inter
cooperation

Report on

Terminal Evaluation
of the project
Capacity Development for Local Governance
(CDLG)

March, 2013

By
Intercooperation Social Development India
#153/A/4, Sappers Lane,
Balamrai,
Secunderabad 500 003.
Andhra Pradesh, India.
Tel: + 91 40 2790 6952
Fax: +91 40 27906954
Email: info@intercooperation.org.in
Website:www.intercooperation.org.in

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank UNDP India for giving us this opportunity. It was a great learning exercise for us, having got the opportunity to learn about many interventions in the country to strengthen Panchayati Raj. Ministry of Panchayati Raj-Government of India was very supportive in this evaluation process; the same was the case with all the partner states. The National Project Cell and the corresponding units in the partner states along with the concerned institutes and departments were kind enough to provide all the relevant documents and information. Thanks to all of them.

Our sincere thanks to Ms. Sumeeta Banerji (Assistant Country Director, UNDP), Ms. Ritu Mathur (Programme Associate, UNDP) and Mr.Sanjeev Sharma (National Project Manager CDLG) for giving support throughout the process. Special mention has to be made about Mr. Sudhir Krishna (Secretary, Ministry of Urban Affairs and formerly National Project Director CDLG) and Mr. Ashok R. Angurana (Additional Secretary, Ministry of Panchayati Raj and National Project Director CDLG) for sparing time to give their comments and suggestions. Ms. Antara, Mr. Rajesh Kumar, Ms. Komal Bhatia and Mr. Mohit of the National Project Cell and all the SPCs and TSOs in the states provided all relevant information. We are obliged to all of them.

We also place on record the excellent support provided by all the state level nodal officers of the project, training institutes and faculty members who were involved with the CDLG project. We also thank all those who shared their experiences on the CDLG project, which included other state government officials, elected representatives, experts and civil society organisations who provided us with information.

Finally, it was Ms. Sreelatha and Ms. S. Madhuri of Intercooperation India who coordinated the activities of the evaluation, and they rightfully earn our gratitude

Joy Elamon
Buddhadeb Ghosh
Mariamma S George (Nirmala)
Mustak Khan
Ashish Srivastava

Abbreviations

AMR-APARD	Andhra Pradesh Academy of Rural Development
ATI	Administrative Training Institute
AWP	Annual Work Plan
BDO	Block Development Officer
BRGF	Backward Region Grants Fund
CA	Capacity Assessment
CA-CDS	Capacity Assessment and Capacity Development Strategy
CB&T	Capacity Building and Training
CD	Capacity Development
CDLG	Capacity Development for Local Governance
CPAP	Country Programme Action Plan
CTI	Central Training Institution
DoPR	Department of Panchayat Raj
DoPT	Department of Personnel and Training
DPNGO	District Partner Non Government Organisation
DPR	Detailed Project Report
DRI	Deendayal Research Institute
DRP	Detailed Project Report
ER	Elected Representatives
ETC	Extension Training Centres
EWR	Elected Women Representatives
FAQ	Frequently Asked Questions
FGD	Focus Group Discussions
GEF	Global Environment Facility
GoC	Government of Chhattisgarh
GoO	Government of Odisha
GoI	Government of India
GP	Gram Panchayat
ICSD	Intercooperation Social Development India
IDA	Integrated District Approach
IDS	Institute of Development Studies
IGPR&GVS	Indira Gandhi Panchayati Raj and Gramin Vikas Sansthan
ISC	Inter-ministerial Standing Committee
KII	Key Informants interviews
KILA	Kerala Institute for Local Administration
M&IE	Monitoring & Impact Evaluation Guide
MDG	Million Development Goal
MGNREGS	Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme
MGSIRD	Mahatma Gandhi State Institute of Rural Development
MoPR	Ministry of Panchayat Raj
MP	Madhya Pradesh
MPAPIT	Madhya Pradesh Agency for Promotion of Information Technology
MPPRDD	Madhya Pradesh Panchayat and Rural Development Department
NAWP	National Annual Work Plan
NCBF	National Capability Building Framework
NEX	National Execution
NGOs	Non Governmental Organisations
NIRD	National Institute for Rural Development
NPMU	National Project Management Unit
NPSC	National Project Steering Committee
OBC	Other Backward Castes
PESA	Panchayat Extension to Scheduled Areas
PEVAC	Pre-Election Voters' Awareness Campaign
PMU	Project Management Unit
PPP	Public-Private Partnership
PR	Panchayati Raj

PRD	Panchayati Raj Department
PRI	Panchayati Raj Institution
PRIT	Panchayati Raj Institute for Training
PSC	Project Steering Committee
PS-PRD	Principal Secretary Panchayats & Rural Development
PTC	Panchayat Training Centre
PTG	Primitive Tribal Groups
PTI	Panchayat Training Institution
RCB	Regional Centre in Bangkok
RD	Rural Development
RGSPA	Rajiv Gandhi Panchayat Sashaktikaran Abhiyan
RGSY	Rashtriya Gram Swaraj Yojana
RRTDC	Regional Rural Training and Development Centre
Rseti	Noronha Academy of Administration and Management, and Rural Self-Employment Training Institute
SATCOM	Satellite Communication
SC	Scheduled Caste
SDC-LoGIn	Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation -Local Governance Initiative South Asia
SE	Solution Exchange
SGIYLD	Sanjay Gandhi Institute of Youth Leadership and Development
SIATO	Senior Internal Auditors and Taxation Offices
SIRD	State Institutes for Rural Development
SPA	services providing agencies
SPC	State Project Coordinator
SPSC	State Project Steering Committee
ST	Scheduled Tribe
TIA	Training Impact Assessment
TNA	Training Needs Assessment
ToR	Terms of Reference
ToT	Training of Trainer
TPIPRD	Thakut Pyarelal Institute of Panchayat and Rural Development
TSO	Technical Support Officers
UC	Utilization Certificate
UNDAF	United Nations Development Assistance Framework
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNICEF	United Nations Children's Fund
UNV	United Nations Volunteers
UP	Uttar Pradesh
UT	Union Territory
WALMI	Water and Land Management Institute
YASHADA	Yashwantrao Chavan Academy of Development Administration
ZP	Zilla Panchayat

Executive Summary

The Government of India - United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) 2008-2012 was designed to add value to the various priorities of the Eleventh Five Year Plan. It envisages, among other areas, to develop the capacities of all governance actors at the district level and sub district levels so as to improve delivery of public services through a participatory governance process. On the basis of the UNDAF, the UNDP India Country Programme Action Plan (CPAP) focuses on capacity development of elected representatives, particularly women belonging to Scheduled Caste and Scheduled Tribes and government officials at State, district and local levels for gender sensitive and inclusive planning, implementation and monitoring in support of decentralisation. Moreover it also aims to strengthen the institutions responsible for capacity development as well as the mechanisms.

The Governance Outcome Evaluation of the UNDP programme done in 2007 recommended that UNDP's future programme should focus on strengthening capacities of public administration and elected representatives for designing and planning more inclusive and gender sensitive programmes and schemes, so as to enhance participation of the hitherto excluded groups. On the other side, the Ministry of Panchayati Raj of the Government of India highlighted the need for capacity building which was articulated the National Capacity Building Framework (NCBF). This was followed up with specific component for capacity building in the Government of India scheme called. It is in this context that the UNDP decided to provide support to the implementation and enrichment of the framework incorporating elements of UNDP's capacity development approach (explained in the Strategy section) with a focus on the UNDAF States.

It is in this context that the project *Capacity Development for Local Governance (CDLG) Project of UNDP-MoPR was* started in 2008 and continued till the end of 2012 with the aim to strengthen institutions and mechanisms to enhance capacities of elected representatives and functionaries for human development oriented inclusive planning, implementation and improved accountability in local governance. The project was implemented at the national and state levels. The seven states where the CDLG project was implemented were Bihar, Chhattisgarh, Jharkhand, Madhya Pradesh, Orissa, Rajasthan and Uttar Pradesh.

Intercooperation Social Development India has been contracted by the UNDP to undertake the Terminal Evaluation of the project on Capacity Development for Local Governance (CDLG).

The basic approach was to evaluate the project based on its (i) **Relevance,** (ii) **Effectiveness,** (iii) **Efficiency,** (iv) **Results/impacts and** (v) **Sustainability.** The evaluation and documentation was conducted in a participatory manner working on the basis that its primary purpose is to assess the results (outcomes), impacts, performance (on the basis of the indicators identified in the Results matrix) and sustainability of the project.

Findings and Analysis

CDLG project has played the role of a catalyst, motivator and trigger – for the first group it acted as the catalyst to improve and perform better, for the second group the project acted as a motivator to further their efforts and for the third group it became the trigger on which the states initiated their capacity building activities. And at the national level, the project played all the three roles. While there was already the National Capability Building Framework and the provisioning for capacity building through BRGF, it was the CDLG project which provided the appropriate opportunities for taking further actions.

Technical support to implement the *National Capability Building Framework (NCBF) was the focus at the national level* for 1) strengthening State-specific capacity development (CD) strategies, 2) undertaking policy, research and network support, 3) advocating and sharing of good practices, and 4) designing and pilot-testing interventions for community empowerment and mobilization.

At the state level, the project provided technical support to the Panchayati Raj Departments and or SIRDs in - 1) developing PRI CB&T material development, 2) undertaking PRI training needs assessment (TNA), 3) providing support for implementing PRI CB&T activities in the State funded by MoPR's BRGF and RGSY schemes, 4) supporting development of a pool of State level trainers, 5) undertaking action research, 6) organizing exposure visits, and 7) providing support to the activities that are led by MoPR within the respective States, as and when required.

The project supported the development of capacities at three levels such as: a) the enabling environment (i.e. funding frameworks, policy advocacy, etc.), b) the organisational / institutional level (i.e. training institutions, expert networks, etc.) and c) the individual level (i.e. PRI members, officials, legislators, etc.).

Capacity Assessment studies in each of the states, together with various guiding documents that would help in systematizing the PRI CB&T programmes in the Country were a few of the important activities guided from the national level under the leadership of MoPR and supported by the project. The most important of these documents are review of the National Capability Building Framework (NCBF) and The Outsourcing Reference Guide, followed by TNA Methodologies Guide and Monitoring & Impact Evaluation Guide. The knowledge repository created by the CDLG was an important step. It provided details about various capacity building activities across the country and a good wealth of resources. The study on social inclusion at the various levels of Panchayati Raj system and the document prepared for the development of a national centre of excellence on Panchayati Raj are other initiatives from the national level which could have long term impacts for the capacity development of PRIs. "Training Repository for Panchayati Raj" to make the PRI related resources available for public reference was found to be a useful effort.

A pilot intervention designed and implemented by MoPR with the support of SIRD Madhya Pradesh in the tribal majority Umaria district of Madhya Pradesh to exclusively engage with

women GP Sarpanches with the intention of enhancing their leadership and communication skills to provide effective leadership to Gram Panchayats and Gram Sabhas could be a forerunner for many capacity development initiatives in future.

CDLG project with its limited resources were not meant to provide direct trainings to Panchayat functionaries. However, in most of the states, it provided the support to plan and design training programmes, develop training system, prepare modules and training materials, develop resource persons at various levels and provide ToT. These have made the states organize large scale training programmes envisaged to cover the entire population of elected representatives. The target in most of the cases was to provide first round of training to all the newly elected representatives, immediately after elections. This succeeded in all the states.

The project had five major components but provided appropriate flexibility for each of the partner states to address its own requirements. Institutional mechanism at the national and state level seems to have worked well in the overall implementation of the project. Rajasthan gave us a slightly different experience where there was lack of coordination between the SPC and the nodal institute.

Though the major allocation was for national initiatives, it has not affected the project as the states were allowed to integrate its activities through the BRGF and RGSY provisions. All the states utilized this provision. While Madhya Pradesh utilized the funds allocated in a regular manner where as Bihar was far behind. The reasons are many and even in other states where the utilization was weak or slow, the activities did not get affected as all the states were able to pool in other resources with the CDLG funds as the basis. The human resources/technical support from the CDLG was considered the most useful contribution and the states acknowledge that with base funds and human resources from CDLG, these were made possible. Funds were not evenly spread across the components and most of the states used it for developing plan, design, modules, handbooks and other materials for training programmes or for ToT and pilot trainings. Second item in the expenditure was for exposure visits.

