

1) BACKGROUND

The Western India Rainfed Farming Project (WIRFP) was initiated in 1993. Phase-I, the pilot phase of the project, had been implemented by KRIBHCO during **1993-1999** under "**KRIBHCO Indo-British Rain fed Farming Project (KRIBP)**" banner. Around **80** villages of three districts of Gujarat, Rajasthan and Madhya Pradesh were identified to develop a model for uptake of technologies through an integrated farming system approach. Total outlay of 1st Phase was Rs. 19.06 crores and local cost was Rs. 11.45 crores.

The project components during Phase-I were designed in a way to develop an approach for farming system development and livelihoods while the Phase-II builds on the lessons learnt in Phase-I and contains some new strengthened components as:

- Promotion of farming system development and livelihoods.
- Enhancing dissemination through partnership.
- Participatory Technology Generation.
- Innovative programmes like Challenge Fund and Migrant Support Programmes.

Phase-II was sanctioned for a period of seven years from April 1999 to March 2006, during this **699** villages have been covered, of which project invested financially on **202** Villages (core villages) and also used community resources to scale up **497** dissemination villages.

GOAL

More effective policies and programs, which reduce poverty in Rainfed areas of India, implemented widely by 2010.

PURPOSE

Livelihoods of 6,75,000 poor rural people in selected areas of western India sustainably enhanced and technologies used widely disseminated.

EXPECTED OUTPUTS

- Output 1: Sustainable farmer managed groups, Self Help Groups, Federations, Linkages with other Institutions, village Specialists (Jankars) and Participatory Planning & Implementing System operational in 202 villages.
- Output 2: Appropriate Farming System & Technologies tested, adapted and implemented in 202 Core villages.
- Output 3: Off-farm employment, income-generating and expenditure-saving activities for women and men promoted in all core villages, including direct support to migrant laborers.
- Output 4: Appropriate Project technologies disseminated to farmers in 535 dissemination (Prasar) villages.
- Output 5: Appropriate approaches & technologies actively promoted in a further 1000 villages via GO/ NGO/ PRI/ CBO partners.
- Output 6: New Project approaches and participatory technology and approaches generated, tested and made available in project villages and more widely in the region.
- Output 7: More sustainable and effective ways of

Project Area	Rajasthan	Gujarat	Ratlam	Jhabua	Total
District Covered	2	2	1	2	7
Cluster Undertaken	24	8	14	19	65
No. of Core Villages	60	20	50	72	202
No. of Dissemination Villages	175	75	105	142	497

End of Project Report-WIRFP

Total outlay of Phase-II is Rs. 148.53 crores of which local cost is Rs. 87.12 crores (Reimbursable cost from DFID 82% and from KRIBHCO 6%).

1.1 SOME KEY SUCCESSES OF PHASE - I

- Confident communities better able to articulate their needs and with better relationships between men and women;
- An effective model to promote and support village groups;
- Village specialists (JANKARS) effectively using technical and organizational skills;
- An innovative demand-led approach to research and implementation.;
- Community designed and implemented soil and water conservation;
- Leveraging of government funds and influencing government policies to adopt approaches

1.2 ISSUES AND CONCERNS FOR PHASE - II

Emphasize use of participatory techniques e.g. regular field visits; PRA's; Issue focused PRA's etc.

- Mainstream project activities through partnership with government and non-government agencies, including research institutes.
- Enhance groups' capacity to function independently of the project with more attention to savings and credit, and federations, co-operatives and other formal group structures.
- Strengthen non-land based activities, including a pilot migrant support program;
- Fast track the "model" for its replicability and cost effectiveness, and make Jankars more responsible for project extension;
- Mainstream gender through sensitization, more supportive personnel policies and gender appraisal;
- Emphasize wasteland development and other common property;
- Strengthen KRIBHCO and IFFDC management systems and arrangements;
- Introduce withdrawal strategies and additional impact assessment for its new elements.

2) ABOUT GVT

2.1 GENESIS

Krishak Bharti Cooperative Limited (KRIBHCO) by virtue of its occupation in the manufacture, distribution and marketing of nitrogenous fertilizers, bio-fertilizers and seeds for the benefits of farmers in India is a settler of GVT, which is entirely a separate legal entity, a Trust, as Gramin Vikas Trust (GVT).

Gramin Vikas Trust established in 1999, extends technical as well as financial assistance to the socially, economically disadvantaged people living in rural areas by

- Evolving, developing and implementing gender and poverty focused participatory approaches for agriculture research and development through integrated farming system.
- Establishing village based self-help groups/institutions, largely to facilitate the process of sustainable agriculture development.

The Trust aims to establish and maintain long-term links with the state Governmental Organizations, Community Based Organizations (CBO's), external donors and Institutions, so as to be able to learn and replicate similar approaches in other parts of the country.

VISION

GVTs' Vision envisages being a fully autonomous and independent organization that is recognized nationally and internationally as a reputed organization with the capacity to:

- Meet the goal of sustainable and equitable poverty reduction in rural Rainfed areas of India.
- Build partnerships, provide strategic support and share experience with other agencies as resource organization.

MISSION

To act as a catalyst to enable the socially and economically disadvantaged rural and tribal communities to improve their livelihood on a sustainable basis especially those in resource poor and Rainfed areas.

STRATEGY

- Prioritization and negotiation of development options through the active use of PRA's- meeting the needs of poor and women (i.e. through Annual Village Work Plans)
- The formation of village self help groups leading to develop and capacitate local men and women to share more responsibilities for better livelihoods.
- Development of Wastelands through village cooperatives for afforestation by linking them with Gram Panchayat.

APPROACH

- An effective project model to promote and support village groups.
- Bottom up involving communities in planning, prioritization and implementation.
- Process approach, blue prints fixed targets to be avoided.
- Develop rapport, interest and trust between community's experts and self.
- Flexible time frames, innovative demand led approach to research.
- Promote collective action(s) and overcome individual benefits – equity.
- Awareness building and workshops of communities, self and experts for sustainable rural livelihoods.
- Search, testing and up scaling of farmers preferred production technologies.

3) PROJECT AREA : WIRFP – II

The project has worked for sustainable livelihood enhancement of poor community in highly risk prone tribal (Bhil) dominated area covering 7 districts namely Dahod, Panchmahal in Gujarat, Ratlam, Jhabua and Dhar in Madhya Pradesh, Banswara and Dungarpur in Rajasthan. In its seven years duration WIRFP worked in **202** core villages and **497** dissemination villages, covering **93,774** of households and a total population of **6,46,701** persons.

Project area is characterized by low and variable rainfall, subsistence agriculture, limited ownership of various assets, work force depending on seasonal migration, limited diversification of economic activities and the area under cultivation has been more or less stagnant over two decades.

AGRO-ECOLOGY OF PROJECT

- Semi Arid Areas of Western Part of India.
- Average rainfall 800 mm – 400 mm with 35 to 60 rainy days per year.
- Receives rainfall from southwest monsoon.
- 3 types of Monsoon aberrations – Early Cessation; Late on-set; long Irregular; Drought Spells.
- High to very high temperatures,
- Topography-hilly, remote (Moderate to High Vindhya / Satpura & Aravalli Ranges, 800 – 2500 ft. varying altitudes)
- Soils highly eroded with sub-soil exposed at middle and upper reaches, occasionally patches of shallow to medium black soils in lower regions. Surfaces very stony.
- Soils low in nitrogen and medium in phosphorous content.

3.1 COMMUNITY LIVELIHOODS PROBLEMS WITHIN THE PROJECT AREA

- Small land holding below– subsistence level agricultural production (75% feed less than 6-8 months)
- Crop based farming with limited livestock.
- Labour – migration – based strategies (65% HHs).
- Low literacy rates (10 – 25% for men and 4-20% for women), low level of Confidence.
- Skewed access to technology, resources, assets and rights.
- Limited access to Government resources.
- Division of labour – misrepresenting women's role (low priority jobs).
- Male lineages and women as property and labour.
- Poor and stretched civic amenities i.e. roads, electricity, housing, health and education.
- Deficit – induced debt.
- Dependence on poor non-land based actions.
- Erosion of traditional systems of collective actions.

End of Project Report-WIRFP

- High infant mortality rate.
- Top-down subsidized investments in natural resources.

3.2 COMMUNITY LIVELIHOOD ASSETS WITHIN THE PROJECT AREA

- Thirst or knowledge and willingness to group working.
- Resilience of natural resources.
- Resilience of village communities – more so women.
- Willingness to diversify income – opportunities.
- Learning by doing.
- Minimize risks through multiple diversified approaches.
- Strong traditional systems of labour sharing.

4) WIRFP - II: PROGRAMMATIC DETAILS

The main components of the project are:

Component A: Farming System Development – Expanding Project interventions, activities to 202 core project villages (where these activities will be concentrated) and 535 proximal villages (where dissemination shall take place), thus bringing substantial livelihood benefits to about 5,60,000 rural poor.

Component B: Promoting Dissemination through Partnership – Project technologies to another 500 villages via GOs, NGOs, PRIs and CBOs in the region (thus benefiting at least another 4,10,000 rural poor) and to selected organizations within the country.

Component C: Participatory Technology Generation – By facilitating links between research institutes and project communities, especially poor.

