.

A building was constructed in the Block Office compound to locate the unit. Necessary machinery and equipment like air conditioner, inoculation chamber rocks, auto clave, LPG connection, furniture and vessels were provided by the Block Panchayat. Total amount spent on this project from the Block Panchayat's plan fund is about Rs. 13 lakhs (including the working capital of Rs. 3.14 lakhs). Beneficiaries were selected by the Block Panchayat direct through open recruitment. Thirty beneficiaries were selected and given training in mushroom cultivation and spawn production by the experts from Kerala Agriculture University. A monthly stipend of Rs. 400/- was given to the trainees during the 2-month's training period started in January 99. A society was registered with the 30 beneficiaries who completed the training as members, each one contributing Rs.500/- towards the share capital of the society. Rs. 3.14 lakhs was allotted by the Block Panchayat from the plan fund for meeting the operating expenses of the unit. For the first 3 months of functioning of the unit, the participants were given a monthly stipend of Rs. 500/- each.

Soon after the start of production some, construction defects were detected in the building. There are allegations of corruption in the construction of the building. Rs. 40000 had to be spent to rectify the defect. By the time the repair work was carried out, rats had entered the building

and destroyed some of the vital installations and equipment causing an estimated loss of Rs. 9000/-. This had to be made good from the funds allotted by the Block. Actual production of mushroom during the trial period was minimal as there was no arrangement for marketing the products. Members of the society, however, used to attend the unit so long as they were given stipend. Once the stipend was stopped, many of them ceased to attend and 13 of them withdrew from the society leaving only 17 left. In the mean time, there was a theft in the unit and some essential equipment like gas stove, vessels, pressure cooker, frying pans, tumblers etc were stolen completely stalling the production. The unit became non-functional and all but two - the president and the secretary - of the remaining 17 members also withdrew from the activities of the unit. Electric supply was disconnected because of the non-payment of bills. Efforts made by the president Mrs. Syamala and secretary Mrs. Jalaja to revive the unit did not succeed because none of the other 15 members was interested and did not even turn up to attend the general body meetings convened.

Efforts are now on to revive the unit at the initiative of the Districts Industries Officer. Seven of the existing members of the society expressed their unwillingness to participate in the activities of the unit unless they are assured of some regular income. So, it has been decided to curtail the

membership to 11 and to diversify the activities of the unit to the manufacturing of food products like pickles, squash, jam, etc and even to tailoring and embroidery.

The main reasons for the failure of the project as far as we could identify are:

1. The production line and the project report are seen to have been mechanically adapted from the model projects included in the publications of the State Planning Board. The project idea has not come up from the people who are genuinely interested in the project but was decided at the Block Panchayat level without any feasibility studies.

2. The project report is not seen properly appraised by the BLIC. Production targets were too ambitious to realize and the actual production in the initial trial period did not touch even a significant fraction of the targets. Marketing aspects, vital to any commercial production programme, were completely ignored.

3. Majority of the participating members disassociated themselves from the projects, because they were not getting any income from the project after the withdrawal of the monthly stipend

of Rs. 500/- paid in the initial 3 months. They were neither committed to the project nor properly motivated to participate.

4. 4.The mode of selection of beneficiaries itself was not conducive to the success of a participatory project. Their participation was not voluntary out of any genuine interest in the project. They were 'recruited' giving the wrong signal that they were getting a remunerative job in a Govt. project. Once their hopes were belied, naturally they lost interest in the project. They could earn more income by working as agriculture laborers or construction worker elsewhere.

The ongoing efforts to rehabilitate the project by product diversification, if at all succeed, may change the characteristic of the original project, but can achieve, to some extent, the basic objective of providing some self-employment opportunities to SC women. But for manufacturing pickles and jams (the market for which is already highly competitive) one does not need air-conditioning, machinery and equipment already installed on which substantial investments have been made from Plan fund.

2.2. Paddy Cultivation

(Kollayil Grama Panchayat)

A project for group farming of paddy in the entire paddy fields [Elas] was taken up by Kollayil Grama Panchayat in its annual plan for 2000-2001 as part of a comprehensive programme for the development of paddy cultivation. This project is an example of how an old departmental programme which could not produce the desired results due to flaws in implementation and leakages of assistance could be made more effective and purposeful through participative action by the beneficiaries and departmental agencies. Agriculture Department has been distributing subsidies to paddy cultivators for the purchase of seeds, chemical fertilizers and pesticides under the group farming programmes for quite sometime now. Many farmers in Kollayil Panchayat whom we interviewed concede that in the absence of an effective mechanism to monitor the use, subsidies distributed under the programme were widely misused defeating the very purpose of the programme. It is in this context that Kollayil Panchayat formulated a project for the promotion of paddy cultivation by streamlining the existing group farming programme to the collective action mode of peoples planning. A beginning had been made in the annual plan for 1999-2000 by introducing

the programme for the second crop of paddy in selected clusters of paddy fields (padasekharam). Rs. 90,000 was allocated from the plan fund for that programme. Objective of the larger project taken up in the annual plan for 2000-01 by allocating Rs. 3.6 lakh from the plan fund was to bring all the clusters of paddy fields in the Panchayat under the ambit of the programme.

The first step towards the implementation of the project was the constitution of group farming committees for each cluster of paddy fields elected by the members of the cluster. Panchayat member representing the ward is the convener of the committee which has a representative of the agriculture department and a local voluntary worker nominated by the Panchayat. To guide and co-ordinate the working of these committees at the Panchayat level, there is an apex committee with the president of the Panchayat as chairperson and the Agriculture Officer as convener. The representative nature of the Group farm committees increases their acceptability among the member farmers especially when these committees exercise the rather unpalatable job of physical checking of the utilization of subsidies.

With a view to preserving the fertility of the soil, the project insists that each member farmer should apply a minimum prescribed quantity of bio-fertilizer (Cattle dung) to his paddy field. Cattle dung, in separate basket

lots in proportion to the area should be spread in the field and the group farm committee would physically count and verify these lots at an appointed time and satisfy that the farmer has applied bio-fertilizer on the prescribed scale. For each basket of cattle-dung (nominally valued at Rs. 15/- per basket) applied, the farmer gets a subsidy of Rs.7.50. Chemical fertilizers are distributed pro-rata to the size of holding, at subsidized prices through permits issued by the Agriculture Officer. These permits are delivered to the farmers at the farm gate. Purchases are to be made from the primary co-operative society of the Panchayat by paying 50 percent of the normal price. The subsidy portion, i.e., 50 percent of the value is reimbursed to the society by the Agriculture Department, which is the nodal agency for implementing the project. A subsidy of 50% is given on pesticide's also and is routed through the committee which arranges its application in the fields collectively.

According to the project report the programme was to cover 22 hectares in the first crop and 42 hectares in the second crop in 2000-01. Estimated outlay of the project was Rs.6.69 lakhs-Rs.3.65 lakhs from plan fund, Rs.0.13 lakhs from the Panchayat's own fund and Rs. 2.91 lakhs as beneficiaries' contribution. This outlay included Rs. 0.77 lakhs for subsidised distribution of seeds, which was dropped later as it was not

permitted under state government guidelines, and Rs.50000 as subsidy for the purchase of a tractor for Kalatharakkal Group Farming society. According to Agriculture Department's data on actual distribution of subsidy, area covered by the project in 2000-2001 was only 13.7 hectares in the first crop and 16.0 hectares in the second crop. Total amount of subsidy distributed through the Agriculture Department was Rs.1.1 lakh, which means about Rs. 3718 per hectare or Rs. 14.64 per one cent. However, as the actual distribution of subsidy had spilled over to the next financial year, the actual area covered might be more. According to the convener of the implementation committee, the project covered an area of 48 hectares in 2000-01.

The project report claims that as a result of a similar programme implemented on a limited scale for the second crop of paddy in 1999-2000 in Kalatharakkal Ela, yield rate had gone up from 7.5 to 10 kg. to 20 to 25 kg. per one cent of area, i.e. by about 150 percent. This appears to be an exaggeration. No reliable estimate of additional production is available. Many of the participant farmers of the project interviewed by the survey team told that there was, on an average, about 50 percent increase in yield - from about 10 kg. to 15 kg. per cent of area. We could not do a detailed

survey for a cost-benefit analysis of the programme for want of time and resources.

None of the sample beneficiaries of the project had any serious complaints against this programme and all of them want this project to continue. Only one farmer complained that the transporting charges of the fertilizer from the co-operative society to the farm more or less neutralize the subsidy.

As regard the sustainability of the project, the issue is not localized but much more wider. It is a matter of state policy to decide whether paddy production in the state can continue to be popped up for ever by doling out subsidies. Given the present cost-price imbalances, once the subsidy is withdrawn, the cultivation practices and therefore the yield rate may drift back to the earlier uneconomic levels forcing the farmers to quit paddy cultivation. Many of the participating farmers have pointed out that the major component of the cost of cultivation of paddy is labour charges and subsidies on seeds and fertilizers give only a marginal relief to them, According to some local farmers, the trend of filling and converting paddy fields as house plots or diverting for other crops has come to a halt in areas covered by this scheme. .

Even if the subsidy continues, yield rate that has almost reached

A plateau cannot increase further to neutralize any future escalations in the overall production cost. Moreover, the project is not local specific and whatever local initiatives and farmers' participation cannot sustain it in isolation from similar projects implemented all over the state.

2.3. Vaikkottukonam Lift Irrigation

(Kadakkavoor Grama Panchayat)

Vaikkottukonamkulam is an ancient natural pond in Kadakkavoor Panchayat. Rain and surface water collected and stored in the pond used to be outletted to vaikkottukonam canal and used for irrigating a second crop of paddy or pulses and vegetables in Melattingal paddy field (Ela) some 500 meters away. In course of time due to lack of proper maintenance, silting and sliding of the sides, availability water in the pond for irrigation purpose depleted. A project was formulated by the Kadakkavoor Panchayat for renovating the pond and the feeder canal to Melattingal 'Ela' and installing a pump set so that the farmers of Melattingal paddy field could raise a third crop of paddy or pulses and vegetables. The project was included in the annual plan of the Panchayat for 1997-98. Total outlay of the project was estimated at Rs. 7.25 lakhs - Rs. 7 lakhs from plan fund and Rs. 25000 as

voluntary services from the beneficiaries. Work of the project was taken up in 1997-98, but could not be completed in the year. Out of the plan allocation of Rs.4.74 lakhs for the project in 97-98 Rs. 4.68 lakh was spent. The project spilled over to 1998-99 and Rs. 1.73 lakhs more was spent on it. A pump set was installed but the vital lift irrigation part of the project is yet to become operational for want of electricity connection for which necessary deposit has already been made with the state electricity board. Rs. 26000 targeted to be collected as beneficiaries' contribution could not be mobilized as the project has not delivered the promised benefit so far.

Works of the project were executed by a local beneficiaries committee with one Mr. Asokan as convener. The pond has been renovated and protected by sidewalls. The 550-metre canal which runs through a sloppy terrain has also been renovated and protected by sidewalls. Funds for the renovation and side- walling of 300 out of 550 meters of the canal length was made available by the Block Panchayat. Left boundary of the canal is so elevated that the masonry work of the sidewall on that side is some 3 to 5 metres high at many segments. The right side bund of the canal provides a convenient footpath from the pond to the paddy field. But the quality of the masonry work of this bund seems to be rather poor. In many places the top plastering and the masonry work are already broken making through passage

over it difficult. Deposit of domestic waste by people living on the left side of the canal, silting and weed growth have partially blocked the flow of water through the canal. According to local people, it would be cleaned when water is needed for irrigation, but it was not clear who would bear the cost of cleaning; the beneficiaries or the Panchayat. Land on the right side of the canal from the pond is at an elevation of 1 to 2 feet from the bottom level of the canal. At present these areas do not get water from the canal. Had the bottom of the canal been raised by 1 or 2 feet, irrigation of these areas also would have been possible. Some farmers owning land at the tail end of the 'ela' apprehend that even if the canal is cleaned and the lift irrigation system is commissioned, sufficient water may not reach their fields because of heavy seepage all along the canal. A possible solution, according to them, is to concrete the bottom of the canal. But concreting the bottom, according to some farmers, may affect the availability of ground water in the lands all along the sides of the canal. It appears that neither the people who prepared the project report nor the experts of the BLEC who appraised the project and gave technical approval have considered these issues when assessing the feasibility of the project.

Commissioning of the project is held up for want of electricity connection. Contrary to what was visualized in Peoples' Planning,

there was no proper co-ordination among different departmental agencies at local level in the formulation and execution of this project

Seven out of the eight sample beneficiaries have participated in the project activities at some stage; three of them actively. All of them have contributed voluntary labour

At present the project has no recurring cost except the cost of the periodical maintenance of the canal, which the beneficiary farmers are likely to bear. But once the lift irrigation system is commissioned disputes may arise as to who should bear the operation cost; the Panchayat or the beneficiaries, Sustainability of the project depends on a mutually agreeable decision on this issue.

2.4. Chavarcode Ela Lift Irrigation

(Navaikkulam Grama Panchayat)

This is a project taken up by Navaikkulam Panchayat as a model lift irrigation project but failed to deliver the expected benefits because of faulty implementation.