Relevance of CDLG lies in the fact that it required technical support, motivation and guidance to try out new initiatives and develop systems. With limited financial and human resources the project got their ownership and by efficiently linking with other schemes, the overall outputs have been remarkable.

UNDP came forward with support whenever required and also together with MoPR monitored and steered the project. Such an approach is ideal for a project of this kind where the governance through local governments is the focus and ownership by the governments is crucial. However, the UNDP could have contributed more in terms of technical support by bringing international knowledge and learnings on capacity development for local governance for which UNDP is known for.

It is not yet time to comment on the impact on the various MDG goals and functioning of Panchayats as only a round of trainings or rather orientation has happened so far. However, the project has been able to impact on the training system in most of the states or institutes.

Financially the activities initiated through CDLG are sustainable in all the states in the present circumstance as the funds can be mobilised from various sources like BRGF and now RGPSA provided there is a base fund like CDLG to design programmes and systems. However, it is the additional technical support through human resources, motivation and guidance through national level coordination and exposure to new knowledge and learnings from other states and countries along with the base funds which would make them sustainable in the long run.

The CDLG project has shown the country that it is possible to have such capacity building and training initiatives, if proper motivation and technical support through human resources are provided to the states. Probably this would be the most important learning of policy implication from the CDLG project.

Key Recommendations

Considering the magnitude of such responsibilities entrusted with the Panchayats and the local population, and their potential as platforms for social inclusion, the capacity needs are also growing. While the governments have earmarked funds for trainings, it requires adequate technical support, motivation and guidance to make the capacity development initiatives happen in these states as institutional capacities are also not adequate. However, if these capacity needs are met, the impact it would create on the development scenario of rural India leading to human development would be phenomenal. This is an opportunity as well as need of the hour.

There are not many agencies supporting this kind of capacity development support to the local governments in India. Thus UNDP emerges as the main agency which could contribute to capacity development for local governance in a comprehensive way. UNDP with its focus on local governance and human development has been pioneers in this area over the last decade and it is very much close to the UNDP mandates and experiences.

Institutionally, the same arrangements can be continued with MoPR as the national ministry and DoPR at the state level. There is a need to associate with other actors like the various development departments of relevance to Panchayati Raj, Finance Commissions and Election Commissions.

Now that the RGPSA is rolled out, CDLG can work with it and focus on select states. Most of the UNDP supported projects on governance have relevance to local governments. Considering this and the limited resources, it would have more impact potential if a single project with multiple partners with role clarity be instituted rather than many projects. Possibility of linking with projects of similar nature supported by other UN agencies also needs to be probed.

Specific focus could be on support to the operationalisation of the strategies for capacity development prepared in the first phase which would make the training systems to be in place and sustainable. Focus now should be on skills rather than rules and responsibilities. More focus on Dalits, women and other disadvantaged groups as Gram Sabha seems to be the ideal

platform for participatory democracy and social inclusion. A strategy for capacity development for social inclusion in local governance based on the study conducted and Umaria experiences to be developed and operationalised. Policy influencing through institutions like Finance Commissions and Election Commissions.

Apart from state led capacity building training initiatives, the project could support selected cluster of Panchayats (block or district) in a more focused and comprehensive way, identifying their day to day support needs and providing them. These pilots would enable UNDP and the governments to identify the real capacity needs at the local level, for which policy advocacy could be undertaken.

Project should provide appropriate platforms for sharing and dissemination of knowledge generated and disseminate the learnings to other states and using other MoPR schemes, upscale them to all other states.

As far as the Ministry of Panchayati Raj is concerned, the RGPSA has been launched and it gives a comprehensive picture about the initiatives the Government of India together with state governments would take in capacity development of PRIs. Any new project or initiatives should continue to be based on the basic approach and strategies of the RGPSA.

Local governance and building capacities are areas where there is need and UNDP has the legitimacy, experiences and potential. Providing technical support (derived from international level, national level and from the concerned state, as per the situation) and base funds to utilise the technical support on demand basis to states as well as nationally could be the priority. This requires coordination with regional office and other UNDP institutions and country offices across the globe.

Quality technical support through human resources has been the most important aspect of the project acknowledged and appreciated by all the states. Providing UNVs as the technical support is to be done away with or the qualification and experiences should be of higher nature so that it is quality technical support which is provided and not clerical support.

UNDP cannot function merely as a donor agency. What the states look forward is the technical support and UNDP's own resources and knowledge should be able to provide overall knowledge requirements as well as new insights into capacity building for local governance.

To conclude, it would have more impact potential if the learnings and experiences of the past UNDP supported projects on various aspects of governance are pooled together and a comprehensive project which focuses on human development through participatory planning at various sub state levels, budgeting, implementation and community monitoring is rolled out. This should have major components on capacity development and social inclusion.

1. Introduction

Background and Context

The Government of India - United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) 2008-2012 was designed to add value to the various priorities of the Eleventh Five Year Plan. It envisages, among other areas, to develop the capacities of all governance actors at the district level and sub district levels so as to improve delivery of public services through a participatory governance process. On the basis of the UNDAF, the UNDP India Country Programme Action Plan (CPAP) focuses on capacity development of elected representatives, particularly women belonging to Scheduled Caste and Scheduled Tribes and government officials at State, district and local levels for gender sensitive and inclusive planning, implementation and monitoring in support of decentralisation. One of the aims is strengthen the institutions responsible for capacity development as well as the mechanisms.

UNDP has always recognized the need for developing capacities at the local level to improve local governance, which in turn would address human development challenges, preserve human rights, reduce poverty and prevent conflicts. In fact, the Governance Outcome Evaluation of the UNDP programme done in 2007 recommended that UNDP's future programme should focus on strengthening capacities of public administration and elected representatives for designing and planning more inclusive and gender sensitive programmes and schemes, so as to enhance participation of the hitherto excluded groups. Implementation and monitoring capacities also need to be strengthened accordingly.

On the other side, the Ministry of Panchayati Raj of the Government of India has been highlighting the need for capacity building which was articulated through its document, the National Capacity Building Framework (NCBF). This was followed up with specific component for capacity building in the Government of India scheme called Backward Region Grants Fund (BRGF) and RGSY.

It is in this context that the UNDP decided to provide support to the implementation and enrichment of the framework incorporating elements of UNDP's capacity development approach (explained in the Strategy section) with a focus on the UNDAF States. This is on the basis of the CPAP Output on "Strengthening State Support Institutions". While the project was to operationalise the NCBF in the seven UNDAF States, learnings from the project were expected to provide inputs for strengthening the framework and provide opportunities for upscaling beyond the focus States. A scoping study, followed by a workshop preceded the development of the project. Consultations with a varied group of stakeholders were organized, including the discussion on the Decentralization Community of Solution Exchange.

The project thus developed took into consideration the fact that while rural decentralization and subsequent Panchayati Raj has been initiated by the centre, its implementation and its success depends on the State governments. Therefore, it is an imperative to work at State level when

addressing capacities of the local governance stakeholders. State governments will anchor all the State specific activities.

Based on the National Capacity Building Framework (NCBF), the project sought to address capacity gaps by supporting State governments in strengthening training institutions and developing effective mechanisms that build the capacities of elected representatives and functionaries of the Panchayati Raj Institutions (PRIs) and to some extent of elected representatives in ULBs. The focus of the project was to build capacities for human development oriented, inclusive planning, implementation, and improved accountability in local governance.

It was envisaged that the project builds on previous UNDP-supported projects such as "Strengthening of State ATIs in India" (2000-2002, DoPT) and "Capacity Building of Elected Women Representatives and Functionaries of PRIs" (2003-2007, MoPR), by way of continuing support to established networks and integrating the lessons-learnt. In Orissa, this project was expected to build on the PRI Capacity Building project "Dakshyata" of the Government of Orissa and UNDP, implemented by the Orissa SIRD in 2008.

The project *Capacity Development for Local Governance (CDLG) Project of UNDP-MoPR* started in 2008 and continued till the end of 2012. It aims to strengthen institutions and mechanisms to enhance capacities of elected representatives and functionaries for human development oriented inclusive planning, implementation and improved accountability in local governance.

The project was implemented at the national and state levels. At the national level, the *National CDLG Project Cell* at MoPR undertook the activities that had relevance for MoPR supported capacity development work in all the States and Union Territories (UTs). The seven states where the CDLG project was implemented were Bihar, Chhattisgarh, Jharkhand, Madhya Pradesh, Orissa, Rajasthan and Uttar Pradesh. At the level of States, the project was implemented through *State CDLG Project Cells* located in the State-specific Panchayati Raj Departments (PRDs) and/or the State Institutions of Rural Development (SIRDs).

Technical support to implement the *National Capability Building Framework (NCBF) was the focus at the national level and this is provided at various fronts* for 1) strengthening State-specific capacity development (CD) strategies, 2) undertaking policy, research and network support, 3) advocating and sharing of good practices, and 4) designing and pilot-testing interventions for community empowerment and mobilization.

At the level of seven States, the project provided technical support to the Panchayati Raj Departments and or SIRDs in - 1) developing PRI CB&T material development, 2) undertaking PRI training needs assessment (TNA), 3) providing support for implementing PRI CB&T activities in the State funded by MoPR's BRGF and RGSY schemes, 4) supporting development of a pool of State level trainers, 5) undertaking action research, 6) organizing exposure visits,

and 7) providing support to the activities that are led by MoPR within the respective States, as and when required.

Based on the capacity development concepts of UNDP, the CDLG project supported the development of capacities at three levels such as: a) the enabling environment (i.e. funding frameworks, policy advocacy, etc.), b) the organisational / institutional level (i.e. training institutions, expert networks, etc.) and c) the individual level (i.e. PRI members, officials, legislators, etc.).

The project had five deliverables:

Strengthened capacity development strategies
Elaboration or strengthening of a State Capacity Development Strategy in all UNDAF States which address identified needs in terms of institutional structures, the adequacy of human resources in State Training Institutions and the allocation of funds to capacity development interventions by a range of actors. This includes strengthening State training institutions in the formulation, design and piloting of a comprehensive capacity development strategy for elected representatives and officials with a focus on content and curriculum, modes of delivery as well as monitoring and evaluating the impact of training.

Policy, research and network support
Creation or strengthening of a national centre of excellence / think tank providing policy support to the Ministry of Panchayati Raj in regards to strengthening local governance related policies and schemes. Issue specific studies by external experts, evaluations and scientific project support from an expert pool. Establishing or strengthening networks of institutions and experts, elected representatives and officials.

Advocacy and sharing of good practices
Advocating good practices and fostering experience sharing through exposure visits for practitioners and lawmakers, discussion form and documentation. By showcasing and discussing the downstream interventions, upstream results may be achieved through changes in the policy frameworks (e.g. NCBF, BRGF, and other schemes).

Community empowerment and mobilisation
Training at the Gram Sabha level accompanying the training pilots for GP elected representatives and officials to ensure participation and understanding of the accountability methods (e.g. citizen charters, social audits, citizen report cards).

Strengthening capacities for management and design of activities including establishment of project management structure at the National and State level as well as in the State Institutes for Rural Development.

Intercooperation Social Development India (ICSD) has been contracted by the UNDP to undertake the Terminal Evaluation of the project on Capacity Development for Local Governance (CDLG).

2. Objectives and Scope of the Evaluation

Terminal Evaluations are intended to measure outcomes, demonstrate the effectiveness and relevance of interventions and strategies, document lessons learned (including lessons that might improve design and implementation of other UNDP projects and government interventions), indicate early signs of impact and recommend what interventions to promote and abandon. It also looks at potential impact and sustainability of results.

The Project Evaluation is intended to be a systematic learning exercise for project partners and will identify and document lessons learnt and make recommendations that might improve the design and implementation of similar projects.