Component D: Engaging with Government- More sustainable and effective ways of delivering livelihood programmes demonstrated and lessons learnt disseminated.

Component E: Migrant Labour Support Programme

Project has worked in a multi pronged approach to improve poor people's livelihoods, in a sustainable way. For the purpose project has ensured the facilitation of its interventions according to following themes:

4.1 BUILDING COMMUNITY INSTITUTIONS & LINKAGES

- There are **2610** SHGs of which **881 (33.8 %)** are female SHGs, with a total savings of **184.4 lakhs**. All villages have at least one women's groups.
- Meetings in SHGs are held regularly. **65213** meetings with 90% attendance per meeting continued in groups by PY6.
- Proper and timely, as per modalities, recovery of loans observed in **65% SHGs (70% recovery)**. Loan taken for catering to Consumptive need to Productive need stands at **30:70**.
- **340** Groups linked with SGSY, NABARD, SWA-SHAKTI benefiting **5696 H/Hs (40%)**.
- Total **30** formal and **90** informal federations have been formed in the Project area.

- Working with groups (or also called Self-help Groups – SHGs) is one of the key strategies for community engagement as well as a mechanism for project inputs.
- SHGs formed by the project, encouraged savings and credit. Project also used these groups as facilitators for carrying out the project activities at the village level.
- The project encouraged the amalgamation of SHGs into federations, so that in future they will have greater bargaining power and clarity of vision to gain outside support (funds, resources, government programmes) and to better manage of the resources of the villages. Joint maintenance & improvement of CPRs and other activities by, self help federations & other formal structures, meeting equity criteria, started continuing in more than **95%** of villages.
- Focus has been given on backward and forward linkages for Community Groups (SHGs) as a key strategy for linkage, resource sharing and sustainability. Linkages created include other NGOs, Government, PRIs, CBOs, etc.
- Groups, both men and women are showing maturity in dealing with other institutions and taking initiatives and participating in local governance. There is substantial evidence their confidence and knowledge levels have been built up to play a part in local development.

Financial Health of SHG

S. No.	Item	Core	Prasar
1	Age of SHGs (Years)	3.9	2.6
2	Average savings per member per month (Rs.)	25.3	25.8
3	Average total Savings per SHG (Rs.)	42174.8	24372.6
4	Average total credit given to SHGs (Rs.)	32253.1	15125.2
5	Average total credit recovered	16155.9	2685.5
6	Average loan taken from Bank by SHGs (Rs.)	8786.3	9083.3
7	Average Bank Loan refunded by SHGs (Rs.)	5106.7	4929
8	Average loan outstanding (Rs.)	1609.2	1243.7

4.2 EMPOWERING COMMUNITIES THROUGH CAPACITY BUILDING AND SELF HELP

- The project has facilitated various trainings for the community and Jankars either at village level or at different organisations for skill development. The major area in which project provide training are cropping system, micro-credit and micro-finance, soil and water conservation, tree and agro-forestry, aquaculture, paramedical and paravet etc. Keeping in view the importance of exposure in the process of learning communities are being exposed to different Govt. and Non Govt. organisations, which helped them a lot in acquiring innovative ideas for starting the new programme / activities.

- **12** Training Development Centers and **59** Palayan Suchana Kendras and **3** self-started PSK established for training, information and has been actively disseminating technologies and approaches cost-effectively to SHG members, Jankars, PRIs, line departments, NGOs, CBOs etc.
- Project has built a cadre of Community Leaders and facilitators – Jankars. There are **4537** Jankars, of which about **1362** are women and many are independently carrying out the work of Community Organizers.
- All villages have detailed plans (annual, seasonal and long range). Sample study shows **74%** of the very poor category know about the village plans and are active participants – showing a high degree of targeting.
- Project and Jankars have established forward and backward linkages for sustainable micro enterprises and group enterprises – close to a hundred such examples exists across the project – tapping into financial institutions, PRIs, Government, etc. Communities have contributed over **11 %** of all costs of the project (while project document envisages **6 %**). Pilot experiments in different states on working with PRIs has provided the project with different models and approaches.
- Project activities in the **497** dissemination villages are lead by Jankars. Very little facilitation is done by the project.
- **125** Jankars providing their services as resource persons to the GO/NGOs, PRIS on PRA, village development plan, social development and impact studies.

4.3 HELPING COMMUNITIES SUSTAINABLY USE AND MAINTAIN NATURAL RESOURCES

a) Crop Programme – The objective of crop programme is to increase the overall production of food grains and vegetables with the introduction of locally suited high yielding crop varieties. Different activities like Farmer Managed Participatory Trials (FAMPAR), Integrated Crop Management (ICM), Micro irrigation system, bio-fertilizers, NADEP pits, supply of farm tools and implements, supply of crop and vegetables seeds, establishment of research farms, seed multiplication have been taken up in the projects in the project areas.

End of Project Report-WIRFP

- **3229.6 Ha.** Gross cropped (**29%** of total gross cropped area) area brought under testing and adoption of new crops and/or varieties identified during Phase-I & II.
- About **335240** FAMPAR trials done on Maize, Paddy, Pigeon Pea, Chickpea, Soybean, Mustard, Horse gram & Black gram crops on more than 25 varieties with **64874** farmers in **172** villages. For the purpose total **4731.01 Qts.** seeds provided to the farmers.

b) Ergonomics Programme - The main aim of ergonomics programme is to integrate the concepts from social sciences with technological development to humanize technology and thus improve the quality of life. Ergonomics benefits in rural development includes a) Improved productivities; b) Reduced drudgery and fatigue; c) Improved safety and d) Reduced musculo-skeletal injuries. Keeping in view the above benefits project has started working on the issue, which may be solved by the simple ergonomic intervention. A humble attempt has been made by the project to introduce farmers' friendly implements/ technologies in the villages, which can make life easier, save time and can improve working efficiency of both men and women.

Findings of OPR study indicate that **96%** of very poor and **98%** of poor have adopted at least two new technologies.

- **589** Micro Irrigation system installed in **131** villages.
- **8900** Compost Pits constructed in **196** villages.
- **455** water lifting devises (Pump Sets) provided by project
- **291** Travis installed in **203** project villages.
- **133564** Sanitation Kits introduced in **483** project villages.
- Total **18732** farm implements like Spray pumps; Threshers; Chaff cutter; Dutch Hoes (for weeding purpose); Handcarts; Winnowing Fans; Rope making machines; Single Dora (beam extra); Maize Shellers; Ball bearings; Dufans, Khargone type ploughs & Bakharshave been introduced in M.P Project area.
- **1728** NADEP Pits constructed in **52** villages.

End of Project Report-WIRFP

c) Water Resource Development - In WRD programme the main focus given on renovation of well and ponds, construction of new ponds, check dams, bush dams etc for collection of surface water for irrigation and other uses. WRD programme has also included by installing pump sets in different clusters for irrigation purposes.

Improved irrigation has been ensured in **5652** Hectare area indicates **14.94%** increased irrigation in core villages.

- **24000** H/Hs benefited directly through well deepening/Construction, which reduced workload & travel distance for women.
- **2098** wells deepened, **388** wells constructed, **455** Water lifting devises provide like Pump Sets, **2** cannel lining, **6** Lift Irrigation Schemes, **9** Earthen Dams, **8** low cost water harvesting structures (dugout ponds, farm reservoir), **32** Check Dams constructed by PY6.

- **589** Micro Irrigation systems installed, to provide irrigation in kitchen gardens & small orchards.

End of Project Report-WIRFP

d) Soil and Water Conservation - SWC and irrigation are the high priorities of farmers in project villages. These are important in watershed development and sustainable farming systems on long-term. The most of the SWC works is being done in severely degraded lands, where soil is hard with minimum moisture contents. Physical measures like earthen bunds, stone bunds, gully control structures, gabion fixing and other measures are being taken for conserving soil moisture and check soil erosion.

Much emphasis has been paid on this activity to conserve the soil and moisture of the project villages, under this **21994.17 ha.** area (more than 65% of treatable area) has been covered in **163** villages

- Under SWC measures like **985329.87** cum earthen bunds, **476750.42** cum stone bunds, and Gully control structures have been constructed.
- **185** Gabions constructed in **113** villages.

3154196 person days generated through SWC activities by EoP.

e) Tree and Agro forestry programme -Tree programme is an important component of project activities under farming system for development of natural resources in cluster villages. The project not only emphasized on plantation and creating awareness among the participants but also on development of skill of participants to grow nurseries of different types of trees like timber, fruit and fuel trees etc. and its plantation on the waste land and homestead area. Agro forestry programme has also been taken under tree programme.

Under this programme real need identified through IFPRA/FGD (Pre) on fruit , fodder and timber tree species like Bamboo, Teak, Seven, Eucalyptus, Subabool, Guava, Papaya, Mango, Grapes, Lemon, Ber, Aonla, Custard apple and grass species like *Cenchrus*, *Hucawa*, *Hecosophola*, *Deenanath*, *Dhaman* & *Stylo Hamata*.

- **37096.8 kgs.** of grass seeds of four varieties introduced in **163** villages.
- Plantation of fruit and other tree varieties achieved **2369190** saplings average survival rate is more than 30% .