The project included in the annual plan of the Panchayat for 1998-99 was meant to irrigate about 20 hectares of traditionally rain fed single crop

paddy field in Chavarcode Ela so as to enable the farmer of the 'Ela' to raise a second crop of paddy and a third crop of pulses and vegetables. The project was to lift water from the tank at the head of the 'Ela' and supply to the paddy field through lead channels. Total estimated outlay of the project was Rs. 5.15 lakhs- Rs. 4.75 lakhs from the plan fund Rs. 0.4 lakhs as voluntary services from the beneficiaries and local people. Rs.5 lakhs was allotted to the project from the Plan fund of the Panchayats in 1998-99. Execution of the project was entrusted to an implementation committee constituted of beneficiaries and local people. The project was completed in February 1999 well within the scheduled time.

A pump house was constructed near the tank and a pump set installed. A two feet wide lead channel was laid to the tail end of the 'Ela' some 500 meters away from the tank. Land for the channel was contributed by the beneficiary farmers. Stones were laid at the bottom of the channel to reduce seepage and the sides were protected by masonry sidewalls. The project was commissioned in March 1999 and water was supplied for a few months. Gradually, the availability of water at the tail end dripped because of water loss due to seepage through the cracks developed in the stones laid at the bottom of the channel. Another defect of the system noticed at the time of operation was that the bottom level of the channel is below the level of the

adjacent paddy fields on both sides at the upper segment of the channel. As a result, during summer months when the level of water pumped into the channel receded due to reduced availability of water in the tank, there was a reverse flow of water from the paddy fields to the channel instead of from the channel to the paddy fields. Finding that the project was not serving the purpose for which it was meant, its operation was suspended within a few months of its commissioning.

There was good participation by the local people and the beneficiaries in the execution of the project. All the 7 sample beneficiaries have some participation, mainly by offering voluntary labour. Three of them were active participants. According to some of the local farmers the defects of the channel were pointed out to the convener and members of the Implementation Committee at the construction stage itself, but they were ignored. Some local young men confessed that even though they were aware of these defects at the construction stage, they did not dare to raise these issues before the senior local leader who was in the overall supervision of the project, for fear of attracting his displeasure.

Anyway the project is not functioning now. Panchayat continues to pay the electricity bills lest the electric supply should be disconnected. According to the local farmers the only solution available now to revive the

project is to raise the bottom level of the channel and concrete it. But the new Panchayat committee, after the change of political control from LDF to UDF is not inclined to take up this work partly because of the paucity of funds and partly, may be, because of partisan considerations. As of now, the project is as good as abandoned causing wastage of assets worth Rs. 5 lakhs and the continued payment of electricity charges for the non-operating pump set.

2.5.Chooryode Lift Irrigation

(Parassala Block Panchayat)

Chooryode Ela (paddy field) in Kottakkakam ward of Kulathur Grama Panchayat had been facing frequent crop failures in summer months due the lack of irrigation facilities. There are twenty-two farm households in this area extending to about 2 hectares. All of them are small farmers holding 10 cents to 1 acre of land. The main crops of the area are paddy, coconut, plantain and vegetables. Neyyar River that flows at a distance of 300 hectors from Chooryode. The project was approved by the Grama Sabha and it was included in the 1998-99 annual plan of Parassala Block Panchayat. The total outlay of the project was estimated at Rs. 2.15 lakhs-Rs. 2.00 lakh from plan fund as Rs. 15000 as voluntary services from the beneficiaries. A

tank was constructed and a pump set installed on the bank of Neyyar River at Mavilakkadavu. Water is pumped into the tank and distributed through pipeline to the Ela which is about 300 meters away. There was a delay of 2 months in getting sanction from Irrigation Department and another 6 months for getting electricity connection. All the works of the project was carried out by a beneficiary committee elected from among the farmers of the Ela. Actual expenditure of the project, Rs.2.5 lakhs, was in excess of the plan allocation and the excess expenditure was contributed by the beneficiaries' committee through monetary contributions and voluntary services.

Unlike many other irrigation projects we studied in the district Chooryode project is functioning well. It is one of the very few success stories of participative development in the district under Peoples' Planning. Water is supplied only for six months during the summer months facilitating the raising of a second crop of paddy or vegetables. The system is operated by the members of the committee voluntarily, mostly by the convener, Mr.Sasi. Electricity charges which comes to about Rs. 900/- bi-monthly, which the beneficiary committee was paying initially for a few months by collecting a monthly subscription of Rs.20 from members, is now paid by the Block Panchayat.

All the 10 sample beneficiaries participated in the project activities at some stage, mostly by contributing voluntary labour. Only 3 of them were active participants

None of the 10 beneficiaries of the project interviewed by us did have any complaint about the functioning of the project. Some of them however expressed the desire to upgrade the project either by increasing the capacity of the pump-set or by constructing a channel to replace the present pipeline so that more farmers could be brought under the ambit of the project and the water could be used for drinking purpose also.

Two important factors contributing to the successful functioning of the project that we could identify are:

1. The beneficiaries have a direct stake in the project in the sense they get water for raising additional crops on their land and earn some additional income.
2. They get water free of cost now as the Panchayat is paying the electricity bill.
3. Genuine and active participation of the beneficiaries and the earnest and sincere efforts of the implementation committee, particularly its convener Mr. Sasi, an agriculture labourer.

In order to assess the sustainability of the project, the study addressed itself to two questions: first, Can the Panchayat afford to pay the electricity charges i.e., continue with the subsidized distribution of irrigation water, for all the years to come and secondly, what will happen if the Panchayat, in future, stops the subsidy? Then, the farmers will have to pay the electricity bill and meet the expenses of repair, maintenance and operation charges. Our experience with some other projects including very essential projects like drinking water projects is that they do not function because the beneficiaries are not willing to contribute for operational expenses. Members of the beneficiaries' committee of this project assert that even in such an unlikely event, they will run the project by collecting subscription from the beneficiaries. But, most of the beneficiaries of the project are poor farmers who may not have the means to pay for the water. Sustainability of the project of this kind is conditional to the continuing subsidy from Government,ie, the Block or Grama Panchayat.

2.6.Kavukulam Lift Irrigation

(Parassala Grama Panchayat)

Cheruvarekkanam-Ramayyanvila area of Parassala Grama Panchayat is an elevated area inhabited by about 70 families. Coconut, tapioca and plantain are the main crops of this area. Due to lack of irrigation facility, yields of these crops have been remaining very low. Waterbed is too far low in the area to be tapped by individual farmer economically by digging well and installing pump set. A community irrigation system has been a long felt need of the people of this area. With the launching of peoples' planning, the farmers of this area approached the Panchayat with a proposal to set up a lift irrigation system in Kavukulam, an ancient pond adjacent to the area. A project was formulated and included in the annual plan of the Panchayat for 1998-99. But it could not be completed in the year. A plot of land for constructing a pump house was purchased near Kavukulam. The project spilled over to next year's annual plan. The project was taken up in 99-2000 as spillover project with an estimated outlay Rs. 3.3 lakhs- Rs.3 lakhs from the plan fund and Rs. 30000 as voluntary services from the beneficiaries.

The project was to lift water from Kavukulam by digging a well inside the pond and distribute it through pipelines laid across the area. The work of the project was entrusted to a beneficiary committee with one Mr. Rajendran as convener. A well, 10m x 8m x 3m was dug inside Kavukulam pond. A pump set with a 7 HP motor was installed. Distribution pipeline were laid all over the project area. Work of the project was completed in Jan 2000 but it could not be commissioned so far (Sept.2001) for want of electricity connection Application for electricity connection along with the required deposit was given to the KSEB soon after the completion of work. Electricity connection is delayed; it is leant because it involves drawing of a 3-phase line to the area, which takes time. An investment of Rs.3.3 lakhs has been lying idle for nearly two years now and in spite of collective efforts, the aspirations of the people of the area still remain a dream. This yet another case of lack of co-ordination among the plan implementing agencies at local level.

2.7.Kadaikkulam ‘Ela’ Channel

(Vizhinjam Grama Panchayat)

Kadaikkulam ‘ela ‘ (paddy field) in Vizhinjam Panchayat had no irrigation facility. There was an old channel reaching the ‘ela’ from Thendurkonam tank, an ancient pond, some 600 metres away. The channel was in a dilapidated condition due to sliding of the side bunds and silting. A project for renovating the channel by deepening it and protecting it by sidewalls was taken up by the Vizhinjam Panchayat in 1997-98. Total outlay of the project was Rs. 3.2 lakhs-Rs. 3 lakhs from plan fund and Rs. 20000 as voluntary services from the beneficiaries. Declared objective of the project was to irrigate I hectare of land in Kadaikkulam ela.

Rs. 2.85 lakhs was allocated for the project from the plan fund in 1997-98 . But the project could not be completed in the year and it spilled over to 1998-99. The channel from Thendurkonam pond (which was already renovated and protected by side walls earlier) was deepened and masonry work sidewall and a 2 feet bund on the left bank were constructed. A cement platform with high sidewalls at the head of the channel at the entry point of water through the

sluice from the pond was also constructed. The project was completed at a total cost of Rs. 2.56 lakhs. The voluntary service envisaged in the project report was not at all realized. There was no significant participation by the local people in the execution of the project. The entire work, according to the local people, was done by a benami contractor in the name of implementation committee.

The primary objective of the project, ie, irrigating 1 hectare of land in the Ela could not be realized because the thin flow of water in the channel in the summer months is almost lost in seepage and is not sufficient to reach the 'ela' located at the tail end. Land on either sides all a long the channel are much elevated from the bottom line of the channel and do not benefit from the channel. However, the project has realized two undeclared side benefits; first, provided a convenient bath place in the platform at the head of the channel and secondly, a convenient pedestrian footpath along the reconstructed left bund of the channel between the tank and Vizhinjam beach. According to the local people, hundreds of people even from places as distant as Vizhinjam town come to this pond daily for taking bath and washing clothes. As the project has failed to achieve its declared objective, ie, irrigation, it has no

direct beneficiaries. A permanent construction with no recurring cost involved, the project will sustain of its own.

2.8. Coir Mats and Matting Society

(Chirayinkeezhu Block Panchayat)

The project, included in the annual plan of Chirayinkeezhu Block Panchayat for 1998-99 was to give an outright grant of Rs. 5 lakhs to the newly started Chirayinkeezhu- Anchuthengu Coir Mats and Matting Society at Muttappalam in Azhoor Grama Panchayat for the purchase of 3 mechanised coir looms.

Chirayinkeezhu Taluk, particularly areas like Anchuthengu, Chirayinkeezhu, Azhoor and Murukkumpuzha has a concentration of coir workers. There are about 15 coir factories in this area but all of them produce only coir yarn and coir ropes. Need for setting up a factory for manufacturing value -added products like coir mats and matting in this area was a long- felt need. The mat and matting society at Muttappalam was set up by a group of promoters to fill this gap. Work on this project started in June 2000 and the factory was formally inaugurated in January 2001.

The Society has a total investment of about Rs. 87 lakhs in land, buildings, machinery and working capital financed by the share capital (Rs.4.1 lakhs) contributed by the promoters and members, Government subsidy (Rs. 24.6 lakhs) NCDC loan (Rs. 53.3 lakhs), Grants from Azhoor Grama Panchayat (Rs. 2.5 lakhs) and the present grant from Chirayinkeezhu Block Panchayat (Rs. 5 lakhs). At present the society has 180 members. All of them except 5 percent sympathizer members are traditional coir workers. Value of one share is Rs. 1000/-. All the 60 workers, presently working in the factory are members of the society. There are 3 mechanised looms (purchased with Block Panchayat Grant) and 40 handlooms installed in the factory with necessary accessories required for making coir ropes, dyeing etc. The factory is working much below its installed capacity for want of adequate market for its products. According to the management of the factory, so far it has not faced any payment crisis.

Block Panchayat's contribution of Rs. 5 lakhs from its plan fund to the society comes to only about 5.5% of the society's total investment and does not have any significant influence on the functioning of the society. Moreover, the Block Panchayat has

neither any stake nor any control over the society. Nevertheless, the asset created by the project can be treated as a community asset assuming that membership of the society is open to any coir worker within the block Panchayat. Sustainability of the project is entirely dependent on the sustainability of the society.

2.9. Readymade Garment Units

(Karumkulam Grama Panchayat)

This project, included in the annual plan of Karumkulam Panchayat for 1998-99 was to set up 10 readymade garment units by women, each with 10 members. Each unit was to be supplied with 10 sewing machines, one inter-locking machine and other accessories and furniture required for a tailoring unit. Estimated outlay of the project was Rs. 4.59 lakhs-Rs.3.09 lakhs from plan fund and Rs. 1.5 lakh as beneficiaries' contributions. According to the annual plan document of the Panchayat, the project was not implemented in the year because of some technical problems which nobody in the new Panchayat committee or office could explain. Our enquiries with some former members of the Panchayat and local people reveal that there were not many takers for the project who could afford to pay the

beneficiaries' contribution of Rs. 1500/-. In the first year of peoples plan, 1997-98 the Panchayat had already distributed sewing machines to 281 families spending Rs. 6.18 lakhs from the plan fund. Distribution of sewing machines under individual beneficiaries programmes was banned by the government in 1998-99. The project for setting up of garment units in the society mode was perhaps intended to circumvent this ban.