From the point of view of the design and implementation of the project, the key stakeholders are:
1. National government – Ministry of Panchayati Raj
2. State government – State Panchayati Raj Departments, State Institutes for Rural Development
3. Beneficiaries in the selected Districts/Blocks/Panchayat level;
4. Resource persons and resource institutions (including service providing agencies/NGOs);
5. Panchayat elected representatives who have received training as a result of the Project interventions; and UNDP India

Objectives

The Project evaluation has the following main objectives:
- To evaluate results and impacts against planned outcomes and outputs, including an assessment of sustainability;
- To provide a basis for decision making on actions to be taken post-project; and
- To assess the effectiveness and efficiency of resource use.

The purpose of the evaluation is to:
- Provide substantive direction to the formulation of programme and project strategies in the next phase, including possible integration with work on decentralised planning
- Support greater UNDP accountability to national stakeholders and partners in India;
- Serve as a means of quality assurance for UNDP interventions at the country level; and
- Contribute to learning at corporate, regional and country levels.

Scope

The evaluation is to assess the appropriateness of the project's concept and design, efficiency and adequacy in implementation, review the results, document stories and lessons learnt and finally to provide recommendations to the future interventions. Field work had to be conducted in all the seven project states.

Methodology

Overall methodology for the evaluation was designed based on the following UNDP handbooks and guidebooks:

- The Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP supported GEF financed projects
- Handbook on planning monitoring and evaluating for development results and
- A companion guide to the handbook on planning monitoring and evaluating for development results for programme units and evaluators

We have also incorporated parts of ICSD's methodology for similar evaluations, without in any way affecting the overall methodology proposed in the various UNDP guides, handbooks and manuals on evaluation.

Guiding Documents

The key guiding documents for the Terminal Evaluation of CDLG project were:

- National Annual Work Plans (AWPs) signed by MoPR and UNDP
- State-specific AWPs signed by PS-PRDs
- Minutes of Project Steering Committee Meetings
- Quarterly Reports
- Utilization Certificates
- Back-to-office Reports
- Publications, manuals, guiding documents and reports
- Government orders/correspondence

Basic Approach

The basic approach was to evaluate the project based on its (i) **Relevance,** (ii) **Effectiveness,** (iii) **Efficiency,** (iv) **Results / impacts and** (v) **Sustainability.**

    1) R**elevance** (is the project dealing with the priorities of the target population)
    2) E**fficiency** (are resources used in the best possible way to achieve the outputs),
    3)**Effectiveness** (have outputs contributed to the achievement of the project purpose/objective),
    4) I**mpact** (to what extent has the project contributed to its goal) and
    5) **Sustainability** (will there be continued positive impacts as a result of the project after external funding has ended) of the project.

The evaluation and documentation was conducted in a participatory manner working on the basis that its primary purpose is to assess the results (outcomes), impacts, performance (on the basis of the indicators identified in the Results matrix) and sustainability of the project.

The CDLG approach basically follows in the following three components of capacity building namely.

- **Intellectual Capacity:** This implies capacity to think in the larger horizon of capacity building and demonstrate through various scalable models.
- **Institutional Capacity:** Advocating and supporting the initiatives of Panchayati Raj Department This implies setting up procedures, systems, planning, implementation and monitoring. It also includes mechanisms for building linkages with other institutions and actors.
- **Material Capacity:** Supporting development of various types of resources on local governance domain areas.

A semi-structured guidance note prepared on the basis of the above guided the evaluation.

Methods, Sources and Data Collection Tools

Multiple methods, sources and tools were used in the study through a multi-disciplinary team. Key documents mentioned above were the basis. The information on various outcome and outputs indicators of the project were collected using different sources of evidences & using different method of data collection.

The sources of data were both secondary as well as primary. The primary data was collected from different sources using different methods such as direct observation, Focus Group Discussions, and Key Informants interviews (KIIs). These included field visits to the seven states. Specific activities included:

a. **Desk Review:**
- Documents mentioned earlier
- Academic literature available on capacity development for local governance
- Literature review of similar large and local initiatives, in India as well as outside

b. **Field Reviews:**
Key Informant Interviews:
Key stakeholders and government functionaries at the national, state, district and sub-district level as well as SIRDs were interviewed. Field visits to seven CDLG states.

FGDs and meetings:
At the state, district and sub-district levels, in order to cover maximum possible number of stakeholders and other functionaries and to get varying views and counter points, FGDs and consultative meetings were organised. These covered specific group of people engaged at various levels in the implementation of the project like faculty members / trainers of training institutes, elected representatives of PRIs, other functionaries of PRIs. These meetings and FGDs were based on a semi-structured format, prepared on the basis of the ToR.

Documentation like manuals, guidebooks, training modules, handbooks, progress reports, annual reports, other written reports of events etc were collected to support the primary data collected through interviews and other methods. Thus the facts collected from different sources were used in a converging manner to define the "facts" of the case.

c. Tools used for Data Collection

Case Study Protocol:
 For the key case studies from the seven states, case study protocol was used.

Questionnaire/Schedules:
Semi-structured schedules were used for case studies of different stakeholders and institutions engaged in implementation of the project.

Check list:
A check list was also used for taking interviews and Focus Group Discussions (FGDs).

Process of Analysis

Terminal evaluation of such a project is dominantly qualitative in nature. There were some quantitative data related to trainings, workshops, financial aspects and budgets. The process of collection of both types of data and integration were undertaken simultaneously. The analysis process in the present study were undertaken in two parts:

i) **With-in case analysis (Main Cases)**
    The main cases are of the national and states (each state is a different case as the focus and content are varied across states). Within each such case, there are the embedded cases considering the specific outputs. The single case data was analyzed first for the main cases as well as the embedded cases associated with each case. Hence, cases of seven states and national level.

ii) **Cross Case analysis (Main Units of Analysis / Cases) – Comparing different states**
    Cross Case analysis across the cases were done adopting the replication strategy (Yin1984) using different modes of analysis such as pattern matching, explanation building etc. The patterns or explanations for each single case were compared across the cases, following the replication mode for multiple cases. This enabled us to highlight the uniform orientation of the project as a whole, which would be necessary for replication and future phase planning.

Elaboration of Key Assessment Criteria of Terminal Evaluation

i. **Relevance:** The extent to which the project is suited to local and national development priorities and organizational policies, including changes over time. In the context of CDLG project, the issue of relevance will be - "to what extent the project is

addressing or addressed problems of high priority, mainly viewed by the stakeholders, particularly the project's participants and other people who might have been its beneficiaries.

ii. Efficiency: The extent to which results have been delivered with the least costly resources possible. Efficiency in context of CDLG can be elaborated as –
"The amount of outputs created and their quality in relation to the resources (Capital and Personnel) invested."

iii. Effectiveness: The extent to which an objective has been achieved or how likely it is to be achieved.

iv. Impact: The positive and negative, and foreseen and unforeseen, changes to and effects produced by a development intervention. Impact of the project will be related to - Long-term effects produced by the interventions either directly or indirectly, intended or unintended.

v. Sustainability: The likely ability of an intervention to continue to deliver benefits for an extended period of time after completion. Sustainability aspect is important in the context of the CDLG project. The understanding of sustainability in context of this project is –"The maintenance or augmentation of positive changes induced by the programme or project after the latter has been terminated." Sustainability may relate to all levels in the framework of the project.

vi. Replicability:

By replicating, we mean – The feasibility of replicating the programme or project or even parts of it, in some other context -
- At a later time
- In other areas (In other parts of the country or in other countries),or
- For other group of people (Other target group)

The replicability of a particular programme or project depends on project/programme's – internal as well as external factors.

vii. Gender Issues
Promoting gender equality was one of the key themes of the UNDAF 2003-2007. The UNDAF (2008-2012) also focuses specifically on the inclusion of women and girls. Gender sensitive outcome evaluation will contribute to improve future interventions. The purpose for the gender analysis is to understand the mechanism underlying dominant development problems and policy, programme and project intervention in terms of their implications for women and men, and the relationship between them.

Review of Institutional Mechanisms:
The evaluation has tried to understand the institutional mechanism/s put in place for the Project at the national and states levels.

Key Findings and Achievements

Findings are based on the documents provided and collected from the UNDP, MoPR and the states as well as the visits made by the evaluation team to all the seven states. The findings are based on the project objectives which are divided into the following components:

- Strengthening of Capacity Development Strategies
- Policy, research and network support
- Advocacy and sharing of good practices
- Community Empowerment and Mobilisation
- Strengthening capacities for management and design of activities including establishment of project management structure at the National and State level as well as in the State Institutes for Rural Development.

What Happened at the National Level?
1. Strengthening Capacity Development (CD) Strategies
This component has been addressed at two levels:
  a. Strengthening the planning and delivery of PRI CB&T programmes supported with MoPR funding under various schemes such as BRGF and RGSY
  b. Strengthening CD strategies by developing capacity assessment and capacity development strategy (CA-CDS) reports for the seven CDLG States.

MoPR decided to engage with the States and UTs on the issue of PRI CB&T planning and delivery by holding Regional Workshops, with the funding and support from the National CDLG project cell. In three successive years – 2009, 2010 and 2011, an annual cycle of three regional workshops was followed, which provided opportunities for the participating States to learn from each other's experiences.

PRI CB&T – Outsourcing strategy
CDLG organized the PRI CB&T Business meet on 7th January 2010, where MoPR laid out its Outsourcing Strategy to complement the existing capacities of the States and UTs to roll out CB&T programmes. Since then several States have opted this strategy in part or full. Among the CDLG States, Jharkhand and Uttar Pradesh have adopted the outsourcing strategy in full and Odisha has adopted it partially.

Strengthening CD Strategies by undertaking CA-CDS Reports
On the recommendations of the first Inter-ministerial Standing Committee (ISC) meeting held on 27-28 May 2009 in NIRD Hyderabad, UNDP was requested to undertake capacity assessment in the CDLG States to develop CD strategies for strengthening PRIs. It was decided to invite a CA expert from UNDP's Regional Centre in Bangkok (RCB) to do capacity assessment in Chhattisgarh in August 2009. The RCB team was joined by experts from the prominent institutions in India. Subsequently, the CA studies were undertaken in the remaining six states including Bihar, Jharkhand, Madhya Pradesh, Odisha, Rajasthan and Uttar Pradesh.

PRI CB&T Laying Standards and Providing Handholding Support-
Besides the seven CA-CDS Reports, the project supported MoPR to develop and publish some guiding documents that will help in systematizing the PRI CB&T programmes in the Country.

The most important of these documents is the National Capability Building Framework (NCBF), which was developed by MoPR in 2005. The NCBF Review Report is now published and the recommendations have been incorporated in MoPR's Rajiv Gandhi Panchayat Sashaktikaran Abhiyan (RGSPA) scheme appropriately.

The PRI CB&T Outsourcing Reference Guide was developed in Hindi and English to ensure that TNA is undertaken in a systematic manner, followed by a TNA Methodologies Guide by drawing upon various TNA approaches and also encouraged the states to undertake training of trainer (ToT) workshops to develop a pool of experts to undertake TNA.

Developed a Monitoring & Impact Evaluation Guide and organized Training of Trainers (ToT) workshops to develop a pool of M&IE experts in the states.

Manual for integrated Village Planning and Development has been developed to help the elected representatives and functionaries working at the level of Gram Panchayat prepare and effectively implement the local development plans. It draws from the experiences of four Gram panchayats including Hiware Bazar (Maharashtra), Gangadevipalli and Ramachandapuram (Andhra Pradesh) and Piplantri (Rajasthan) where some exemplary work has happened.

The CDLG project also promoted the film Hiware Bazar (Maharashtra) during the PRI CB&T Regional Workshops in 2009. In 2010, the CDLG project cell developed a film titled Swaraj in Piplantri (Rajasthan).

2. Policy, Research and Network Support

This was addressed at three levels, including:
  a. supporting research in key areas having significance for MoPR.
  b. developing an online training repository to support Panchayati Raj
  c. creating and supporting opportunities for interaction among the stakeholders.
- Research Support to MoPR:
  Detailed Project Report (DPR) for the National Institute of Local Governance was developed to help MoPR establish a national centre of excellence to provide intellectual leadership in the area of local governance in the country. The matter is under consideration at MoPR.

