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1. INTRODUCTION

It has been time and again noticed that a community or a village receives development inputs from various sources that include Government, NGOs, INGOs, philanthropic organizations and individuals. A large number of times, it is also seen that programs overlap, duplication of efforts take place even within the government programs. It is not uncommon to notice that in most of the government schemes the spirit of the program is lost primarily due to lack of community ownership as well as the mechanical attitude of the government machinery. The general demand of both bureaucracy and the polity is restricted towards target fulfillment and target achievement. For example, a district collector and the elected representative would be interested in understanding the number of hand pumps installed in the village rather than the quantum and quality of water that the hand pump is able to turn out. In such cases the spirit of development is lost and the process is reduced to target fulfillment and number.

Drawing from the experiences of examples from maternal and child health one always finds that the primary health center and ICDS are in overlapping roles, each claiming the success on their account. In such cases assessing the impact of individual program and agency is extremely difficult as no framework or methodology is available to analyze the impact resulted due to each organization / program.

The objective of this study is to develop a framework for Impact Analysis of community based approaches to development. The major approaches to the subject are identified through review of literature for understanding economic approaches based on Result Based Management (RBM) & Logical Framework Analysis (LFA) and Participatory Approach. While economic approaches emphasize quantification of impact and their valuation, RBM and LFA based approaches have managerial concerns at the core and impose serious restrictions on flexibility of framework particularly on assessing unintended and unforeseen impacts. Participation is in ideological concern that can be accommodated in the methodology that is being proposed in the IA framework. A separate chapter on review of literature is being included while developing this framework.

The study considers intense community reflection, learning and overall assessment of project impacts as major concerns of impact analysis exercise. It conceives the human and eco system well being as the end objective of a project intervention in a community based development project. The framework attempts to understand the following:
a. The distinctive feature of the role of change agents and the influencing factors thereon. The change agents identified through review of literature and field experience of micro planning suggests the following:

   i. Community action
   ii. Partnership
   iii. Democratic decentralization
   iv. Empowerment of Women
   v. Convergence
   vi. Empowerment of Youth

b. The process and resolution level of a community in adopting the development gains from a project output.

c. The gestation period of transforming development gain into well being gain in a community and its relationship with the change agents.

d. Distinctly identify the organization, program, strategy and its specific influence.
1.1. **Evaluation assessment and impact analysis**

1.1.1. **Evaluation**

Program evaluation is an integral part of the program planning, implementation, review, and change cycle. Patton (1997) defines program evaluation as *the systematic collection of information about the activities, characteristics, and outcomes of programs to make judgments about the program, improve program effectiveness, and/or inform decisions about future programming.*

There are a variety of different approaches to evaluation. The key is to choose the approach or approaches that provide the highest quality, most useful information to answer the evaluation questions given the program context and the resources available to conduct the investigation.

1.1.2. **Assessment**

Assessment is the process of identifying and understanding a problem and planning a series of actions to deal with it. There are usually a number of different stages in this process, but the end result is always to have a clear and realistic plan of activities designed to achieve a set of clear aims and objectives.

1.1.3. **Impact analysis**

*What is impact analysis?*

Development in a society can be understood from various perspectives. It can be caused due to program intervention of Government, NGOs, religious organizations etc on one hand, or due to spontaneous people’s action. In either of the case tracing development impact as end result or as a process pose numerous challenges. The first challenge that one may encounter is when a development program or a social action has caused multiple impacts. In such a case the challenge is to identify *what impact to be analyzed and where to look for them?* The second challenge is *identification of specific change agent* that has caused the difference. The third challenge is *identification of the indicators of the change agents* and which one of them has had the maximum influence. Yet another challenge is looking at the *influence of the indicators in isolation as well as when grouped together.* There could be many more.
The intension of impact analysis and how it is understood here is of crucial importance. What the study proposes to undertake is to analyze the impact path (process indicators) that leads to transform program output to development gain and development gain to well being gain. Let us suppose achieving the target of providing at least one source for every ten families fulfilled the output of a drinking water project.

The impact needs to be seen whether sufficient hygienic water was provided to the families and further whether it has resulted in reducing the water borne diseases. To that extent, this is analysis of development gain. However, analyzing the resultant of development gain in a family i.e. whether the family has utilized the savings from health to enhance other area of quality of life, or enhancement of other social indicators (e.g. education of girl child) this would mean the understanding of well being gain.

1.2. Need for IA Framework

The IA framework is being designed to enhance sound community driven monitoring and management at the local level. Effective development planning includes a number of important characteristics. UNICEF considers a particular development process to be sound if it minimizes adverse environmental impacts, is suitable for the location, is community driven & managed, makes efficient use of existing community infrastructure and services, accounts for community costs, is the product of broad community consensus and is consistent with community regional character. This study of the IA process is being designed to ensure that sound community knowledge and practices are integrated into overall operations of local government and are included in long-range plans for communities by the district authorities.

Development, especially that which is large, unique or precedent setting may have a substantial impact on a community’s financial, environmental and cultural resources. IA framework will provide an opportunity for communities to gain advance understanding of the potential impacts of a particular development, so that they may plan to both efficiently meet new service demands and avoid potential environmental or social costs that may accompany the development. IA framework is also important because it potentially could:

- **Promotes communication and conflict resolution among local officials and residents.** The assessment process involves collaboration between local officials and community to identify concerns, exchange information and evaluate potential impacts associated with the development. The process is also a valuable tool for minimizing the risk of conflict between groups about the proposed development.
• **Encourages responsive and informed decision-making.** The assessment of impacts helps ensure that local officials acknowledge and respond to community concerns. Active involvement of both community and local officials in the assessment can lead to informed decisions that are consistent with long-term goals of the community.

• **Addresses the range of potential impacts associated with a proposed development.** The IA framework is being designed to address the potential, fiscal, environmental and socio-economic impacts related to a proposed development. The comprehensive nature of development impact assessment ensures that many impacts are considered in the planning process and thus results in more informed development-related decisions.

• **Facilitates interagency cooperation and efficiency.** Since comprehensive impact assessment considers the range of potential impacts of a proposed development, the process requires substantial cooperation among various governmental departments to collect and analyze data about the project. For example, a proposal to construct a shopping center on the outskirts of town may require estimates of increased traffic congestion from the Department of Transportation, a biological assessment of the site from the Department of Natural Resources, and a benefit/cost analysis from the Department of public works or Planning Department. Moreover, the IA framework will provide a common repository for information collected from each agency and the public.

• **Promotes fairness and consistency in the development process.** The systematic approach applied during the assessment process will ensure that all impacts are considered for each proposed development.

• **Identifies resource needs and constraints.** An important component of the IA is that the process will help district officials identify community services that need to be expanded or community facilities that need to be built or improved upon to accommodate growth. It will also identify, in advance of development, potential resource constraints (e.g., financial or environmental resources) that may impede the success of a proposed development.

• **RBM has thrown new challenges where by the outcome have to be result oriented in the larger context.** It has been recognized that in a single development sector and sub sector, there will be several agencies (both funding and implementing) working at the same time with the same goal. Identifying the impact caused due to the intervention of each organization will be increasingly difficult due to methodological problem. There is a need to generate a field based methodology and the framework to handle the complex development impacts in the community.
2. DEVELOPMENT AND SOCIAL CHANGE

2.1 Identification key change agents

In the jigsaw puzzle of development it is difficult to identify what exactly are the key factors that bring change in the society. Surely there are specific change agents that play crucial role. All development through program intervention is effort towards bringing about planned social change. In this context it calls for further identification of the change agents and also to qualify the buzzword "planned social change".

Planned Social Change

Human beings are a social species. We need to belong, to identify with a group. Social systems are our natural human environment: interdependent, interactive groups, which share important concerns - for example, a neighborhood or a community. Like individuals, social systems must change - adapt and grow - or they risk becoming unsuccessful or dysfunctional.

The key to successful adaptation and growth is to plan for change, so that changes are proactive rather than reactive. Planned social change, then, is a rational approach to implementing significant changes in the structure or function of our social systems. It takes the big picture into account, seeking long-range growth and health rather than finding a "quick fix."

Planned change implies direction-a vision of the future for the neighborhood or community. If you think 5, 10, or even 25 years into the future, how would you wish your neighborhood or community to be? What would be different? What would be the same? Planned social change turns that vision into a new reality.

However, change is not always comfortable. Most of us have reached some level of accommodation to the status quo, and the prospect of significant changes may leave us feeling threatened and uneasy. When faced with this discomfort, we may deny the need for change, resist it, or rationalize our desire to remain unchanged. Though it is a natural part of the change process, we can still initiate social change while lessening or avoiding resistance by using these three types of strategies:

**Power strategies** bring about change by the threat of punishment or consequences. For example, passing a city ordinance imposing a fine for smoking in municipal buildings is a power tactics. Such strategies aim for behavior change rather than a change in attitudes or beliefs, thus avoiding one cause of resistance.
Using power tactics requires adequate and appropriate resources to provide enforcement, but may bring about behavior change very quickly.

**Persuasion** strategies create change by convincing us that is the socially acceptable thing to do. Persuasion tactics urge us to identify with new group norms as we become convinced, for example, that "Friends don't let friends drive drunk." This quotation, from a public service announcement aired some years ago, illustrates how persuasion tactics lower our resistance to change by assuring us of our group identity and acceptance.

**Education** strategies bring about change by offering information, knowledge, and/or skills. Change through education is often slow, but tends to be long lasting because we have shifted our attitudes, values, or beliefs. The early warning on cigarette packages is an example of an education tactics. It took a while; many of us denied the validity of a link between smoking and cancer; but once that knowledge was accepted it became part of our personal identity as nonsmokers.

Each of the categories - **Power, Persuasion, and Education** - is valid and useful. The most effective campaigns typically employ all three.

Planned change takes time. After all, people create social change, and it takes time to communicate and accept new ideas. Even a power strategy will be very difficult to implement without the acceptance and cooperation of most members of the social system. (Witness the difficulty of enforcing extremely unpopular laws.) Power, persuasion and education can be further understood into the elements of larger change agents and all the three components are integral part of the following:

1. Community action
2. Partnership
3. Democratic decentralization
4. Empowerment of Women
5. Convergence
6. Empowerment of Youth

Numerous research and documentations have revealed that the presence of the above six singularly or in combination have played essential role in bringing about major change in the society. The IA framework would take the above six as the major premise and expect that all or any community driven program intervention must encompass / collaborate with these change agents for the ultimate achievement of
development goal. At this point it may be important to very briefly understand each of these before we proceed further.

2.2 Importance of change agents

2.2.1 Community action

“Community action” can be understood as the action, reaction and active participation of the people in a geographically specified area who come together to meet and fulfill their aspirations & goals that are common. More often, this is voluntary in nature or such actions are initiated through an animator who may be a social activist or a program person. Community action is a well understood change agent for the poor whose collectivism is the source of their inspiration that help them to revive from their economy of poverty.