The project was implemented in 1999-2000 but at a reduced scale. The number of units was cut to 2 and both were entrusted to two of the existing women self help groups; one at Nambiadi and the other at Pallam. Estimated outlay of the project was Rs. 1.25 lakhs but only Rs. 81000 was spent on the project according to the annual plan documents of the panchayat. Each unit was supplied with 10 sewing machines, one interlocking machines and other accessories as envisaged in the original project report. Of the two, only the unit at Nambiadi is now functioning although erratically. The unit does not make any readymade garments for the market, but imparts training in tailoring to a few girls. Remuneration of the trainer is shared by the trainees themselves. The only other purpose the unit serves that the members can stitch their own garments or tailoring work they get sporadically from some known customers.

The income earned by the unit is not sufficient even to pay the rent of the one-room shop where it is functioning. Members pay the rent from their own pockets. None of the members of the unit is optimistic about the future of the unit as they cannot sell their produces in the market where competition from cheaper factory made garments is very severe. The unit is almost on the brink of closure.

The other unit at Pallam, which functioned for a few weeks, is defunct now. Members of the unit have taken the machines to their homes, as they could not afford to pay the rent of the room because of poor earnings.

The project failed because it was formulated and implemented without even a preliminary feasibility study. Panchayat, it appears, has taken up this project as a 'project of convenience'; as an easy avenue to spend the plan fund within the 10 percent for- women- condition stipulated by the government. The motive behind the selection of this project immediately after distributing 281 sewing machines to individual beneficiaries in the previous year.

2.10. Mini Industrial Estate

(Kazhakkootam Block Panchayat)

This project for setting up a mini industrial estate was taken up by Kazhakkootam Block Panchayat in the annual plan for 1998-99. The project was to be completed in 3 years, ie, by the end of 2000-01. According to the project report, 10 industrial sheds each with a covered area of 600 sq.ft were to be constructed in a 1-acre plot to be located in a suitable area within the Block Panchayat . Total cost of the project was estimated at Rs. 45.5 lakhs (including 15% interest for one year on the total investment of Rs. 39.6 lakhs) and cost of each shed at Rs. 4.55 lakhs. These sheds were to be allotted to the prospective small-scale entrepreneurs on hire-purchase basis at Rs.4.55 lakhs each, to be repaid in 40 quarterly installments of Rs. 11385/-. Expected annual earnings of the Block Panchayat by way of these repayments would be Rs. 4.55 lakhs. This amount would be utilized to provide interest free loans to the allottees for the development of their industries. These estimates appear to be mere window dressing rather than any realistic assessment based on standard project appraisal norms.

Rs. 8 lakhs of plan fund was allocated to the project in the annual plan for 1998-99 for the purchase of land. One acre of land at Mundakkal in Mangalapuram Grama Panchayat area, some 3 kms from Mangalapuram junction in the national highway was purchased. In 1999-2000, plan allocation made for the project was Rs. 4.5 lakhs which was spent for the construction of a compound wall around the plot of land purchased. Construction of the sheds started in 2000-01 utilising the plan grant of Rs. 5 lakhs allocated for the project in the year. Halfway through the construction, original design of the sheds had to be altered and some reconstruction works were done to enclose the sheds. At the time of our fields visits in August – September 2001, 4 sheds were complete and the construction of the remaining sheds were held up for want of funds. Rs. 4 lakhs have been earmarked for the project in the Block's annual plan for 2001-02 but the fund was yet to be made available. No provision has been made for water supply and electricity connection which together will cost about Rs.6 lakhs as per the approved estimate. The project taken up with a vision, which would have emerged as a growth centre for the development of a remote, rural area of the Block, notwithstanding the not so encouraging experience of mini industrial estates already set up in the state in the past, is held up

now. The only benefit of the project to the local people is a 3 km bituminized road from Mangalapuram junction to the industrial estate.

There was not even a touch of participatory development in the selection or execution of the project. It is being executed through a contractor by the Block Panchayat with the secretary as the implementing officer.

We had taken up this project for study as this is the only mini-industrial estate project being implemented among many such projects included in the plan documents of some Panchayats of the district and included in the sampling frame.

2.11.Manufacturing of Electronic Chokes

(Kilimanur Block Panchayat)

A project for setting of an industrial production unit for the manufacture of electronic chokes was originally included in Kilimanur Block Panchayat's annual plan for 1997-98. Four such units, each with 5 women members as beneficiaries were proposed to be set up one each in 4 selected Grama Panchayats of the Block- Pazhayakunnummel, Pallickal,

Nagarur and Madavoor. The selected participant beneficiaries were to be given stipendiary training for the manufacture of electronic chokes. The amounts of stipend proposal was Rs. 300 p.m. A trainer would be engaged at a monthly honourarium of Rs. 3000/- per month. Necessary tools would be supplied by the Block Panchayat to each unit. An allocation of Rs. 100000/- Rs. 25000 for each unit- was set apart for the project. But approval was given to the project by the BLEC/DP only after cutting the provision for stipend and honourarium. Therefore the project could not be implemented in that year although the Panchayat has selected the beneficiaries for all the four units and the units were registered as societies. The amount of Rs. 1 lakh allotted for the project from the plan fund was drawn and deposited in the bank accounts of the 4 societies at the rate of Rs. 25000 per unit.

The project was again included in the annual plan proposals of the Block Panchayat for the year 1998-99 with provision for stipend and honourarium and got approved by the BLEC and DPC. Total outlay of the project was Rs. 3.38 lakhs- Rs. 2.73 lakhs from the plan fund (including the unspent balance of Rs. 1 lakh carried forward from the previous year and Rs.65000 as beneficiaries' contribution or bank loan at the rate of Rs. 3250 per beneficiary. Training of the members of all the 4 units started in March 1999. Rs. 37900 was spent from the plan fund for this scheme in 1998-99,

mainly for giving out stipend and honourarium. The project spilled over to 1999-2000 with an allocation of Rs. 1.35 lakhs and Rs. 117106 was spent mainly for the purchase of tools, equipment and materials.

Three months stipendiary training of the selected beneficiaries was conducted in March-June 1999. There was no follow up action after training. Chokes manufactured during the course of training and the tools and equipments purchased are dumped in a Block Office buildings. Not a single choke manufactured could be soled in the market although the project report had envisaged an annual sales turn- over of Rs. 12.0 lakhs by selling 18000 chokes at the rate of Rs. 150/- a piece. Plan fund now available for each units to start commercial production in Rs. 25000- the first year's allocation deposited in the bank, which is far too inadequate to start the units again. Beneficiaries contribution/ bank loan of Rs. 3250 per member has also not materialized. According to the President and Secretary of the Block Panchayat, efforts are on to pump in more money to make the units viable. But our assessment is that the chances of reviving the project are remote for 2 reasons. First, many of the beneficiary members of the units, dispersed after the training might have either lost interest in the project or sought other occupations. They are scattered over 4 village Panchayats of the Block and our repeated efforts to trace at least a few of them could not succeed.

Secondly, the quality of the chokes manufactured by them is reported to be poor and may not sell in the market competing with other quality products available in plenty.

The basic reason for the failure of the project seems to be the faulty formulation of the project without proper feasibility studies or even a preliminary assessment of the marketability of the product. The project report does not even touch the marketing aspect. This is a project that has very little chance of reviving, let alone sustaining, even with continued subsidy from the plan fund.

2.12. Grant to Handloom Society

(Pallichal Grama Panchayat)

Pallichal Panchayat has a sizeable concentration of handloom weavers and workers. Handloom industry has been the leading employment provider in the area. According to the socio-economic survey conducted in the Panchayat in 1998 as part of the peoples plan campaign, about 11 per cent of the total population of 42308 of the Panchayat depend either directly or indirectly on handloom industry, both in private and co-operative sectors. These handloom workers, like their counterparts in many parts of the state as well as in the country have been facing problems like lack of employment

opportunity, high cost of production, inadequate demand for their products, low income etc. Rehabilitation programmes like financial assistance to deserving individual weavers to purchase looms were initiated by the Panchayat in the first year of the peoples plan itself.

Thittavelikkara Gramodharana Handloom Industry (workshop) Co. operative society Ltd. established in 1967 is one of the ancient handloom societies in the Panchayat. The society that was functioning fairly well for many years has been facing problems in recent years as part of the general crises gripping the handloom industry in general. The society which earned a net profit of Rs. 1.23 lakhs in 1997-98 and Rs. 0.24 lakhs in 1998-99 incurred a loss of Rs. 1.44 lakhs in 1999-2000. Between 1998-99 & 1999-2000, production fell by 7% and sales by 23%. In order to save the society from the crisis, the Panchayat decided to give a grant of Rs. 3.11 lakhs from the plan fund by including this as a project in the annual plan for 99-2000. The grant was given for the specific purpose of purchasing yarn from the Co-operative Spinning Mill, Kollam.

A novel feature of this project, distinct from normal welfare grants doled out by governments, is that although the money given to the society from the plan fund in an outright grant, the project report envisages that it would generate an indirect or deemed income to the Panchayat in the form

of a 20% subsidy the society would give on the sale of handloom cloth to women self help groups (SHG) sponsored by the Panchayat under the peoples planning programme and to the schools for uniforms. This means that by selling cloth worth Rs. One lakh to SHG's and schools, the society gets only Rs. 80000 and the balance Rs. 20000 given out, as subsidy would be treated as a deemed return to the Panchayat. Thus the entire grant would be deemed to have been returned by the society to the Panchayat when the society's sales under this arrangement reaches Rs. 16 lakhs. The project report also envisages a second phase of the project when the Panchayat will organise a massive awareness programme and publicity campaign among the school authorities and school children of the Panchayat in order to persuade them to purchase uniform cloths from the society taking advantage of the subsidy scheme. A Panchayat level guidance committee has been formed to oversee the functioning of the project.

In spite of the grant paid, the Panchayat has no control over the society. The sustainability of the project is dependent entirely on the sustainability of the society, on which this project has no significant bearing.

2.13. Reed-based Cottage Industry

(Vellanad Grama Panchayat)

Vellanad Panchayat has a sizeable number of families mostly belonging to SC/ST, traditionally engaged in reed based cottage industries like making of mats, baskets, winnowers and various other household and decorative products from reed. In order to assist these people to improve their economic condition, a project was formulated and included as a women development programme in the annual plan of the Panchayat for 1999-2000. According to the approved project report, 20 units, each consisting of five neighborhood women who have the skill in making these products would be set up and registered under Charitable Societies Act. Only one member would be allowed from one family. Each unit should contribute Rs. 1000 each for the purchase of necessary tools and on production of vouchers for the purchase would be given a grant of Rs. 10000 (Rs. 2000 per member) as share capital. This amount would be deposited in the bank account of the society. Each society would have an elected convener. Total outlay of the project was Rs. 2.2 lakhs-Rs. 2.00 lakhs from the plan fund and Rs.20000 as beneficiaries' contribution. Nineteen such units were set up in 1999-2000 and one more in 2000-01

Reeds are supplied on credit by the Kerala State Bamboo Corporation from its depot at Veliyannur. Reeds are usually supplied in bundles of 10 or 20. The members have to take delivery of the supply from the depot and carry them home by themselves. For every 100 rupees worth of reeds supplied, the members have to deliver back to the Corporation woven reed mats of prescribed specification and quality worth a minimum value of Rs.450/-. Supply prices of reeds and purchase prices of woven mats are decided by the corporation. Value of reeds taken by the members are deducted from the value of mats they deliver back. The present purchase price of mats fixed by the Corporation is Rs. 16.20 for a 24-sq.feet mat of the size 6'x4' and Rs. 45.90 for a 35 sq.ft mat of the size of 8 1/2' x 4 1/2'. From a small bundle of 10 reeds, roughly 750 sq.feet of mats can be made. Cut pieces of reeds left after making mats are made use of for making baskets, winnowers, lampshades and other household and fancy items that the members sell in the market.

As mentioned earlier there are 20 units functioning under this project. Each one is independent and has a separate name and identity e.g., Kripa Eera Industrial society, Deepti Eera unit, Sarvodaya Eera unit, sudhir Eera unit, Rejani Eera unit, Sanu Eera unit etc at Veliyannur. Some of these units are functioning well, but some not that well depending on the skill of the

members and quantum of their work. Each member of the society contributes a small share of their earning to the society to constitute a common fund from which annual bonus is distributed to the members.

Two main reasons for the success of the project that we could identify are:

1. Making of reed-used products is a craft requiring skill and most of the members engaged in this industry are people who have acquired the skill traditionally. These products have a market segment of their own, somewhat protected by the traditional skill of the producers and ethnic character of the products.
2. The participation by the beneficiaries of the project, although mobilised is genuine as it earns them their livelihood.

After the one-time assistance given from the plan fund, the project is operating without any continued assistance and has become self-sustainable. Given the present conditions, the project will sustain. But there are external factors like increasing competition from plastic substitutes which may cut into the market of the products of this traditional cottage industry.