- **25411** nurseries developed by PY6 provided around **10823** plants.
- **4193.71 ha.** of silvi pasture lands being developed in **5** villages where around **41** quintals of grass were sown. The community has processed **45 lacs Pullas** of fodder. Plantation of **174500** trees of fuel and fodder species in this area has also been done.

4.4 LIVESTOCK PROGRAMME

Farming system remains incomplete without livestock. Livestock component provides not only draught animal power for land management and manure for crop production but also ensures increased income and nutritious food for poor community. Project helped the poor community to increase the number of small animals (goatery, piggery, poultry etc.) as per their needs and preferences. Due consideration has also been given for improved rearing methods for existing livestock through organizing veterinary camps and paravet training for developing para vet-professionals at village level.

- Adoption of new / improved practices reached up to **90544** poultry birds (including 4 new breed)/ **4752** goats (including 3 new breed) / **14** dairy (2 new breed) / **291** Travis/**229** Paravet kits/ **745** Chaff cutter etc .
- **7960 H/Hs** involved/benefited from Poultry/ Goatery program.

- **1090** animal health camps organized benefiting around **210573** animals of **41413** H/Hs.
- Around **50** FGD (Post) conducted to evaluate the impact of new poultry/Goats/other issues.

4.5 DRUDGERY REDUCTION (Especially for Women)

The Project promoted several small and medium technologies, esp. those which reduce drudgery of women. Such technologies include Flourmill, Hand pump, smokeless Chula, Ball bearings, maize shellers, Winnowing fans, fiber sheets roof fitments, etc. These are identified through participative exercises and then promoted after piloting and field-testing. Some of the technologies have multiple effects – e.g. well deepening – increases water availability and reduces women’s travel to get potable water, smokeless Chula – reduces fuel wood requirement and also effects of smoke during cooking.

According to the findings of the Output to Purpose review study total 18 drudgery reducing technologies introduced by project, nearly all the women reported usage of at least one such technology. Women have adopted anywhere between 9-14 technologies while men have adopted 12-18 technologies.

- **5250 H/Hs** benefited directly by Hand pump installation/hand pumps repaired, which reduce workload & travel distance.
- **4500 H/Hs** benefited directly by Maize Shellers and **7590 H/Hs** by ball bearing installation in hand grinder reporting reduced workload.5872 H/Hs benefited directly by smokeless Chulhas constructed reporting reduced smoke and fuel

End of Project Report-WIRFP

consumption and **6137 (20%)** households benefited through fiber sheet installation which increased the day light in side the houses.

4.6 COLLABORATIVE RESEARCH WITH STATE AGRICULTURE UNIVERSITIES (Participatory Technology Generation)

The projects have undertaken a number of research programmes in collaboration with State Agricultural Universities and other organisations. The nature of research is mainly participatory with aim to meet the specific need of farmers, community that needs immediate attention.

- a) On the farming front, **9** new crops and **18** different varieties in all are under development through **15** MOUs with agricultural universities. Two varieties already released and several in pipeline. All these are developed participative through **335240** FAMPAR trials conducted (Women form **30 %** of the FAMPAR participants) and **3768 Ha.** under improved crops. Initial feedback from communities has been very positive. **3768 Ha.** already under improved varieties / crops.
- b) Production and productivity increases in tree and fodder is becoming evident. Varieties and experiments of the project has produced several success stories (E.G. Giriraja poultry bird). **35662 Ha.** is under horticulture and **92389** benefit from livestock programme
- c) SWC measures have treated **21994.17 Ha** in **163** villages, generating about **3154196** employment days.
- d) Sample study shows that **100 %** of women contacted use at least one drudgery reduction technology promoted by project (total **18** in all). **36** new Farming System Development (FSD) technologies promoted.
- e) Sample study shows **96 %** of Very Poor and **98 %** of Poor have adopted at least two technologies.
- f) Common Property Resources – In a Sample Study, **254** kinds (5-6 per village) of them have been facilitated by the project. **85 %** of them are operational and **66 %** of beneficiaries are the very poor and poor and **45 %** women.
- g) Some evidence of increased production, coverage exist. Various new varieties of trees and nurseries have been developed. **35662 Ha.** has been brought under horticulture. Several experiments on silvipasture being conducted. About **6536 HHs** have benefited from livestock programme.
- h) Sample Study shows over **40 %** of farmers have come forward to adopt new technologies, a similar percentage of women participating. **45 %** of all benefits have accrued to very poor category.

Average Crop Production of different Crops in Project Areas (in Quintals)

End of Project Report-WIRFP

S. NO.	CROP	GUJARAT	M.P.	RAJASTHAN
1.	MAIZE	750	800	950
2.	COTTON	-	3200	3350
3.	BLACK GRAM	620	620	875
4.	SOYABEAN	-	1600	1850
5.	UPLAND RICE	740	740	860
6.	CHICKPEA	-	-	550
7.	VEGETABLES	1850	1533	-
8.	PIGEON PEA	1300	1300	1300

4.7 IMPROVING LIVELIHOOD OPTIONS OF THE POOR

Increased income & reduced costs: The Project's approach on improved income livelihoods have several facets:

- Improved utilization of existing resources (through crops, SWC and other NR based programmes).
- New micro enterprises for the groups – which help in supplementing and complementing incomes
- Reduction in expenditure (some of them wasteful), so that more money is available
- New support programmes, such as the Migrant Labour Support Programmes (MLSP) which helps organize and improve the earnings of those who migrate.
- Complementary activities improved consumption within families from vegetables, poultry and improved live stock health & production in the village.

➤ Findings of the "Study of Impact of WIRFP on Net Incomes of Target Households" indicates that **54%** of households from the lower wealth ranks registered **25%** increase in income from complementary activities.

▪ The same study revealed that in terms of creating additional employment opportunities, the project inputs had contributed to increases in cultivated area and irrigated area (in Rabi), developing new enterprises (brick laying, grocery shops), and improving incomes through livestock (mainly poultry). About 50% of Phase II respondent households reported increases in employment days at local level due to project.

➤ According to the findings of the Output to Purpose review study **22%** household have taken up at least one IGA, trained and supported by project. **25%** of very poor and poor households have taken up at least one project supported/ initiated IGA.

State of IGA Activities initiated in Project Villages

S. No.	Type of IGAs	Gujarat		Madhya Pradesh		Rajasthan	
		No. of beneficiaries	Amount spent (In Rs. Lakhs)	No. of beneficiaries	Amount spent (In Rs. Lakhs)	No. of beneficiaries	Amount spent (In Rs. Lakhs)
CORE VILLAGE							
1	Agro Based	359	7.04	4673	47.5	2563	9.1
2	Non-Agro Based	1825	12.2	2917	27.4	7460	26.1
DISSEMINATION VILLAGES							
1	Agro Based	8	0.05	2998	19.3	Nil	Nil
2	Non-Agro Based	20	0.75	2659	19.9	Nil	Nil

4.8 SUSTAINING PARTNERSHIPS TO HELP POOR

The project worked in close partnerships with various agencies – NGOs, CBOs, Government Departments, PRIs and Academic institutions. For a detailed account of GVT’s work with various partner organisations,

The technologies developed by the project are disseminated through the partners. In some cases, the Project and its resources have been utilized by GOs and NGOs. The Project has also gained by collaborating with various resource agencies, drawing on their specific help or domain knowledge.

5) INNOVATIONS

The project has over a period of time, through the process of trial and error and experimentation been able to develop successful strategies to counter poverty in a comprehensive manner. In the pursuit of poverty alleviation, the project has come across a number of learning and innovations, the value of which cannot be underestimated. Following are the glimpses of main innovations:

5.1 JANKAR SYSTEM

Jankar is a paraprofessional, identified by the community, who serves as an internal catalyst, information bank, service provider, trainer, knowledge disseminator and innovator. The Jankar provides help to a village group in monitoring and acts as a link between Government or any extension agency and community.

Trained male and female Jankars have been instrumental in facilitating both planning, implementing and monitoring activities with the communities. The Jankar system is used intensively by the local community, neighboring villages, government organizations, non-government organizations and other agencies.

5.2 PARTICIPATORY TECHNOLOGY GENERATION

The Participatory Technology Generation (PTG) designed to develop new technologies or to modify existing technology, which has the potential to sustainably enhance the livelihood of poor rural families in the project area and more widely in the region. Such generation of technologies have been taken up in collaboration with research institutions. Participatory Technology Generation follows a sequence of steps right from need assessment to up scaling.

Most of the present work on technology generation has been related to agriculture particularly in crops. This has been done by signing MoUs with the concerned Universities. PTG has also been taken up on minor issues where the cost of technology is less but the pay off is high like introduction of ball bearings in the local grinders and seed priming.

5.3 FARMER MANAGED PARTICIPATORY RESEARCH VARIETAL SELECTION

One of the alarming facts is that out of around 525 varieties that have been released in India, only the top 10 varieties account for 60% and the bottom 57 varieties for 1% of production. Project has played an important role in ensuring that the technical know-how is being used to come out with varieties that suits local farmers' needs by an intense involvement of the latter. The Farmer Managed Participatory Research has been one of the most innovative and effective programs that GVT has launched.