The economy of poverty is characterized by a high degree of labour division. In the endeavor to survive, human ingenuity appears inexhaustible. One can easily list 350 to 400 income-generating activities the poor undertake with skill and perseverance. Despite its labour and skills, however, the economy of poverty is at the losing end of the rope. The resources base is too narrow. Poverty is poverty because it cannot, on its own, overcome the inherent and chronic gap between production and consumption. Much less can it start and sustain the process of accumulation that is a premise for progress. (Yunus, 1982)

The poorest have no land or a very limited access to land. They have no access to credit or only to credit, which is highly exploitative. They are underpaid for their work and this cycle of degradation is compounded by the inadequacy of food intake which depletes their only remaining resource, their labour.

In the economy of poverty, prices, profits, wages, interest rates, shortages or famines are not functions of quantifiable economic variables, but results of powerful social processes which can be described better in qualitative terms. (Fuglesang and Chandler, 1986)

At one end we have the Marxian viewpoint from which community action would appear as a retreat from the essential task of capturing state power through class struggle. Instead of leading the poor and marginalized into a political change, community action could in fact, from this perspective, appear to provide legitimacy to the existing state by providing it with a smokescreen, as to how accommodating and sensitive the state is to the needs of the people. A counter view might be that particular forms of community action might actually lead people to fight for their legitimate rights, and need not therefore be inimical to the assertion of their political rights.
This necessitates a closer examination of the concept of community action. In general, a participatory approach implies a major, but not exclusive role for local populations in allocating rights and responsibilities. The substance of participation is however ill defined and obscure; who is participating, how, and in what. Who has decision-making and regulatory powers, and who has access to resources and funds. Community action as mentioned above is the active participation of people of that community who strive to achieve their goal. In this context the levels it is necessary to differentiate amongst various levels of participation that may or may not be part of a community action process.

**Passive participation:** People participate by being told what is going to happen or has already happened. Decentralization of administration is often held out as a modality that increases participation. However, when the decentralization is no more than extending the reach of the administration to lower levels, by adding tiers from the district to block to gram Panchayat level, the participation may at best be passive, in that a local official is handy to inform people about the decisions of the government.

**Participation in information giving:** People participate by giving answers to questions posed by extractive researchers and project managers. A lot of participatory research ends here, since the analysis, policy formulations and the project holders formulate implementation strategies.

**Participation by consultation:** People participate by being consulted and external agencies listen to their views. External agencies define both the problems and solutions. In this category, the interaction with the people may be more human than formal and the nature of consultations may be sensitive to the language, customs and priorities of the people.

**Participation for material resources:** People participate by providing resources, for example labour in return for cash or food. Many rural development schemes require such an assurance from project holders, and the quantum of participation is judged by the amount of non-cash contributions from the community. In fact many schemes already prescribe such participation in percentage terms as a norm!

**Functional participation:** People participate by forming groups to meet predetermined objectives relating to the project, which can involve the development or promotion of externally initiated social organization and goals. One might cite the watershed development program and the mass literacy campaigns as approximate examples of such participation.

**Legislated Participation:** People are endowed with constitutional rights to create local forms of governance. The 73rd and 74th amendments of the constitution are examples. However, the functionality of
such bodies is critically dependent on the actions of the state to devolve powers, resources and institutions to such bodies, and to equip them in every sense to perform their obligations.

**Interactive participation:** People participate in joint analysis, which leads to joint action-plans and formation of new groups or strengthening of old ones. The People’s Planning Process of Kerela, where every Panchayat has made its five year plan which has been incorporated in the overall ninth plan of the Kerela state, with assured funding for each of the local plans could be an illustration for this category of participation. Similarly, in case of the district of Chandrapur, over 300 micro plans have been formulated through the interactive process.

**Self-mobilization:** People participate by taking initiatives independent of external change systems or agents. With some variation, many people’s movements would fall in this category.

### 2.2.2 Partnership

Recent development trends have provided a strong foundation for innovative partnerships. Most developing countries have begun to liberalize their markets, reform state regimes to ensure some basic tenets of democracy, and take advantage of increased capacity on the part of civil society. While the three sectors are becoming more effective and efficient in achieving their sectoral goals, no one sector can solve every local or national issue. Collaboration and coordination among the sectors can lead to the production of some essential collective goods and services still not provided by individual sectors, and a more efficient use of resources in addressing a number of issues of local importance.

The ability of Inter Sectoral Partnerships (ISP) to address a wide range of particularly difficult issues is making the formation of ISPs an increasingly important development strategy. ISPs have demonstrated substantial success—often following poor results of one-sector strategies—in spurring economic development; building water, road, and other infrastructure systems; addressing environmental degradation; and in helping to provide health and education services. Partnership thus is being seen as a essentials change agent in the process of development.

Donors are particularly interested in this strategy as it often contributes to a reduction in the transaction costs and risks associated with alternative institutional arrangements. Donors can access and share an important resource—information—that contributes to the overall decline of these costs and risks. Donor organizations often provide resources and technical expertise that facilitate the partnership process. Finally, donors are particularly valued for their ability to engage in policy dialogue with other governments.
The benefit of ISP can be seen in:

- Increase the scale of their activities
- Raise their credibility
- Take advantage of each partner’s strengths
- Mobilize resources
- Reduce transaction costs and risks
- Address externalities
- Exchange technical or other forms of information
- Develop undefined opportunities, based on the understanding that collaboration among different, and frequently opposing, sectors creates new ideas and solutions to common problems
- Capitalize on the political advantage or power derived from coalition building
- Achieve a mutual goal that would be unattainable if each sector were working alone

Models for Partnerships

The different forms of partnership will stem from planning and execution of the diverse activities. The study envisages three categories of partnerships:

**Category A:**

**Government** (includes federal, state and district levels)

*Government is essentially the author of and the agent responsible for fostering global and specific policies for the sector.*

**Category B:**

**Community** (NGOs, universities, professional and community associations, etc…)

*The community is essentially the multiplier-agent responsible for technical support for target-populations.*

**Category C:**

**Informal organizations representative of CBOs**

*These are essentially the target-populations, the demand regarding the need for implementing policies and programmes in the community.*

As a result of this classification, there are six actual possibilities for partnerships among these agents:

1. Intergovernmental partnership;
1. **Intergovernmental partnership**

This kind of partnership makes it possible to strengthen and develop the capability of states and districts to formulate and carry out the work, confirming the tenet of political and administrative decentralization. This is an integrated relationship between the National Programme and the other governmental social agents or a relationship between similar government levels, *e.g.*: the relationship between a Ministry and another Ministry, between a state and another state, with a view to rationalizing and reducing technical and financial efforts.

2. **Intercommunity partnership**

A type of partnership which makes it possible to build up the capability of community institutions through effective exchange of information, and particularly of experiences in this area. It also fosters the strengthening of the institution’s technical capability and the capability for resource-mobilization and self-sustainability.

3. **Government/Community Partnership**

This kind of partnership fosters the exploring and stimulation of the potential of NGOs and other community agents which have been carrying out work on information and education and are currently developing activities which imply, for example, formulation and implementation of more systematic and continuous policies and programmes in the workplace.

4. **Partnership between Government and NGOs**

Mainly targeted to ensuring a regular information flow. This information flow, which is a one-way flow (Government/Organizations), furnishes directives and guidance with a view to orienting the course of actions to be carried out. The information which flows in the other sense, *i.e.*, from the organizations/NGOs to the government are fundamental data for a better understanding of the reality and for evaluating the public policy for the sector.

5. **Partnership between Community/ NGOs**
A type of partnership, which fosters and explores the potential shown by the diverse community segments, stimulating accessibility of technical support to the NGOs-CBOs which need them. Particularly in the case of NGOs, it also allows for continuity of activities, not only those regarding prevention and assistance, but also of activities for institutional development.

6. Tripartite partnerships (Categories A, B and C)

This type of partnership is between the Government, NGOs and community. The Government realizes the expertise of the NGO on their critical information regarding the community and use the data in making a realistic plan. The NGO on the other hand ensures the participation of community towards formulating a community driven plan of action and NGO acts the interface between community and the Government.

2.2.3 Democratic decentralization

Democratic decentralization in the context of IA framework should be understood in two ways:

1. The Panchayati Raj Institutions (PRI)
2. The informal village institutions / CBOs

Both the above-mentioned institutions when effective can function as change agents. While the former is a phenomenon of constitution of India, the later is informal people’s organizations that emerge locally through people’s participation.

Decentralization is the process where a central government relinquishes some of its management responsibilities and powers to a local government, local leader, or community institution.

About 60 developing countries are currently undertaking some form of decentralized natural resource management (Agrawal 2001:208; Ribot 2002b:1). At least in developing countries, the status quo prior to decentralization reforms is usually a central government with the power to make most major decisions about natural resources or land use. Commonly, central governments set the framework for environmental governance at the provincial, district, and local levels. For example, a conservation agenda for a park or reserve will frequently be made by a national parks service or a state wildlife conservation department—agencies operating at some distance from the actual resource and the people who rely on it for employment or subsistence. National forest ministries often assert legal authority over forest ownership
and use policies. These determine who has access to forests, what timber resources are harvested, how revenues are used, and how well rules are enforced.

In most cases, all that is left to local governments or communities is the management of natural resources that are of little commercial value. For instance, a community may get to decide how to harvest non-timber forest products such as latex, mushrooms, rattan, or bamboo for household consumption, or how to allocate local fishing resources. In contrast, central government ministries tend to reserve the right to allocate timber, mining, or fishing concessions, provide hunting licenses, or manage tourist parks—all sources of significant revenue (Kaimowitz and Ribot 2002:5). Local authorities and citizens also may have little say when it comes to the citing of polluting industries and heavy infrastructure such as mines, airports, or roads, even though the pollution, noise, and traffic they create are felt locally.

Decentralization reforms can begin to break down such centralized—and sometimes highly exclusionary—decision-making systems in various ways. Reforms can range from grants of only small additional responsibilities to a sub-national government, to significant empowerment of local leaders and previously underrepresented groups in major policy decisions or management. The powers that are typically decentralized to municipal or local institutions vary widely, ranging from regulatory and fiscal powers, to enforcement, and even some judiciary powers.

The local institutions that are granted these new decision-making powers also vary, and can include (Dupar and Badenoch 2002:3; Ribot 2002b:4–5):

- Elected local authorities, such as a mayor, a town or Sarpanch in a village council.
- Elected or appointed user groups, such as agricultural cooperatives or wildlife management groups or SHGs
- Local members of a political party apparatus
- Local, national, or international nongovernmental organizations (NGOs), and traditional leaders, such as local chiefs, defined by local custom.

In short, decentralization can describe a variety of changes in who makes decisions on social development and natural resources and how those decisions are made: A central government may grant some control over fisheries or tracts of state land to a local government, along with responsibility for infrastructure, such as water supply, sanitation, and irrigation. An agricultural agent, employed by the national government but based in a field office, may be allowed to issue rules on resource access for a tract of land, such as grazing permits. A central government may grant locally appointed bodies responsibility for surveying and
leasing forest land to households. Or it may empower a nongovernmental organization (NGO) and a community group to jointly set hunting quotas for elephants in a wildlife preserve.

**Effective democratic decentralization**

Ideally, decentralization reforms help balance central government oversight and regulation with local input and empowerment. Done well, this effort should bring government closer to the people and increase opportunities for citizens to take an interest in public affairs because it devolves power to the local and municipal level. Particularly in developing countries, opportunities to have meaningful input in resource use and decision-making are likely to decrease mutual suspicion and enable all major groups to participate in managing the shared environment on an equal footing (UNEP 2002:409). Decentralization should also benefit the environment and improve equity in natural resource management because it can tap local knowledge of the environment and bring a better appreciation of local people’s needs. In addition, local groups are more likely to respect resource decisions made with local input.