- Status Report:
  PRI Capacity Building and Training (CB&T) in India

- Evaluation of the Rashtriya Gram Swaraj Yojana (RGSY):

- The report evaluates the RGSY scheme in six States, including Andhra Pradesh, Assam, Madhya Pradesh, Odisha, Rajasthan, and West Bengal and was shared with the parliamentary Committee dealing with Panchayati Raj related issues.

- MoPR Structural Review led MoPR to expand the consultant support base by creating a dedicated budget line under the BRGF scheme and saving UNDP resources used for this purpose previously.

- Review of the National Capability Building Framework (NCBF):
  The findings of the NCBF Review Report have been shared at the highest level within MoPR and have contributed towards enriching the Rajiv Gandhi Panchayat Sashaktikaran Abhiyan.

Training Repository for Panchayati Raj

Developed an online platform to make the PRI related resources available for public reference. In this regard, the website called Training Repository for Panchayati Raj (www.pri-resources.in) was developed and maintained.

The repository has four databases which provide information on the relevant training materials, resource persons, training institutions and training courses, including some materials developed by international organizations. In addition, there is a dedicated page for the products developed under the CDLG Project, both at the national level and at the level of States, where all the documents developed under the CDLG project are made available for public viewing.

3. Advocacy and Sharing of Good Practices
Over 30 workshops/conferences have been supported / organized involving key stakeholders.

Supported exposure of the policy makers to international events and institutions. As such, over twenty officers from MoPR, State PRDs, SIRDs, and Zila Parishad have been sent to vital institutions and attend local governance related programmes in Brazil, Philippines, South Africa, Switzerland and United Kingdom.

Supported The Solution Exchange (SE) – Decentralization Community to promote discussion on issues concerning decentralized local governance and sharing of best practices.

4. Community Empowerment and mobilization – Umaria Experience
This intervention was primarily aimed at mobilizing people from the disadvantaged groups such as women, SC, ST and OBC backgrounds, to enhance their participation in the effective functioning of the Gram Sabhas and the Gram Panchayats, with the larger goal of ensuring participation of women and men from the marginalized groups in the development process.

In this context, a pilot intervention was designed and implemented by MoPR in the tribal majority Umaria district of Madhya Pradesh through the Mahatma Gandhi State Institute of Rural

Development (MGSRID), Jabalpur. Having developed the profiles of Gram Panchayat Sarpanches in the district, MoPR and MGSIRD developed an Action Plan to exclusively engage with 124 women GP Sarpanches with the intention of enhancing their leadership and communication skills to provide effective leadership to Gram Panchayats and Gram Sabhas. It included:

- The orientation workshop,
- The launch event,
- The Capacity Building and Training (CB&T) workshops focusing on leadership skills and gender sensitization.
- Exposure-cum-Training Visits to Jain Irrigation campus in Jalgaon (Maharashtra) and the community festival cum Gram Sabha meetings in select GPs.

5. Project Monitoring and Evaluation

Since 2009, the high level Inter-Ministerial Standing Committee (ISC), involving the MoPR, MoRD, MoUD, and DoPT, has met twice. The three annual SDLG Project Review meetings were held by Secretary (MoPR) ensured that the CDLG Project remained relevant to the MoPR priorities. The most important have been the quarterly National Project Steering Committee (NPSC) meetings, which have guided the project and the entire decision making process. As of now, thirteen NPSC meetings have been held at regular intervals since the beginning of the CDLG project.

In the States, the project is steered by the State Project Steering Committee (SPSC), chaired by the Principal Secretary PRDs. The State teams include a State Project Coordinators (SPC) and three Technical Support Officers (TSOs). Under the overall guidance of the State PS-PRDs, the teams report and liaise on the project related work and also support the work of the PRDs.

What happened in the States?

1. **BIHAR**

CDLG project in Bihar is under the overall leadership of the Panchayat Raj Department (PRD). Bihar has received a total of Rs. 42 lakh of the CDLG funds, against which the State has reported expenditure of Rs.40.49 lakh as on January 2013.

Key Stakeholders & Activities-
The CDLG project has been supporting State PRD on various CB&T related activities such as preparation of training materials, developing a pool of trainers, and organizing exposure visits.

Pool of Trainers-
With CDLG project support, the State PRD has developed a pool of resource persons over a period of time. A two-month long orientation programme was conducted and a pool of 119 master resource persons (DRPs). In addition, workshops have been organized to orient the Deputy Directors, the DRPOs and BDOs in three batches on management of the training programme to the ERs of PRIs.

Development and Review of CB&T Materials-

In 2010, the project supported the State PRD in preparing training materials in Hindi and a 60 page flip chart for ERs and officials. A directory of resource persons with detailed profiles was also compiled.

Experience Sharing-

The State has used a major part of the CDLG funds to support exposure visits for the ERs. As a result, over Rs.18 lakh have been used for supporting exposure visits of ERs from 38 districts to other States including Maharashtra, West Bengal, Odisha and Uttar Pradesh to share experiences and learn. Over 280 ERs and officials have benefitted from these exposure visits.

2. CHHATTISGARH

In Chhattisgarh the CDLG Project is primarily located in the Thakut Pyarelal Istitute of Panchayat and Rural Development (TPIPRD). Chhattisgarh has received a total of 94.10 lakh of the CDLG funds, against which the State has reported an expenditure of Rs. 90.89 lakh as on January, 2013.

Key Stakeholders-

TPIPRD, under the overall guidance of the State PRD, undertook various capacity building and training (CB&T) related activities in partnership with academic institutions, non-government organizations, and the ERs and officers associated with the PR system in Chhattisgarh, largely with funding provided by MoPR under the BRGF (Capacity Building component) and the RGSY schemes. The CDLG Project has supported efforts leading to the development of training and other reference materials, resource persons, and training courses, organizing exposure isits and undertaking field work as and when required.

Pool of Trainers-

The CDLG Project has contributed to the TPIPRD efforts to develop a pool of more than 700 trainers to facilitate PRI CB&T programmes in the State. In addition, more than 100 recently promoted Senior Internal Auditors and Taxation Offices (SIATOs) have been provided orientation training.

Development of CB&T Materials/Aids-

The CDLG Project has supported TPIPRD in developing two Certificates Courses namely Livelihood Planning and Supply Chain Management and Decentralised Planning, which have been successfully launched in partnership with Pandit Ravishankar Shukla University with the intention of creating a pool of technical experts to support grassroots level planning.

In addition, the project has supported the development of a question bank in the form of a book enlisted Panchayat Prashonnatari Pustika that is used for organizing quiz competitions for elected representatives. The project has also contributed to the development of a training module for SIAROs. The project is also contributing towards the

efforts of the State PRD and TPIPRD to undertake studies and conduct consultations on EWR related issues, with the larger intention of setting up federations of EWRs.

Exposure Visits-
The CDLG Project has also supported the participation of 86 ERs and officers in a training programme on local resource mobilization organized by Kerala Institute of Local Administration. In addition, 85 persons were sent for training on Value Based Leadership at the Friends of Moral Re-Armament (india), Asia Plateau, Panchgani, Maharashtra with CDLG project support.

3. JHARKHAND

In Jharkhand, the CDLG Project comes under the overall leadership of the Panchayati Raj Department (PRD). Since the beginning of the project, Jharkand has received a total of Rs. 42 lakh of the CDLG funds, of which the State has reported an expenditure of Rs. 62.52 lakh as on January, 2013. The State has used the CDLG project funds for a variety of activities as indicated below.

Key Stakeholders and Activities-
Under the overall guidance of the state PRD, the CDLG project has involved the Administrative Training Institute (ATI), State Institute of Rural Development (SIRD), Central Training Institution (CTI), Panchayat Training Institution (PTI)and a number of professional services providing agencies (SPAs) on issues related to PRI C&T. the project has contributed to developing training materials and helping the State PRD deliver the training programmes funded by MoPR's BRGF and RGSY schemes.

Pre-Election Voters' Awareness Campaign (PEVAC)-
Before the PRI elections, the CDLG project supported the State PRD to launch PEVAC to make people aware about the importance of the PRI elections.

Development of CB&T Material/Aids-
Another Important contribution of the CDLG project has been in the area of developing PRI CB&T modules for training at all levels, including training of trainers (ToTs). The State has also undertaken training needs assessment (TNA). The training modules developed include:
    a. Gram Sabha Training Module – General Area
    b. Gram Sabha & PESA Training Module – Scheduled Area
    c. Gram Panchayat & natural Resource Management Planning Module
    d. Gram Panchayat Training Module
    e. Panchayat Samiti Training Module
    f. Zilla Parishad Training Module
    g. Panchayat Budget and Account Module
    h. Training of Trainers Module
    i. PEVAC materials

State CB&T approach and Achievements-
  Jharkhand is one of the two CDLG States where the state PRD decided to adopt the PRI CB&T Outsourcing Model promoted by MOPR.

4. MADHYA PRADESH
Of the 7 CDLG states, MP is the only state that has been able to claim its full entitlement of Rs. 28 lakh in 2009, Rs. 35 lakh in 2010 and Rs 28 lakh in 2011. Since the beginning of the project, MP has received a total of Rs. 1.13 crore, against which the state has reported an expenditure of Rs. 1.06 crore as on September 30, 2012.

Key Stakeholders and Activities-
  The project, under the overall guidance of the State PRD, supported the work of MGSIRD in the area of strengthening its strategies to build the capacities of ERs in the State by providing suitable training in partnership with Administrative Training Institiute (ATI), Extension Training Centres (ETCs), Water and Land Management Institute (WALMI), Sanjay Gandhi Institute of Training Youth in Leadership and Rural Development, Noronha Academy of Administration and Management, and Rural Self-Employment Training Institute (Rseti). The State has also involved, with the CDLG project support, some prominent experts from civil society to provide substantive depth to CB&T related interventions at MGSIRD, largely funded under the MoPR's BRGF (Capacity Building component) and RGSY schemes. The State has also involved NGOs in select areas, especially the use of performing arts to communicate local governance related messages through Kala Jathas.

Pool of Trainers-
  The CDLG project has contributed towards MGSIRD's effort in developing trainers to facilitate PRI CB&T programmes in the state. A pool of over 65 master trainers and over 5000 trainers has been created.

Development of CB&T Materials/Aids-
  The CDLG project has contributed to MGSIRD's efforts in the development of training modules for Gram Panchayats, Panchayat Samitis, Zilla Parishads and Panchayat Secretaries and booklets on PR and RD schemes in Hindi. A special training module was developed for Elected Women Representatives (EWRs), along with the necessary training material for the training of trainers (ToTs). In addition, the CDLG project supported MGSIRD in developing training material for the implementation of PESA Act. The Project has also supported activities to ensure quality training by enhancing the capacity of the monitors, providing monitoring tools and developing tools to cross check the knowledge assimilated by the ERs.

Overall CB&T Approach and Achievements-
  MP has achieved remarkable training coverage in 2010-2011 as a result of intensive efforts by MGSIRD, supported by the CDLD project, to mobilize the existing network of training institutions and a well coordinated mechanism for delivery of training programmes. Over 90% of the newly elected representatives (ERs) were trained within eleven months of the

elections in January 2010. As a result, the State has achieved over 90% coverage in 2010-2011 as against 56% in 2009-10. This is impressive, considering the large number of ERs, which is over four lakh. The training programmes have been based on the findings of the Training Needs Assessment (TNS) conducted with the CDLG project support.

Exposure visits and others-
The Project has also supported exposure visits for Sarpanches, Panchayat officials, NGO team members, and the SIRD, ETC, PTC faculty for four days to the Deendayal Research Institute (DRI) in Chitrakoot.

5.ODISHA

Since the launch of the CDLG project, Odisha has received a total of Rs. 49.06 lakh of the project funds, against which the State has reported an expenditure of Rs. 36.61 lakh as on 30 September, 2011.