Participatory Varietal selection (PVS) is a farmer participatory approach for identifying improved crop cultivars or varieties. It is a rapid and cost-effective process of identifying farmer-preferred cultivars. There are different phases in PVS right from identifying the needs of the farmer to wider dissemination of the farmer-preferred varieties. The PVS as carried out by project are of various types including mother trials, baby trials and IRD.

One another important component of FAMPAR is Participatory Plant Breeding. The farmer participatory approaches are being adopted in selecting and breeding better adoption varieties that would benefit the poor farmers. PPB is used under two situations. The first is when there are no suitable cultivars identified which cater to the farmer's requirements. The second situation when the participatory Varietal fails to produce results.

5.4 DISSEMINATION

No matter how good the interventions of project are, it is neither possible nor expected that Project covers all the villages. It is also not possible for GVT to treat every village as its core village and thereby invest handsomely. Given this limitation, it was decided that the project could do was to fuel

End of Project Report-WIRFP

the natural dissemination in such a way that maximum benefit is derived. This brought about the concept of dissemination villages where GVT's investment would not be more than five lakhs and where the work would be done with the help of Jankars, with GVT monitoring broadly. The Jankars take up the role of Community Organiser and disseminate the technologies and approaches that GVT uses in the core villages. It is also found that such an intervention which cashes on natural dissemination addresses the concept of sustainability much more comprehensively.

5.5 MIGRANT LABOUR SUPPORT PROGRAMME

A new unique programme has been started for the benefit of the migrant laborers in the project area. Special Information and communication centers, PSKs (Palayan Suchna Kendras) have been opened in different Cluster areas so that migrant laborers could know the employment opportunities, legal awareness, the human rights and other laws of contract labour. Special identity cards have been issued to these migrants laborers and PSKs and MRCs (Migration Resource Centers) have been opened for their smooth functioning between their native places and the place of work.

Objective of the Program :

After going through the pros and cons of the life of migrants, GVT has developed an effective strategy to support these people.

The main objectives of the program are as follows:

- To develop a vision on unionism of group formation among migrants
- To create awareness about different labour law
- To ensure maximum returns from migration
- To reduce, cost of transportation and the cost incurred in finding job
- To development communication system, to avail better job opportunities.

Status of MLSP Program (Till 31st Jan.'06)

S. No.	Particulars	Progress till date
1	Total Villages Adopted	568
2	Total PSK Initiated	59
3	Self-Initiated PSKs	3
4	Total Migrants Registered from villages	18759
5	Total Identity Cards distributed after signature of Sarpanch	11149
6	Total MRCs established	3
7	Total Migrants covered under Group Insurance	2115
8	Total no. of Trainings organized at MRC level	17
9	Total No. of male Migrants imparted training	616
10	Total No. of Female Migrants imparted training	32

End of Project Report-WIRFP

11	Total complaints lodged at MRCs	88
12	Total Cases settled to benefit migrants	34

5.6 PRI LINKAGES

Panchayati Raj Institutions (PRIs) are key legal institutions facilitated by the Government. The role, quality and importance of the PRIs vary from state to state. Of the four states WIRFP worked in, two have been taken up for analysis – Madhya Pradesh and Rajasthan. Both have very different kinds of PRIs and the attitude and working of the State Governments are significantly different. Here expertise of Samarthan (M.P) and Unnati (Rajasthan) have been utilized to set up improved practices and approaches in the working of PRIs.

Achievements:

The empowerment and reaching to poor for better say in the Gram Sabhas is mainly through the development of the pro-poor model by out reaching to the expert and experienced organisations, e.g. Unnati and Samarthan, both these are PRIA off shoots/ networks.

- Two Panchayat have been identified in M.P. for collaboration and they participated very actively in this initiative.
- Regular workshops of Jankars and committee members on Gram Swaraj and Panchayati Raj system.

The impact assessment study conducted by the project during 2003 revealed improved linkages with PRIs in all the sample core and withdrawal villages. In core villages group members accessed resources of **Rs.7416831 (35%)** through linkages with PRIs. Community contribution in accessing these resources was **Rs.1209610 (6%)**. Similarly in withdrawal villages this amount was **Rs.1113200**, which was **17 %** of the total resources accessed through linkages. Gram Sabha records also show improved presence of the SHG members in the meetings.

5.7 CHALLENGE FUND PROGRAMME

After the review of the project at the end of the second year, it was decided to establish a 'Challenge Fund'. The purpose was 'to provide financial and other resources, training and advice to other organizations engaged in strengthening the livelihoods of the rural poor through natural resource management and/or enterprise development .

CF is an innovative endeavor initiated by GVT to strengthen the partnerships with GOs, CBOs, PRIs and NGOs to accelerate the process of sustainable enhancement of livelihoods for rural poor. Through Challenge Fund project has created a platform for outsourcing the capacity of project for ensuring the sustainable livelihood.

End of Project Report-WIRFP

For the purpose potential GO/ NGO agencies have been identified in Madhya Pradesh and Rajasthan. Total 6 Government agencies and 7 NGOs have been supported under the Challenge Fund programme during 2004-06.

5.8 PARTICIPATORY MONITORING AND EVALUATION SYSTEM

In order to ensure the sustainability and effectiveness, project has ensured that active involvement of the community members in all aspects of its interventions. One such area that of monitoring and evaluation. Project has introduced strong monitoring component.

Different types of monitoring are carried out like the input monitoring, process monitoring, and output monitoring and impact assessment. There are different standard formats and indicators, tools have been developed to facilitate this process.

Monitoring is also carried out at different levels of administrative hierarchy right from the village level to the Head Office level.

Monitoring, Evaluation and Impact Assessment Model adopted by the Project

Stage	Type	Method
Project Implementation	Impact assessment	Livelihood asset status, * monitoring and reviews
	Output monitoring	Group assessments, Jankar (village specialist) system assessment, Participatory Planning Process (PPP)
	Tangible	Intangible
	Activity Monitoring	Qualitative and quantitative (target free) critical evaluation and process monitoring
Post Implementation	Sustainable impact assessment	Livelihood asset status, * continued monitoring and impact evaluation studies

(*Assess the changed livelihood asset status, e.g. access to moneylenders or banks, increased agricultural productivity, change in size and composition of herd, and jewellery.)

5.9 WITHDRAWAL STRATEGY

In order to achieve successful project withdrawal process from the project villages, project team has developed comprehensive take over and handover plan through joint discussions effort with community members. The project have identified villages for initiating Top/Hop where a reasonable amount of village work plan has been successfully implemented.

Objectives:

To insure that after the project withdrawal, the village community will have the capacity and vision to sustain the processes and activities initiated during the project period by way of increasing their social, natural, financial, physical and human capital in a sustainable and equitable manner.

Output:

- Review of overall work/interventions.
- Plan for the new interventions with new sources of funding
- To prepare planning of colander for capacity building of groups and Jankars for future demands.
- Developing vision among villagers towards self-management.

6) ACHIEVEMENTS AND IMPACT

TABLE - I

6.1 Componentwise Achievement during the Project Period(1999-2006)

6.2 CONTRIBUTION DETAILS THROUGH VARIOUS SOURCES IN WIRFP

The project places importance in communities contributing and taking ownership for activities. Total community contribution is Rs.98135571 which is around 11.26% of the total financial inputs. It was previously kept that contribution from Community should be at least 6% of total financial inputs. This shows the community contribution is higher than what decided. The graph below graph gives a comparative position of promises made in the project document and actual position.

The project had made projections that certain portion of the costs will be met of DFID (82%), 6% from KRIBHCO, 6% from the community and 6% from GO/ NGO agencies. Given the increasing participation of the communities and large contribution from the local State Governments, the project has already surpassed end of project projections.

7) MAIN FINDINGS OF VARIOUS IMPACT ASSESSMENT STUDIES

(7.1) Finding of 'Cost Benefit Analysis' Study

(i) Economic Analysis :

The economic analysis is sensitive to four key assumptions:

- i) The economic wage rate used to determine the opportunity cost of unskilled agricultural labour. This was estimated to be 75% of the official government wage rate. The migration labour study should provide additional information with which to test this assumption;
- ii) The incremental crop net margin was based on the results of the NHIS. Although this study was carefully conducted, the sample size was relatively small. Further, because the NHIS data was available in the terms of incremental income per household, the CBA links these incremental incomes to the village population, by well being class. The alternative approach of estimating benefits on an area basis should be considered as a means of validating the CBA assumptions. A overall 20% increase in crop incremental benefits is required to achieve an EIRR of 12%. Although this might appear as being within the margin of error, the position for many of the villages is more difficult. For the 14 out of the 20 sample villages which did not achieve an EIRR of 12%, net margins would need to double to achieve an EIRR of 12%;
- iii) The period over which incremental benefits are assumed to continue. If this period was reduced from 20 to 12 years, the EIRR would fall to 0%. The financial and institutional analysis suggests that 20 years may be an over optimistic assumption; and recurrent costs have not been factored into either project or activity budgets, and therefore the CBA team estimated recurrent cost post project on the percent basis of investment or activity costs. If these initial base assumptions were increased by 20%, the overall EIRR would fall to 8%.