But achieving decentralization’s potential depends largely on how the reforms are designed and implemented (World Bank 1999:109). To best benefit the environment and improve equity in resource management, four minimum criteria must be met:

- Decentralization must result in a transfer of meaningful powers—including fiscal powers—to a local institution.

- The institution to which power is transferred must be representative of the local populace in its diversity—not just elite interests—and have a broad knowledge of local natural resources and people’s dependence on them.

- The local public must be able to hold the institution accountable through elections, hearings, or other democratic means.

- Fiscal and regulatory incentives must be in place to promote sustainable management of natural resources over the long term.

Meeting all four criteria is not easy.

2.2.4 **Empowerment of Women**
The empowerment of women has time and again demonstrated the power and pace of development in a society. One of the impressionistic reports of Unicef has vividly brought out the point that empowerment of women can bring about multi faceted social development in a community (Ghosh: 2001). The examples of Dharva and Pandharkawada block have amply demonstrated how there has been major attitudinal change in the community wherein the status of women has grown from their traditional homebound to active economic and political equals.

No matter which way you choose to address the developmental challenge, you will come back to the core issue of the empowerment of women. The respect for women's rights as an indivisible part of the human rights, the education of women and the support that they need for their more effective socio-cultural and economic roles by access to credit and the removal of discriminatory barriers to their full participation in economic, social and political life, all have enormous benefits to society, and are the keys to resolving some of the overarching problems of our time.

There is no effective attack on the problem of poverty without the education and empowerment of women. The statistics on the feminization of poverty, and the systematic discrimination against women and the girl child are clear.

There is no better way to reduce population growth than the education and empowerment of women to reduce unwanted pregnancies and reduce fertility. There is no better way of promoting the well-being of children and ensuring their better education and preparation than the education and empowerment of women.

There is no better investment in reducing infant mortality and improving basic health and nutrition than the education and empowerment of women. Every one of these considerations calls for the empowerment and education of women.

Empowerment of women means removing the discriminatory barriers that are frequently legislated against them, or mercilessly maintained as an integral part of prevalent social practices. From personal statute law (marriage, divorce and custody of children) to economic laws (ownership of property and access to financial services), to civil/political laws (citizenship, elections, holding of public offices, travel restrictions, etc.) - all these need to be revised with an eye to implement the fundamental principles of equality and respect for the International Declaration of Human Rights that is clear on many of these points.

2.2.5 Convergence
The dictionary meaning of “Convergence” is coming together in harmony. The developmentalist of 21st century has come to terms with this terminology and is being used in almost all fields. Nevertheless there are some interesting observations on this term that come in light as a point of view.

“Convergence’ is arguably a word that to a great many people means precious little. Although most have heard of the concept, and can identify the fact that convergence embodies a ‘coming-together’ of the telecom, information technology and the audio-visual sectors, it can be argued that the ‘convergence’ concept remains just that -- a concept -- to the general population.”

The emerging concept of development emphasizes the need for involvement and participation of the community in their own development. This can be fruitfully realized when involvement and participation is ensured at micro-level development initiatives and efforts. It makes a paradigm shift from the pyramidal top-down bureaucratic approach, which has stultified the effectiveness of many, a well-intended plan. The new paradigm emphasizes that true development for the people comes only when it is by the people, showing community level initiatives in problem identification, planning and acting on them. This is at the center of Participatory Learning & Action (PLA) exercises, the logical extension of which is Convergent Community Action (CCA). CCA is an excellent strategy to involve the community in development and evolve plans to converge all basic services for the poor through community initiative together as a partner with the Government and civil societies.

Understanding the above as the central phenomena, Unicef’s CCA approach has been put to test at field level throughout the country. As I have understood it, the contextual meaning of convergence can also be synonym to “synergy”. When we are talking of convergent community action, the term community should be understood here in its broadest sense i.e. working as partners in the form of a triangle – the community, the Government and the civil societies. Any one of them not converging will be the missing angle of a triangle thus creating wide gap in the approach. Understanding the magnitude of the problem of country like India, ignoring the wide network of the Government and their program will be siting in the fool’s paradise and dreaming of development. Hence the Government has to be an integral part in the process. The civil societies on the other hand can creatively concentrate in a community, relate to community people better and thus can evolve models for replications. This is generally not possible in a government system due to various rules, regulations and rigidities. Hence the civil societies are the second important angle of the approach. The third and the final arm as well as the base of the triangle is the community. Their participation and acceptance of a program, their ability to think for themselves and initiative to solve their own problem is the prime base of the triangle in the convergence approach.
Convergence in the context of IA framework is seen as yet another change agent that can accelerate development. Convergence though closely linked to partnership, yet it has its distinctive feature. It is like understanding the properties of a chemical composition and defining “mixture” and “compound”. 

**Partnership is mixture** whereby individual program/ agency collaborate yet retain their own identity. Whereas **convergence is like compound** that collaborate together in harmony and bring about a distinctive property of its own.

### 2.2.6 Empowerment of Youth

Young people - when organized and equipped with a vision for social change - are a powerful force. Youth from under-resourced communities are not given the support they need to develop as healthy human beings and effective citizens, and they are blamed for the conditions in their communities. But when young people come together and organize, they can change their conditions, and they can understand their own power as community leaders. Youth organizing can both change young peoples' understanding of their own role in society and change society itself.

But grassroots youth organizing efforts often cannot survive purely on their own initiative. The same young people who have the most innovative visions for social change often lack the technical skills, the infrastructure and the connections to other youth groups that they need to achieve their goals.

A call for the establishment of an Education and ICT fund to promote North-South and South-South cooperation was one of a number of recommendations set out in the final document adopted by the World Youth Forum of the United Nations System following five days of debate and consultation between youth groups and representatives of United Nations agencies.

The Preamble to the Strategy declares the concern of the young people participating in the Forum about the continued deterioration of the status of youth worldwide, who face growing levels of unemployment, poverty, armed conflict, epidemic diseases, functional illiteracy, and substance abuse – among other social and economic challenges -- despite global advances made in technologies, entrepreneurship development and medical research. Other concerns addressed in the Preamble include hunger and malnutrition, homelessness and unsafe environments, social exclusion, the cycle of indebtedness of developing countries, the HIV/AIDS pandemic, unequal opportunities for education, human rights abuses, including
child labour, trafficking and sexual exploitation, and children and youth in armed conflict, the unequal status of young women and girls, violence and suicide, and the deterioration of the environment.

The youth in addition to their social exploitation are also subjected to political exploitation. It is unfortunate that the social development sector has not been able to sufficiently utilized and channelize the energies of young people. The political parties have conspicuously used them for their own benefit. They are very powerful change agents who can make or break a community process. When their energies are channelized toward development they can be an extremely positive force. The participation of youth in both the district of Chandrapur and Yavatmal are examples of towards their positive participation and the extent of change it has brought in the community. IA framework plans to rank the power of youth as one of the parameters for accelerating development.

3. METHODOLOGY ADOPTED

Development being a multi faceted and complex phenomenon, gauging impact is yet more difficult. Especially when we talk about human development it encompass all the realms of social, economic, political, ecological and cultural development of a community. Hence analyzing the impact that would comprehensively answer all the facets would require multiple techniques. Accordingly it was decided that a combination of tools would be used.

They are:

3.1.1 Value engineering
3.1.2 Stakeholder analysis
3.1.3 Case study
3.1.4 Social survey
3.1.5 Generating of equation

3.1 Use of tools and their justification

3.1.1 Value engineering (evaluation matrix) to generate indices in order to arrive at a numerical value.

The methodology that will be adopted will be from the Value Engineering (VE) concept. This method has been accepted as one of the most powerful method of eliminating waste. One of the tools used in VE is known as Evaluation Matrix. We will be using only Evaluation Matrix to arrive at the numerical indices. Brief on this method is given below:
Evaluation matrix - creation phase

During the creation phase of the job-plan, the team focuses only on the generation of ideas and does not consider whether or not they will actually work. The stress is on quantity, and judgment is postponed. The time has now come to evaluate all those ideas and really find out the best alternative idea that will equally satisfy the basic function.

There are several yardsticks used to judge ideas, some of the most commonly used techniques are:

1. Using filters - If the team has done a good job during the creation phase, then they must have a number of ideas to evaluate. If the number exceeds more than 100 then it becomes really difficult to evaluate every single idea for all its advantages and disadvantages. The idea needs to be filtered on the basis of need, technique, implementation difficulties, cost, risk and so on. The method involves glancing at all the ideas rapidly, and then deciding whether or not they will be acceptable according to any one of the points mentioned above.

One of the primary filters is “risk”. If the team feels that some of the ideas may involve high level of risk in the program or process then all such ideas are filtered and kept aside for a later scrutiny.

The second filter is “technique”. If some of the ideas involve new techniques that the team or organization is not fully conversant with, or technology requiring considerable R & D effort before implementation, then such ideas may be filtered and stored separately for subsequent R & D review.

The third filter could be “implementation problems”. The team may feel it is not possible to implement certain ideas or that the organization would face severe problems in implementing them, for reasons such as the organization’s commitment to the government or funding agency. In all such cases, the ideas may be dropped temporarily. Theses ideas may be grouped and sent to the management team for a review to be taken up for revival and implementation at the appropriate time.

Segregation into long and short-term

This is not a process of elimination but essentially one of segregation. In this method, the ideas are segregated into long-term and short-term implementation proposals for drawing greater attention of the team. The team scans all the ideas and marks quickly whether or not it is possible to implement the idea rapidly, say within three months. The short-term ideas are taken up for a detailed review first and then the long-term ideas. The decision regarding whether the implementation should be short-or long-term, and what period should be considered short of long, is left to individual teams.
Ranking
The ideas, now bought down to a manageable number, are individually ranked in order of importance by the group. The whole group attempts rank the filtered and segregated ideas in order of priority. First the group identifies the most important and the least important idea. For instance, if the group has 12 ideas then the team assigns rank 1 to the best idea and rank 12 to the least important idea. From the remaining, the team again identifies the best as rank 2 and the worst as rank 11. This is continued until all the ideas are ranked. This is a very simple approach but eaves a number of doubts in the minds of the team members.

3.1.2 Stakeholder analysis (12 X 12 matrix)
Stakeholder analysis is the identification of a project's key stakeholders, an assessment of their interests, and the ways in which these interests affect project risk and viability. It is linked to both institutional appraisal and social analysis: drawing on the information deriving from these approaches, but also contributing to the combining of such data in a single framework. Stakeholder analysis contributes to project design through the logical framework, and by helping to identify appropriate forms of stakeholder participation.

Stakeholders are persons, groups or institutions with interests in a project or programme. Primary stakeholders are those ultimately affected, either positively (beneficiaries) or negatively (for example, those involuntarily resettled). Secondary stakeholders are the intermediaries in the aid delivery process. This definition of stakeholders includes both winners and losers, and those involved or excluded from decision-making processes.

Key stakeholders are those who can significantly influence, or are important to the success of the project.