Key Stakeholders and Activities
Under the overall guidance of the State PRD, the SIRD organizes various CB&T programmes for the ERs and functionaries of PRIs in collaboration with Extension Training Centres (ETCs) and 78 non-government organizations at the district and block levels. The CDLG project has been helping the SIRD to coordinate with the district partner NGOs (DPNGOs) to ensure systematic implementation of the CB&T programmes, development of training and other reference materials, and orientation of the resource persons.

Development of CB&T Materials / Aids
The CDLG project has supported SIRD Odisha's efforts to develop a web based platform for knowledge management (www.sirdodisha.org) and has also contributed in the development of reference material, including FAQ on MGNREGS, Gram Sanjoyak Training Manual, and Gram Sabha. In addition, the project has supported the development of communication material like posters in the thematic areas of MGNREGS, Gram Sabha, Palli Sabha, and women's empowerment. Radio magazine programme called Pragati Pathe Panchayat was broadcast by All India Radio through six audio spots and twenty two magazine programmes, each of 15 minutes duration, over a period of 120 days.

A series of eleven films on various flagship programmes vis-à-vis the role of the Gram Panchayat are being developed. These films will aid the training methodology by citing case studies and promoting role play and will also be utilized as a repository in Block Resource Centers and Rajiv Gandhi Seva Kendras.

State CB&T Approach and Achievements
The State has adopted the strategy of delivering the PRI CB&T programmes by engaging the services of non-government agencies at the district level, referred as the district partner non-government organizations (DPNGOs). The training coverage of ERs in 2010-11 was over 53 percent. A large number of officials were also trained during the same period.

Experience Sharing

An exposure visit was conducted for 132 PESA and gram sabha elected members of PTG Panchayat to Ganjam and Puri districts to share experiences and learn.

6. RAJASTHAN

Since the beginning of the CDLG project, Rajasthan has received a total of Rs. 63 lakh of project funds, against which the State has reported an expenditure of Rs. 51.91 lakh as on 30 September 2011.

Key Stakeholders and Activities

The CDLG project supported the efforts of IGPR&GVS on PRI CB&T under the overall guidance of the State PRD, largely funded under MoPR's BRGF (Capacity Building component) and RGSY schemes. The project also supports IGPR&GVS efforts to develop training materials, conduct Training of Trainers (ToTs) and undertake training needs assessments (TNA) and training impact assessments (TIA).

Pool of Trainers

The project has contributed to the efforts of the IGPR&GVS to develop a pool of 1300 resource persons to train the ERs and functionaries of PRIs.

Development of CB&T Materials/Aids

The CDLG project supported the development of PRI training materials in 2010, based on the findings of the TNA undertaken in 2009. Technical exchange workshops were also organized jointly for ERs and functionaries of PRIs in July 2011. The project has also supported the development of two films and interactive video training modules in the local language, which cover issues related to the Roles and Responsibilities of Sarpanch and Ward Panches and effectively conducting Ward Sabha and Gram Sabha.

Experience Sharing

The CDLG project has also contributed to the organization of exposure visits supported by the MoPR funds. Three groups of 25 members each, comprising elected representatives and officials associated with PRIs, IGPR&GVS faculty, and CDLG team members visited Andhra Pradesh, Himachal Pradesh, Kerala and Maharashtra. The learning from these visits was shared in a workshop attended by State PRD officers and chaired by Honourable Minister, Rural Development and Panchayati Raj, Rajasthan.

7.UTTAR PRADESH

The CDLG Project in Uttar Pradesh is being implemented under the overall guidance of the State Panchayat Raj Department (PRD). Since the beginning of the CDLG project, Uttar Pradesh has received a total of Rs. 77.58 lakh of the project funds against which the State has reported an expenditure of Rs.75.11 lakhs as on January, 2013.

Key Stakeholders and Activities

Under the overall guidance of the State PRD, the CDLG project has been implemented largely in partnership with professional service providing agencies (SPAs), whose services have been used in a variety areas including development of CB&T material, conducting training need assessment (TNA), and planning and delivery of CB&T programmes using outsourcing model. These activities are largely funded under the MoPR's BRGF (Capacity Building component) and RGSY schemes.

Development of CB&T Materials / Aids

The CDLG project has contributed in developing CB&T related core course content covering various areas, including (a) Overview of Panchayati Raj with background / history of PRIs in India and Uttar Pradesh, (b) State Specific Constitutional Provisions for Gram Panchyat (c) State Specific Constitutional Provisions for Kshetra Panchayat, (d) State Specific Constitutional Provisions for Zila Panchayat, (e) Promoting/building effective leadership among Elected Representatives of PRI, (f) Various Central and State sponsored schemes implemented through Panchayats (g) Core Course Content-Functional Literacy, (h) Computer training to enable concept of e-governance (i) Compilation of Government order/notifications issued by Government of Uttar Pradesh. In addition, training modules for the three tiers of PRIs a training manual for trainers, and reference literature have been developed for use across the State.

The CDLG project has also supported the efforts of the State PRD in conducting training of trainers and undertaking TNA, with special focus on illiterate and women elected representatives. In addition, the CDLG project is funding the preparation of a Detailed Project Report (DPR) for Establishment of Panchayati Raj Institute for Training (PRIT).

Overall CB&T Approach and Achievements

Uttar Pradesh is one of the two CDLG States where the State PRD decided to adopt the PRI CB&T Outsourcing Model promoted by MoPR.

Experience Sharing

In 2010, the State PRD organized a two day exposure visit for two senior level officials of the Zila Panchayat to AMR-APARD, Hyderabad to share their experiences and learn from the experiences of AMR-APARD.

Evolution of the Project in States

The project evolved in different ways in each state. Notable being the Chhattisgarh case where the State developed its own approach for capacity building for Panchayati Raj and project implementation. Madhya Pradesh developed its own activities within the various components of the CDLG project. Odisha had started its capacity building activities through the Dakhshyata project which could be considered as a fore-runner for the CDLG project. Rajasthan was a pioneer in capacity building for Panchayati Raj and CDLG was used to add value to its own programme. Jharkhand and Uttar Pradesh initiated their first ever large scale capacity building

initiatives through CDLG. Bihar was slow in the beginning but could catch up with others later towards the final year of the project.

Project Partners and Institutional Mechanisms
In all the States, Department of Panchayati Raj (in certain states, it is the Panchayati Raj and Rural Development) was the nodal department. The department then aligned with the SIRDs in Odisha, Madhya Pradesh, Chhattisgarh, and Rajasthan where as in Uttar Pradesh, Jharkhand and Bihar, the department itself undertook the project activities.

At the national level and states, there were the Steering committees with the respective nodal officers heading them. There was a project cell at the national level. National level Steering committee meetings have been exemplary in terms of its regular meetings, documentation of the proceedings and follow up. In the states too, the steering committees have been meeting at least once or twice in a year, and the minutes recorded. However, the rigour in which the national steering committee documentation was absent in the state steering committees. In all the cases, there was no proactive or active involvement by members other than the MoPR/DoPR.

Human Resources
At the national level, the project provided a National Project Manager supported by three Technical Support Officers, the latter group being from among the UN Volunteers. Similarly in the states, there were the State Project Coordinator (SPC) and three TSOs. All of them were on one year contracts, getting extended every year. TSOs were provided living allowance and not salary. A few of the TSOs left in between, substituted by a new group of TSOs.

Funds
In all the States, the Panchayat elections were held roughly between 2010 and 2011. Fund utilisation to some extent was dependent on this factor too. In all the States orientation training was given to all the elected representatives' in all the tiers. As the activities are very important but in view of limited financing other funding sources were drawn. Funds for such training were leveraged from MoPR's BRGF (CB&T) and RGSY in all the States. CDLG funds were mainly utilised for assessing training needs and preparing modules. In some states a few courses on Training of trainers were funded from CDLG project.

Annual Work Plans
Both at the national and state levels, the yearly activities were planned through Annual Work Plans. The work at the level of States has been undertaken as per the Annual Work Plans (AWPs) prepared by the State CDLG Cells in consultation with the State Panchayati Raj Departments (PRDs) / State Institutions of Rural Development (SIRDs) and approved by the State Project Steering Committee (SPSC) chaired by the Principal Secretary / Secretary, PRDs.

AWPs of the seven States vary in focus and content reflecting priorities of the States and, therefore, may have achieved results in different areas. As the priorities differ, the States may

not have necessarily undertaken work in all these areas at the same time. Nevertheless, under the overall guidance of State PRDs and SIRDs, the CDLG teams in States have undertaken activities in areas that broadly fall under the following categories:

1. Developing PRI CB&T core content (training materials including printed modules, manuals and other interactive materials/films, etc.)
2. Undertaking PRI training needs assessment (TNA) studies, with focus on elected representative and officials from the disadvantaged groups
3. Supporting planning and implementation of the PRI CB&T activities in States funded by MoPR schemes
4. Supporting development of a pool of State level trainers at the State, district and sub-district level
5. Organizing exposure visits selected ERs and faculty of training institutions, ensuring participation of disadvantaged groups
6. Undertaking action research related to PRIs, particularly focusing on disadvantaged groups
7. Developing State-specific IEC materials focusing on disadvantaged groups
8. Support activities to promote discussion on Panchayat and Gram Sabha related issues
9. Support special training for faculty members of the State Training Institutions
10. Provide support for the initiatives led by the national project cell at MoPR in the States
11. Undertake any other activities that do not fall within the areas mentioned above but approved in the State AWPs.

Analysis and Conclusions

PART 1 Overview

1.1.1. The Catalyst, Motivator, Trigger

Seven states could be classified on the basis of their previous efforts in building capacities for local governance. At least three of them have been proactive earlier itself (Madhya Pradesh, Rajasthan and Odisha), a couple of them had initiated a few efforts (Chhattisgarh and Bihar) and the third group so far being non-starters (Jharkhand and Uttar Pradesh). CDLG project has played the role of a catalyst, motivator and trigger – for the first group it acted as the catalyst to improve and perform better, for the second group the project acted as a motivator to further their efforts and for the third group it became the trigger on which the states initiated their capacity building activities. And at the national level, the project played all the three roles. While there was already the National Capability Building Framework and the provisioning for capacity building through BRGF, it was the CDLG project which provided the appropriate opportunities for taking further actions.

1.1.2. Strategic Issues

Simply by having a project of this kind could change the course of capacity building for Panchayati Raj would be an overstatement. At the national level, decisions of the various round tables (especially the Jaipur round table) followed by National Capability Building Framework and the capacity building component of the BRGF had provided the environment for such a project. At the state level, the various flagship programmes being implemented by the Panchayats or them having a major role to play has genuinely created the demand for capacity building for Panchayats though might not have been articulated well. In addition, the component on capacity building envisaged in the BRGF too encouraged the states to focus on capacity building. It is in this context that the CDLG became important, as it could help the states to plan, design and pilot many of the initiatives, which they were finding difficult to start within the BRGF framework.

1.1.3. Role of UNDP

Approach the UNDP had taken seems to have paid off. There was freedom for the MoPR and state governments, but within the overall framework of the project. This instilled confidence and ownership among them and in general they were proactive. UNDP came forward with support whenever required like in the case of preparation of CD strategy and also together with MoPR monitored and steered the project. We feel that such an approach is ideal for a project of this kind where the governance through local governments is the focus and ownership by the governments is crucial. However, the UNDP could have contributed more in terms of technical support by bringing international knowledge and learnings on capacity development for local governance for which UNDP is known for. The initial support in development of capacity development strategy paved the way for the formulation of such strategies in all the other six states.

Similar support in other areas of capacity development could have added value and been of much use.

PART 2 Project Content

1.2.1. Orientation vs. Training vs. Capacity Development

CDLG project with its limited resources were not meant to provide direct trainings to Panchayat functionaries. However, in most of the states, it provided the support to plan and design training programmes, develop training system, prepare modules and training materials, develop resource persons at various levels and provide ToT. These have made the states organize large scale training programmes envisaged to cover the entire population of elected representatives. The target in most of the cases was to provide first round of training to all the newly elected representatives, immediately after elections. This succeeded in all the states.