2.14.Pezhumkamukal water supply scheme

(Vamanapuram Grama Panchayat)

Pezhumkamukal in Kalamachal ward of Vamanapuram Grama Panchayat is a hilltop area inhabited by 96 families consisting of 486 people. This area had been experiencing severe shortage of drinking water, especially during the 9 months period from August to May every year. It was an ordeal; a strenuous and time-consuming effort for the people of the area, particularly for the women folk, to fetch drinking water from wells in the valley, some 300 to 500 metres down the hill. . A scheme for supply of drinking water was a felt need of the people of the area. As demanded by the local people as well as the ward Grama Sabha, Vamanapuram Panchayat formulated a project for supply of drinking water to the area by digging a well at Chirakkonam in the valley, pumping water to an overhead tank at the top of the hill and laying a distribution pipeline with public taps. The project was included in the annual plan of the Panchayat for 1998-99. The project was to be completed in two years. Estimated outlay of the project was Rs. 8.8 lakhs - Rs. 3.2 lakhs from the plan fund in 1998-99 and Rs. 5.6 lakhs from plan fund and Rs. 10000 voluntary services and contribution of the

beneficiaries in 1999-2000. Later, the District Panchayat allotted Rs. 3.0 lakhs for the project in 1998-99 itself. Work of the project started in February 1999. With the technical guidance and co-operation of Kerala Water Authority, the project was completed and commissioned in August 2000.

The task of implementing and running the project was entrusted to a local beneficiaries committee with one Mr. Pushpolbhavan as convener. Two cents of land for the well and the pump house purchased by the Panchayat at chirakkonam, adjacent to the existing tank in the valley. A well of 2.5 metre diameter and about 10 metres depth was dug in the land. A pump house was constructed at the site and a 15 hp motor was installed. A 4x3x2.5 metre water tank with 25000 litres capacity (as against 15000 litres originally envisaged) was constructed at the top of the hill, about 500 metres away from the pump house. The land for construction of the water tank was donated by a local resident. Distribution pipelines covering the area within about 2 km radius of the water tank was laid and 7 public taps were installed. After some usual delay in completion, the project was commissioned in August 2000, about 3 months behind the schedule.

Recurring expenses for running the system - Salary of the pump operator, Rs.300 per month and electricity charges are borne by the

Panchayat. Consumers need not pay anything for the water. However, if there occurs any damage to the pipeline or taps in any locality the replacement or repair charges should be borne by the consumers of that locality. Water is supplied for about 1 to 1 ½ hours on alternate days.

This is the only successful one of the 3 drinking water project covered by our sample study. The prime or rather the critical reason for the successful functioning of the scheme is that the running expenses are paid by the Panchayat making the supply of water absolutely free. Beneficiaries participation in the formulation and execution of the project was good. All the 10 beneficiaries we interviewed had participated at one or other stage of the project. Five of them had actively participated and 9 contributed voluntary labour.

So long as the present system of the Panchayat bearing the running cost continues, there need not be any threat to the sustainability of the project. But once the Panchayat's assistance is withdrawn and the consumers are asked to bear the running cost or to pay for the water, the continuance of the projects may become uncertain. Whether the Panchayat should do so or not is an issue on which opinions can differ. There is a case for making the beneficiaries pay for the water at least equal to their opportunity cost they saved, i.e., the cost of manually lifting water from the

wells in the valley. At the same time there is a case for supplying this basic need free to the people of the area who are in a geographically disadvantageous position especially when most of them are poor weavers and agricultural labourers. Any suggestion on this issue will involve a value judgment. The decision has to be political.

2.15.Chevalakkonam water supply scheme

(Pazhayakunnummel Grama Panchayat)

Thundilkada-Chevalakkonam is an area in Pazhayakunnummel Panchayat, which had been facing the most acute scarcity of drinking water. Seventy-eight families consisting of more than 500 members inhabit this area. A project for solving the problem of drinking water shortage of this area was taken up by the Pazhayakunnummel Panchayat under the Peoples' Planning Programme. Two cents of land was purchased for the purpose in the first year of the plan, 1997-98. A project for digging a well in this land, pumping water to a 20000 litre capacity tank constructed some 300 metres away and distributing it through pipelines and public taps was included in the annual plan of the Panchayat for 1998-99. Total estimated outlay of the project was Rs. 3.48 lakhs-Rs.3.03 lakhs from the plan fund, Rs. 25000 from Panchayat fund and Rs. 20000 as beneficiaries' contribution.

Work of the project was started in January 1999. It could not be completed by December 99 as expected and the project spilled over to 1999-2000 annual plan with an outlay of Rs. 1.2 lakhs from the plan fund. The project was executed by a beneficiaries' committee with Mr. Babukkuttan as chairman. A well of 3 metres diameter and about 6 metres depth was dug at Thundilkada-Pottimukku. Project proposal was to dig a well of 8 metres depth but it could not be done because hard rock was struck before reaching that depth. A pump house was built in the site and a 15 HP motor was installed. An overhead tank of 20000-litre capacity was built some 300 metres away at the delivery site at a height of 75 metres from the ground level. Some 2000 metres of distribution pipelines were laid (as against 750 metres estimated originally) with 7 public taps for the supply of water. The project was commissioned in February 2000. Initially a committee of beneficiary- women was in charge of operating the system. A monthly charge of Rs. 20/- per month was collected from each beneficiary family towards the operational cost-operator's remuneration and payment of bi-monthly electricity bill of Rs. 1500-2000, on an average. Within a couple of months after the system started functioning rifts developed among the beneficiaries. Some people demanding that water should be supplied free refused to pay the monthly charge of Rs. 20/-. Somehow, water supply

continued, though at a reduced level depending on the availability of funds with the committee, till May 2000. Since then, there has been no water supply except for a few days at the time of Assembly election in May 2001. The rift among the beneficiaries has assumed a political colour now, with the supporters of LDF (which controls the Panchayat) willing to pay the monthly charge probably out of political compulsions and the supporters of UDF (which rules the state but in the opposition in the Panchayat) refusing to pay any charges demanding free supply of water as promised by both the political parties at the time of election campaign. The stalemate continues and the project meant to meet an essential need of the local people remains idle. The Panchayat could have redeemed the situation by agreeing to pay the running cost of the project from the Panchayat fund as the neighbouring Pezhumkamukal Panchayat has been doing. This is a typical case, and the only one we came across in our study, of narrow political interests sacrificing even an essential community project involving sizeable investment of public funds. One can only wish that this is only an isolated and localised case and not indicative of the way the Peoples Plan projects may go in the future.

The project had good participation of the beneficiaries. All the 5 beneficiaries of the project we interviewed had taken part in the selection

and execution of the project; two of them actively, and contributed voluntary labour. Actual beneficiaries contribution to the project was Rs. 12800 as against Rs. 20000/- originally envisaged in the project report. Many of the beneficiaries have offered voluntary services of some kind or other for the execution of the project. So, the beneficiaries have a clear stake in the project but paradoxically, this does not appear to be a reason strong enough to sustain the project withstanding the onslaught of the negative impact of the exogenous forces emanating from the excessive politicisation of the society.

2.16.Panchikkala Water Supply Scheme

(Poovar Grama Panchayat)

Payanthi-Panchikkala area of Poovar Panchayat is a rocky area with an undulating topography, which has been experiencing scarcity of drinking water. There are about 1000 families living in this area. In order to solve this problem, the Panchayat formulated two projects to set up two water supply schemes, one for Payanthi and the other for Panchikkala areas. Initially it was taken up as a twin project in the annual plan for 1997-98. Land for digging wells and construction of pump houses and water tanks for both the projects was acquired at a cost of Rs.1.88 lakhs. The project was to

be implemented in 3 years. In the annual plan for 1998-99 water tanks were constructed for both the projects in the site purchased. Two wells, one at Koikkavilakom for Panchikkala and the other at Poovar for Payanthi were dug in 1999-2000. As both the projects are similar and on nearby sites, we selected only the Panchikkala project as one of the sample projects for this study. Both the projects have been progressing more or less parallel. The two were treated as separate projects up to 1998-99 because Payanthi and Panchikkala were in two different wards of the Panchayat at that time and the people of the two wards and the members of Panchayat elected from these wards were demanding two separate projects. As a result, two separate wells, two pump houses and two overhead tanks had to be constructed in the same site. At least in the cases of wells and pump sets, these duplication of efforts and double expenditure could have been avoided by increasing the size of the well and capacity of the pump set. The reasons for the duplication of efforts are no more valid; after 1998 delimitation of the wards of Panchayats, Payanthi and Panchikkala are now in the same Panchayat Ward.

A 75000 litre capacity water tank (instead 50000 litre capacity envisaged in project report) was constructed for the Panchikkala project in 1998-99 spending Rs. 2.4 lakhs from the plan fund from an approved outlay

of Rs. 6.5 lakhs for both the projects combined. In the third year, 1999-2000, Rs.2.4 lakhs was spent for digging a well with 3-metre diameter and about 15-metre depth for Panchikkala alone. Two 7 HP pump sets (as against 5 HP approved in the project report) have been installed. Part of this works spilled over to 2000-01, and Rs. 1.64 lakhs was spent in the year. Pipes have been purchased and kept for laying. Electricity connection has not been provided so far.

According to the original schedule the project would have been completed in 2000-2001. But work of the project is still incomplete even after spending more than Rs.7 lakhs (including proportionate cost of land). Constructions and installations already made are idling. Main reasons for the delay in commissioning the project that we could identify in the field survey are:

- i. There were faults in project formulation. Land was purchased in 1997-98. Tank was constructed in the next year without assessing the availability of water and its potability. Quantity of water available from these wells should have been assessed before deciding the capacity of water tank and construct it. The engineer who did the technical appraisal of the project had pointed out this issue, but his suggestion was overlooked by the

then Panchayat Committee. But the new Panchayat committee, which came to power after 1999 local body elections reviewed the issue. Laying of pipelines is held up pending the testing of the water in the well for potability and also an assessment of the quantity of water available from the well. Slow down of the work of the project, according to the new Panchayat Committee, is also due to paucity of funds.

ii. The second reason seems to be the competing demands of the two groups of beneficiaries of the twin project- Panchikkala and Payanthi, backed by some local politicians to serve their own interest. The prospective beneficiaries of Payanthi project which lies behind Panchikkala project in the progress of work demand that both the project should be completed and commissioned simultaneously. The member representing the ward in the Panchayat has also taken this stand. Issues of availability of water and its potability, sidelined by the earlier Panchayat committee, have again been brought to life. The project that would have been activated long ago is held up because of narrow political and parochial interests. An allocation of Rs.2.5 lakhs earmarked for the

project in the annual plan of the Panchayat for 2000-01 is reported to have lapsed.

There has been good participation by the local people in the implementation of the project. They have built an approach road to the project site by donating land and contributing voluntary labour. Many of them expressed their anguish over the inordinate delay in completing the project. Even if the water is tested positive and availability assessed as sufficient, it is still uncertain how far the pumping of water from the project will affect the overall availability of ground water in the area, particularly that of private wells and tanks. Problems might also arise about the operation costs of the project: wherever the Panchayat should pay the electricity bill and pump operator's salary. Project report is silent on this issue and it seem that the Panchayat authorities have not taken a decision on this issue.

As of now, the future of the project is uncertain. This is an example of how a typical peoples' plan project conceived to fulfill the aspirations of local people could get bungled by conflicting sectoral interests in adept and visionless political leadership and indifference of the so called technical experts who cleared the project.

2.17.Computer Centre

(Karakulam Grama Panchayat)

A computer centre meant, mainly, for imparting advanced and job-oriented training in computer application, data processing, DTP, Software, information technology etc to the aspiring students of the Panchayat and the neighbouring areas was set up by Karakulam Panchayat in its annual plan for 1997-98. The centre functions as part of the Rural Study Centre established as a separate project in the same year with the objective of conducting scientific studies and providing consultancy services and training in different fields of local level planning.

Total outlay of the computer centre project was Rs. 7.61 lakhs. To start with 10 computers, accessories, furniture, air-conditioner etc were purchased utilizing the plan fund. It was inaugurated in April 1999. The centre is functioning in the Rural Study Centre building, a renovated building in the Panchayat Office compound at Enikkara. The centre offers different job-oriented computer training courses like PGDCA, DCA etc. The fee charged by the centre for its various courses are almost 40 to 50 percent less than the rate prevailing in the open market. The centre using its own resources has acquired more computers and accessories. The annual

report of the centre for 1999-2000 shows a gross profit of Rs. 1.97 lakhs. The quarterly intake of students, on an average is 40-45 for PGDCA, 25-30 for Diploma and 25-30 for certificate courses. All the student-beneficiaries, present and past, we interviewed expressed, unanimously, satisfaction over the cost effectiveness and high quality of the training course offered by the centre.

The project is certainly a success. The Rural study centre, which controls the computer centre, is governed by a 9-member board of directors registered as society under the Charitable Societies Act. President of Karakulam Panchayat is the chairman and Vice-President and standing committee chairman of the Panchayat and 6 experts nominated from among the Plan activists are members of the director board. The centre is working more or less on commercial lines. It earns substantial profit because of its competitive advantage over other private computer training institutes in the city and suburbs because of its zero capital cost. The project has become self-sustainable.