Why do a stakeholder analysis?

| IMPORTANCE |
| INFLUENCE  |
| PARTICIPATION |
Stakeholder analysis will be done on a composite matrix in order to map the positioning of the stakeholder on the impact of a program in the cross-matrix format. In this format, participation of the stakeholder in a program and the importance mapping will be done in the outer matrix, and the program performance and influence of the stakeholder (on the programme) will be done in the inner matrix. All these will be done in the scale of high, medium, and low. Thus, we will be able to formulate both qualitative as well as a quantitative index of critical relationship through the village level participation.

This will further assist the district administration and advisors to assess a project environment, and their negotiating position in project talks. More specifically, doing a stakeholder analysis can:

- Draw out the interests of stakeholders in relation to the problems that the project is seeking to address (at the identification stage) or the purpose of the project (once it has started).
• Identify conflicts of interests between stakeholders, which will influence development agency’s assessment of a project’s risk before funds are committed.
• Help to identify relations between stakeholders, which can be built upon, and may enable “coalitions” of project sponsorship, ownership and cooperation.
• Help to assess the appropriate type of participation by different stakeholders, at successive stages of the project cycle.

3.1.3 Case study
Focus on relationships and processes. Relationships and processes within social settings tend to be interconnected and interrelated. To understand one thing it is necessary to understand many others and, crucially, how the various parts are linked. The case study approach works well here because it offers more chance than the survey approach of going into sufficient detail to unravel the complexities of a given situation. It can deal with the case as a whole, in its entirety, and thus have some chance of being able to discover how the many parts affect one another. In this respect, case studies tend to be ‘holistic’ rather than deal with ‘isolated factors’. It follows from this that within case studies there is a tendency to emphasize the detailed working of the relationships and social processes, rather than to restrict attention to the outcomes from these.

To understand the process some specific case study would be undertaken as integral part of IA framework. For e.g. the intervention of CCA as an approach in Pandharkawada block of Yavatmal district has played an important role in empowerment of women and several women have been elected as Sarpanch from this block from the non-reserved seat. In this context mere statistical analysis of cause and effect will not be sufficient to interprete the complex relationship variable as well as to gauge the process path.

3.1.4 Social survey
Social survey is one of the most common methods of evaluation and assessment. It is particularly useful since it applies a range of statistical tool to arrive at result, which is then interpreted by the concerned experts on the basis of the objectives of the research. Its mathematical ability to interpret the cause and effect of a social situation specifically makes it useful for eliminating the bias. IA framework proposed to use this method for understanding the program level interventions and their dependency and inter dependency factors. For this application of multivariate analysis will be done. This analysis will be undertaken particularly to separate the program strategy factors.

3.1.5 Generating of Equation
Assuming, several organizations will be working towards same development goal, it most often becomes extremely difficult to specifically understand the contribution caused due to the program intervention of each organization. Using the Weightage of the main parameters as constant, simultaneous equation will be developed to understand the multiple unknown factors. Here x, y and z will be considered as organizations.

Action research site
The location of the project will be termed as:
1. Control group – Chandrapur and Yavatmal that has received more organized inputs and interventions since last several years.
2. Treated group – Aurangabad and Latur that has received inputs transferred from the experiences from Chandrapur and Yavatmal and subsequently developed on its own.
IV. PROGRESS TILL DATE

4.1 Brainstorming for developing indicators

Initially brainstorming exercise in a two days workshop was organized at NYK Chandrapur to develop the indicators of the four major parameters that were identified earlier. However two more parameters were added later, on the basis of interaction in the villages and field experience. The following are the identified six parameters:

1. Community action
2. Partnership
3. Democratic decentralization
4. Women’s empowerment
5. Convergence
6. Empowerment of youth

In case of first four, the indicators were developed during the first workshop in the month of April 2003, while for the later two, the indicators were developed in the month of Sept. 03 and Nov. 03 subsequently.

It was agreed upon that the presence of any or all of the six parameters could work as vital change agent in a community. However it is important to further understand the indicators of each of these parameters and then undertake a conscious field-testing on the basis of their occurrence in the field.

Hence it was decided that after the brainstorming exercise the indicators will be put to field-testing in fifteen specifically identified villages. The villages were chosen that characterized levels of input received from NYK i.e. representative villages should have variations in terms of having maximum inputs to very little or no inputs from NYK.

The indicators under each was identified as follows:

I. Community action – The extent of community action can be understood by the presence of indicators mentioned below:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Sub-indicator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Action</td>
<td>1. Volunteerism</td>
<td>Willingness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mixed age group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Equal representation between men/women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Trust</td>
<td>Openness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Helping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Division of work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Micro planning</td>
<td>Understanding the village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Preparation and orientation of MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Identification of infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Micro-plan assessment and appraisal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Community feedback and agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Documentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Implementation with responsibility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Follow-up</td>
<td>Enquiry from the facilitator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Internal follow-up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Going to government office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Resolving Village conflict</td>
<td>Difference of value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Religious conflict</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Family conflict</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Resource conflict</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cultural conflict</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Volunteerism – There should be a sense of voluntary participation of the people towards community / village affairs. Volunteerism can be further characterised by the following points:
   - Willingness to take responsibility
   - Mixed age group of different religion and different caste coming together for community meetings
   - Adequate representation of men and women

2. Trust – There should be a general feeling of trust within the community. This can be further characterized by:
   - Openness during discussion
   - Helping one other
   - Division of work
3. Micro planning – Micro planning was thought to be another important element of community action.

4. Implementation with responsibility – After the micro plan is developed implementation of the plan and taking adequate responsibility was identified as important element of community action.

5. Follow-up – Extent of follow up on various village affairs was also identified an important element of community action.
   - Enquiry from the facilitator by the people regarding work
   - Internal follow-up
   - People going to the Government office for follow up

II. **Partnership** – While discussing about partnership, the group felt that partnership could be understood in a triangular relationship hence sub parameter was further developed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Sub parameter</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Partnership</td>
<td>Partnership between community and NGO</td>
<td>1. Inter-coordination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Joint decision-making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. Initiative through NGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5. Joint responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6. Participation in social functions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnership</td>
<td>Partnership between community, NGO and government</td>
<td>1. Involvement of community and NGO in government programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Involvement of community and NGO in government decision-making body</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Government functionaries' participation in community functions related to government programmes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. Government functionaries' participation in community functions other than government programmes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Partnership Triangle Diagram](attachment:partnership_triangle_diagram.png)
1. Partnership between NGO and community – The indicators of partnership between NGO and community emerged as follows:
   - The extent of coordination between community and NGO
   - Trust – The extent of trust that the community has on the NGO
   - Joint decision making – The extent of involvement of community in the decision making
   - Initiative through NGO – The types and extent of initiative taken by the NGO in community affairs and resolving community conflicts
   - Joint responsibility – The procedures and methods of responsibility
   - Participation in social function – The frequency of NGO functionaries’ participation in the community social functions.

2. Partnership between NGO, community and government -
   - Involvement of the community and NGO in government programme
   - Involvement of the community and NGO in government decision-making body
   - Government functionaries participation in community functions related to government programs
   - Government functionaries participation in other than government programs

III. Democratic decentralization – Democratic decentralization or Panchayati Raj was thought to be an extremely important parameter that can work as a change agent. However developing the indicators for this parameter was difficult. It was felt that there might be more indicators developed while field-testing these indicators. It was further felt that democratic decentralization in the context of IA framework must be understood from both constitutional as well as voluntary angle. Hence Panchayati Raj and Village Institutions / CBOs were taken as sub parameter and indicators developed accordingly.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Sub parameter</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Democratic Decentralization</td>
<td>Panchayat Raj Institutions</td>
<td>1. Number of programmes implemented by Panchayat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Participation of Sarpanch and Gram sevak in resolving village conflicts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Announcements for Panchayat events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. The deprived class being benefited through Panchayat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5. Condition of Panchayat Bhawan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decentralized village institutions</td>
<td>1. Number of camps related to development organised in the village</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Number of young people coming forward for village development work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Number of women coming forward for village development work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Initiative taken by the villagers in village infrastructure development programme and extent of involvement of SHGs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Involvement of the deprived class/BPL families in SHGs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Number of programmes organized by village exclusively for girl child</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. Number of enrolment/ regularity of attendance of girl child in the school</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8. Number of girls married under 18 years old</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9. Number of young people engaged in self-employment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10. Regularity of meetings of SHGs/informal committees/CBOs and maintenance of minute’s book</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11. Number of women practicing safe motherhood</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12. Number of informal local development committees in the village</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 6. Regularity and extent of tax collection |
| 7. Adoption of new agricultural practice introduced by Panchayat |
| 8. Initiative taken by Panchayat for additional development work |
| 9. Re-elected Sarpanch without fear psychosis |
| 10. Number of issues raised/ recommended by Panchayat to Block and Zilla Parishad |
IV. **Women empowerment** – Empowerment of women was unanimously thought to be one of the most important change agents in the development scenario. However the group felt that empowerment must be understood by the following indicators:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Women's Empowerment</td>
<td>1. Number of women elected in unreserved seats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Involvement of SHGs in different village development work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Active participation of SHG in decision making process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Marriage above 18 years old</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Choice of pregnancy (safe motherhood)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Financial stability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. Share of household income</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8. Right to do expenditure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9. Right to earn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10. Number of women regularly attending SHG’s meeting/Gram Sabha/ training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11. Girls’ education</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

V. **Convergence**: The approach of Convergent Community Action (CCA) was one of the most successful inputs in the district of Chandrapur. With CCA approach there were major change observed in the villages that accelerated the pace of development. Accordingly the following indicators were developed for convergence:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Convergence</td>
<td>1. Joint decision-making through universalization of problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Inter-agency cooperation (Community, NGO &amp; government)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Leadership development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Awareness increase in women’s rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Women’s political participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Pressure groups for combating social evils</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. Competitive spirit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

VI. **Empowerment of youth**: While interacting in the group in Aurangabad which happens to be the second district for indicator testing and confirmation, the group identified yet another parameter of
change agent i.e. empowerment of youth. It was decided that this parameter will also be discussed in the group in Chandrapur and the indicators should be developed and field-tested. Accordingly the group developed the following indicators:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Empowerment of Youth</td>
<td>1. Initiative taken by youth for village development work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Number of active youth groups/SHG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Participation in village decision-making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Number of educated youth in the village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Number of self-employed youth in the village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Number of youth from the village in the formal employment sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. Transfer of power from older generation to younger generation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8. Decision on marriage age and dowry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9. Number of youth groups having equal participation of male and female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10. Number of active youth group involvement in various government/non-governmental committees at district/block/village level</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2 Community focus group discussion and testing of indicators

Location and rationale of village: Fifteen villages were identified from the development block of Rajura, Korpana and Jivati. It was decided that villages should be chosen in such a way that should have variation in terms of inputs (time and money –both together and separately) provided by NYK. Hence the villages were divided in a scale of 1-5 as follows:

1 = Villages receiving / received very little or no direct inputs from NYK
2 = Villages receiving / received some inputs from NYK
3 = Villages receiving / received average amount of inputs from NYK
4 = Villages receiving / received reasonable amount of inputs from NYK
5 = Villages receiving / received maximum amount of inputs from NYK

It was decided that the developed indicators would be put to test in the field for a period of 2 months. Scoring method would be used for testing each of these indicators. Accordingly a score sheet was developed wherein indicators were written on the left side with blank space on the right. It was decided that
each of the indicators would receive 1 mark each time it occurs / realized. They were also advised that they could add any further indicators or sub parameters, which they feel was important.