(ii) Financial Analysis :

- i) The financial analysis focused on the viability and sustainability of the SHGs and IGAs and, by extension, of the jankar system. No financial analysis was undertaken for farm income as this is clearly positive when development costs are carried by the project. Wage labour generated by the project was estimated.
- ii) The SHGs are responsible both for accounting for project activities and for operating a savings and credit programme. However, the role of the SHGs was perceived very differently by the implementing agencies, with the result that different levels of information were available for SHGs supported by GVT. Both implementing agencies maintain transactional records (such as passbooks etc) at SHG level. Apart from the transactional records, there were no summary accounts and much less financial discipline, in GVT-supported communities.

End of Project Report-WIRFP

iii) The long term viability of SHGs will determine the sustainability of many of the project interventions. The qualitative field work suggests that for many people the main benefit of the programme has been wage employment and regular savings have been seen as a mechanism to gain entitlement to work. However, many SHGs have accumulated sizeable balances – which could provide an incentive to continue operation after the project period. The likelihood of each SHG being sustainable is greater for the IFFDC-supported than for the GVT-supported SHG.

(iii) Institutional and Social factors

- i) There was a clear perception that the main project benefit had been wage employment leading to reduced out-migration and debt repayment. This perception is supported by the analysis of the purposeful sub-sample which shows that an average of between 40 and 145 workdays per household were generated per year during the project period.
- ii) Voluntary labour contributions are required from communities for work on both private land (50%) and public land (25%). Even with these contributions, the primary economic benefit for many people will have been wage employment. This conclusion is supported by the lack of concern exhibited in the community and amongst project staff to the use of public works (with half of the labour being contributed by the labourer) to create a private benefit in the form, for example, of SWC structures on private land.
- iii) The lack of clarity in the contractual arrangements (agreements) over the terms of loans for borrowers or responsibility for repairs and replacement of IGAs has resulted in recurrent costs not being considered and allowing for non-rePAYERS to capture an unfair share of benefits.
- iv) The viability and sustainability of the jankar system depends on the institutions, such as SHGs, remaining in place. The group jankers are also dependent on the savings and credit arrangements continuing at the end of the project. Livestock jankars may have scope to become self-funding from fee income, although they have to compete with more qualified government staff and will not continue to receive subsidized drugs etc.

(B) FINDINGS OF 'GROUP ASSESSMENT STUDY' : Facilitated by GVT Team during Year 2003 in 62 groups

In trend with the general realization that working through groups is much more effective than working through individuals, GVT has also used the same strategy in Western India Rainfed Farming Project over the past several years.

In the Western India Rainfed Farming Project it has been understood that by the time the project ends, the interventions that are being carried out would have reached a stage where the impacts are sustainable. For this to happen it was realized to closely monitor the progress of the interventions and their delivery system and correct any deviations.

End of Project Report-WIRFP

This study was planned to critically analyze this delivery system and assess its maturity so that the path ahead is much more clear.

Overall Status :

After assessing the groups against all the above indicators it can be concluded that the majority of the groups (55%) are above average and quite a few (15%) show an average performance. The remaining 9% of the groups that rated below average were studied in detail to analyze the causes of their ineffective functioning. It was found that the unsatisfactory performance of these groups is attributed to local reasons that were beyond the control of the project.

This study reflects that the majority of the groups in Western India Rainfed Farming Project have rated fairly well against all the parameters and the project team is convinced about their sustenance. It also reveals that the challenge before the project is to provide focused attention and support to the groups that perform below average and see that they reach the scales of above average by the end of the project.

It can be safely concluded that the groups of WIRFP have absorbed the benefits of working in groups and are satisfactorily following the decided norms and procedures.

(C) MAIN FINDINGS OF 'QUALITY OF LIFE' : Facilitated by GVT Team & Jankars during 2003 in 6 villages

The major objective of the study was to understand and analyse the impact created on the quality of people's lives through the project's interventions and /or people made it through linkages, networking with the government/NGO/Panchayats, as a result of empowerment and encouragement through capacity building by the project. It also aimed to see whether these villagers see themselves differently from others or *vice versa*.

1. Natural Resources & Land quality

It was learned through the study that the people generally have been benefited by soil and water conservation (SWC) works in the villages. During the initial *PRA*s this was the most important priority in all the villages. This had qualitatively improved the productivity of the land and had increased the area under cultivation. This had enabled farmers to enhance their economic position by increased productivity and production of food grain, including reduced erosion of soil and nutrients. Almost every *nalah* of the villages had been plugged and the communities said that this had helped in retaining moisture and water in these *nalahs*. This has given them the capacity and empowerment to combat drought.

End of Project Report-WIRFP

The practice of *palabandi* (SWC bunding) has not only checked the wastage of fertilisers and fertile land but also increased the farmers' earnings. It has also contributed to an increase in the altogether land area and food production.

a) Crops:

It was very interesting to learn there were very good impacts due to the crops programme, particularly 'seeds'. Seeds are very much liked by farmers and they claim that their yield and crop production has increased. The issue of food security has been met to a large extent. Prior to the start of the project, home produced food grains used to last for 4-5 months whereas now it lasts for 8-9 months: some farmers are growing food for the whole year. Communities are now using improved, easily handled agricultural implements.

b) Livestock:

The study concluded that people in the project villages (core and withdrawal) have earned dividends from poultry farming. Chickens, reared under the income-generating activity component, yield an increased number of eggs on a regular basis. This has ensured a supply of a nutritious diet to the families and a regular income to the owner. The people also acknowledge the positive impact of veterinary camps, which had not only successfully helped in reducing the level and types diseases but also enhanced the people's confidence and trust in Para-vets and the camp process.

c) Drinking Water:

The tube-wells dug on the initiative of the project and villagers have ensured an unabated supply of safe drinking water. Prior to the Project, the villagers were forced to drink either polluted water or had to commute long distances to fetch water. The female members of the family had to take the burden of ensuring the supply of drinking water. Now that safe drinking water is available at hand, the frequency of children becoming ill has been reduced considerably. Besides, the animals too are benefiting from this water supply fit for drinking. Apart from drinking, the water is also used for irrigation by a section of farmers.

Even in the control village Rakhadia the van Samiti of JFM has been working very effectively, the JFM is shared with Palasiapada.

2. Physical Resources/ Infrastructure

People have valued the physical resources developed by the Project in both withdrawal and core villages. The main resources developed or created are flourmills, water pumps, hand pumps, farm implements and small interventions (like grind stone ball bearings, transparent roof tiles, water pulleys and lift irrigations).

3. Human Resources

The capacities of people in different sectors have been improved. Some people are utilizing these enhanced capacities. Not much impact can be seen in core (Phase II) villages but in the withdrawal

End of Project Report-WIRFP

(Phase I) villages the impact is greater: people with enhanced capacities had initiated their own resources

a) Migration:

Migration had been reduced in core villages. This might be an impact of the seasonal employment provided by the project through SWC works but there has also been a positive impact in withdrawal villages, where there have been no recent SWC works.

b) Literacy:

People have certainly started spending on quality health and education. Awareness and interest for sending children to school has been enhanced in the core and withdrawal villages, where people previously were not sending their children even to primary schools in the village. Now they have started enrolling children outside, particularly girl children, for better education. Similarly, the awareness of literacy in withdrawal villages has increased and people have started sending their children to school. The enrolment in schools has increased, dropout children have also been enrolled in schools.

c) Health:

The awareness of health issues in core and withdrawal villages has increased. The health camps organised by the project had created interest and awareness in people about health. An increase in incomes had enabled the communities to spend more on their health and people are going to the doctors too. However, people still believe in and approach the *badwas*. Since the Traditional Birth Attendants (TBAs) have been trained and received wider exposure, some are practicing improved ways of administering deliveries. Most of the trained TBAs, are recognized by the Government and are attending the cases.

(D) FINDINGS OF STUDY ON 'IMPACT OF WIRFP ON NET INCOMES OF THE TARGET GROUP:

Facilitated by GVT team with support from the TC consultants N. Raghunathan & N. Shiv Kumar during 2003

The main objective of the study was to assess the sustained impact of WIRFP project on net incomes of the target households. The study was planned to be the first leg of a process, wherein the purpose was to develop and test a methodology to assess the net incomes, to understand changes in net incomes in sampled villages, and to develop a team in GVT and IFFDC to take up the study in remaining villages after the MTR.

Main Findings:

- The findings of the study suggested that the effects of the WIRFP on net incomes of the project participant households were significant and clear in the project villages studied. There

End of Project Report-WIRFP

were significant increases observed in *per capita* net incomes of the project participant households. Benefits had been distributed across different WBR categories.

- There had been an overall increase of 46% in *per capita* net incomes of the target group observed in Phase I villages (in 2002-03), compared to baseline situation (1993). The average increase was highest for the better off households, at about 107%, followed by the poor households (52%). The change observed among the very poor households was marginal, with only 9% increase.