2.18. Renovation of Kunnathukulam

(Kudappanakkunnu Grama Panchayat)

Kunnathukulam in Kudappanakkunnu Panchayat is an ancient pond used by the local people for bathing, washing clothes, irrigation and practice swimming. There are quite a few people in the neighbourhood and near-by areas of the pond, who practiced swimming in the pond and became known swimmers at district and state level. Some of them have secured jobs in sports quota in various Government departments. In course of time, particularly in the past 5-10 years there was no proper maintenance and the pond has become unusable due to silting and weed growth. There has been persistent demand from the local people, particularly the swimming ‘alumni’ of the pond, to renovate the tank and make it again useful for practicing swimming. There have been some sporadic efforts by the members of 3-4 families in the neighborhood to renovate the pond by removing the silt. But their efforts could not succeed because the work involved was too voluminous for a few families to tackle. When the campaign for people’s planning started in the Panchayat in 1997, the local people again raised their demand in the Grama Sabha meetings of their ward. Conceding to the demand of local people the Panchayat included a project for renovation of the tank in its annual plan for 1997-98. Approved outlay of the project was

Rs. 5.8 lakhs. This entire outlay was to be met from the plan fund. A project report was prepared. Objectives of the project as laid down in the project report were 1) To supply pure drinking water for the people of the area. 2) To irrigate about 30 areas of land in the neighbourhood of the pond. An implementation committee with one Mr. Radhakrishnan Nair as chairman and Mr. Prasannakumar as convener to execute the project. The entire work of the project was carried out by the Implementation committee without engaging any professional contractor. Slits & weeds were removed from the tank with the active participation of the local people. Many of them did voluntary work. A dry rubble masonry bund was constructed around the tank and plastered. During the course of implementation, the objectives of the project changed from irrigation to converting the pond into a swimming pool. The bottom of the tank is so laid as to suit swimming practice-slanting from the boundaries to the centre. No additional facility has been provided for irrigation. The paddy field across the road gets water through the existing sluice. All the neighbouring compounds are much elevated from the water level of the pond. Owners of these compounds lift water manually to irrigate their homestead cultivation.

In the annual plan for 2000-01 the Panchayat gave an additional grant of Rs. 30000/-to the project for providing a swimming track in the pond.

Eight tracks have been laid utilising the grant. A number of students and youngsters of the local and neighbouring area come to this swimming pool regularly to practice swimming. The swimming pool is presently looked after by the local Kusavarkal Sports Club, set up in 1952. The main driving force behind the success of this project is the collective leadership of this club and some local sports enthusiasts.

One of the widely accepted and distinct advantage of participative development project is its flexibility or adaptability. Unlike in the conventional blue print approach where project implementation should strictly be on the already formulated or pre-determined lines, in the flexible approach to participative development projects, the design, activities, objectives, and cost estimates of the project can undergo changes in accordance with the changing needs and priorities of the participants or beneficiaries of the project. Kunnathukulam swimming pool project is an example of this flexibility approach. As the participation of local people is genuine, the project can sustain without any further aid from the Panchayat.

2.19. Labour Bank

(Kunnathukal Grama Panchayat)

The Labour Bank project of Kunnattukal Panchayat is one of the very few innovative projects taken up by any Panchayat in Trivandrum district under the Peoples' Planning Programme. Originally conceived as one to constitute a labour corps as part of a comprehensive agriculture development programme, the project was included in the annual plan of the Panchayat for 1997-98. It was implemented in 1998-99 by constituting a 'Labour Force' with an initial membership of 125. The number of members had gone up to 225 next year. The declared objectives of the labour corps were: 1) To arrest the declining trend in the area under paddy cultivation due to high cost of cultivation and non-availability of farm labour especially during peak operating seasons. (2) To increase the employment opportunity of local labourers by taking up the development works like construction of houses and roads, renovation of irrigation tanks etc, collectively. Total outlay of the project for 1998-99 was Rs. 2.41 lakhs - Rs. 1.99 lakhs from the plan fund and Rs. 0.42 lakhs as voluntary services of the participants. This project for labour corps was subsequently transformed into a Labour Bank in the annual plan for 1999-2000 with the added objectives of 1) making labour available to the needy farmers or credit in the form of labour

loans; 2) to take up the cultivation of fallow land and leased- in land collectively on crop-sharing basis and 3) to reduce the cost of cultivation by partial mechanization of farming operations like tilling, harvesting, threshing etc by providing these services on a collective basis. At present the labour bank has about 425 labourers as members. All these members have been given a 2 days training in farm operations. Selected members have been trained in operating farm machinery like tractors, threshers etc. The Bank has a full-fledged office with a secretary and staff. It has all the essential agricultural implements, machinery and tools.

Main features of the functioning of the Bank project are:

1. Making trained farm labour available to the farmers at reasonable wage rate. The present wage rate charged by the Bank is Rs. 115/- per day as against the prevailing market rate of Rs. 125/-. Farm machinery services are provided at reasonable charges. Supplies of other inputs like planting materials are also arranged.
2. Labour is supplied to the needy farmers on credit almost on the line of bank loan. Any farmer who wants to raise a seasonal crops like paddy, tapioca, plantain etc in his farm but doesn't have the means to meet the labour cost can approach the Bank and by executing a bond he can get Rs. 5000/- worth of labour and machinery services on credit. This labour

loan has a maximum term of 12 months and will have to be repaid with 12 percent interest after the harvesting of the crop is over. For farmers with limited resources and time this is a better and more convenient an alternative to a conventional crop loan from a bank or primary co-operative society.

3. All subsidies available to the participant farmers from the Panchayat and Agriculture Department are routed through the Bank. These subsidies- on seeds, fertilizer etc- are adjusted against the dues the participant farmer has to pay to the Bank as wages of labourers, hire-charges of machinery etc. This arrangement, to a great extent, avoids the farmer's botheration of getting the subsidies direct from the Agriculture Department or Panchayat.
4. During the lien season for farm operations, the Labour Corpse undertake other developments works like construction of houses, roads, renovation of irrigation tanks etc under the peoples planning programme entrusted to them by the Panchayat. This provides a steady stream of employment to the members of the Corpse.
5. The Labour Bank also takes up cultivation of fallow land and land taken on lease on share cropping basis from the owners. The Bank carries out the cultivation of these land and the produces are shared with the

landowner on a mutually agreed proportion. Bank's share of the produces is distributed among the participating members of the Labour Corpse at nominal prices.

During the first year of its operation from February 2000 to January 2001 the Labour Bank could provide 12694 days of work to its members, ie on average, 1058 days per month. Barring the initial month of February 2000, monthly employment provided by the bank varied from 537 to 2111 days. Most of the members of the Labour Corpse we interviewed get on an average 15 to 20 days work in a month. Many of them expressed the desire to get more workdays.

Farmers who engage labourers from the Bank remit the wage charges to the bank. Payments to the labourers are made by the Bank once in a week. Some of the members of the Labour Corpse we interviewed complained that this payment system causes some difficulties to them because they do not get cash for their daily needs, but we do not find much validity in this complaint. The members are given credit slips for the work they do everyday, which can be used to purchase their daily needs from the co-operative store run by the Agricultural Labourers Co-operative society, a sister concern of the Bank. However, credits coupons and ready cash make

a difference in the consumption choices of the members especially of those who are used to take daily doses of liquor.

Members of the Labour Corpse are covered by a group insurance scheme at a nominal rate of premium and are also paid annual bonus based on the member of days worked in the year.

Majority of the participant labourers and farmers support the project and are confident about its success and sustainability. But there are dissenters, mostly among the non-participants. Some of the criticisms leveled against the project are:

1. It reduces the employment opportunities of non-participating labourers as the Labour Bank appropriates bulk of the employment opportunities is subsidy-linked farm operations and Panchayat works under the peoples planning programme.
2. Some of the farmers complained that members of the Labour Corpse work strictly according to their time schedule-8 AM to 4PM, with no flexibility and often behave in an authoritarian manner.
3. Another complaint is that farm labour from the Bank is not always available for the cultivation of crops like tapioca, plantain etc which

involve more physical strain than paddy cultivation which is partially mechanized.

4. The farmers have no choice in the selection of labourers. The warm inter-personal relationship traditionally existed between the farmer and labourers has disappeared.

Notwithstanding these criticism which may be partially true at least in theory, we find that the net social benefit of this programme is certainly positive in so far as labour loan facility, lower wage rate and better availability of farm labour have led to more cultivation and more production. There is no evidence to show that the project has reduced the overall employment opportunity of the farm labourers of the Panchayat.

One of the conclusions of our earlier study on peoples planning programme in two Panchayats was an efficient and sincere leadership acceptable to the people cutting across party lines is an important factor in the success of the programme. The success story of the Labour Bank project reiterates this conclusion. The main driving force behind the labour bank project of Kunnathukal Panchayat has been Mr. Girish kumar, the Agriculture Officer of the Panchayats. He has shown exceptional leadership qualities,

organizational skill and sustained hard work in leading this project into success right from the inception stage.

As regards the sustainability of the programme, we do not find any destabilizing factors inherent in it, which may lead to its failure. But we do not rule out the possibility of two exogenous factors playing a destructive role in future. One is the probability of a leadership vacuum created by the transfer of Mr. Girish kumar out of the Panchayat. Second in the political overtone of the programme. Membership and management of the Labour Bank are dominated by people lenient towards LDF which rules the Panchayat. Patronage of the Panchayat and the then State Govt. has played a catalyst's role in the success of the project. With political patronage changing side a political fight for the control of the Bank threatening its existence cannot be ruled out.

2.20. Women self-help groups

(Venganur Grama Panchayat)

This is a project taken up by Venganur Panchayat in its annual plan for 1999-2000, for the promotion of 6 selected women self-help groups by providing them with financial assistance to start some income-earning self-employment activity. There are some 200

registered women self-help groups (SHG) in the Panchayat but only about 25 of them are active now. The 6 SHGs are selected from among the functioning groups from different wards of the Panchayat. The SHGs selected, their activities and the number of members are given below:

Name the SHG	Activities	No. of members
1. Aiswarya	Making of coir ropes	14
2. Darsana	Handloom weaving	16
3. Dhanalekshmi	Readymade garments	13
4. Anaswara	-do-	13
5. Lekshmi	Processing of copra	12
6. Sarika	Market on wheel	10

Total estimated outlay of the project for the year was Rs. 2.57 lakhs. Assistances were given to the SHGs for the purchase of assets and the amount of assistance varied depending on the type of activity with the ceiling of Rs. 50000 per society. These amounts, along with the beneficiaries' contribution are deposited in a bank. Amount needed for the purchase of machinery looms etc are met from this fund. Banks were expected to extent loan facilities up to

Rs. 15000 to these SHG but till the time of our survey in Sept-Oct 2001, none of the 6 SHG have received bank finance.

All these units have been carrying out the thrift and credit operations in accordance with the common and almost standardized activity pattern of SHGs all over the state. As far as the specific income-earning activities are concerned, the performance of these 6 SHGs varied. The average earnings of the members were: - Handloom units Rs. 45 to 50 per day, Readymade garments units Rs. 20-30 per day, Coir units, Rs. 30-50 per day, and Copra units, Rs. 50-75 per week. The market on wheel (unit selling grocery, provisions etc through its mobile van) operating once in a month or so because of slackness in demand does not earn any significant income.

Sustainability of these SHGs, and for that matter, any of the thousands of SHGs set up all over the state depend on individual initiatives and collective efforts of the members. With capital cost and opportunity cost of labour almost equal to zero, there is no reason why should not these groups survive the competition in the market if they select appropriate activity/product line and adopt an effective marketing strategy.

Chapter 3

PARTICIPATION

Our study has hypothesized that beneficiaries' participation is a crucial determinant of the sustainability of the social development projects implemented under the Peoples' Plan Programme of Kerala. Participation is a term that eludes a consensus definition. Its level could be anywhere between mere passive participation or association with the project activities, i.e., attending meetings or giving moral support and active participation by taking leadership or controlling roles in the formulation and execution of the project. The levels of participation in the projects covered by this study have been assessed both in its passive and active forms. We have taken participation as active if the participant has creatively participated in the deliberations on the project or served as member of any committee or group like Task Force, Implementation Committee, Monitoring Committee etc, constituted to formulate or implement the project. In order to get a more realistic picture of public participation, Presidents and members of the Panchayats who acted as project leaders in some projects are

excluded from the sample frame. Participation by contributing the beneficiaries' share of the project cost or voluntary labour are not counted as active as these are, by and large, mobilised type of participation

Appropriateness of using this loose definition of participation for the purpose of the study may be open to question. Many of the studies on participative development at the international level conclude that the participation would be genuine and effective only if: 1) it encompasses¹ all project activities including decision making, 2) Participants are empowered to conduct all affairs of the project and 3) Ownership of the project rests with the participants². As Bastian pointed out, participation is generally used in three ways: 1) as a cosmetic label to make whatever is purported appears good, 2) as a co-opting practice to mobilize local labour and reduce costs and 3) to describe an empowering process³. Participation envisaged in the Peoples' Plan programmes of Kerala falls into either of the first two categories. The beneficiaries have no decisive role in the selection and formulation of projects. However, some of the Implementation

Committees of the projects we studied (eg, Kunnathukulam swimming pool, Kavukulam Lift Irrigation, Pazhayakunnummel water supply) have exercised an informal decision making authority to make some minor alteration to the projects. In all cases, except outright grants to co-operative societies, the ultimate ownership of the projects rests with the Government; represented by the Panchayats. The beneficiaries committees which ceases to exist once the project work is complete, have no ownership feeling about the projects. Character of participation is more or less that of a patron-client relationship. So, for the purpose of this study we had to dilute the concept of participation.