In consultation with the coordinator of NYK it was further decided that a general village meeting would be conducted in all the selected 15 villages to discuss the indicators with the villagers in the form of focus group discussion. It was also decided to record the detailed observations during the meeting particularly the attendance of women and the extent of their participation in the discussion.

The following villages were chosen, visited and responsibilities assigned as mentioned in the table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Village name</th>
<th>Name of persons present for the meeting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mahapandhrwani</td>
<td>Sujit, Nasir, Pralhad, Dilip, Pramod, Smita Devidas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paradhiguda</td>
<td>Balaji Borkute, Shobha Kharkar, Lata Rohane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Umarzara</td>
<td>Dilip Naitam, Ranju Umare, Manjusha Anmulwar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dhanaguda</td>
<td>Pornima Junghare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maya Bhandakakar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devalaguda</td>
<td>Balaji borkute, Varsha Kharkare, Sunita Jivtode, Sunita Paypare, Gita Duryodhan, Shila Upare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tatakohad</td>
<td>Varsha Ramteke, Vanita Aatram, Rekha Bahade, Gopika Nair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelpur</td>
<td>Simta Lonare, Tanuja Karmankar, Kalpana Gangerlwar, Sulochana shende, Ravita Khirsagar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lendiguda</td>
<td>Devidas Kamble, Dilip Devtale, Shankar Chavan, Ashok Gaikwad, Gundubai Vaghmare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marakalmeta</td>
<td>Pralhad Madane, Tanebai Madavi Girija Duryodhan, Sumitra More</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maharajguda</td>
<td>Manisha Dkondwar, Pratibha Patange Deivshela Telange, Sarika Chavan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chincholi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gadegaon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talodi</td>
<td>Dilip Devtale, Pramod, Smita, Varsha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sevadas nagar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kostala</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition each of the meeting was participated by 50 – 150 villagers.

The actual field recording of the indicators is summarized below:
MAHAPANDHARWANI

Population – 295
Adults – 200
Children – 95
Total families - 85

Community action

Volunteerism
Meeting dates – 3/6/03, 7/6/03, 14/6/03, 17/6/03, 23/6/03, 27/6/03
1. Attendance for the meeting is average 55 to 56
   17/6/03  52  
   27/6/03  67  
   23/6/03  56  
2. Responsibility
3. Mixed age group
4. Equal representation of male and female

Trust
5. Openness during discussion but less discussion on female problems
6. Helping one another

Micro planning on education and health
Implementation with responsibility

Follow up
7. Regular follow up
8. Regularly updating the register for government follow up

Village conflict – A new parameter developed under this category. The community has internal mechanism to solve village conflicts. They seldom resort to legal/government mechanism for solving their conflicts. To that extent the cohesiveness and community action gets added weightage.

Partnership
9. Good relations with NYK
10. One CBO is there who have good rapport with NYK and government
11. Joint decision making
12. Full cooperation for Health but less in ICDS. NYK and government, both works on it

Democratic decentralization
13. Regular Panchayat meeting with proper recording
14. Review of the previous meeting - minutes are reviewed
15. Active participation of women – low women’s participation in Panchayat meetings.

Women empowerment
16. Women elected unopposed
17. Less contribution of women in upgar, kendragar
18. Active participation of youth in decision making
19. No choice of pregnancy
20. No right to do expenditure
21. More contribution of women in household income
22. Women regularly attending SHG’s meeting
23. Less number of women attending Gramsabha
PARADHIGUDA

Population – 118
Male – 63
Female – 55
Number of families – 20

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age group</th>
<th>Boys</th>
<th>Girls</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 – 3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 – 5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 – 9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 - 14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Distance from Taluka to Paradhiguda – 25 k.m.

**Community action**

**Volunteerism**
1. Responsibility (do the work told to them)
2. Equal representation of male and female

**Trust**
3. Openness during discussion
4. Helping one other

**Micro planning**
5. Micro planning not done

**Implementation with responsibility** – enthusiastic in taking responsibility

**Follow-up**
6. Anganwadi formed through people’s contribution
7. Regular enquiry done from the facilitator by the people regarding work

**Partnership**

**Partnership between NGO and community**
8. Good coordination with community and NGO
9. Trust
10. Joint decision making on all village affairs through village meeting
11. Participation in social function – NGO is part of almost all social functions in the village

**Democratic decentralization** (Panchayat Raj)
12. No regular Panchayat meetings due to group Gram Panchayat
13. Active participation of women

**Women empowerment**
14. Women elected in reserved seats
15. Involvement of women in different development work
16. Women takes decision
17. All marriages of girls are below 18 years
18. No choice of pregnancy
19. Financial stability
20. Right to do expenditure
21. Women’s right to earn
22. More participation of women
UMERZARA

Population – 106, No of families – 24

Community action

Volunteerism
1. Responsibility (do the work told to them)
2. Caste wise only one group – subdivided by age group
3. 50% representation of male and female

Trust
4. Have faith on each other
5. Openness during discussion
6. Help one another
7. Distribution of work

Micro planning
8. Micro planning done (5 days)
9. Jeevanshala Karyshala

Implementation with responsibility – lack of initiative

Follow up
10. No follow up
11. Enquiry from the facilitator by the villagers
12. Very less internal follow up by villagers
13. People go to the government offices very often but individually

Partnership

Partnership between NGO and community
14. Good coordination with community and NGO
15. Trust – high trust but dependency syndrome
16. Joint decision making
17. Initiative through NGO – good initiative from the NGO particularly towards getting the community to become active
18. Participation in social function

Partnership between NGO, community and government
19. Involvement of the community and NGO in Government programme
20. Involvement of the community and NGO in government decision-making body.

Democratic decentralization
21. No regular Panchayat meeting with proper recording
22. No evaluation of the previous meetings minutes
23. No active participation of women
24. Active relationship with Block and Zilla Parishad

Women empowerment
25. Women generally do not get elected unreserved seats
26. Involvement of SHG’s in different development work
27. Active participation of women in decision making process
28. Marriage above 18 years age
29. No choice of pregnancy
30. Financial stability
31. Share in household income
32. Women have the right to do expenditure
33. Women’s right to earn
34. Number of women’s regularly attending Gram sabha

**DHNAGUDA**

Population – 194
Male – 99
Female – 95
Number of families – 35

Sarpanch – Mr. Lingu kumbhare
Patil – Mr. Bhimrao kumbhare
Anganwadi sevika – Tanebai vidurkar
Anganwado madatnis – Chandrakalabai Raigedam
BPL families – 11
Kishori girls – 13
Z. P. school principal – Mr. Prakash Chavan
Hand pump – 2
Name of Youth mandal – Jai Persapen Yuvak Mandal
President – Mr. Namdeo Lingu Kumbhare
Shoshkhadde – 8
Hirakhat khadde – 1
Gandulkhat khadde – 3
Parasbaug – 9
Z. P. school students – 24 (1st – 4th standard)
Sandhi shala students – 13 (5 girls and 8 boys)
Savings group - Laxmidevi Mahila bachat gat
    Adivasi mahila bachat gat
    Jai Bhivsan purush bachat gat
Kishori gat sanghtika – Ku. Sanjivani Kumbhare
NYK sahayogini – Mrs. Maya Bhandalkar
NYK paryaveskika – Mrs. Pournima Junghare

**Community action**

**Volunteerism**

1. Responsibility
2. Mixed age group of different religion and different caste
3. Equal representation of male and female

**Trust**

4. Openness during discussion
5. Helping one another
6. Distribution of work

**Micro planning done**

**Implementation with responsibility**

**Follow up**

7. No follow up
8. Enquiry from the facilitator by the people regarding work
9. Internal follow up
10. People go to the government office very often

**Partnership**

**Partnership between NGO and community**
11. Good coordination with community and NGO
12. Trust
13. Joint decision making - initially there was a lack in taking responsibility on the decisions which has now improved and people come forward to take responsibility
14. Initiative through NGO on the joint plan made
15. Participation in social function

**Partnership between NGO, community and government**
16. Involvement of the community and NGO in Government programme
17. Involvement of the community and NGO in government decision making body.

**Democratic decentralization**
18. No regular Panchayat meeting with proper recording
19. No review of the previous meetings minutes done
20. No active participation of women
21. No active relationship with Block and Zilla Parishad

**Women empowerment**
22. No women elected unreserved seats
23. Involvement of SHG’s in different development work
24. Active participation of women in decision making process
25. Marriage above 18 years age
26. No choice of pregnancy
27. Less financial stability
28. Share of household income
29. Right to do expenditure
30. Women has right to earn
31. Women regularly attending Gramsabha
DEWLAGUDA

Population – 611= 320+291
Number of families – 107

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age group</th>
<th>Boys</th>
<th>Girls</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 – 3</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 – 5</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 – 6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 – 8</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 – 8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 – 14</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 – 14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Meeting in this village was done unannounced. This village received practically no inputs from NYK. However one of the Sahayog karyakarta happens to be from this village, though he is responsible for other adjoining villages. There are two other neighboring villages which had received NYK’s intervention. It was very heartening to note that the community organization effect of the neighboring village also had strong influence on this village. The village suffered from chronic alcoholic habit particularly by the men folk. The women of the village got together and decided to uproot the alcohol menace in the village and take responsibility of their respective men folks. The participation of women in the village is extremely good. There are 10 SHG’s - 7 of women and 3 of men. The village meeting was attended by over 150 villagers who gathered there on short notice. The discussion dominated mainly on the primary school which did not have teacher. In the meeting the villagers decided to go to the block development office and demand for teacher. The date was fixed for 25th Aug. 03 It was also decided that one representative form each SHG will represent and accompany in the group. It was also decided that the travel expenditure to the block office will be born by the respective SHGs.
TATAKOHAD

Population -
Male –
Female –
Number of families –

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age group</th>
<th>Boys</th>
<th>Girls</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 – 3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 – 5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 – 9</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 - 14</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Anganwadi

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age group</th>
<th>Boys</th>
<th>Girls</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 – 6 months</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 – 1yr.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 – 3 yr.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 – 6 yr.</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Community action
Volunteerism

1. Responsibility - People voluntarily come for community work
2. All age groups with equal representation of male and female in the meeting
3. Women generally are present for Gram sabha
4. Community program such as common dinning on several occasions and festivals.

Trust

- Openness during discussion
- Helping one other – there is a grain bank in the village
- Division of work – well coordinated

Micro planning – the villagers were very vocal about the benefit of micro planning. Almost rooted out the moneylenders and middle men from the village.

Implementation with responsibility – most of the items in the micro plan received adequate people’s response with responsibility.

