

Z-11011/09/2008-PPC (Pt.1)
Government of India
Ministry of Rural Development
Department of Land Resources

6th Floor, 11th Block
CGO Complex, Lodhi Road
New Delhi 110 003

Date: 23rd July, 2012

To

The Chairman, SLNA for IWMP in all States (as per list attached)

Subject: Guidelines for 'Evaluation of Preparatory Phase of IWMP Projects' and Criteria for Selecting Evaluating Agencies under IWMP - reg.

Sir,

This has the reference to the provision of concurrent Evaluation under Integrated Watershed Management Programme (IWMP). 1% of the total project cost is earmarked for this component for conducting concurrent project evaluation during the project period.

2. The Broad Guidelines for '**Evaluation of Preparatory Phase of IWMP Projects' and the Criteria for Selecting Evaluating Agencies under IWMP** is enclosed herewith for necessary action at all levels of implementation. It is further informed that these are broad guidelines and the SLNA may issue detail modalities for same as per State requirements.

Encl.: As above.

Yours faithfully,

-Sd-

(Jagdish Singh)

Deputy Inspector General of Forests
(011-2436 2569)

Copy to

1. The PPS to Sec0retary (LR)/ PPS to AS (LR)/ PS to JS (WM), DoLR
2. Director (WM)/ AIGF/ DC (WD)
3. Economic Advisor, DoLR/ US (M&E), DoLR
4. The Principal Secretary/ Secretary/ Commissioner of Nodal Department for IWMP in all States (as per list attached)
5. The CEO. SLNA for IWMP in all States (as per list attached)

Copy also to

The Chief Executive Officer, National Rainfed Area Authority (NRAA), NASC Complex, DPS Marg, PUSA, New Delhi

Guidelines for Evaluation of Preparatory Phase of IWMP Projects

Rationale:

Monitoring and **Evaluation** on regular basis is essential from project management point of view as it allows to cross check the status of the project, identify drawbacks and strengths, offer paths of correction/revision, gain knowledge, build expertise and share experiences within and between the various groups of actors and stakeholders.

While **Monitoring** involves routine assessment of progress and status of various ongoing activities, **Evaluation** on the other hand is more of a periodic assessment of achievement/milestones in accordance with the objectives of the project.

In the Common Guidelines for Watershed Development Projects, 2008, one of the guiding principles is Monitoring, Evaluation and learning. The principle states that “ A participatory, outcome and impact oriented and user focused monitoring and evaluation and learning system would be put in place to obtain feedback and undertake improvements in planning, projects design and implementation. “

Broadly the objectives of evaluation for watershed projects can be summed up as follows:

1. To obtain essential benchmark data related to the project and incorporating the same in DPRs.
2. To identify phase wise tangible outputs and behavioral outcomes that can be used in the long-term impact evaluation of the project.
3. To suggest improvement and initiate timely actions.

Monitoring & Evaluation have been elaborated under the component 11, Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning in the Common Guidelines for Watershed Development Projects, 2008 from Para 85 to 90.

The common guidelines elaborates that there will be a national panel of Evaluating Agencies in each Ministry. A minimum percentage of evaluations and impact studies will be carried out by national level agencies that will ensure objectivity as well as infuse a national perspective. There will also be an SLNA panel of evaluators, approved by the Departmental Nodal Agency at central level. The panel will include only institutions and agencies – not individuals. The SLNA will enter into a formal contract with these agencies. The WCDC may

choose any agency from the SLNA approved panel, the only condition being that the agency should not belong to the area being evaluated. Each evaluation will include physical, financial and social audit of the work done. Evaluators are to be seen not so much as inspectors but as facilitators. However, they will be very strict in ensuring that these guidelines are being followed. In accordance with this, these guidelines have been prepared for evaluation of preparatory phase activities under IWMP.

Framework:

The suggestive framework for evaluation to assess the preparatory phase activities is given below. The external evaluation agency may use this framework to assess the performance of the watershed project and accordingly rank the performance and state their remarks against each activity. Based on that, the overall performance may be indicated as Excellent/Very Good/Good/Satisfactory/Poor without any ambiguity.

Methodology: In order to assess the performance it is important to gain a view of stakeholders involved and also evaluate the information collected during the process by various institutions involved in the watershed project. The process of evaluation shall include review of records & reports use online MIS / project data base, minutes of meeting, focus group discussion with the Primary Beneficiaries, dialogue and multistakeholder meeting at PIA and District level, and field visits to the watershed sites to verify the status of activities/works on the ground and social audit.

The Evaluation will cover all the sanctioned project areas for the particular batch/year of project. The sample size under the project should not be less than a minimum of 30% of the project area for general evaluation and this shall be selected through random sampling method. The physical verification of the EPAs, works and institutions shall be carried out covering atleast 20% of the EPAs, works and institutions in the project area on stratified random sampling basis. The evaluation report should be prepared for each project taking into account the findings of the sample watersheds along with a consolidated evaluation report for each batch of projects (example- batch1/2009-10 projects).

Key: Performance rank: Score**Score** (for working out cumulative performance)

Excellent-E =on schedule, >90% achievement and as per plan,	(9.5)
Very Good-VG= 80-90% achievement as per plan,	(8.5)
Good-G= 60-<80 % achievement as per plan,	(7.0)
Satisfactory-S= 50-<60 % achievement as per plan	(5.5)
Poor-P = <50 % achievement as per plan	(4.0)

Information may be filled in terms of Nos. , ₹ and Yes or No or descriptive as deemed necessary and applicable under each indicator

T = Target in Nos./ ₹ A=Achievement in Nos. / ₹

Y=Yes, N= No, NA= Not applicable

Observation, suggestion if any may be mentioned in the column titled remarks.