The ex-post survey method we used in the study for assessing the actual levels of beneficiaries participation in the sample projects have some severe limitations in tracking the participation history and characteristics of the projects and documenting them. Conventional Participative Appraisal Method or the recently developed Process Documentation Research Method⁴ in which the evaluators associate themselves with the entire project activities, right from inception to evaluation, living within the project area among the participant beneficiaries and document the

whole project activity could not be followed as it was beyond the scope of a limited purpose study that we have carried out.

Our assessment of participation is based on the words of the sample beneficiaries covered under the survey, corroborated by information gathered from some key informants among the local people, conveners and members of Implementation and Monitoring Committees, ward members and officials of the Panchayats. Participation matrices⁵ based on the responses of the sample beneficiaries interviewed, indicating the number of beneficiaries participated in each participative project classified by the levels of participation and activity stages are given in annexure 1.A combined participation matrix is given in Table 3.1.

Table 3-1.

Participation Matrix of 15 projects

(No. of sample beneficiaries: 120)

Activity/ Participa- tion level	No. of responses				
	Informed	Consulted	Participa- ted	Actively- participated	Controlled the activities
1.Conceiving the project	6 (5.0)	11 (9.2)	13 (10.8)	4 (3.3)	0 (0)
2.Selection of the project	1 (0.8)	17 (14.2)	43 (35.8)	14 (11.7)	0 (0)
3.Formulation of the project	5 (4.2)	11 (9.2)	38 (31.2)	25 (20.8)	0 (0)
4.Execution of the project	4 (3.3)	9 (7.5)	55 (45.8)	46 (38.3)	3 (2.5)
5.Evaluation of the project	0 (0)	1 (0.8)	1 (0.8)	0 (0)	1 (0.8)

Note: Figures in bracket show percentage to total

Participation Matrices were prepared only for 15 out of the 20 sample projects which had some kind of participation by the beneficiaries at some activity stage or other. Among the rest 5, one is executed departmentally (Kazhakkootam mini industrial estate), one by a binami contractor (Kadaikulam ela), two with no participating beneficiaries (Karakulam computer center and Karumkulam readymade garment units) and one with beneficiaries untraceable (electronic choke, Kilimanur).

Of the 15 participatory projects, only in six, -Chooryode and Kavukulam lift irrigation schemes, Pezhumkamukal, Chevalakkonam and Panchikkala water supply schemes and Kunnathukulam swimming pool project –beneficiaries’ participation was genuine and active. Five of these projects (excluding Chevalakkonam water supply) can sustain, with or without Panchayat subsidy. In seven other projects – Mushroom cultivation, Group farming for paddy, Chevalakkonam lift irrigation, Reed-based industries and Women self-help groups- participation was mostly mobilized by the Panchayats after formulating the projects. In the other two cases- Handloom Society and Coir Society-participation was only notional as the project has no direct bearing on the existing participant workers of these Societies.

By activity stages of projects, active participation by beneficiaries was insignificant (3.2 per cent) in conceiving the project ideas, marginal (11.3 per cent) in the selection of the projects, fairly good (20.2 per cent) in the formulation of the projects and highest (37.1 per cent) in the execution of the projects. Nearly half (45.2 per cents) of the participants were associated with the execution of the projects but only 37 percent were active participants.

Chapter 4

Summary and conclusions

1 The key objective of our study was to assess empirically, whether public participation in the social development projects implemented under the Peoples' Planning Programme of Kerala has improved the sustainability of the projects. Twenty sample projects from among the social/community development projects implemented by the Block and Village (Grama) Panchayats of Trivandrum District in the first three years (1997-98 to 1999-2000) of the Peoples' Planning Programme were selected for the study. Being an ex-post evaluation, the study has some severe conceptual and practical limitations in making a realistic assessment of the actual levels of participation by beneficiaries and local people in the formulation and execution of these projects and their sustainability. So, the concepts of participation and sustainability were somewhat diluted to make them operational. Sustainability is defined as short-term sustainability and participation, both in its broad sense, meaning passive participation or mere association and in its real sense, meaning active participation. Number of beneficiaries participated in each participative project, classified by the

levels or kinds of participation and activity stages are presented in a Participation Matrix format.

2. Only 15 out of the 20 sample projects (75 percent), which had some participation by the beneficiaries at some activity stage or other. Among the rest 5, One is executed departmentally (Kazhakkootam mini industrial estate), one by a binami contractor (Kadaikulam ela), two with no participating beneficiaries (Karakulam computer center and Karumkulam readymade garments) and one with beneficiaries untraceable (electronic choke, Kilimanur).

3. Beneficiaries participation in none of these 15 projects fulfills the three-fold conditions of genuine participation i.e., decision-making authority, empowerment and sense of ownership, except for some limited decision-making authority informally exercised by the beneficiary committees of 3 projects-Kavukulam lift irrigation, Pezhumkamukal Water supply and Kunnathukulam swimming pool.

4. Of the 15 participatory projects, beneficiaries' participation was genuine and active only in six. Five of these projects (excluding Chevalakkonam water supply) can sustain, with or without Panchayat subsidy. In seven other projects participation was mostly passive and

mobilized by the Panchayats after formulating the projects. In two other cases participation was only notional, as the project has no direct bearing on the existing participant workers.

5. By activity stages of projects, active participation by beneficiaries was insignificant (3.2 per cent) in conceiving the project ideas, marginal (11.3 per cent) in the selection of the projects, fairly good (20.2 per cent) in the formulation of the projects and highest (37.1 per cent) in the execution of the projects. Nearly half (45.2 per cents) of the participants were associated with the execution of the projects but only 37 percent were active participants.

6. Only 10 out of the 20 projects are local specific. Others are foot-loose projects, more or less standardized, which can be started anywhere and were apparently picked up from the State Planning Board' project shelves as convenient avenues to spend the plan fund on time and in accordance with Government guidelines.

7. Voluntary services as envisaged in the project reports were not realized in majority of the projects. Main reasons for this indifferent attitude of the beneficiaries and local people that we could identify are: (1) They consider

that these projects as government works like any other conventional Government or Panchayat programme for which funds are provided by the Government and therefore it is the sole responsibility of the Panchayat to carry out the works. (2) Unwillingness, indifference or failure of the Plan activists like conveners or active members of implementation committees to mobilize voluntary services.

8. Co-operation and collective action among the beneficiaries cutting across party lines have been observed in all but one of the 15 participatory projects. Only in one project, Chevalakkonam water supply scheme in Pazhayakunnummel Panchayat, political divide among the beneficiaries have stalled the functioning of the project in spite of their clear stake in the project.

9. Only 4 of the 20 projects failed to achieve their objectives due either to faulty formulation (Mushroom cultivation, Readymade garments and Choke manufacturing) or defective implementation. (Chavarcode lift irrigation)

10. Failure of two projects-Mushroom cultivation and Chevalakkonam water supply-can be partly attributed to the 'dependency syndrome' in which the beneficiary participants look forward to the Government even to solve minor problems confronted by them in the execution of the project, which

they could have solved by their own initiative. Mindset of the beneficiaries of some self-employment programmes sponsored by the Panchayats, (eg, Mushroom cultivation and electronic choke manufacturing) appears to be that of paid employees of a Government programme the onus of the responsibility of management resting exclusively on The Panchayat authorities.

11. Political and parochial interests, often pointed out as two major detractors of decentralized planning, have caused the suspension of the activity in one project (Chevalakkonam water supply) and halted the commissioning of another project (Panchikkala water supply)

12. Documented case studies on evaluation of participative development projects in some developing countries have concluded that dominance of interest groups, patronage relations, leadership struggles and other power relations determine the social conditions of participation over-riding the common welfare objective⁶ This, we find, was true only in the cases of two projects-Chevalakkonam and Panchikkala water supply schemes.

13. A project the success of which is excessively dependent on individual leadership (e.g., Unnatural Labour Bank) runs the risk of unsustainability with an adverse change of leadership.

14. Chooryode lift irrigation; Kavukulam lift irrigation, Pezhumkamukal water supply and Kunnathukulam swimming pool- have very high probability of sustaining. In all these As regards sustainability, we find that 4 participative projects- projects the beneficiaries have a clear stake in the physical assets created and a sense of belonging and get direct benefit from the projects. There are no foreseeable exogenous factors that may affect the sustainability of these projects in the immediate future. Sustainability of the other 16 projects-12 participatory and 4 non-participatory- which have no built-in sustainability factors depends, largely, on exogenous factors like continued financial support from the Panchayats, changes in the market environment etc. Even in the cases of the 11 participatory projects, beneficiary's participation was too weak and ineffective to sustain them. Participation is certainly a decisive element of sustainability, but not a sufficient condition.

Summing up the findings of the study, we conclude that in majority of the social development projects taken up under the Peoples' Planning in Kerala, there was no genuine or effective participation by the beneficiaries that would have improved the sustainability of the projects.

Notes

- ¹ See Kanchan Chopra et.al,(10),R.Parthasarathy and Sudarshan Iyengar: *Participatory Water Resources Development in Western India* in David Mosse et.al,(3), Overseas Development Administration,(12), Hartmut Schneider et.al,(6),Lawrence F.Salman(11) and Sunil Bastian et.al.(14)
- ² Hartmut Schneider et.al,(6)
- ³ Sunil Bastian et.al,(14)
- ⁴ David Mosse et.al,(5)
- ⁵ Overseas Development Administration,(12)
6. J. W.Cusworth et.al, (10)

Select References

1. Cusworth, J.W. and Franks T.R. (Ed.) (1993), *Managing Projects in Developing Countries*, Longman, U.K.
2. David Marsden and Peter Oakley (Ed.)(1990), *Evaluating Social Development Projects*, Oxfam, Oxford.
3. David Mosse et al (Ed), (1998), *Development as Process: Concepts and Methods for Working with Complexity*, Routledge, London.
4. Hartmut Schneider and Marie Helene Libercier, (Ed) (1995), *Participatory Development from Advocacy to Action*, OECD, Paris.
5. Howard E.Freedman, Peter H.Rossi and Sonia R. Wright, (1979), *Evaluating Social Projects in Developing Countries*; Development Centre of OECD.
6. James G. Albert (Ed), (1974), *Social Experiments and Social Programme Evaluation*, Ballinger Publishing Co.Cambridge.
7. John Moris and James Copestake, (1993) *Qualitative Enquiry for Rural Development: A Review*, International Technology Publications Ltd, London.
8. Lawrence F. Salman (1987), *Listen to the People: Participant Observer Evaluation of Development Projects*, Oxford University Press.
9. Overseas Development Administration (1995), *A Guide to Social Analysis for Projects in Developing Countries*, London.
10. Robert Chambers (1997), *Who's Reality Counts? Putting the First Last*, Intermediate Technology Publications, London.
11. Vijay Padaki (Ed) (1995), *Development Intervention and Programme Evaluation: Concepts and Cases*, Saga Publications, New Delhi.