Logframe Indicator Achievements:

- In terms of log frame indicators for the Phase I villages, the study showed that:
 - 54% of households (indicator target 20%) from the lower wealth ranks registered 25% increase in income from complementary activities.
 - Income of households¹ in project villages (including the value of their own production) increased by 46% by EOP (indicator target 50%).
- In Phase II villages, there was an increase of about 164% in *per capita* household net incomes compared to 1999. In terms of log frame indicators for Phase II villages:
 - 83% of households (indicator target 20%) from lower wealth ranks registered 25% increases in income from complementary activities.
 - Income of households² in project villages (including the value of their own production) increased by 83% by EOP (indicator target 50%).
- The study also suggested that the attributability of these increases to WIRFP appeared to be high and evident in most cases. Agriculture, livestock and IGA enterprises had been the main sources that contributed to increases in incomes. The inputs in the area of agriculture (specifically LIS, SWC work and training on agricultural practices and crop management), livestock (poultry birds, hatching techniques) and micro-enterprises (credit and guidance for managing enterprises) had contributed to these increases. The potential incomes from common property resources seemed to be high, particularly from forest (JFM inputs).
- The data from control villages showed substantial reduction in *per capita* net incomes of the households across all WBR categories, except for the medium households. The continuing drought, lack of water harvesting and irrigation facilities, absence of alternative income sources, lack of supportive programmes and lack of access to various services, including credit, were stated as reasons for the reduction in net incomes over the years. The greatest decreases were recorded for the very poor households, as they were the most vulnerable due to these factors.

Food Security:

¹ *Per capita* net incomes

² *Per capita* net incomes

End of Project Report-WIRFP

- About 89% of respondent households in Phase I villages reported improvements in food security, and 78% in Phase II villages. This was attributed to increases in agricultural production (most cases increased area under cultivation, additional *rabi* crop). It is to be noted that about 40% of respondent households (mostly the poor and very poor) were yet to reach a comfortable level of food security.
- However, compared to the situation in control villages, where the food security had reduced across various WBR segments, the achievements by project are noteworthy. Most respondents in project villages reported that the interventions in agriculture had provided enough food availability, and the status of migration as an income source had become 'opportunistic' (to earn more), rather than 'distress'.
- In terms of creating additional employment opportunities, the project inputs had contributed to increases in cultivated area and irrigated area (in *Rabi*), developing new enterprises (brick laying, grocery shops), and improving incomes through livestock (mainly poultry). About 40% of the Phase I and 50% of Phase II respondents reported increases in employment days due to project.
- Increases in production in agriculture had been reported mainly from increased cropping area or additional crop in *Rabi* season (in Phase I villages mainly). In the case of productivity, all households had reported increased productivity (and lesser use of seeds) in main crop (maize), and improved seed varieties (particularly in Phase II villages). However, the exact quantum and proportion of increases could not be measured. In terms of livestock too, the assessment could not be done well because much time would have been needed to track each animal over the two time periods; also the recall by villagers on products and by-products was very poor. However, in poultry, improved incomes had been attributed to improved method of hatching and selling the live birds rather than eggs. Households reported improved hatchings due to better management practices.

Income Generation:

- The incomes generated from various sources were mainly used for household expenditure and, in limited cases, investment in productive or household assets. Most of these increases were in terms of products and by-products (in kind). There was little difference in household expenditure patterns between the two time periods. There had been an increase in expenditure reported among all categories of households and the changes in proportion of expenditure under various heads did not vary much. About 50% to 60% of income was spent on food and related items. The data from control villages showed that there had been an increase in the proportion of expenditure, along with increases in cost of credit, showing their dependence on the higher cost of credit.
- The study tried to address the issue of control over increased incomes through household case studies and in focus group discussions. In most households, the increase in incomes was reported in terms of increased production in agriculture, which was usually kept as food

End of Project Report-WIRFP

grain and seeds stock. In livestock too, the increases were due to higher consumption of products and by-products, except in the case of poultry, where the sale of birds was taken up. The cash incomes had just started flowing, after the achieving the level of self-sufficiency in food grains and other products. Most households reported joint decision-making between husband and wife regarding use of income. However, this issue needed further probing, as the project was aiming at developing enterprises that are women focused.

Drought Impacts:

- In terms of externalities affecting incomes, the drought situation was reported to be similar in project and control villages (i.e. continuous drought for four years 1999-2002). The respondents in project villages reported that if the drought had not occurred, their production and incomes would have been much higher than the currently reported levels. They also referred that the current year (*Kharif* 2003) returns would be more than double that reported, because there were enough rains during this year.

Impact of Level of Project Investment:

- From the data from the project, it was clear that in villages where the investments had been higher (in the range of Rs.1.5 to 2.0 million and above) all respondents reported increases in incomes. In these villages most of the work was highly resource-intensive (eg: SWC and WRD). About 80% of the investments were mainly in SWC and WRD work. In those villages where the investments were in the range of Rs.0.4 million, the proportions of households reporting increases in incomes and the quantum of increase were less. This data also gives some indication of the attributability of the outputs to project inputs. The cost effectiveness or return on investments could not be worked out within the current timeframe or the samples studied. They have not been attempted here.
- The finding of this study, to a large extent, reconfirms the results of a similar study conducted by Centre for Development Studies, University of Wales (1998). Their main findings were that there was an increase of 29% in net incomes of households, increased food security, benefits distributed across WBR categories and improved agricultural production being the main contributory factor.

8) LESSONS LEARNT

GVT's experience through running WIRFP related to livelihood improvement strategy for the poor and the women shows that following strategies need to be a core or integral part of any livelihood improvement strategy to adopted:

End of Project Report-WIRFP

- Recognizing the heterogeneous nature of the community, disaggregated information base on gender and poverty lines needs to be developed. Livelihood and empowerment strategies should be developed recognizing the diversity of the experiences of the different social groups - most vulnerable persons and women.
- All issues that have link with poverty like health, child marriage, education, low wages, employment have direct bearing on poverty and backwardness. These issues have to be dealt as part of strategy to have more impact on poor by reduction of same.
- PRAs and participatory planning is one of the tools for the realization of the community about existing five capitals i.e. Social , Human, Physical, Financial and Natural and plan in order to mobilized the existing resources but it may not be enough to address the needs of most vulnerable and women, as BLAD and gender related work shows. Separate strategies have been developed to involve the BLAD persons in to the planning processes through intensive home visits and discussions with the larger community to enable such persons to come out of the social isolation they faced. Improving their social capital and human capital was central to improving their livelihood. Similarly, the gender and the GST work shows that beyond the women's participation in PRA processes, enabling them to articulate their rights based concerns such as domestic violence or household burden is important – otherwise gender issues would never be mainstreamed in the organizational practice.
- Establishment of links with Govt. is essential starting from local to higher level with a view that govt. systems & structures should compliment rather than competing with the structures established by Projects in order to ensure long term sustainability of the same.
- Developing local understandings of gender and poverty issues through appropriate participatory appraisal, process documentation and participant observation and group discussion techniques.
- Institutionalizing of gender and poverty related concerns into project programme and practices, is possible only with a extensive training strategy. Training of the facilitators particularly on facilitation of differences and conflict resolution. One of the training tools often found useful in gender sensitization workshops with the communities, is the use of matrix exercise highlighting women and men daily work calendar to sensitize men about the women's situation followed by a discussion on how to change this unequal situation.

End of Project Report-WIRFP

- The move of 'self-help' by Jankar 'take over' the role of project staff. The Jankar System is not only the effective tools for transfer of technology in favour of the community but also play a role to train government official and other. The use of Jankar system is most cost-effective and sustainable measure in order to ensure the improvement of the livelihood of the deprived and poorest section.
- Qualitative indicators of change such as promoting empowerment processes, social recognition, confidence among deprived category and encouraging these category to save own self help group and access to loan as well as resources over quantitative targets needs to be recognized and valued.
- Adequate time and effort needs to be dedicated for implementation of social mobilization including selection & capacity building of staffs. Inadequate attention to this will jeopardize this approach.
- To reach the poorest in those areas where we had worked with the destitutes, elderly, disabled, seasonal migrants, additional elements of social security needs to be implemented while replicating to other areas.
- Systematic documentation, dissemination of learning & significant experiences gained through project implementation, and research work influencing policy issues is necessary.
- There should be system of cross learning. In today's development world many innovations and new approaches are being practiced by organizations. These cross learning forum is highly essential since it will help the other players implement similar projects with similar efficiency.
- Since the ownership of the assets created by NGOs in the village during project implementation will go to PRIs after project withdrawal hence closer involvement of PRIs is necessary. They must be involved in project from planning phase and must be provided with different kinds of capacity building inputs to look after the maintenance of assets created to ensure sustainability of same.
- GVT's approach & style of working developed through the experience generated constant work at grass root level. GVT has mastered the art of participatory method of working and providing holistic approach of interventions in livelihoods. This has also been recognized by no. of organization who have been using staff of GVT as Resource Person resulted in better delivery.

End of Project Report-WIRFP

- The system & procedures followed by an organization during project implementation should be flexible & responsive to the needs & priorities of communities.
- No Project is self sufficient in itself to address all the development issues of the operational area. Hence there should be a strong convergence mechanism with the concerned line depts. This is necessary for checking overlapping of activities and providing better result in the project area.
- In Core villages households have developed high dependency syndrome on GVT. A feeling has developed that GVT would continue supporting them in all the aspects. This is also evident from the fact that less numbers of IGAs started by villagers on their own, low initiative for market linkages, etc. GVT should have tried to introduce few of the Microfinance principles as followed by MFIs to treat these primary stakeholders as per 'clients' & not 'beneficiaries' and secondly strongly introducing the 'loan system' for each and every component rather than adopting 'grant system'.
- Though the technical inputs was continuously reaching the Prasar villages through skilled Jankars but due to lack of capital investment through project in this areas, they were handicapped in many areas, i.e. insufficient SWC work, more dependency on money lenders, dependency on migration related wage employment, etc. In order to reduce this and to carry out development activities some percent of Fund should have been allocated for these area as well.