Follow-up

- Regular enquiry from the facilitator by the people regarding work
- Extensive internal follow-up
- People regularly go to the Govt. office for village work in group

Special points:
1. Village cleaning done through Shramdaan
2. Good awareness and knowledge about bank loan
3. Women were knowledgeable about functioning of SHGs
4. Women take active part in monitoring the school and Anganwadi
5. Good facilitation of work plan
6. Villagers come forward both through Shramdaan as well as through cash for village development work
7. Drastic reduction in water borne diseases.
8. 50% of the villagers have resorted to Vermi compost
9. Local dispute and conflicts are resolved within the village
10. Villagers do open discussion regarding overall economic enhancement of the village.
11. Women regularly visit the government office for village development work
12. There is a general consensus while taking decisions in the village
13. Most of the marriages are above 18 years
14. There is a choice of pregnacy of the women
15. Nursing mothers are well aware and take adequate care of the child.
16. Breast feeding is initiated immediately after the child birth
17. Women’s group do not allow liquor, gambling or any kind of obscene videos in the village.
MICHAELPUR

Population – 143
Male – 69, Female – 74
Number of families – 34

Community action
Volunteerism
1. Responsibility (do the work told to them)
2. Mixed age group
3. Equal participation of male and female

Trust
4. Openness during discussion but regarding female problems there is no discussion
5. Helping one another
6. Division of work

Micro planning
7. Education micro planning
8. Health micro planning (21 – 26th Nov. 02)– there were 12 cases of adults and 3 children who
suffered from diarrhea in 2002. However there were no incidences of any water born disease till
Aug. 03.

Implementation with responsibility
9. Villagers have bought mats and pots for community use from the village fund

Follow up
10. Regular enquiry from the facilitator by the people regarding work
11. Intensive internal follow up
12. People go to the government office

Village conflict
13. Villagers take their decisions in village Panchayat

Partnership
Partnership between NGO and community
14. Coordination with community and NGO
15. Trust
16. Joint decision making
17. Initiative through NGO
18. Joint responsibility
19. Joint participation of community and NGO

Partnership between NGO, community and government
20. Involvement of the community and NGO in government programme
21. Involvement of the community and NGO in government decision making body

Democratic decentralization
22. Regular Panchayat meetings with proper recording
23. Regular review of the previous meetings minutes
24. Active participation of women in Gram Sabha
25. Active relationship with Block and Zilla Parishad

Women empowerment
26. Involvement of SHG’s in different development work
27. Marriage above 18 years age - Balvivah avoided
28. Choice of pregnancy
29. Share of household income
30. Rights to do expenditure
31. Number of women regularly attending SHG’s meeting
LENDIGUDA

Population – 342
Male – 181
Female – 161
Number of families – 60 (SC)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age group</th>
<th>Boys</th>
<th>Girls</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 – 3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 – 5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 – 9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 - 14</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collage going</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Distance from Taluka – 12 Km.
Pucca road – 9 Km
Kuchha road – 4 Km

Community action
Volunteerism
1. Responsibility (do the work told to them)
2. No separate group by caste and age, cordial relationship amongst different caste and religion.
3. Equal representation of male and female

Trust
4. There are SHGs as well as village development fund
5. Openness during discussion – decision was taken jointly for rain water harvesting
6. Helping one another
7. Division of work

Micro planning done
Implementation with responsibility – Implementation on the micro plan being followed strictly. Women visit Anganwadi and also prepare growth chart of the child, which is regularly updated.

Follow-up
8. Regular enquiry and review from the facilitator by the people regarding work
9. Internal follow up (Savings group)
10. People go to the government office

Partnership
Partnership between NGO and community
11. Good coordination with community and NGO
12. Trust
13. Joint decision making – all decisions made at the village meeting
14. Initiative through NGO – Zilla Parishad school building work completed
15. Joint responsibility
16. Participation in social function
Partnership between NGO, community and government
  17. Involvement of the community and NGO in government programme
  18. Involvement of the community and NGO in government decision making body

Democratic decentralization
  19. No regular Panchayat meetings due to Gath Gram Panchayat
  20. Evaluation of the previous meetings minutes in Gram Panchayat
  21. No women participation
  22. Active relationship with Block and Zilla Parishad

Women empowerment
  23. No women elected from unreserved seats
  24. Involvement of SHG’s in different development work
  25. Active participation of SHG in decision making process
  26. Marriages are below 18 years age
  27. No choice of pregnancy
  28. Financial stability
  29. Share of household income (60%)
  30. No right to do expenditure
  31. Women’s right to earn
  32. Women regularly attend Gram sabha meeting/ training.
MARAKALMETA

Population - 316 (SC – 50, ST – 1, OBC – 15)
Male – 154, Female – 162
Number of families – 66

Community action

Volunteerism
1. Responsibility – the villagers take responsibility voluntarily to monitor the functioning of Anganwadi
2. No group system by caste and age – mixed group
3. Women participation is more

Trust
4. Openness during discussion
5. Helping one another
6. Equal division of work between men and women

Micro planning done

Implementation with responsibility
7. Women and youth take specific responsibility.

Follow-up
8. Regular enquiry from the facilitator by the villagers regarding work
9. No internal follow up
10. Regular follow up with the government is done by the villagers

Partnership

Partnership between NGO and community
11. Good coordination with community and NGO
12. Trust
13. Joint decision making
14. Initiative through NGO – NYK & Villagers have jointly prepared the community Vermi compost pit
15. Joint responsibility
16. Participation in social function

Partnership between NGO, community and government
17. Partnership between NGO, community and government
18. Less involvement of NGO and community in government program
19. Negligible involvement of NGO and community in decision taking committee

Democratic decentralization
20. Regular Panchayat meeting with proper recording
21. Review of the previous meetings minutes
22. No active participation of women
23. Active relationship with Block and Zilla parishad

Women empowerment
24. No women elected in unreserved seats
25. Involvement of SHG’s in different development work
26. Active participation of SHG in decision making process
27. No marriage after 18 years ages
28. No choice of pregnancy
29. Financial stability – economically weak
30. Share of household income
31. Right to do expenditure
32. Women regularly attend training programs
**MAHARAJGUDA**

Population - 280 (NT – 46, SC –1, OBC – 3, ST (Vadar) – 2)  
Male – 166  
Female – 114  
Number of families – 52

**School details**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age group</th>
<th>Boys</th>
<th>Girls</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 – 3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 – 5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 – 9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 - 14</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Distance from Tahasil – 15 Km.  
Pucca road – 14 Km, Kutcha road – 1 Km

**Community action**

**Volunteerism**

1. Responsibility  
2. No group system by caste and age  
3. Equal contribution of male and female

**Trust**

4. Trust (library, saving group, Kendra group, Vermi compost)  
5. Openness during discussion  
6. Helping one another  
7. Division of work

**Micro planning done**

**Implementation with responsibility** - Villagers do take responsibility for implementation of the micro plan.

**Follow-up**

8. Regular enquiry from the facilitator by the people regarding work  
9. Internal follow up (mostly on SHG matters)  
10. People go to the government office voluntarily

**Partnership**

**Partnership between NGO and community**

11. Good coordination with community and NGO  
12. Trust  
13. Joint decision making  
14. Initiative through NGO  
15. Joint responsibility  
16. Participation in social function

**Partnership between NGO, community and government**

17. Involvement of NGO and community in government program  
18. Involvement of NGO and community in decision taking committee

**Democratic decentralization**
19. No regular Panchayat meeting with proper recording
20. No review and evaluation of the previous meetings minutes
21. No active participation of women
22. Active relationship with Block and Zilla parishad

**Women empowerment**

23. No women elected in unreserved seats
24. Involvement of SHG’s in different development work
25. Active participation of SHG in decision making process
26. Most of the marriages are below 18 years
27. No choice of pregnancy
28. Financial stability – mostly farming and farm laborers
29. Share of household income – 60%
30. No right to do expenditure
31. Women regularly attending training

In addition to the 10 villages the parameters were also tested in 2 additional villages by the Sahayogini. They are Mauja Ekoki and Mauja Nirli. However visit could not be made due to paucity of time. The data in general is summarized below:
MAUJA - AKOKI

Population - 299
Male – 156
Female – 143
Number of families –

Anganwadi

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age group</th>
<th>Boys</th>
<th>Girls</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 – 1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 – 2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 – 5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 - 14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

School children

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Boys</th>
<th>Girls</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourth</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Community action

Volunteerism

1. People come by their own
2. Regular savings group meeting
3. Loan was taken from saving group
4. Village sabha
5. Village cleanliness work
6. Less spending on illness in the village
7. Marriage above 18 years age
8. Family planning after 2 children
9. Sahabhojan
10. Buying the things required for village work
11. No savakar in the village
12. Female know everything about committees
13. Regular check up for children and pregnant women
14. Unsatisfactory implementation of government schemes
15. Open discussions are held in Gram sabha
16. Villagers take responsibility
17. Less participation of female in Gram sabha
18. Check dam made through shramdaan by the villagers
19. Women pay attention to education of their children
20. Attendance of men in the meeting was unsatisfactory.
MAUJA – NIRLI

1. Villagers participation - 80%
2. For village development villagers ask for NGO
3. Women do open discussion amongst themselves
4. Women visit to government offices
5. Women contribute in small business
6. Women were present for gram sabha
7. Parents takes interest in their children’s study
8. Villagers spending less money on illness
9. Regular check up for children and pregnant women
10. Mothers take care of their children
11. Less number of kuposhit children
12. Every villager have minimum 5 acres of land
13. Villagers take responsibility for the work told to them
14. Vermi compost
15. Equal participation of women and men
16. Villagers monitor NGOs work
17. Joint decision making
18. The government scheme of Pani Adva and Pani Jirava was well implemented.
19. All households have socking pits.
4.3 **Workshop on Feasibility Ranking (FR)**

Feasibility ranking is a method from value engineering, which has already been explained earlier in this report. While the conventional method of FR is to evaluate a component in a unilateral manner against certain fixed and agreed upon criteria, the first workshop in Chandrapur to do this exercise (Sept. 03) revealed that the method required modification to suit the specific need of social sector program. For example, during Sept. workshop we ranked the indicators only on the basis of difficulty ranged against each criterion. This method could not specifically bring out the importance of an indicator in the numerical index. To further illustrate, when we ranked the indicator of “choice of pregnancy” in the parameter of women’s empowerment, the difficulty range of implementing / enhancing the indicator in the village was ranked very high. However the group unanimously felt that though difficult, it was extremely important to enhance this indicator in the community for multiple reasons. FR in its conventional method was unable to rank both difficulty and importance range. Hence the method underwent some changes and mapping was done on a cross-matrix manner and the multiplicative value of both difficult and importance range was noted. Accordingly a second exercise had to be undertaken to re-rank all the indicators in another 5 days intensive workshop held in he month of Nov. 03. The workshop details are mentioned below:

**Process documentation of Workshop on Impact Analysis with NYK Chandrapur**

10-13th November 2003, Tadoba, Chandrapur

Recorded by Aya Sonoda

**Overall observation of the workshop:**

A four-day-workshop was held in Tadoba Guest House in Chandrapur. A total of 16 participants attended the workshop. All of them attended the last workshop in September.

This time, the new scaling, which gauges both “difficulty” and “importance” level of the indicators, was introduced. Participants learned quickly about the new scaling. The ranking of indicators changed than the last time after the new scaling was used – namely, after the “importance” component was added to the scaling.