Annexure i

Participation Matrix

[No. of responses]

1. Name of the project: Mushroom Cultivation
Athiyannur Block Panchayat
Total no. of beneficiaries: 30
No. of beneficiaries interviewed: 2

Activity/ Participation	Inform- ed	Consul- ted	Partici- pated	Actively parti- cipated	Contro- lled the activities
	1	2	3	4	5
1.Concieving the Project idea					
2.Selection of the Project					
3.Formulation of The project					
4.Execution of The project		2	2	2	2
5.Evaluation of The project					

2. Name of the project: Paddy cultivation
 Kollayil Village Panchayat
 Total no. of beneficiaries: Farmers of project area, not specified
 No. of beneficiaries interviewed: 9

Activity/ Participation	Informed 1	Consul- ted 2	Partici- pated 3	Actively Partici- pated 4	Controlled the activities 5
1.Concieving the Project idea					
2.Selection of the Project			8	3	
3.Formulation of The project					
4.Execution of The project			8	8	
5.Evaluation of The project					

3. Name of the project:

Vaikkottukonam Lift Irrigation
Kadakkavur Village Panchayat

Total no. of beneficiaries:

Farmers of project area, not specified

No. of beneficiaries interviewed: 8

Activity/ Participation	Informed 1	Consul- ted 2	Partici- pated 3	Actively Partici- pated 4	Controlled the activities 5
1.Concieving the Project idea			1		
2.Selection of the Project		1	2	1	
3.Formulation of The project			2	1	
4.Execution of The project			4	3	
5.Evaluation of The project					

4. Name of the project: Chavarcode Ela Lift Irrigation
 Navaikulam Village Panchayat
 Total no. of beneficiaries: Farmers of project area, not specified
 No. of beneficiaries interviewed: 7

Activity/ Participation	Informed 1	Con- sulted 2	Partici- pated 3	Actively Partici- pated 4	Controlled the activities 5
1.Concieving the Project idea					
2.Selection of the Project		1	4	2	
3.Formulation of The project		1	3	3	
4.Execution of The project			2	1	
5.Evaluation of The project					

5.Name of the project

Chooryode Lift Irrigation

Parassala Block Panchayat

Total no. of beneficiaries:

Farmers of project area, not specified

No. of beneficiaries interviewed:

10

Activity/ Participation	Informed 1	Consul- ted 2	Partici- pated 3	Actively Partici- pated 4	Controlled the activities 5
1.Concieving the Project idea	2	3	2		
2.Selection of the Project		1	3		
3.Formulation of The project	4	5	9	3	
4.Execution of The project	3	4	5	3	
5.Evaluation of The project					

6. Name of the project: Kavukulam Lift Irrigation
 Parassala Village Panchayat
 Total no. of beneficiaries: Farmers of project area, not specified
 No. of beneficiaries interviewed: 3

Activity/ Participation	Informed 1	Consul- ted 2	Partici- pated 3	Actively Partici- pated 4	Controlled the activities 5
1. Conceiving the Project idea			1	1	
2. Selection of the Project			1	1	
3. Formulation of The project			1	1	
4. Execution of The project			3	1	
5. Evaluation of The project			1	1	

8. Name of the project: Coir Mats and Matting Society
 Chirayinkeezhu Block Panchayat
 Total no. of beneficiaries: 180 members of society
 No. of beneficiaries interviewed: 9

Activity/ Participation	Informed 1	Con- sul- ted 2	Partici- pated 3	Actively Partici- pated 4	Controlled the activities 5
1.Concieving the Project idea					
2.Selection of the Project		8	1	1	
3.Formulation of The project					
4.Execution of The project			9	9	
5.Evaluation of the project					

12.Name of the project

Grant to Handloom Society

Pallichal Village Panchayat

Total No. of beneficiaries

363 members of the society

No. of beneficiaries interviewed: 10

Activity/ Participation	Informed 1	Consul- ted 2	Partici- pated 3	Actively Partici- pated 4	Controlled the activities 5
1.Concieving the Project idea					
2.Selection of the Project		3	4		
3.Formulation of The project	1	1			
4.Execution of The project			1		
5.Evaluation of The project					

13. Name of the project: Reed-based cottage Industry units, Vellanad Village Panchayat

Total no. of beneficiaries: 200

No. of beneficiaries interviewed: 9

Activity/ Participation	Informed 1	Con- sulted 2	Partici- pated 3	Actively Partici- pated 4	Controlled the activities 5
1. Conceiving the Project idea					
2. Selection of the Project		1	3	1	
3. Formulation of The project		2	3	2	
4. Execution of The project			9	9	1
5. Evaluation of The project					1

14. Name of the project: Pezhumkamukal Water Supply
 Vamanapuram Village Panchayat
 Total no. of beneficiaries: 96 families
 No. of beneficiaries interviewed: 10

Activity/ Participation	Informed 1	Consul- ted 2	Partici- pated 3	Actively Partici- pated 4	Controlled the activities 5
1.Concieving the Project idea			1		
2.Selection of the Project			8		
3.Formulation of The project			7	4	
4.Execution of The project			1	1	
5.Evaluation of The project					

15

Name of the Project:

Chevalakkonam Water Supply
Pazhayakunnummel Village Panchayat

Total no. of beneficiaries:

78 families

No. of beneficiaries interviewed: 5

Activity/ Participation	Informed 1	Consul- ted 2	Partici- pated 3	Actively Partici- pated 4	Controlled the activities 5
1.Concieving the Project idea		1			
2.Selection of the Project			2		
3.Formulation of The project					
4.Execution of The project	1	1	3	2	
5.Evaluation of The project					

18. Name of the project: Renovation of Kunnathukulam
 Kudappanakkunnu Village Panchayat
 Total no. of beneficiaries: Local people, not specified
 No. of beneficiaries interviewed: 10

Activity/ Participation	Informed 1	Con- sulted 2	Partici- pated 3	Actively Partici- pated 4	Controlled the activities 5
1.Concieving the Project idea	4	5	5	1	
2.Selection of the Project					
3.Formulation of The project					
4.Execution of The project			2	1	
5.Evaluation of the project					

19. Name of the project

Labour Bank

Kunnathukal Village Panchayat

Total no. of beneficiaries:

Farmers and labourers,not specified

No. of beneficiaries interviewed: 10

]

Activity/ Participation	Informed 1	Consul- ted 2	Partici- pated 3	Actively Partici- pated 4	Controlled the activities 5
1.Concieving the Project idea			1		
2.Selection of the Project	1		3	1	
3.Formulation of the project		1	2	1	
4.Execution of the project		1	2	1	
5.Evaluation of the project					

20. Name of the Project:

Women Self-help Groups
Venganoor Village Panchayat

Total no. of beneficiaries:

Members of 6 groups

No. of beneficiaries interviewed:

6

Activity/ articipation	Informed 1	Consul- ted 2	Partici- pated 3	Actively Partici- pated 4	Controlled the activities 5
1.Concieving the poject idea		2	2	2	
2.Selection of the project		1	4	4	
3.Formulation of the roject		1	5	4	
4.Execution of te project		1	4	3	
5.Evaluation of te project					

**SURVEY RESULTS: RESPONSES OF SAMPLE
BENEFICIARIES TO QUESTIONNAIRE
[Percent]**

Questions	Projects		
	Mushroom Cultivation, Athiyannur B.P.	Paddy cultivation, Kollayil G.P.	Renovation of Vaikkottukulam, Kadakkavur G.P
	[2]	[9]	[8]
1.As a beneficiary/local resident, do you get any direct benefit from the project			
1.Yes	100	100	88
2.No			12
2.If not do you get any indirect benefit			
1.Yes			
2.No			12
3Have you participated in the activities of this project			
1.Yes	100	100	88
2.No			12
4.Apart from participation what are your other contributions to the project			
1.Money/Materials			
2.Voluntary services	100		100
3.Nothing		100	
5.Have you paid anything as beneficiaries' contribution for the project			
1.Yes	100		
2.No		100	100

6.If yes, do you get any benefit commensurate with your contribution			
1.Yes			
2.No	100		
7.Do you think that this project will help the development of your locality			
1.Yes		100	100
2.No	100		
3. Do not know			
8.If not, do you have any better programme to suggest			
1.Yes	100		
2.No		100	100
9.Do you think that there was any personal/political interest in the selection of this project			
1.Yes			
2.No	100	100	100
3.Do not know			
10.Do you think that there was any irregularity or corruption in the implementation of this project			
1.Yes	100		
2.No		100	100
3.Do not know			
11.Do you think that this project in its present form will continue to sustain			
1,Yes	50	67	100
2.No	50	33	
3.Do not know			

12. Do you have any suggestion to improve the working of this project			
1. Yes	100	67	100
2. No		33	

Questions

Projects

Chavarkode Ela develop- ment, Navai- kulam G.P. [7]	Chooryode Lift Irrigation Parassala B.P. [10]	Kavukulam Lift Irriga- tion, Para- ssala G.P. [3]
---	---	---

1. As a local resident, do you get any direct benefit from the project			
1. Yes		100	100
2. No	100		
2. If not, do you get any indirect benefit			
1. Yes			
2. No	100		
3. Have you participated in the activities of this project			
1. Yes	100	100	100
2. No			
4. Apart from participation what are your other contributions to the project			
1. Money/Materials		100	
2. Voluntary services	100	100	67
3. Nothing			33
5. Have you paid anything as beneficiaries' contribution for the project			
1. Yes		20	
2. No	100	80	100

6.If yes, do you get any benefit commensurate with your contribution			
1.Yes			
2.No			20
7.Do you think that this project will help the development of your locality			
1.Yes	100	100	100
2.No			
3. Do not know			
8.If not, do you have any better programme to suggest			
1.Yes			
2.No	100	100	100
9.Do you think that there was any personal/political interest in the selection of this project			
1.Yes			33
2.No	100	100	67
3.Do not know			
10.Do you think that there was any irregularity or corruption in the implementation of this project			
1.Yes			
2.No	100	100	100
3.Do not know			
11.Do you think that this project in its present form will continue to sustain			
1, Yes	100	100	33
2.No			33
3.Do not know			33

12. Do you have any suggestion to improve the working of this project			
1. Yes	100	100	33
2. No			67

Questions

Projects

	Grant to Coir Society, Chira- yinkeezhu G.P [9]	Grant to Hand- loom Co-op. Society, Palli- chal G.P [10]	Reed-based Industries, Vellanad G.P. [9]
1. As a local resident, do you get any direct benefit from the project			
1. Yes	100	100	100
2. No			
2. If not, do you get any indirect benefit			
1. Yes			
2. No			
3. Have you participated in the activities of this project			
1. Yes	100	100	89
2. No			11
4. Apart from participation what are your other contributions to the project			
1. Money/Materials	100		100
2. Voluntary services			
3. Nothing		100	
5. Have you paid anything as beneficiaries' contribution for the project			
1. Yes	100		100
2. No		100	

6.If yes, do you get any benefit commensurate with your contribution			
1.Yes	100	100	89
2.No			11
7.Do you think that this project will help the development of your locality			
1.Yes	100	100	100
2.No			
3. Do not know			
8.If not, do you have any better programme to suggest			
1.Yes			
2.No	100	100	100
9.Do you think that there was any personal/political interest in the selection of this project			
1.Yes			
2.No	100	100	100
3.Do not know			
10.Do you think that there was any irregularity or corruption in the implementation of this project			
1.Yes			
2.No	100	100	100
3.Do not know			
11.Do you think that this project in its present form will continue to sustain			
1,Yes	100	100	67
2.No			33
3.Do not know			

12. Do you have any suggestion to improve the working of this project

1. Yes	67	40	100
2. No	33	60	

Questions

Projects

Pezhumkamukal water Supply, Vamanapuram G.P	Chevalakkonam Water supply Pazhamakunnummel G.P.	Panchikkala Water Supply, Poovar G.P
---	--	--------------------------------------

[10]

[5]

[9]

1. As a local resident, do you get any direct benefit from the project

1. Yes			
2. No	100	100	100

2. If not, do you get any indirect benefit

1. Yes			100
2. No	100	100	

3. Have you participated in the activities of this project

1. Yes	90		89
2. No	10	100	11

4. Apart from participation what are your other contributions to the project

1. Money/Materials			55
2. Voluntary services	60	100	33
3. Nothing	40		12

5. Have you paid anything as beneficiaries' contribution for the project

1. Yes		100	
2. No	100		100

6.If yes, do you get any benefit commensurate with your contribution				
1.Yes				
2.No			100	
7.Do you think that this project will help the development of your locality				
1.Yes	100		100	100
2.No				
3. Do not know				
8.If not, do you have any better programme to suggest				
1.Yes				
2.No	100		100	100
9.Do you think that there was any personal/political interest in the selection of this project				
1.Yes				
2.No	100		100	100
3.Do not know				
10.Do you think that there was any irregularity or corruption in the implementation of this project				
1.Yes				
2.No	100		100	100
3.Do not know				
11.Do you think that this project in its of present form will continue to sustain				
1,Yes	100		100	100
2.No				
3.Do not know				

12.Do you have any sugges- tion to improve the wor- king of this project			
1.Yes	80	100	100
2.No	20		

Questions

Projects

Questions	Projects		
-----	-----		
	Renovation of Kunnathukulam, dappanakku- nnu G.P.	Labour Bank, Kunnathukal G.P	Women self- help groups. Venganur G.P.
	[10]	[10]	[9]
1.As a local resident, do you get any direct benefit from the project			
1.Yes	100	100	100
2.No			
2.If not, do you get any indirect benefit			
1.Yes			
2.No			
3.Have you participated in the activities of this project			
1.Yes	100	80	100
2.No		20	
4.Apart from participation what are your other contri- butions to the project			
1.Money/Materials			100
2.Voluntary services	100	70	67
3.Nothing		30	
5.Have you paid anything as beneficiaries' contri- bution for the project			

1.Yes		80	100
2.No	100	20	
6.If yes, do you get any benefit commensurate with your contribution			
1.Yes	100	100	100
2.No			
7.Do you think that this project will help the development of your locality			
1.Yes	100	100	100
2.No			
3. Do not know			
8.If not, do you have any better programme to suggest			
1.Yes			
2.No	100	100	100
9.Do you think that there was any personal/political interest in the selection of this project			
1.Yes		20	
2.No	100	80	100
3.Do not know			
10.Do you think that there was any irregularity or corruption in the implementation of this project			
1.Yes			
2.No	100	100	100
3.Do not know			
11.Do you think that this project in its present form will continue to sustain			
1,Yes	100	100	100
2.No			
3.Do not know			

12. Do you have any suggestion to improve the working of this project

1. Yes

100

100

100

2. No

Note: Figures in brackets show the number of respondents

Appendix ii

List of projects collected from the annual plan documents of Panchayats and Municipalities and included in the sampling frame.