It is to be noted that in most of these cases, it was more of preliminary orientation on Panchayati Raj rules and processes. This needs to be followed up with in depth trainings on specific topics. And more needs to be done to reach the stage of capacity development as defined by UNDP. As a first step, whatever has been done are progressive and a major step towards capacity development.

1.2.2. Governance vs. Government

Distinction has to be made between governance and government. Though the project is titled as Capacity Development for Local Governance, the focus has been on local governments.

1.2.3. Need based

As mentioned earlier, the project had five major components. The project has been able to address the overall objectives. However, there are differences in the achievements in each of the components in the states. Focus differed in each of the states as well as at the national level. In a way this is acceptable as the policy priorities, status of local governance and needs vary from state to state. Thus, it can also be argued that the project provided appropriate flexibility for each of the partner states to address its own requirements.

PART 3 Project Management, Ownership and Linkages

1.3.1. Partners and Ownership

The project had the Ministry of Panchayati Raj and the seven states as the partners. This was one project which enjoyed definite ownership by the Ministry of Panchayati Raj at the national level. The ministry played a proactive role and saw to it that the learnings and experiences from the project are used for similar activities in other states. Thus, the MoPR included other states in various workshops and occasionally used the services of the CDLG team in providing support to the states outside the CDLG states. In the states too, the Department of Panchayati Raj and State Institute of Rural Development

(wherever they were involved) were proactive and owned the project. This was evident in the way they tried to link the project resources to other resources and activities so that there is proper convergence and harmonization.

1.3.2. Institutional Mechanism

Institutional mechanism at the national and state level seems to have worked well in the overall implementation of the project. Rajasthan gave us a slightly different experience where there was lack of coordination between the SPC and the nodal institute. This definitely has affected the implementation of the project too. In such situations, what could be the role of national PMU, MoPR, DoPR and UNDP is a matter to be discussed.

1.3.3. Other Departments

Panchayats and their functioning involve many sectors and thus many departments. The project and the capacity development initiatives are yet to involve them or get their support. Even though the steering committee has members from a few of such departments, the active involvement was never seen in any of the states or at the national level.

1.3.4. National Initiatives and State Response

As noted earlier, there have been many initiatives from the national level. Panchayati Raj being a State subject and capacity development being part of it, how can such national initiatives be of use in states was a question. States have responded positively to many of the initiatives like the capacity development strategy, CB&T outsourcing etc. However, some of these initiatives are yet to be tested or used by the states due to the delay in finalization. In addition, being national initiatives the ownership seems to be lacking at the state level. For example, the capacity development strategy was developed for each of the state and some elements of the recommendations have already been implemented by the states, but one cannot also confirm that the actions were based on the strategy prepared. This is also true for TNA methodology and Monitoring and Impact Evaluation which were developed almost towards the closure of the project and states did not get the time to study them and adapt to their own situations. But, in which ever case the process reached upto the states, things were different. For example, CB&T Outsourcing strategy was disseminated through a national level workshop of all the states and a few of the states found it useful and took it up.

1.3.5. Other UNDP Projects

At least two more UNDP supported projects of related nature were there during the same period - on decentralized district planning and on NREGS. Both of them involve capacity development of the Panchayati Raj system. A proper convergence of these three projects could have added value and provided more impact potential.

1.3.6. Other Schemes

In the states, the CDLG had linkages with other GoI schemes like BRGF and RGSY, thus bringing convergence. This is one good practice which could be considered while designing similar projects.

1.3.7. Other states

There were efforts by the MoPR to take the CDLG project initiatives to other states also, as in the case of CB&T outsourcing strategy. Materials prepared were also shared with other states. This could be considered as an innovative idea in similar projects implemented only in a few states. Though not envisaged in the project, it would have been good to develop a strategy for such dissemination as well as institute a system for such dissemination and cross learnings.

PART 4 Project Activities

1.4.1. Documents/publications/Studies

NCBF Review report was a timely intervention and it seems to have helped the MoPR while designing the RGPSA. MoPR structural review report too helped the MoPR in redesigning its strategy.

As part of the project, a preliminary study was conducted on establishing a centre of excellence for Panchayati Raj. This has been an important contribution by the project but the follow up has not yet happened.

1.4.2. Exposure Visits

Most of the states have taken up exposure visits, but it is yet to be proved about its impact. It would have been more useful if there were specific objectives and guidelines for such exposure visits and follow up action ensured.

1.4.3. Social Inclusion

Madhya Pradesh and Rajasthan Jharkhand and Odisha had attempted specific activities on PESA related capacity building and policy advocacy.

At the national level, the study of social inclusion with a focus on disadvantaged groups was organized. The results of this study have a lot of relevance and importance and the study itself is unique. This was prepared towards the end of the project and so the results could not be used in the present phase but would be very useful in future interventions.

The Umaria experiment is a step towards addressing the concerns of social inclusion in Panchayati Raj, the impact of which is yet to be ascertained.

Probably, there a strategy on capacity development for social inclusion can be developed based on the study conducted and the Umaria experiences.

Part 5 Funds and Budget

1.5.1. Assessment of Budgetary Allocation

Major allocation was for national initiatives and the balance was divided among the states, thus the individual states received only a smaller proportion. This has not affected the project as the states were allowed to integrate its activities through the BRGF and RGSY provisions. All the states utilized this provision.

While Madhya Pradesh utilized the funds allocated in a regular manner where as Bihar was far behind. The reasons are many and even in other states where the utilization was weak or slow, the activities did not get affected as all the states were able to pool in other resources with the CDLG funds as the basis. The human resources/technical support from the CDLG was considered the most useful contribution and the states acknowledge that with base funds and human resources from CDLG, these were made possible.

An example from training coverage will help in understanding this phenomenon. Training coverage of elected representatives in the project states increased from 33 percent in 2008-09 to 36 percent in 2009-10 and to 66 percent in 2011-12. It was reported that in absolute numbers the total figure of trained personnel including ERs and officials reached an unprecedented number of 2.45 million. This is without considering the Jharkhand figures, the elections to Panchayats in the state were held later and the trainings conducted. These were done through pooling of funds from other sources like BRGF and RGSY, thus the capacity of states being able to absorb such resources was proved.

Even within the allocation from CDLG, how the funds were utilized also requires attention. It was not evenly spread across the components and most of the states used it for developing plan, design, modules, handbooks and other materials for training programmes or for ToT and pilot trainings. Second item in the expenditure was for exposure visits. In a few states in certain years, disproportionate amount seems to have gone in for such exposure visits which catered only to a very limited number of individuals. Usefulness of such activities vis a vis the expenses involved (efficiency) needs detailed analysis.

1.5.2. Funds and Funding Mechanism

As mentioned earlier, the CDLG funds were useful in initiating new activities, piloting, developing systems etc. Thus, the fund utilization and time of utilization were dependant on such new initiatives. There were delays by a few states in fund utilization. If this case was identified / informed early enough, the funds could have been diverted to states which were in need at that time.

Linking CDLG finds with BRGF resources in CB&T activities was a useful and innovative action, thanks to MoPR. States too utilized this opportunity. However, this

system has to be fine tuned within the project as mixing the two funds made it difficult to identify the areas/activities where CDLG funds were used.

A proper monitoring system for CDLG fund utilization was lacking. Utilisation certificate does not seem to have helped in this as it does not give a clear understanding about the actual progress of the project and fund utilization.

Part 6 Others

1.6.1. Internal Capacity Building and Technical Support

Apart from the initial orientation workshops (which the later batches were not covered), there seems to have no trainings provided to the SPCs or TSOs. A few of them learnt while doing whereas a few of the TSOs were functioning more as administrative support than technical support (though appreciated by the state government).

1.6.2. Knowledge Management and Dissemination

The knowledge repository created by the CDLG was an important step. It provided details about various capacity building activities across the country and a good wealth of resources. But, electronic platforms alone do not work well in the case of state governments and institutes. It requires proactive dissemination of knowledge developed through regular face to face events and interactive platforms.

1.6.3. Capitalisation of Opportunity

When the project was started, Jharkhand had not held its first election to the Panchayats. By the time the state went in for Panchayati Raj and the elections, the CDLG was able to play a very important role in preparing the citizens for Panchayati Raj and later the elected representatives and functionaries. A well designed training strategy and programme could be established. Rajasthan too provided a very important opportunity (and need as well) as the state decided to transfer six of its departments entirely to the local governments during the project period. This required massive capacity building in terms of developing systems, orientation, training and skills to manage these departments by the local governments. Though CDLG contributed to the state's initiatives in training, it could have contributed more and reoriented itself to cater to this need.

PART 7 Relevance, Efficiency, Effectiveness, Impact, Sustainability and Replicability

1. **Relevance:** Constitutional amendments gave legitimacy to Panchayats as local governments, they became mandatory, various flagship programmes works through Panchayats, Thirteenth Finance Commission has specifically earmarked finds for local governments, many states had started devolving functions to them and all these required a lot of capacities to be developed at the local level. While there were funds to be tapped for capacity development, it required technical support, motivation and guidance to try out new initiatives and develop systems. Relevance of CDLG lies there.

2. **Efficiency:** CDLG could arguably be one of the recent projects which could show evidence of success through very limited resources – both financial and human. For the state governments or for that matter SIRDs, an average of Rs. 28 lakhs per year is a very meagre amount. However, the project could get their ownership and by efficiently linking with other schemes, the overall outputs have been remarkable. In the case of human resources also the story is the same – one SPC and three UNVs were the human resources support to each state and they have been acknowledged to have contributed to various capacity building and training activities. As mentioned earlier, the overall improvement in the number of PRI functionaries trained over the three years is a pointer towards how CDLG helped in tapping the resources like that of BRGF and RGSY.

3. **Effectiveness:** Considering the way in which the capacity building and training activities were rolled out in each of the states and the initiatives undertaken at the national level, it would be definitely concluded that the CDLG project was effective, despite the limited resources it had. However, this is not applicable to all the components as the key achievements were in ensuring well designed training programmes.

4. **Impact:** Impact can be considered in two ways – one, the impact on the functioning of Panchayats and the second on the training system. It is not yet time to comment on the impact on the functioning of Panchayats as only a round of trainings or rather orientation has happened so far. It is too far to comment on the impact of the project on various MDG goals. However, the project has been able to impact on the training system in most of the states or institutes. The process in which training programmes are designed like the TNA, preparation of modules, ToT, and developing various training materials followed by training monitoring and evaluation have changed in these institutes.

5. **Sustainability:** Financially the activities initiated through CDLG are sustainable in all the states in the present circumstance as the funds can be mobilised from various sources like BRGF and now RGPSA provided there is a base fund like CDLG to design programmes and systems. However, it is the additional technical support through human resources, motivation and guidance through national level coordination and exposure to new knowledge and learnings from other states and countries along with the base funds which would make them sustainable in the long run. That is where the need for a second phase of CDLG becomes crucial. If such a phase is not there, many of the initiatives launched in the present phase could die out. The time lag between the present phase and the next phase also makes the initiatives unsustainable. The human resources who got trained and capacitated during the process and who have the institutional memory of CDLG is lost during this time lag, again affecting sustainability. This concern was highlighted by the officials in all the states.

6. **Replicability:** If such initiatives on capacity building and training had happened in better performing states like Kerala or Karnataka, the immediate response would be that the situation is different in most of the Indian states and things will not work as in those states. But, when well organised capacity building and training programmes could happen in states like Odisha, Madhya Pradesh and Jharkhand, the replicability of various CDLG initiatives cannot be doubted. We too feel that the CDLG project has shown the country that it is possible to have such capacity building and training initiatives, if proper motivation and technical support through human resources are provided to the states. Probably this would be the most important learning of policy implication from the CDLG project.

7. **Gender consideration**
   In all the states, the training programmes had specific focus on women elected representatives, especially in states like Madhya Pradesh. However, promoting gender concerns is yet to be operational. In fact, much needs to be done on even the conceptualisation of gender in local governance in the context of capacity development.