This time, we did some group work. As there were so many indicators to be ranked, we had to find a good way to do the work efficiently. As Mr. Gopi Menon had suggested before the workshop, the participants were split into 2 groups, and did the ranking by themselves. The group work was followed by the presentation by each group and all the ranking was reviewed by all the participants. The group work facilitated more informal and lively discussion – I observed quieter people speak up in the small group. Also, initiative taken by the participants in small groups helped keep the high morale. It helped avoid total monotonous during the long workshop. If we had continued the discussion in one group for the whole 4 days, the participants would have felt bored and tired.
Although the schedule was as tight as the last time and the session lasted one more days than the last time, the morale among participants was as high as the last time and we accomplished the entire schedule. The workshop started at 10am every day and lasted till 9pm or 10pm. At one night, group work lasted after 12:30am.

On the second night, the NYK Zonal director visited us. Also, Mr. Jirafe was very keen on the workshop and visited quite often to observe the discussion. He gave us many inputs in the discussion on selecting new indicators for a new sub-parameter of “Decentralized village institutions” and a new parameter of “Empowerment of youth”.

**Participants:**
1. Samir Ghosh
2. Mamta Singh (Secretary, Shivangi Education & Rural Development Society)
3. Aya Sonoda (UNICEF)
4. Nazir Qureshi (Programme Officer, NYK)
5. Pramod Bambole (Assistant Programme Officer, NYK)
6. Dilip Deotale (Assistant Programme Officer, NYK)
7. Pralhad Madane (Supervisor, NYK)
8. Smita Lonare (Supervisor, NYK)
9. Balaji Borkute (Supervisor, NYK)
10. Sujit Nagarale (Supervisor, NYK)
11. Manisha Dikondawar (Supervisor, NYK)
12. Nila Kinnake (Supervisor, NYK)
13. Varsha Ramteke (Supervisor, NYK)
14. Devidas Kamble (Supervisor, NYK)
15. Pournima Junghare (Supervisor, NYK)
16. Dilip Naitam (Supervisor, NYK)
For reference: Parameters and Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Sub-parameter</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Action</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 Volunteerism</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 Trust</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 Microplanning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 Implementation with responsibility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 Follow-up</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 Village conflict</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnership</td>
<td>Partnership between community and NGO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 Inter-coordination</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 Trust</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 Joint decision-making</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 Initiative through NGO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 Joint responsibility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 Participation in social functions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnership</td>
<td>Partnership between community, NGO and government</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 Involvement of community and NGO in government programme</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 Involvement of community and NGO in government decision-making body</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 Government functionaries’ participation in community functions related to government programmes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 Government functionaries’ participation in community functions other than government programmes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic Decentralization</td>
<td>Panchayat Raj Institutions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 Number of programmes implemented by Panchayat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 Participation of Sarpanch and Gram sevak in resolving village conflicts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 Announcements for Panchayat events</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 The deprived class being benefited through Panchayat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 Condition of Panchayat Bhawan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 Regularity and extent of tax collection</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7 Adoption of new agricultural practice introduced by Panchayat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8 Initiative taken by Panchayat for additional development work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9 Re-elected Sarpanch without fear psychosis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10 Issues recommended by Panchayat to Block and Zilla Parishad</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decentralized village institutions</td>
<td>Number of camps related to development organised in the village</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 Number of young people coming forward for village development work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 Number of women coming forward for village development work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 Initiative taken by the villagers in village infrastructure development programme and extent of involvement of SHGs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 Involvement of the deprived class/BPL families in SHGs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 Number of programmes organized by village exclusively for girl child</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7 Number of enrolment/ regularity of attendance of girl child in the school</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8 Number of girls married under 18 years old</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9 Number of young people engaged in self-employment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10 Regularity of meetings of SHGs/informal committees/CBOs and maintenance of minute’s book</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11 Number of women practicing safe motherhood</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12 Number of informal local development committees in the village</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women's</td>
<td>1 Number of women elected in unreserved seats</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empowerment</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Involvement of SHGs in different village development work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Active participation of SHG in decision making process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Marriage above 18 years old</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Choice of pregnancy (safe motherhood)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Financial stability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Share of household income</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Right to do expenditure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Right to earn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Number of women regularly attending SHG’s meeting/Gram Sabha/training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Girls’ education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convergence</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Joint decision-making through universalization of problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Inter-agency cooperation (Community, NGO and government)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Leadership development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Awareness increase in women’s rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Women’s political participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Pressure groups for combating social evils</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Competitive spirit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empowerment of Youth</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Initiative taken by youth for village development work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Number of active youth groups/SHG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Participation in village decision-making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Number of educated youth in the village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Number of self-employed youth in the village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Number of youth from the village in the formal employment sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Transfer of power from older generation to younger generation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Decision on marriage age and dowry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Number of youth groups having equal participation of male and female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Number of active youth group involvement in various government/non-governmental committees at district/block/village level</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9th November 2003

► Pre-workshop discussion.
Mr. Ghosh and I met with the participants of the workshop at NYK office. We had discussion on the results of field-testing of the indicators under the sub-parameter of “Panchayat Raj Institutions”.
Also, we discussed new indicators under the sub-parameter of “Decentralized village institutions”. As “village institutions”, the following institutions are identified – Mahila Mandal, Yuva Mandal, Saving/credit group, Kishori gath, Bal gath, Old-age group, Village resource person committee. Also, the participants told that after Microplanning, Village Education Committee (VEC) and Health Committee become effective, so these committees can be considered as “village institutions”, although these are originally government-promoted institutions.

The following points were decided as new indicators for “Decentralized village institutions”. These indicators will be field-tested.
1. Number of development-related camps organized in the village.
2. Number of young people coming forward for village development work.
3. Number of women coming forward for village development work.
4. Initiative taken by the villagers in village infrastructure development programme and extent of involvement of SHGs.
5. Involvement of the deprived class/BPL families in SHGs.
6. Number of programmes organized by village exclusively for girl child. (Indicates the strength of Kishori gath.)
7. Number of enrolment/Regularity of attendance of girl child in the school. (Indicates the strength of Mahila Mandal.)
8. Number of girls married under 18 years old. (Indicates the strength of Mahila Mandal.)
9. Number of young people engaged in self-employment. (Indicates the strength of Yuva Mandal.)
10. Regularity of meetings of SHGs/informal committees/CBOs and maintenance of minute’s book.
11. Number of women practicing safe motherhood. (Indicates the strength of Mahila Mandal.)
12. Number of informal local development committees in the village.

After the session, we went to Talodhi village (35km from Chandrapur) in Korpana block. The village has done Education Microplanning 1½ years ago. The population is 930, with 175 families (49 families are BPL families).
We sat together with about 150 villagers. The Sarpanch was also there. One woman whose house not having electricity insisted that she wanted the electricity in her house too. Some other women agreed with her. The Sarpanch said that he had not received any such complaints before. Thus, we helped the women to set up a date to discuss the issue with Sarpanch. This is one example of Joint-decision making and Inter-agency cooperation, both of which are indicators under the parameter of “Convergence” – we jointly discussed an issue which one villager raised, and the community, NGO and government body (Sarpanch) cooperated in making a decision.

10-13th November 2003 (Workshop at Tadoba)

► Explanation of new scaling
A major concern of the outcome of the workshop in September was about the scaling. The scaling which we used in that workshop was to decide only the “difficulty” level of each indicator (5 point-scale, in which Point 5 indicates “the most difficult” and Point 1 indicates “the easiest”). For some indicators, we had difficulty in using this scaling, because we also wanted to include “importance” level of each indicator when ranking it. Thus, this time, we decided to use new scaling which gauge both “difficulty” and “importance” aspects of each of the indicators.
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As seen in the matrix above, Difficulty Range has ratings from 1 to 5, and the same for Importance Range. The score of an indicator is calculated by multiplying the scores of both the ranges. (Ex. If the score of Difficulty range is 3 and that of Importance rage is 5, the total score will be 15.) In this way, we will have scores of minimum of 1 to maximum of 25.

In order to be coherent in ranking all the indicators, we have set criteria more clearly than we did in the last workshop, and for each criterion, we set questions for both Difficulty range and Importance range. For each question, scoring definition from 1 to 5 is set. Below is the table of the criteria and questions.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Scaling – Difficulty range</th>
<th>Scaling - Importance range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Understanding of the parameter in the community</td>
<td>How difficult is it for the community to understand the parameter/indicator?</td>
<td>How important is it for the community to understand the parameter/indicator?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1=Very easy</td>
<td>1=Unimportant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2=Easy</td>
<td>2=Not so important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3=Difficult</td>
<td>3=Important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4=Very difficult</td>
<td>4=Very important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5=Extremely difficult</td>
<td>5=Extremely important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time required to understand the parameter</td>
<td>How much time is required for the community to understand the parameter/indicator?</td>
<td>How important is it for the community to give their time for understanding the parameter/indicator?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1=Very easy (Insignificant amount of time)</td>
<td>1=Unimportant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2=Easy (Little time)</td>
<td>2=Not so important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3=Difficult (Significant amount of time)</td>
<td>3=Important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4=Very difficult (Very significant amount of time)</td>
<td>4=Very important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5=Extremely difficult (Extremely significant amount of time)</td>
<td>5=Extremely important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feasibility of developing and enhancing the parameter in the community</td>
<td>How difficult is it for the community to develop and enhance the parameter/indicator?</td>
<td>How important is it for the community to develop and enhance the parameter/indicator?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1=Very easy</td>
<td>1=Unimportant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2=Easy</td>
<td>2=Not so important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3=Difficult</td>
<td>3=Important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4=Very difficult</td>
<td>4=Very important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5=Extremely difficult</td>
<td>5=Extremely important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of developing/enhancing the parameter</td>
<td>How costly is it for the community to develop/enhance the parameter/indicator?</td>
<td>How important is it for the community to bear the cost of developing/enhancing the parameter/indicator?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1=Very easy (Not at all costly)</td>
<td>1=Unimportant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2=Easy (To some extent costly)</td>
<td>2=Not so important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3=Difficult (Costly)</td>
<td>3=Important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4=Very difficult (Very costly)</td>
<td>4=Very important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5=Extremely difficult (Extremely costly)</td>
<td>5=Extremely important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of technique to implement the parameter</td>
<td>Is technique for implementing the parameter/indicator easily available?</td>
<td>How important is it to use technique for implementing the parameter/indicator?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1=Very easy</td>
<td>1=Unimportant (Can be done without tech.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2=Easy</td>
<td>2=Not so important (Tech. is not so important)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3=Difficult</td>
<td>3=Important (Tech. is important)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4=Very difficult</td>
<td>4=Very important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5=Extremely difficult</td>
<td>5=Extremely important</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The participants are told to use this new scaling and ranked indicators from 2 aspects – difficulty and importance. They found a little difficulty in using the new scaling at first, but when they became familiar to it, they said that they became clearer in ranking all the indicators.
How to look at the tables? – In the table of ranking, we put Difficulty range score in “a”, Importance range score in “b”, then we get “c” by multiplying “a” and “b”. Then, the final score of the indicator of this criterion (“d”) will be attained by multiplying “c” and the weightage score.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Weightage</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>IV</th>
<th>V</th>
<th>VI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Understanding of the parameter in the community</td>
<td></td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time required to understand the parameter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Below are all the rankings which have been derived from the workshop.