9) BUSINESS PROJECTIONS FOR FUTURE

During 31st March'06, DFID funded WIRFP is coming to an end. In order to sustain beyond that period, GVT proposes to follow a Business approach based on opportunities available in the market and the strength the organization has developed during course of years of operation. Focus is on 3 main Business areas:

- Implementation of livelihood projects
- Establishment of a Resource Centre to undertake training
- Consulting and Research and piloting new areas (micro finance, migration support, small grants and participatory technology development)

9.1 ABOUT 'NATIONAL LIVELIHOOD RESOURCE CENTRE'

GVT is in a process of establishing a Resource Centre at Ratlam, with satellite centers in each operational state of Western Region. Permanent infrastructure is under construction at Ratlam, for which the Govt. has provided land to GVT on lease. The value of the land is around Rs.75 lakhs, which will be given to GVT on long term lease basis. In turn govt. expects GVT to establish a demonstration and research unit (land based) in the proposed Centre.

For the building part GVT has requested KRIBHCO to contribute a cost of Rs.101 lakhs, as this investment is likely to help GVT attain sustainability. DFID is supporting this initiative in terms of providing funding support for facilities, demonstration plots and staff development plans.

NLRC proposes to conduct following set of activities:

- Training, Workshops Seminars & Exposure visits
- Research & Impact Assessment
- Documentation, Publication & Dissemination

i) Clientele

NLRC would cater to all types of stakeholders involved in livelihood enhancement of rural poor. This includes government officials implementing various development projects for livelihood enhancement, personnel from NGOs & Civil Society Organizations, representatives of PRIs and communities.

ii) Extent of coverage

Initially the Centre would cater to the needs of the GVT's working areas. However, in due course of time, it would cater to the needs of various stakeholders from various parts of the country as well outside the country.

iii) Marketing of the Centre

It is highly required to market the Centre so that interested stakeholders takes advantage of it as well it generates revenue to meet the operational cost of the Centre. In this regard GVT has strategize to advertised the activities of the Centre in development journals/periodicals for greater access and reach. A series of presentation seminars & workshops would be organized in different zones of country in collaboration with government, NGO

End of Project Report-WIRFP

and other civil society organizations regarding the facilities and services of the centre. It is also thought of putting the information in the website of the GVT, DFID, KRIBHCO & Ministry of Fertilizers & Chemicals.

ANNEXURES

Annexure – I

GVT's Collaborations & Partnerships

- MoU has been signed with DISHA, Ahmedabad to facilitate the process of MLSP at main destinations of migrants in Gujarat.
- MoU on Empowering Gram Sabhas through Civil Society Efforts has been signed with SAMARTHAN. Under this two Panchayats viz. Udaipuriya & Chainpura have been identified to work with. One PRC has been established at Udaipuriya of Thandla block (Dist. Jhabua).
- Government of Rajasthan identified GVT to implement District Poverty Initiative Project (DPIP) in three districts of Rajasthan.
- Rajeev Gandhi watershed Development Mission, Bhopal approached GVT to facilitate sessions during the training programme organized for the Field Coordinators and project Officers of different Milli Watersheds. The project team members have facilitated sessions on different developmental issues in 5 such training programmes.
 - Project has collaborated with N M Sadguru Foundation regarding WRD Structures. In this connection the agency has initiated construction of identified schemes in the project area of all the three states.
- The State Government of Rajasthan identified GVT as District Level Institute (DLI) for execution of 'Supplementary Observation Mechanism (SOM)' of watershed development programme at the district level for Banswara district.
- DRDA, Dahod identified GVT, Dahod as potential PIA to implement its Watershed Development Programme in 2 Micro watersheds of Limkheda & Gadwara blocks.
- Students from IRMA, Anand visited our Dahod project villages in two batches to attend a PRA orientation programme facilitated by WIRFP team members.
- DRDAs of Banswara and Dungarpur districts asked GVT to submit a proposal to Planning Commission for its Rashtriya Sam Vikas Yojana. For the purpose DRDA, Banswara agreed to sanction an amount of Rs.2.32 crores to GVT

Annexure - II

**List of Publications/ Reports/ Consultancy Inputs/ Reviews/
Project Notes/ Working Papers**

Papers on WIRFP:

- KRIBHCO Rain fed Farming Project: An Approach to Participatory Farming Systems Development (Research Issues in Natural Resource Development) David Mosse, University of Wales, Swansea, Centre for Development Studies, U.K.
- Impact of Farmer Participatory Research on Biodiversity of Crops (Research Issues in Natural Resource Management) John R. Witcombe, University of Wales, Swansea, Centre for Development Studies, U.K.
- Impact of Farmer Participatory Research on Biodiversity of Crops (Research Issues in Natural Resource Management) John R. Witcombe, University of Wales, Swansea, Centre for Development Studies, U.K.
- Farmer Participatory Research for the Selection of Rainfed Rice Cultivars (Research Issues in Natural Resource Management) John R. Witcombe, University of Wales, Swansea, Centre for Development Studies, U.K.
- Addressing the demand for fuel wood and tree fodder in high potential production system. By Bezkorowajnyj P.G., Rana R.B., Raghuwanshi B.S., Joshi K.D., Waner M. and Sodhi. P.S. 1998. In M.S. Punia, S.S. Dhankar, S.K. Pahuja and Y. Jindal (eds.). International Conference on Food Security and Crop Science, November 3-9, 1998 CCS Haryana Agriculture University, Hisar, India. Abstracts No. 10.8,300.
- Key technologies: more appropriate varieties and on-farm seed priming by Harris D., Khan P.A., Ghotkar P., Joshi A., Raghuwanshi B.S., Parey A, Sodhi P.S., Virk D.S. and Witcombe J.R. 1998. Tropical Agriculture Association (U.K.). Newsletter 18(2): 51-53.
- Using participatory methods to develop, test and promote on-farm seed priming in India by Harris D., Khan P.A., Ghotkar P., Joshi A., Raghuwanshi B.S., Parey A, Sodhi P.S. 1998. In M.S. Punia, S.S. Dhankar, S.K. Pahuja and Y. Jindal (eds.). International Conference on food Security and Crop Science, November 3-9, 1998. CCS Haryana Agriculture University, Hisar, India. Abstracts No. 10.3, 298-299.
- Participatory evaluation by farmers of on-farm' seed priming in wheat in India, Nepal and Pakistan by Harris D., Raghuwanshi. B.S., Gangwar J.S., Singh S.C., Joshi K.D., Rashid A. and Hollington, P.A. 2001. Experimental Agriculture Cambridge University (UK) Volume 37 pp. 403-415.
- Participatory crop improvement in high potential system by Virk D.S., Raghuwanshi B.S., Sodhi P.S. and Witcombe J.R. 1998. In M.S. Punia, S.S. Dhankar, S.K. Pahuja and Jindal (eds.). International Conference on food Security and Crop Science, November 3-9,1998. CCS Haryana Agriculture University, Hisar, India. Abstracts No. 10.2,297-298.
- A holistic approach to participatory crop improvement in wheat proceeding of International Symposium on 'Participatory Plant Breeding and participatory plant genetic Resource Enhancement: An Exchange of Experience from South and South East Asia' by Virk D.S., Harris D., Raghuwanshi B.S., Raj A.G.B., Sodhi P.S. and Witcombe J.R. 2000 held at Pokhara, Nepal from 1-5 May 2000 CGIAR System-wide-

End of Project Report-WIRFP

Program on Participatory Research and Gender Analysis for Technology Development and Institutional Innovation. Volume ISBN 958-694-041-1 pp. 275-282.

- Seeds of choice by J R Witcombe & Daljeet Singh Virk, UK.
- KRIBHCOs experience; an approach to participatory farming system development by David Mosse (Research issues in natural resource development).
- Local institution and farming system development; thoughts from a project in tribal western India by David Mosse (AgREN paper) ODI.
- An approach to Participatory planning; A review of KRIBP experience; David Mosse.
- Brokered livelihoods; labour migration and development in tribal western India by David Mosse et al and KRIBP teams. The journal of development studies.
- How can we design water resources interventions to benefit poor households? - International paper at Bradford, UK. Ian C. Tod, Water Resources Consultant, WIRFP, Akhilesh Parey, State Coordinator, GVT, Ratlam, RPS Yadav, Project Coordinator, IFFDC, Pratapgarh, India
- Equity issues in water resources development sector? Ian C. Tod, Water Resources Consultant, WIRFP; Akhilesh Parey, State Coordinator, GVT, Ratlam.
- "Participatory Watershed Development" Challenges for 21st Century- A book by John Ferrington Contributed as Extract 8.1 "The use of subsidies for Soil & Water Conservation. Page 281-297
- International Paper no 87, Agriculture Research and Extension network "The use of subsidies for Soil & Water Conservation. A case study from Western India." By Paul Smith.
- "Using Participatory methods to develop, test and promote on farm Seed Priming in India" by Harris D. Paper accepted in International Journal Experimental Agriculture, Cambridge, UK.
- "Past experiences and lessons learnt" Organised by DFID, UK funded KAWAD Project (Karnataka watershed development Project) 16-17 Jan'03 at Bangalore.
- "Agriculture or Livelihoods? Experiences of practitioners and beneficiaries of the DFID funded Western India Rainfed Farming Project. By Keith Virgo, Ragubendra Yadav, Yash Kanugo & Richard Bond TAA, University of Bath, 3rd July 2003
- Experience of KRIBP in "Participatory Natural Resource Development in Asia" Organized by Department for International Development UK at New Delhi from 10th -12th March'99.
- "Farmer Participatory Crop Improvement IV the spread and impact of a Rice variety identified by the Participatory Varietal selection" by J R Witcombe, Paper accepted in International Journal, Experimental Agriculture, Cambridge, UK.
- "ICAR- ODA-KRIBHCO" Organized at Dahod from 5th -10th September'95.
- WIRFP On Farm Seed Priming A Key technology to improve the livelihoods of resource poor farmers in India by DFID & GVT.
- Involvement of corporate sector in rural development; KRIBHCO experience by David Moss.
- On equity issues by Ian & a Parey at KAWAD.
- Empowering community in IIRR & Myrada; Sodhi, Meera and Vijay.
- Participatory monitoring & evaluation in IIRR & Myrada by Sodhi, Meera and Vijay.