Recommendations

Part 1 Strategic Issues

2.1.1. Why such a project?

The 73rd Constitutional Amendment Act based on which the rural local governments were formed are still in vogue and the local governments have established themselves. It is now very clear that neither the states nor the national government could roll back and the Panchayats are here to stay in India as the local governments. While the states are at different levels in terms of decentralisation and local governments, in all the states where the CDLG project was implemented, there were definite steps taken by the state governments for strengthening local governments. In a few states like Rajasthan, Jharkhand, Odisha and Madhya Pradesh, there were even stronger policy indications about strengthening Panchayati Raj during the period.

Most of the flagship programmes/schemes of relevance at the local level are designed to be managed or implemented by the local governments or with their active participation. All these also have a strong component on citizen participation and involvement, thus providing scope for addressing wider issues of local governance. Specific provisions for inclusion of all sections of the society are incorporated in most of these guidelines. Affirmative action through reservation has contributed in a large way in making Panchayats the ideal platform for social inclusion. In fact, Panchayats and Gram Sabhas are the most important of such platforms where the potential for social inclusion is maximum.

Considering the magnitude of such responsibilities entrusted with the Panchayats and the local population, the capacity needs are also growing. While the governments have earmarked funds for trainings, it requires adequate technical support, motivation and guidance to make the capacity development initiatives happen in these states as institutional capacities are also not adequate. However, if these capacity needs are met, the impact it would create on the development scenario of rural India leading to human development would be phenomenal. This is an opportunity as well as need of the hour.

2.1.2. Why UNDP?

There are not many agencies supporting this kind of capacity development support to the local governments in India. The World Bank supports decentralization in three states: Kerala, Bihar and West Bengal. Support to Kerala is more about fiscal aspects, supporting the states in providing funds to the local governments, more in terms of infrastructure related projects and building systems for financial management. There is a capacity building component as part of it. In Bihar, it is more about infrastructure, and capacity building of local governments is very negligible. UNICEF had the IDA (Integrated District Approach) where the approach aims to strengthen integrated and participatory planning, increase the demand and delivery of quality services, and promote inclusive social change, keeping the interests of children and women at the heart of development. This is done through facilitating community mobilization and generating awareness; empowering communities to support them to collective action; and improving the delivery of basic public services. This again is not specifically on local governments, but seeing how UNICEF mandates could be achieved through local governments. This has come to an end and it is not yet clear how their new country programme would look like. SDC-LoGIn is another programme. This is a regional programme and is basically consolidation of what they have been doing in local governance. It again is about knowledge exchange and networking, not on directly supporting capacity building activities. UNWomen project is only in selected districts of three states, it is focused on women alone.

Thus UNDP emerges as the main agency which could contribute to capacity development for local governance in a comprehensive way. UNDP with its focus on local governance and human development has been pioneers in this area over the last decade and it is very much close to the UNDP mandates and experiences.

2.1.3. Where to anchor?

The same arrangements can be continued with MoPR as the national ministry and DoPR at the state level. Depending upon the situation in the states, the SIRDs or other institutes could be brought in. However, without any training institute at the state level the sustainability of the capacity building and training initiatives would not be sustainable.

There is a need to associate with other actors like the various development departments of relevance to Panchayati Raj, Finance Commissions and Election Commissions.

Ownership by the states and each state project should have activities depending on the policy environment and needs of the concerned state. Build on from what has been done so far. Build on from RGPSA and add value to it through the project.

2.1.4. Expand or Reduce

The key question would be on whether the project should be expanded to more states or reduce its direct reach. For the MoPR, the demand would be to extend it to other states as well. However, we feel that considering the limited resources available and the availability of funds with the governments, it would be better to focus on the seven states where the first phase has been rolled out. Even within these states, the project should be based on demand or opportunities. For example, if a state has its own resources and programmes for CB&T, the CDLG project needs to support only for specific requirements. On the other hand, there are states like Rajasthan where devolution has been a key agenda provides opportunities for developing new systems and capacity building strategies.

Now that the RGPSA is rolled out, CDLG can work with it and focus on select states. Most of the UNDP supported projects on governance have relevance to local governments. Considering this and the limited resources, it would have more impact potential if a single project with multiple partners with role clarity be instituted rather than many projects. Possibility of linking with projects of similar nature supported by other UN agencies also needs to be probed.

Part 2 Project Content

2.2.1. Specific Focus

- Operationalisation of the strategies for capacity development prepared in the first phase
- Training systems to be in place and made sustainable
- Support in establishing a Decentralised training system (piloting in a/few districts)
- Focus now should be on skills rather than rules and responsibilities
- Strengthening and working through RGPSA should be the key
- More focus on Dalits, women and other disadvantaged, Gram Sabha is still the ideal platform
- A strategy for capacity development for social inclusion in local governance based on the study conducted and Umaria experiences to be developed and operationalised
- Learnings from the previous project on EWRs to be incorporated in the next phase
- PESA – is important but without state initiative the efforts will not yield results. May support policy advocacy by organising workshops, studies etc.
- Policy influencing through institutions like Finance Commissions and Election Commissions

2.2.2. Advocacy

One concern raised was the role of such projects in advocacy, especially for social inclusion through Panchayati Raj. Can UNDP work on advocacy through NEX method? It might be difficult. But even within NEX, there are possibilities of providing support for advocacy through studies, workshops, policy briefs etc. There again, it is dependent on the partner state and institute interests.

Will it be better to work with NGOs and other civil society organisations for strengthening local governance? Conceptually this is an attractive solution. However, the effort and resources required to make an impact across the country or even a few states would be large. Moreover, care also will have to be taken not to end such initiatives as individual NGO project activities. But a judicious mix of activities with various governments, institutes and NGOs could be tried out.

2.2.3. Pilots

Apart from state led capacity building training initiatives, the project could support selected cluster of Panchayats (block or district) in a more focused and comprehensive way, identifying their day to day support needs and providing them. These pilots would enable UNDP and the governments to identify the real capacity needs at the local level, for which policy advocacy could be undertaken.

PART 3 MANAGEMENT

2.3.1. Role of Governments

- National level – MoPR - Monitor the project through the National Steering committee

- Develop linkage with other MoPR schemes and also with other relevant ministries.
- Coordinate with state governments in developing systems through joint development of guidelines, procedures and systems

- Provide appropriate platforms for sharing and dissemination of knowledge generated

- Disseminate the learnings to other states and using other MoPR schemes, upscale them to all other states

2.3.2. Role of UNDP

As mentioned earlier, the local governance and building capacities are areas where there is need and UNDP has the legitimacy, experiences and potential. It is almost the only agency which can provide such comprehensive capacity development support for local governance through its acknowledged and approved mandates. Providing technical support (derived from international level, national level and from the concerned state, as per the situation) and base funds to utilise the technical support on demand basis to states as well as nationally could be the priority. This requires coordination with regional office and other UNDP institutions and country offices across the globe.

Develop own strengths for providing technical support - UNDP cannot function merely as a donor agency. What the states look forward is the technical support and UNDP's own resources and knowledge should be able to provide overall knowledge requirements as well as new insights into capacity building for local governance. UNDP should be able to transform itself as a provider of knowledge on capacity development for local governance.

2.3.3. Developing the Programme Document

Each state to develop its own project within the overall framework before signing. A joint exercise with MoPR and states would be useful.

2.3.4. Institutional Arrangements

The present institutional arrangements seem to work. However, ensure more active involvement of other departments and ministries especially that of the flagship programmes, Finance Commissions and Election Commissions.

Preferably, instead of a totally separate NPMU, it would be better to have the RGPSA unit (if there would be one) taking care of the CDLG project or the project PMU is linked to RGPSA.

Linkages with other similar projects like that of the UNWomen, UNICEF etc could be established under the leadership of MoPR and the state DoPR so that duplication is avoided.

2.3.5. Human Resources

Quality technical support through human resources has been the most important aspect of the project acknowledged and appreciated by all the states.

Providing UNVs as the technical support to be done away with or the qualification and experiences to be of higher nature so that it is quality technical support provided and not clerical support. They need to be provided adequate and regular trainings and exposure. Technical support should be based on the need and demand from the states.

At the national level too, technical support unit could be provided rather than project management unit. This technical support unit could work with or incorporated within the RGPSA.

2.3.6. Upscaling strategy

Parallelly the MoPR should take the initiative in organizing similar activities in other states. Learnings and experiences from the CDLG states should be concurrently disseminated to other states and probably RGPSA should have provisions for similar activities to be taken up there. This requires up to date information sharing. E-platforms could be one approach, but electronic platforms alone will not work with the state governments and institutes. Innovative ideas on knowledge management to be tried out like horizontal learning.

2.3.7.   Steering and Monitoring

Clarity is required on steering and monitoring. A system is to be in place at the national and state levels and role clarity among the key actors including MoPR, DoPR (states) and UNDP needs to be worked out.

Ideally, steering the day to day operations and activity monitoring should be done at the DoPR level, MoPR to be involved in overall project monitoring and guidance, in close coordination with UNDP. This has to be supplemented with a regular reporting system at all levels.

2.3.8.   Comprehensive Approach

While the recommendations given above have focused on the CDLG, we would also like to point out that the UNDP initiatives on support to strengthening local governance in India could be approached in a larger and comprehensive way. It would have more impact potential if the learnings and experiences of the past UNDP supported projects on various aspects of governance are pooled together and a comprehensive project which focuses on human development through participatory planning at various sub state levels, budgeting and public finance management, implementation and community monitoring is rolled out. This should have major components on capacity development and social inclusion too.

Limitations and Lessons Learnt

- Terminal evaluations take place at the fag end of the project and naturally so. However, by that time the key individuals who have managed the project would have left. Even if the project might have been documented well, there is always the possibility of losing many of the valuable learnings. We had tried to contact a few of the past actors to overcome this.

- Key officials concerned with the project had also been transferred including the national project director and a few of the state nodal officers. Here again, they were contacted so that the important learnings and experiences could be captured.

- This is a project with multiple partners and linkages with many other government schemes. Some of them are closely linked to the activities of the project. Especially, the funds and activities of BRGF and RGSY were integrated with the CDLG project in many states and this made it difficult to differentiate between the CDLG achievements and that of others. Funds utilization on specific activities also got integrated and so we were not able to come out with a clear picture on funds utilization of the CDLG project for each of the specific outputs.

Appendices

Annexure 1 List of Persons Interviewed / FGDs

Bihar
1. Amitabh Verma Principal Secretary, Department of Panchayati Raj, Bihar
2. Anita Kumari, Sadasya, Zila Parishad, Vidyapati, Samastipur, Bihar
3. Anita Singh, Panchayat Samiti Pramukh Nerut Panchayat, Asthawan Prakhand, Nalanda, Bihar
4. Bhola Kumar, Prakhand Pramukh, Harnaut, Nalanda, Bihar
5. Krushna Mohan, former TSO, CDLG, Bihar
6. Mithilesh Kumar, Retired Officer, Department of Panchayati Raj, Bihar
7. Pravin Kumar, Manager IT, Department of Panchayati Raj, Bihar
8. Raghuvar Rai, Upadhyaksh, Zila Parishad Samastipur, Bihar
9. Ranjeet Nirguni, Sadasya, Zila Parishad Sarairanjan, Samastipur, Bihar
10. Rekha Devi, Panchayat Samiti Pramukh Hazpurva, Samastipur, Bihar
11. S Anand, TSO, CDLG, Bihar
12. Seema Singh, SPC, CDLG, Bihar
13. Surendra Prasad, Assistant Director, Department of Panchayati Raj, Bihar
14. V K Pathak Deputy Director BIPARD

Chhattisgarh
15. Anooj Patel, SIRD, Chhattisgarh
16. Ashok Jaiswal, SIRD, Chhattisgarh
17. Ashok Kumar Aggarwal, AIATO, Kharagad Block, Chhattisgarh
18. Madhumita Banerji, Resource Person, Chhattisgarh
19. Manjit Kaur Bal, SIRD, Chhattisgarh
20. Narayan Singh Patel, SIATO, Tamnar Block, Chhattisgarh
21. Neeraj Diwankar, Consultant Faculty, SIRD, Chhattisgarh
22. Nirmaledhu, SPC, CDLG, Chhattisgarh
23. Pandey, SIRD, Chhattisgarh
24. R.K. Singh, Director, SIRD, Chhattisgarh
25. Savitlal Sahoo, SIATO, Khargad Block, Chhattisgarh
26. Sharma D.K., SIRD, Chhattisgarh
27. Vivek Dhand, Additional Chief Secretary, Chhattisgarh

Jharkhand
28. Ajit Kumar Singh, Assistant Director, Central Training Institute
29. Amrit Kuzur of Basant Dynamics Institute of Continuing Education, Ranchi
30. Ganesh Prasad, Director and Special Secretary, PR and NREP Department, Jharkhand.
31. Jiwan Kishore Lakra, Technical Support Officer
32. K.K. Singh, Under Secretary, PR Department and Principal, Central Training Institute
33. Lalita Balnuchu, Mukhiya, Manjhgaon Gram Panchayat, West Singbhum district.
34. Madhabji Pandey, Block Panchayati Raj Officer
35. Md. Shakil Rahi of Manthan Yuva Sanggathan, Ranchi.
36. Nirmala Tudu, Member Zilla Parishad, Dumka
37. R.K. Mandal, Assistant Director, Panchayati Raj department, Jharkhand
38. Salil Kumar, Block Panchayati Raj Officer
39. Shubha Kumar, Assistant Director, SIRD, Jharkhand

40. Sunita Hembram, Member Zilla Parishad, East Singbhum district.
41. Vinay Pande, former State Project Coordinsator, CDLG project, Jharkhand.