**Parameter:** Community Action  
**Sub-Parameter:** -

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Weightage</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>IV</th>
<th>V</th>
<th>VI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Understanding of the parameter in the community</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time required to understand the parameter</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feasibility of developing and enhancing the parameter in the community</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of developing/enhancing the parameter</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of technique to implement the parameter</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>I Volunteerism</th>
<th>II Trust</th>
<th>III Microplanning</th>
<th>IV Implementation with responsibility</th>
<th>V Follow-up</th>
<th>VI Village conflict</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,270</td>
<td>1,320</td>
<td>1,510</td>
<td>970</td>
<td>940</td>
<td>910</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Ranking of Indicators within “Community Action”:
1. Microplanning
2. Trust
3. Volunteerism
4. Implementation responsibility
5. Follow-up by community
6. Resolving village conflict

It is worth noting that “Microplanning”, which was the 4th in the ranking last time, became the 1st in the ranking after “importance” component was introduced in the scaling. It seems the NYK people take much importance in “Microplanning”.

Parameter: Partnership
Sub-Parameter: Partnership between community and NGO

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>IV</th>
<th>V</th>
<th>VI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Understanding of the parameter in the community</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time required to understand the parameter</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feasibility of developing and enhancing the parameter in the community</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of developing/enhancing the parameter</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of technique to implement the parameter</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I Inter-coordination
II Trust
III Joint decision-making
IV Initiative through NGO
V Joint responsibility
VI Participation in social functions
Parameter: Partnership
Sub-Parameter: Partnership between community, NGO and government

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>IV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Understanding of the parameter in the community</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time required to understand the parameter</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feasibility of developing and enhancing the parameter in the community</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of developing/enhancing the parameter</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of technique to implement the parameter</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I  Involvement of community and NGO in government programme  
II  Involvement of community and NGO in government decision-making body  
III  Government functionaries’ participation in community functions related to government programmes  
IV  Government functionaries’ participation in community functions other than government programmes

For this sub-parameter, “Partnership between community, NGO and government”, we used a triangle to do the ranking. Each side of the triangle represents the relationship between the 2 entities which are written at the end of the side. After ranking 3 sides, we got the average score of them in the middle. This will be the score of either Difficulty or Importance range.
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I. Involvement of community and NGO in government programme

**Difficulty**

- **Understanding**
  - NGO: 2
  - Gov: 3
  - Co: 2

- **Time**
  - NGO: 1
  - Gov: 4
  - Co: 4

- **Feasibility**
  - NGO: 3
  - Gov: 3
  - Co: 3

- **Cost**
  - NGO: 2
  - Gov: 2
  - Co: 2

- **Importance**
  - NGO: 5
  - Gov: 4
  - Co: 5

**Note:**

- The numbers represent the level of difficulty or importance, with higher numbers indicating higher difficulty or importance.
II. Involvement of community and NGO in government decision-making body

### Difficulty

#### Understanding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Co</th>
<th>NGO</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gov</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Time

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Co</th>
<th>NGO</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gov</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Feasibility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Co</th>
<th>NGO</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gov</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Cost

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Co</th>
<th>NGO</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gov</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Time

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Co</th>
<th>NGO</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gov</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
III. Government functionaries’ participation in community functions related to government programmes

### Difficulty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Understanding</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Feasibility</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Gov</td>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Gov</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Importance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Understanding</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Feasibility</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Gov</td>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Gov</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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IV. Government functionaries' participation in community functions other than government programmes

**Difficulty**

- **Understanding**
  - NGO: 1
  - Gov: 1
  - Co: 1

- **Time**
  - NGO: 1
  - Gov: 1
  - Co: 1

- **Feasibility**
  - NGO: 4
  - Gov: 4
  - Co: 4

- **Cost**
  - NGO: 2
  - Gov: 2
  - Co: 2

- **Importance**
  - NGO: 3
  - Gov: 3
  - Co: 3
## Parameter: Partnership

### Sub-Parameter: -

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Weightage</th>
<th>Sub-P 1</th>
<th>Sub-P2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Understanding of the parameter in the community</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,410</td>
<td>810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time required to understand the parameter</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>390</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feasibility of developing and enhancing the parameter in the community</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,200</td>
<td>975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of developing/enhancing the parameter</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>760</td>
<td>460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of technique to implement the parameter</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>405</td>
<td>255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>861</td>
<td>688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5,165</td>
<td>2,750</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Ranking of Sub-Parameters within “Partnership”:**
  1. Partnership between Community and NGO
  2. Partnership between Community, NGO and Government

Here also, the ranking changed than the one with the last scaling.
### Parameter: Democratic Decentralization

#### Sub-Parameter: Panchayat Raj Institutions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Weightage</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>IV</th>
<th>V</th>
<th>VI</th>
<th>VII</th>
<th>VIII</th>
<th>IX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Understanding of the parameter in the community</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time required to understand the parameter</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>60</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feasibility of developing and enhancing the parameter in the community</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>375</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of developing/enhancing the parameter</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>120</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of technique to implement the parameter</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>60</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|  | 765 | 790 | 515 | 745 | 285 | 865 | 1,350 | 850 | 1,050 |

1. Number of programmes implemented by Panchayat
2. Participation of Sarpanch and Gram sevak in resolving village conflicts
3. Announcements for Panchayat events
4. The deprived class being benefited through Panchayat
5. Condition of Panchayat Bhawan
6. Regularity and extent of tax collection
7. Adoption of new agricultural practice introduced by Panchayat
8. Initiative taken by Panchayat for additional development work
9. Issues recommended by Panchayat to Block and Zilla Parishad
10. Re-elected Sarpanch without fear psychosis

#### Ranking of Indicators within “Panchayat Raj Institutions”:
1. Adoption of new agricultural practice introduced by Panchayat.
2. Issues recommended by Panchayat to Block/Zilla Parishad.
3. Regularity and extent of tax collection.
4. Initiative taken by Panchayat for additional development work.
5. Participation of Sarpanch and Gram sevak in resolving conflicts.
6. Number of programmes implemented by Panchayat.
7. The deprived class being benefited through Panchayat.
8. Announcements for Panchayat events.
9. Condition of Panchayat Bhawan
There was also another indicator “Re-elected Sarpanch without fear psychosis”, but this was dropped because the participants said that they had not encountered such situation in Chandrapur. As we felt that it was inappropriate to rank this indicator when the participants had not observed, we did not rank it. However, Mr. Ghosh said this situation is so prevalent in large states like UP, MP, AP, Bihar and Rajasthan, that we should not totally drop it, especially because this Impact Analysis is going to be used in whole India. Thus, we concluded that we will make a note in the documentation that this indicator was once chosen but in Chandrapur it was not ranked.

### Parameter: Women's Empowerment

#### Sub-Parameter: -

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Weightage</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>IV</th>
<th>V</th>
<th>VI</th>
<th>VII</th>
<th>VIII</th>
<th>IX</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Understanding of the parameter in the community</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time required to understand the parameter</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feasibility of developing and enhancing the parameter in the community</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of developing/enhancing the parameter</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of technique to implement the parameter</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>965</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I Number of women elected in unreserved seats  
II Involvement of SHGs in different village development work  
III Active participation of SHG in decision making process  
IX Choice of pregnancy (safe motherhood)  
VI Financial stability  
VII Share of household income  
VIII Right to do expenditure  
IX Right to earn  
X Number of women regularly attending SHG’s meeting/Gram Sabha/ training  
XI Girls’ education
Ranking of Indicators within “Women’s Empowerment”:
1. Financial stability
2. Share of household income
3. Girls’ Education
4. Marriage above 18 years old
5. Choice of pregnancy
6. Women attending SHG/Gram Sabha/Training
7. Right to do expenditure
8. Women in unreserved seats
9. SHG participation in decision-making
10. SHG’s involvement in development work
11. Right to earn

A new indicator of “Girl’s education” which was suggested by Mr. Ramani, Divisional Commissioner of Aurangabad, was added, as no participants opposed that it was an important indicator under “Women’s Empowerment”.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter:</th>
<th>Convergence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Parameter:</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Weightage</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>IV</th>
<th>V</th>
<th>VI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Understanding of the parameter in the community</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time required to understand the parameter</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feasibility of developing and enhancing the parameter in the community</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>375</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>625</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of developing/enhancing the parameter</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>240</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>160</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of technique to implement the parameter</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>75</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>120</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>880</td>
<td>1,420</td>
<td>1,240</td>
<td>2,160</td>
<td>780</td>
<td>820</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I  Joint decision-making through universalization of problems
II Inter-agency cooperation (Community, NGO and government)
III Leadership development
IV Awareness increase in women’s rights
V Women’s political participation
VI  Pressure groups for combating social evils
(VII)  Competitive spirit

➢  Ranking of Indicators within “Convergence”:
   1.  Awareness increase in women’s rights
   2.  Inter-agency cooperation (Community, NGO and Government)
   3.  Leadership development
   4.  Joint decision-making through universalization of problems.
   5.  Pressure groups for combating social evils.
   6.  Women’s political participation
      -  (Competitive spirit)

Before ranking, we discussed the indicators chosen in the last workshop and clubbed some of them to make them more clear. The participants gave feedback from their field-testing and based on the feedback, the 7 indicators above were chosen. The indicator “Competitive spirit” will be again field-tested, as the participants said there was misconception among them and there were not many good evidences which convinced Mr. Ghosh to decide that it should be included as one of the indicators.

The following points were decided as new indicators under the parameter of “Empowerment of youth”. These new indicators will be field-tested, together with the indicators under the parameter of “Decentralized village institutions”.

1.  Initiative taken by youth for village development work.
2.  Number of active youth clubs/SHGs.
3.  Participation in village decision-making.
4.  Number of educated youth in the village.
5.  Number of self-employed youth in the village.
6.  Number of youth from the village in the formal employment sector.
7.  Transfer of power from older generation to younger generation.
8.  Decision on marriage age and dowry.
9.  Number of youth groups having equal participation of male and female.
10.  Number of active youth group involvement in various government/non-governmental committees in district/block/village level.
5. **WORK AHEAD**

1. Confirming the index in Aurangabad – While the introductory meeting with the group in Aurangabad was done in the month of Oct. 03, indicators will be developed for each of the parameters and put for field-testing. The exercise of feasibility ranking will also follow so that there is no variation of method.

2. Normalizing of indices and taking out the weighted mean of 2 districts in order to bring a common index – After the field-testing and feasibility ranking of indicators, weighted average of the 2 districts will be done in order to give singular value to each of the parameters and indicators.

3. Stakeholder analysis – Stakeholder analysis will be done to evaluate the program angle in 12 X 12 matrix. This will be done in both the districts with participation of the following:
   a. Government functionaries
   b. NYK/ SECRED
   c. Selected representative from villages of Chandrapur and Aurangabad

4. Common workshop – The framework will be discussed and debated in a workshop which will be represented by the team from both Chandrapur and Aurangabad.

5. Testing of the framework in 3 districts (Latur, Osmanabad and Yavatmal) – The testing will be done for all the 6 sectors program so that the relevance of the technique can be judged cutting across various programs.

6. Documentation – While process documentation is being done on a continuous basis, a comprehensive document will be prepared that will be sent to selected experts and universities for a critical appreciation.