End of Project Report-WIRFP

- Exit strategy in GVT at Manage by Sodhi.
- GVT experience by Sodhi at DFID MP Poverty alleviation program at Bhopal.
- WIRFP experience on Migration issues by Meera at Bangladesh.
- Grain bank in WIRFP; GVT experience at WFP Delhi by Sodhi, Meera.
- Migration programme in UK by Keith, Yash WIRFP experience; GVT Paper Presentation in DFID UK by Sodhi.
- Community development issues by CP Singh at EIRA.
- "The Way We Work" Compilation of 6 working papers by project team.
- Legacy Of Legend" Compilation of case studies by P Bose, A Khanna.
- "Partners in Development" Compilation of successful performance by Jankars.

Films on WIRFP- GVT

1. "Seeds of progress"
2. "Seed Priming"
3. "Symphony of progress"

Presentations/experience sharing by WIRFP; GVT

- a) Experience sharing workshop on "lessons learnt on Income generation activities" workshop organized by DFID India & Western Orissa rural livelihood Project at WORLP Bhubneshwar on 7th August'03
- b) Experience sharing workshop on "Capacity building" workshop organized by DFID India at IIC, New Delhi, 23rd April'03
- c) "Migration issues in development sector " workshop organized by DFID India at New Delhi, 7th march'03.
- d) "Participatory Watershed Management Program" Organized by Indo-Swiss Participatory Watershed Development, Karnataka (ISPWDK) at MANAGE Hyderabad during September'98.
- e) "Local Institution building in KRIBP (West)-A Case study", Organized by Indo-Swiss Participatory Watershed Development Karnataka at MANAGE Hyderabad.
- f) "Project sustainability & withdrawal policy in WIRFP" presented in KAWAD Bangalore
- g) "Capacity building programme in WIRFP" at DFID India at New Delhi
- h) "Capacity building in watershed development programmes" organized by NABARD at MANAGE

Impact & Evaluation

- Socio-economic and Ecological Impact Assessment study of Aravalli Afforestation Project in Rajasthan. The study commissioned to Gramin Vikas Trust in association with TATA Consultancy Services (TCS) by Japan Bank for International Cooperation (JBIC). This project was funded by JBIC to the Forest department of Rajasthan during 1992-98.
- Impact Assessment study of Jhabua District on "Rajiv Gandhi Watershed Development Mission" in Jhabua District for Government of Madhya Pradesh" Study was commissioned to KRIBHCO-Indo- British Rainfed Farming Project, Dahod (Gujarat).
- Study of SGSY scheme in Jhabua District

End of Project Report-WIRFP

- Impact assessment of Government's 20 Point programme in the Ratlam district

Annexure - III

T.C CONSULTANCY SUPPORT STATUS

A consultancy team (Indian and expatriate) was provided by Atkins (UK), in association with NRIL (UK) and MSG (Delhi), under Contract CNTR 98 5604 with DFID. The contract extended from May 1999 to May 2004 but was extended to May 2006. The consultancy contract covered provision of people to both IFFDC and GVT.

Consultancy inputs were to be demand-driven, based on requests from either GVT or IFFDC, subject to approval by DFID. The total input by consultants over the seven years was approximately 3,900 person days (2,400 Indian & 1,500 expatriate). As shown in below Figure, the proportion of Indian consultants fielded generally increased over the period.

FIGURE : CONSULTANT INPUTS

A wide range of disciplines was included, determined by the needs of IFFDC, GVT and DFID. Some consultants worked solely for IFFDC but many others made inputs to both GVT and IFFDC. In Table YYY, an attempt has been made to disaggregate the inputs to the respective organisations. This shows, very approximately, the usage of consultants by GVT as:

	Expatriate	Indian
Number of persons	15	29
Total Person-days	949	1,193
Proportion %	44%	56%

The consultants prepared an unofficial Aide Memoire after each input, and a formal Consultant's Report on completion of a task. The reports were edited to a common standard by the Consultancy Coordinator and circulated to the project offices and DFID. A total of 110 reports had been prepared for IFFDC and GVT by the end of January 2006 (Detailed Below).

Fund allocated for the second phase on T.C Inputs & expenditure made on same

Original Budget was **£1,223,901**. Increased during APRIL'2005. Hence combined total was:

S. No.	Particulars	Amount
1.	Total Staff Costs (£)	1,086,979
2.	Total Reimbursable Costs (£)	327,954
Total Contract (A) +(B) (£)		1,414,933

End of Project Report-WIRFP

Broad Discipline	Name	Primary Post	GVT %	Expatriate Pers days	Indian Pers days	
Coordination & Studies	Keith Virgo*	TC Coordinator	60	196		
	Keith Virgo*	UK Tech Coord + Reports	60	140		
	Sudhirendra Sharma	Technical/Publicity Editor	15		19	
	Renu Parmar	Influencing Study 1	50		10	
	Gurinder Kaur	Influencing Study 2	50		10	
	CS Reddy	Exit Planning	100		11	
Social-Institutional/ Training	Girija Shrinivasan	Micro-finance	90		16	
	Andrew Shepherd*	Org Dev & Management	30	33		
	S Basavaraj*	Org Dev & Management	40		29	
	Subir Ghosh	Presentation Skills	40		38	
	Ram Bhat*	Facilitator	70		50	
	Uma Reddy	Facilitator	70		49	
	Meena Bilgi	Gender & Commtly Dev	25		61	
	Jyotsna Sitling	Village Institutions/Forestry	25		10	
	Robert Leurs*	Micro-Plan Training	90	16		
	Rajeev Sadana	Community Health	15		12	
	Paul Smith	SWC Trainer	85	28		
	Shivani M	Org Dev/Comp B	50		11	
	C Datta*	Loc Gov & Coops	50		1	
	Binoy Acharya	ToT & Training NLRC	100		19	
	Khilesh Chaturvedi	ToT Trainer (1) RCLP	0			
	Munish Kaushik	ToT Trainer (2) RCLP	0			
	Technical	N Durisaminathan*	Irrig Eng/On-farm Water Man	5		4
		Madhu Sarin*	Soc Dev & Gender	70		34
		Peter Branney	Forestry	80	31	
		Ian Tod	Irrigation	65	113	
STS Lepcha*		Forestry	10		2	
Jim Kilduff		Animal Husbandry	70	15		
David Jackson*		Wat Consvr & Man	70	66		
Liz Kiff*		Farming Syst Dev	0	0		
Manik Sharma		Livestock 2	0			
Ian Mathieson*		Irrigation	80	15		
Akkara John		Livestock 1	10		5	
Ian Hancock*		FS Res Man	80	24		
Mohammed Osman		Farming Syst Dev	0			
Girish Bhardwaj*		Micro-planning/SWC/Ext Mat	0			
Employment & Migration		Dinesh Awasti*	Enterprise & Credit	100		14
	Subhash Sharma	Wage Labour Support	0			
	Kirti Vakil	Enterprise & Credit	40		8	
	Sanjeev Gupta	Migration Support	0			
M&IA	Aparna Kher	MLSP Consultant	100		88	
	Shiv Kumar	Fin Rev/M&E	80		252	
	Ric Bond*	M & Impact Assess	20	21		
	N Mukherjee	Impact Assess	40		32	
	Sandhya Chatterji	SRL Train/Impact Eval	60		27	
	Graham Edgeley*	NR Econ (CBA Study)	60	8		
	Viju James	Impact Evaluation Studies	60		20	
	Mohan Ramamurthy	Financial Reviews	75		174	
	N. Raghunathan	Income Studies	95		139	
	Nitin Rao	NGO Accounts	100		48	
Comp C Research	John Witcombe	Particip Crop Breed	100	199		
	Walter de Boef*	Particip Crop Breed	100	1		
	Tahseen Jafry	Ergonomics of Implements	100	44		
GVT APPROXIMATE TOTALS				949	1193	
				44.32%	55.68%	