Madhya Pradesh
42. Aruna Sharma, Additional Chief Secretary, Madhya Pradesh
43. Binu Chaturvedi, SPC, Madhya Pradesh
44. Dwivedi B.K. , MGSIRD, Jabalpur, Madhya Pradesh
45. Gautham M.P., MGSIRD, Jabalpur, Madhya Pradesh
46. Nilesh Parikh, Director, MGSIRD, Jabalpur, Madhya Pradesh
47. Nilesh Rai, MGSIRD, Jabalpur, Madhya Pradesh
48. Pankaj Rai, MGSIRD, Jabalpur, Madhya Pradesh
49. Sanjeev Sinha, MGSIRD, Jabalpur, Madhya Pradesh
50. Shukla K.K., former Director, MGSIRD, Jabalpur, Madhya Pradesh
51. Shyam Bohare, Resource Person, Madhya Pradesh
52. Sonam Jain, MGSIRD, Jabalpur, Madhya Pradesh
53. Surendra Prajawat, MGSIRD, Jabalpur, Madhya Pradesh

Odisha
54. Amita Patra, SIRD, Bhubaneswar, Odisha
55. Aparajitha Sarangi, Commissioner cum Secretary, DoPR, Odisha
56. Gautum Patnaik, SPC, CDLG, Odisha
57. Kajri Mishra, XIMB, Bhubaneswar, Odisha
58. Minak Sarkar, SPO, CDDP, Odisha
59. Minoti Padhi, Institute of Women Development, Odisha
60. Priyanath, TSO, CDLG, Odisha
61. Santosh Kumar Patra, SIRD, Bhubaeswar, Odisha
62. Saroj Dash, Deputy Director, SIRD, Bhubaneswar, Odisha
63. Shivabrata Kar, SPO UNWomen project and former TSO-CDLG, Odisha
64. Sitakant Mohapatra, Orissa Voluntary Health Association, Odisha
65. Subrat Kumar Mishra, SIRD, Bhubaneswar, Odisha

Rajasthan
66. Adesh Chaturvedi, SPC, CDLG, Rajasthan
67. Aggarwal B.D., Accounts Officer, IGPRS (SIRD), Jaipur, Rajasthan
68. Anita Brandon, IGPRS (SIRD), Jaipur, Rajasthan
69. Aparna Arora, Secretary and Commissioner, DoPR, Rajasthan
70. Giriraj Singh, Director General, IGPRS (SIRD), Jaipur, Rajasthan
71. Rajan C.S., Additional Chief Secretary, Rajasthan
72. Ram Babu Sharma, Hathog GP, Rajasthan
73. Ruchi, TSO, CDLG, Rajasthan
74. Shyam Behari Sharma, Secretary, Bhattorigali GP, Rajasthan
75. Surjit Singh, Director, Institute of Development Studies, Jaipur, Rajasthan
76. Yogenda Poonia, IGPRS (SIRD), Jaipur, Rajasthan

Uttar Pradesh
77. Abhishek, TSO, CDLG Uttar Pradeh
78. Brijesh, TSO, Uttar Pradesh
79. Tahir Iqbal, Special Secretary and Project Director BRGF/CDLG, Uttar Pradesh
80. Santosh Kumar Sahu, Accountant, BRGF/CDLG, Uttar Pradesh
81. Pandey O.P., Director, SIRD, Lucknow, Uttar Pradesh
82. Navin Awasthi, SIRD, Lucknow, Uttar Pradesh

83. Uday Mansingh, Principal, RIRD, Lucknow, Uttar Pradesh
84. Gaurav Mishra, former SPC, CDLG, Uttar Pradesh

National

85. Ashok R. Angurana, Additional Secretary, MoPR and NPD, CDLG
86. Rajesh Kumar, National Project Cell CDLG, CDLG, New Delhi
87. Ritu Mathur, Programme Associate, UNDP, New Delhi
88. Sanjeev Sharma, NPM, National Project Cell CDLG, CDLG, New Delhi
89. Sudhir Krishna, Secretary, MoUA, Government of India and former NPD, CDLG
90. Sumeeta Banerji, Assistant Country Director, UNDP, New Delhi
91. Suraj Kumar, UNWomen, New Delhi

Annexure 2 Data Collection Instruments

METHODS, SOURCES AND DATA COLLECTON TOOLS

Under the study, multiple methods, sources and tools will be used in the study through a multi-disciplinary team so that multi-approach is applied to validate of the facts. In the present study, Pro Doc of GoI-UNJPC, Result and Resource Framework of Project and UNDAF outcome and output matrix will be the key source of reference. The information on various outcome and outputs indicators of the project will be collected using different sources of evidences & using different method of data collection.

For the data collection a combination of methods and sources shall be used in MTE. The sources of data will be both secondary as well as primary. The primary data will be collected from different sources using different methods such as direct observation, Focus Group Discussions, and Key Informants interviews (KIIs).

Focus Group Discussions (FGDs): FGDs will be used to cover specific group of people engaged at various levels in the implementation of the project

Observation Method: Since the MTE involves assessment of various processes, system and functioning of different project teams of government schemes, observation method will also be used to verify the reality.

Key Informant Interviews: KIIs will be used for officials of the concerned departments/ village level committees and other relevant agencies for understanding their role in programme implementation.

Documentation like progress reports, annual reports, other written reports of events etc. will be collected to support the primary data collected through interviews and other methods. Thus the facts collected from different sources will be used in a converging manner to define the "facts" of the case. This will satisfy one basic requirement of the qualitative studies - reliance on "multiple sources of evidence".

Check list/Semi structured questionnaire used for FGDs and KIIs

I General issues (Secretary/ Nodal officer/ PC/ Director SIRD)
1. Was the project helpful? How?
2. Was the project executed well in terms of utilisation of funds, creation of awareness about the importance of capacity building of PRI representatives and officials, improving the quality of the training programmes etc. If not, why not.
3. Were the inputs of the project adequate in terms of funding, advisory services, staff support, flexibility in operation allowed by the UNDP, project components and the pattern of allocation of funds among different components?
4. Was the fund-flow regular and timely or whether you faced difficulties in this regard?
5. Whether there was a balance between different components of the project, namely strengthening the state institutions for (i) capacity building of panchayats, (ii) advocacy and sharing of good practices and (iii) community empowerment and mobilisation. With the hind sight, do you think certain components deserved to be given more attention than they received from the project? Please explain your views.
6. Did you receive any guidance for execution of any item of the various components of the project?
7. Can you cite some good practices in the state in the field of capacity building for local governance that can be emulated by others, but remain undocumented?
8. Do you want a repeat of the project and if so, in what manner?
9. What kind of improvement would you suggest if the project is repeated?

Utilisation of CDLG project Fund (2008 – 12)
Year   Opening balance Fund received   Total fund   Implementing agency Fund Expenditure during the year Balance Reasons for low utilisation

II Specific issues on which information has to be collected

Component 1: Improved capacity development approaches
Training

- CB strategy plan: whether prepared, when prepared, process of preparing – whether stakeholders consulted, whether the plan accepted as a government policy, main components of the plan, a copy of the plan.
- Whether any networking initiatives taken by SIRD or other nodal institution? Whether there is SIRD – ATI coordination, especially because the latter is supposed to conduct training on district planning and orienting state officials on PR. Whether SIRD/nodal institution established linkage with universities and other academic institutions.
- Targeted trainees: Last election held, Category of elected representatives, their number, category of officials, their number, others.
- Training needs assessment :   (Org analysis, Job analysis, performance requirement, performance standards and gap analysis. Whether training intervention necessary to fill the gap. if yes, determine who needs training and what are their KSA [Knowledge, skill and attitude] deficits? Select training method).
- Training modules prepared: Among other things, note whether gender issues and MDG goals are adequately addressed. Also see whether planning issues are addressed.
- Developing/revising/updating training materials
- Training of trainers conducted

- Case studies prepared
- Developing a pool of trainers at state, district and Block levels
- Number of training programmes held : category of trainees, Number, % covered, comparison between pre-poject period and post project period.
- Whether evaluation of training programmes made? How?
- Copies of periodical progress reports prepared during the project period

Institutional capacity
1. Identification of the nodal institution: SIRD or other institution. If not SIRD, why? Are ETCs active? Do they have any role?
2. Physical infrastructure of the nodal institution/SIRD/ETC
3. Faculty strength of the nodal institution/SIRD/ETC: Sanctioned posts, Posts filled, manner of recruitment, arrangement for updating knowledge and skill of faculty,
4. Budget of the nodal institution/SIRD (Resource source: State government, central government grants, CDLG project, other donor agencies, others) (Receipts and expenditure during last four years)
5. Number of courses conducted (on campus and off campus)
6. Whether SIRD oversees and facilitates functioning of ETCs.

Component 2: Advocacy and sharing of good practices
1. Whether research studies, case studies or any other kinds of knowledge product generated from the project fund. If so details thereof.
2. Whether seminars and workshops or special lectures were organised to develop/disseminate knowledge on issues relevant for the PRIs. (If so, information on topics of seminars/workshop, nature of participation, venue, names of sponsoring agencies etc needed)
3. Whether programmes were taken up to expose MLAs and officials not connected directly with PRIs to the
4. Whether documentation of good practices was made by competent persons. If so, details thereof.
5. Whether exposure visits organised? If so, details thereof.

Component 4: Community empowerment and mobilisation
1. Mobilisation and training with gram sabhas
2. Campaigning on raising awareness about gram sabha
3. Initiating participatory village level planning
4. Any other innovative programme
5. Networking with grassroots NGOs or CBOs (like SHGs) for community mobilisation.

Interview with elected representatives (If possible)
1. Have you been elected earlier also? If yes, how many times? In which position?
2. Did you receive training? When? Where? For how many days?
3. What is your job profile? What do you do as a PRI member?
4. What do people expect from you as a PRI member?
5. What do women expect from you as their representative? (for women members)
6. What do your colleagues expect from you?
7. What did you expect from the training?
8. Were your expectations fulfilled by the training programme?
9. Do you feel more confident in your work situation after the training?

10. What did the training programme give you in terms of knowledge or information on the following: (a) functioning of panchayat, (b) roles of individual members/Pradhan/other office bearer, (c) decision making process of panchayats, (d) resources of panchayats, (e) Important schemes like MGNREGS, IAY, NRLM, JSY etc.

Information on PRIs and other matters

1. Number of PRIs
2. Number of elected representatives
3. When elected?
4. Fund-flow: Nature and amount
5. Functional devolution: PRIs responsible for delivery of which services?
6. Project steering committees, Review and monitoring mechanism – documents thereof