Sl.No	Name of project	Year	Plan outlay (Rs.'000)	Status as on end-March 2001
1	Watershed development,Pachallloor	1997-98	800	Departmentally implemented
2	Watershed development, Aruvikkara	” ”	2000	”
3	Fodder grass cultivation Chettachal Farm	“ “	519	”
4	Mobile Avian Diagnostic Laboratory	“ “	1000	”
5	Ornamental Fishes Exhibition City at Akkulam	“ “	1000	”
6	Providing facilities for goat and pig farming in Vithura Jersey Farm	1998-99	1444	”
7	Fish landing center at Pulluvila	“ “	1150	”
8	Drinking water project, Kadakkavoor.	1999-00		
9	Vithura Jersey Farm		1214	”
<u>2.BLOCK PANCHAYATS</u>				
PARASSALA				
10	Kunniyode-Kazhithanvila irrigation scheme	“	318	Not started
11	Women Tailoring Unit	“	240	”
12	Women Self-help Society	“	275	”
13	Renovation of Kandamonkottu kulam	“	209	”

14	A unit in the model of SGSY	“	238	”
15	Chooryod Lift Irrigation	1998-99	246	Completed
16	Drinking water project, Pozhiyur	“	225	incomplete
17	Women Restaurant	1997-98	830	”
18	Leather Production Unit	“	533	Completed
19	Mushroom cultivation	“	533	“
20	Panchayat Shopping Complex	1998-99	300	“
21	Sabarimuttam drinking water project	“	500	Cancelled
22	Soil and water conservation: Kannamkulam, Athiyannur	1999-00	300	“
23	“ Chirayilkulam, Venganoor	“	350	Completed
24	“ Vellotukulam, Athiyannur	“	300	Cancelled
25	“ Thennurkonam kulam Vizhinjam	“	300	Proposal stage
26	“ Azhakulam, Venganoor	“	400	Completed
27	“ Poonkulam kulam, Thiruvallam	“	600	Cancelled
28	“ Marthandum kulam, Venganoor	“	700	Work in progress
29	“ Malinamkulam, Kanjiramkulam	“	600	Cancelled
30	Ottukal Valiathode minor irrigation	“	300	Work in progress
PERUMKADAVILA				
31	Distribution of drinking water in public places NEMOM	“	325	Trivandrum city
32	Indo-Tech Unit	“	323	“

TRIVANDRUM RURAL

Nil

VELLANAD

33	Development of Reed-based industries	1998-99	650	Completed
34	Bee-keeping	“	375	Not started
35	Renovation of Chettadikulam, Chempanakkodu	1999- 2000	400	Not complete
36	Attummoola-Chettachal Darbha canal (s.o.)	“	400	NA
37	Renovation of Palekkonam kulam	“	300	”
38	Kodiyarathara-Irachippara channel	“	400	”
39	Kallinkalnada-Mylottumuzhi Channel	“	300	”
40	Nakkara-Alanada Channel	“	400	”
41	Pulimoodu-Palathinkaramukku channel	“	300	”
42	Vitalam channel	“	300	Incomplete
43	Kanchiyooekonam- Anchuthenginkada channel	“	300	NA
44	Pongode-Kecharikkakam channel	“	400	”
45	Bamboo-based industries	“	1000	Completed
46	Water harvesting	“	700	NA
47	Bee- keeping	“	400	Completed
48	Renovation of Kattanakkodu kulam	“	300	NA
49	“ Puthukulangarachira	“	400	”
50	Mini ITI	“	850	”

KAZHAKKOOTAM				
51	Fish marketing stall	1998-99	420	Completed
52	Kariyil Elathodu irrigation project	“	400	NA
53	Mini Industrial Estate	“	1000	Partially complete
54	Pullikkadu-Poovan drinking water scheme	“	300	NA
55	Women Industrial Estate	1999-00	500	”
CHIRAYINKIL				
56	Grant to coir society	1998-99	500	Completed
57	Women Tailoring Unit	“	300	Not started
KILIMANUR				
58	Industrial Training Centre	“	300	Incomplete
59	Women Printing Press	“	1000	Not started
NEDUMANGAD				
60	Manufacture of hollow bricks	1999-00	400	“
61	“ “ - Women	“	600	“
<u>3 MUNICIPALITIES</u>				
NEYYATINKARA				
62	Women readymade garments	“	925	NA
63	Book binding unit (sc)	“	495	“
NEDUMANGAD				
64	Mini industrial estate-acquisition of land	1997-98	1302	Completed
65	Bio-fertilizer from waste-Purchase of tractor	“	393	Complted

66	Building for Kusarkod industrial estate		1998-99	1210	NA
67	Land acquisition for repographic sub-centre		“	478	”
ATTINGAL					
68	Avanavanchery lift irrigation scheme		1999-00	400	”
69	Steel factory		“	500	Not started
70	Women small industries unit		“	300	Training only
VARKALA					
71	Development of Punnamood fish market		“	500	Not started
72	Manufacture of bio-fertilizer		“	1000	“
73	Women-run stall		“	600	Completed
74	Tractor for waste removal		“	315	“
<u>4. VILLAGE PANCHAYATS</u>					
75	Parassala	Kavukulam lift irrigation	1999-00	300	Completed
76	“	Fish marketing centre for women	“	236	“
77	Poovar	Drinking water project Panchikkala and Payanthi	1998-99	718	Incomplete
78	“	Distribution of drinking water	“	645	“
79	Karode	Readymade garment centre	1998-99	231	Completed
80	“	“ (sc)	“	300	”
81	Kulathur	Mazhuvara drinking Water project	1999-00	300	incomplete
82	“	Tacharikkulam water supply	“	300	”

83	Karumkulam	Garment units (women)	1998-99	309	Completed
84	Vizhinjam	Tourist cottage Kovalam	1997-98	1200	”
85	”	Development of Kadaikkulam Ela channel	”	285	”
86	“	Market stall	1998-99	200	Not started
87	“	Fish- peeling shed	“	600	Completed
88	Venganoor	Chirathalavilakom drinking water project	”	2000	Incomplete
89	“	Women’s’ self help groups	1999-00	200	Completed
90	“	Drinking water project		200	NA
91	Thiruvallam	Land acquisition for Coir industry unit	1998-99	230	Trivandrum city
92	“	Puravila drinking water project	“	1141	“
93	Perumpazhuthur	Community irrigation project[sc]	“	201	Neyyatinkara Municipality
94	Vellarada	Drinking water project	1999-00	500	Incomplt
95	Kunnathukal	Copra processing unit	1998-99	200	Not started
96	“	Labour Bank	“	199	Completed
97	Amboori	Renovation of Amboorikkulam	“	200	“
98	Athiyannur	Sabarimuttam drinking water project	“	500	Incomplete

99	Kollayil	Drinking water project	1999-00	800	”
100	Kallikkad	Kalippara water supply Scheme	“	350	“
101	Malayinkil	Land for watersupply Scheme	1997-98	247	“
102	”	Mini cattle feed factory	1998-99	208	“
103	“	Printing press	”	208	Not started
104	Nemom	Land for small industry Unit	1998-99	327	”
105	“	Industrial shed in Panchayat land	1999-00	500	Trivandrum City
106	Kalliyur	Land for power loom Industry	1998-99	250	Not started
107	Pallichal	Renovation of Thunkottukulam	“	250	Completed
108	Marana- llur	Land for overhead tank	“	250	NA
109	“	Bag manufacturing unit	“	293	”
110	Vellanad	Reed-based industry unit	“	350	Complted
111	Vithura	Industrial unit for Women	“	250	”
112	Uzhama- lakkal	Vocational training center for women	1997-98	280	NA
113	“	Land for industrial estate	“	250	”
114	Tholikkod	Typewriting and DTP Center for women	1999-00	410	”
115	Karakulam	Computer center	1997-98	761	Completed
116	“	Rural study centre	1998-99	315	”
117	“	Karimpuvila-Chirakudi water supply scheme	”	210	N A

118	“	Industrial co-operative society	“	1017	”
119	“	Thannipoika drinking water scheme	1999-00		”
120	Vempayam	Land for women Industrial unit	1998-99	300	Not started
121	“	Swimming pool	“	375	“
122	“	Building for women self employment unit	1999-00	494	“
123	Kudappanakkunnu	Khadi industries co-operative society	“	200	”
124	“	Renovation of Kunnathukulam	1997-98	550	Completed
125	Vattiyurkkavu	Kattathela minor irrigation scheme	1998-99	200	NA
126	“	Industrial production unit (women)	“	200	”
127	“	Women welfare co-operative Society	“	275	”
128	“	DTP training centre	1999-00	500	”
129	Pallichal	Renovation of Poonkottukulam	1998-99	380	Completed
130	“	Drinking water project	“	225	Incomplete
131	“	Handloom production and marketing center	1999-00	308	Completed
132	Kadakampally	Book binding unit (sc)	1998-99	315	Trivandrum city
133	Ulloor	Development of Kazhukumood colony	“	400	“

134	Aryanad	Women computer training Center	1999-00	527	NA
135	Poovachal	Labour army	“	300	Not started
136	“	Women garment manufacturing unit	1997-98	211	“
137	Kattakkada	Women self-employment Groups	1999-2000	200	Completed
138	Attipra	Computer training For women	“	350	”
139	Pothencod	Women consumer store	“	200	NA
140	Azhoor	Women tailoring unit	1998-99	300	”
141	“	Women co-operative	“	200	”
142	Kadakkavoor	Renovation of Vaikkottukulam	1997-98	650	Completed
143	Kallara	Women industrial co-operative	1999-00	350	NA
144	Vamanapuram	Pezhumkamukal drinking water supply scheme	1998-99	217	Completed
145	“	Women Tailoring Society	“	217	Incomplete
146	Pangode	Women Poultry Farm	“	300	NA
147	”	Women bee-keeping unit	“	320	”
148	Nanniyode Training	Women Computer Centre	1999-00	350	Completed
149	Manikkal	Swimming pool	1998-99	800	Incomplete

150	“	Women industrial unit- Note books and envelopes	1999-00	685	Not started
151	“	Industrial park	“	400	“
152	Pazhaya- Kunnummal.	Chevalakkonam Water supply	1998-99	303	Completed
153	“	Attinbhagom Pump house	“	369	Incomplete
154	“	Note book manufacturing	“	200	Not started
155	“	Women bakery	“	263	”
156	Madavoor	Women consumer society	“	345	NA
157	Nagarur	Women small industry unit	1999-00	600	”
158	Navaikulam	Chavarkode Ela- model irrigation	1998-99	540	Completed
159	“	“ lead channel	1999-00	320	“
160	“	Women industrial unit	“	350	Not started
161	Manamboor	Valakkottamala water scheme	“	201	N A
162	Cherunniyur	Women industrial units	1998-99	300	”
163	“	Sivanada drinking water scheme	“	150	”

Select References

1. **Amitava Mukherjee (Ed.) (1995)**, *Participatory Rural Appraisal: Methods and Applications in Rural Planning*, **Vikas Publishing House, New Delhi**
2. **Colin Kirkpatrick (Ed.) (1991)** *Project Rehabilitation in Developing Countries*, **Routledge, London**
3. **Cusword, J.W. and Franks T.R. (Ed.) (1993)**, *Managing Projects in Developing Countries*, **Longman, U.K.**
4. **David Mars den and Peter Oakley (Ed.) (1990)**, *Evaluating Social Development Projects*, **Oxfam, Oxford.**
5. **David Mosse et al (Ed), (1998)**, *Development as Process: Concepts and Methods for Working with Complexity*, **Rutledge, London.**
6. **Hartmut Schneider and Marie Helene Libercier, (Ed) (1995)**, *Participatory Development from Advocacy to Action*, **OECD, Paris.**
7. **Howard E.Freedman, Peter H.Rossi and Sonia R. Wright, (1979)**, *Evaluating Social Projects in Developing Countries;* **Development Centre of OECD.**
8. **James G. Albert (Ed), (1974)**, *Social Experiments and Social Programme Evaluation*, **Ballinger Publishing Co. Cambridge.**
9. **John Moris and James Cope stake, (1993)** *Qualitative Enquiry for Rural Development: A Review*, **International Technology Publications Ltd, London.**
10. **J.W.Cusworth and T.R.Franks,(Ed),(1993)**,*Managing Projects in Developing Countries*, **Longman, UK.**
11. **Kanchan Chopra, Gopal K. Kadekodi and M.N.Murthy,(1990)**, *Participatory Development: People and Common Property Resources*, **Saga Publications New Delhi**
12. **Lawrence F. Salman (1987)**, *Listen to the People: Participant Observer Evaluation of Development Projects*, **Oxford University Press.**
13. **Overseas Development Administration (1995)**, *A Guide to Social Analysis for Projects in Developing Countries*, **London.**
14. **Robert Chambers (1997)**, *Who's Reality Counts? Putting the First Last*, **Intermediate Technology Publications, London.**
15. **Sunil Bastion and Nicholas Bastian,(1996)** *Assessing Participation:A Debate from South Asia*, **Konark Publishing House, New Delhi.**
16. **U.N.Asia and Pacific Development Institute, (1980)**, *Local Level Planning and Rural Development: Alternative Strategies*, **Concept Publishing Co. New Delhi.**
17. **Vijay Padaki (Ed) (1995)**, *Development Intervention and Programme Evaluation: Concepts and Cases*, **Saga Publications, New Delhi.**