The Performance under each indicator is to be ranked as E/VG/G/S/P and/or Y/N based on achievement as given in the **key**. The average score of all the indicators will be considered as a cumulative performance. **For Example, if total score obtained is say 350 for all the 50 line items , the average cumulative score will be 7.0, suggesting overall performance as “Good”**

Suggestive framework for Preparatory Phase Evaluation:

1. Name of watershed:
2. Code of watershed:
3. Location
 - a) Longitude
 - b) Latitude
4. Name of District:
5. Name of Taluk/Block:
6. Total area of watershed:
7. Total cost of the project:
8. Names of villages covered:
9. Name of PIA:
10. Name of the Evaluating Agency:
11. Evaluation Indicators: as per **Annexure – I**

Annexure-I

Components	Status		Performance including quality of performance (score for each grading as per the Key)	Remarks
1. Entry Point Activities (EPA)				
	Target	Achievements		
i. Number of EPAs			E/VG/G/S/P (..)	
ii. Expenditure (Rs.)			E/VG/G/S/P(..)	
iii. Type of activities & their quality & utility	Were these in tune with the guidelines and logical demand emerged through PRA : (Y/N)		If yes =E/VG/G/S If no=P (..)	
iv. Participatory process followed in identifying EPAs	Y / partially followed / N		If yes= E/VG If partially followed=G/S If no =P(..)	
2. Village Level Institution Building				
	Target	Achievements		
User Groups (Nos.)			E/VG/G/S/P*(..)	
Self Help Group (Nos.)			E/VG/G/S/P*(..)	
Women Groups including UGs and SHGs (Nos.)			E/VG/G/S/P*(..)	
Major type of activities of SHGs included in Livelihood Action Plan			E/VG/G/S/P*(..)	
Watershed Committee formed as per guidelines	Y	N	If yes =E/VG/G/S If no=P(..)	Score may be given depending on its composition
If yes, when was it formed & status			E/VG/G/S/P(..)	Score may be given depending upon how timely it was formed and activity
Whether the watershed committee is sub – committee of Gram Panchayat	Y	N	Only yes or No, No scoring may be given	
Watershed Committee Registered under Society Registration Act 1860	Y	N	If yes = E If no= P(..)	Based on the registration status

*Depending on the percentage of target achieved, its performance can be scored as E/VG/G/S/P

Chairman of Watershed Committee has been elected / appointed by Gram Sabha	Y	N	If yes =E/VG/G/S If no=P (..)	Score may be given depending upon how timely appointed
Watershed Secretary appointed & when	Y	N	If yes =E/VG/G/S If no=P (..)	Score may be given depending upon how timely appointed
Bank account has been opened for project fund & (When &where)	Y	N	If yes =E/VG/G/S If no=P (..)	Score may be given based on timing of the bank account opening
Number of Members of Watershed Committee	Is it in accordance with the Common Guideline		E/VG/G/S/P (..)	Score may be given based on the No.
Composition of the Watershed Committee	Is it in accordance with the Common Guidelines		E/VG/G/S/P(..)	Score may be given based on the composition & equity
Regular meetings of WC is being called	Y	N	If yes =E/VG/G/S If no=P (..)	Score may be given based on the frequency of meeting
If yes, at what intervals			Only the numbers may be mentioned, No scoring may be given	
Minutes of meeting register being maintained	Y	N	If yes =E/VG/G/S If no=P (..)	Score may be given based on the entry in register, clarity and accessibility and participation
3. Project Implementing Agency (PIA)				
Watershed Development Team formed	Y	N	If yes =E If no=P (..)	Score may be given based timing of the formation
Watershed Development Team composition is as per the Common guidelines	Y	N	If yes =E/VG/G/S If no=P (..)	Score may be given based on the composition and expertise
Involvement of WDT	Y	N	If yes =E/VG/G/S If no=P (..)	Score may be given based on the level of participation

4. Capacity Building				
	Target	Achievements		
Status of Capacity Building Plan (Prepared or not)	Y	N	If yes =E/VG/G/S If no=P (..)	Score may be given depending upon status, quality and participation of the stakeholders in the plan preparation
Awareness camps conducted (Nos.)			E/VG/G/S/P (..)	Score may be given based on the Nos. achieved as per the target
Exposure visits conducted (Nos.)			E/VG/G/S/P (..)	Score may be given based on the Nos. achieved as per the target
Workshops / training conducted (Nos.)			E/VG/G/S/P (..)	Score may be given based on the Nos. achieved as per the target
Total Persons trained (Nos.)			E/VG/G/S/P (..)	Score may be given based on the Nos. achieved as per the target
Farmers and landless trained (Nos.)			E/VG/G/S/P (..)	Score may be given based on the Nos. achieved as per the target
Women trained (Nos.)			E/VG/G/S/P (..)	Score may be given based on the Nos. achieved as per the target
WDT members trained (Nos.)			E/VG/G/S/P (..)	Score may be given based on the Nos. achieved as per the target
WC/GP members trained (Nos.)			E/VG/G/S/P (..)	Score may be given based on the Nos. achieved as per the target
Expenditure (Rs.)			E/VG/G/S/P (..)	Score may be given based on the Nos. achieved as per the target

5. Detailed Project Report				
PRA exercise conducted	Y	N	If yes =E/VG/G/S If no=P (..)	Score may be given based on yes or no and quality of PRA (documentation, no. of men and women participants, information collected and sharing etc.,)
Base Line data collected and documented	Y	N	If yes =E/VG/G/S If no=P (..)	Score may be given depending on Y or N and the quality of information and document
Livelihood action plan with timeline prepared	Y	N	If yes =E/VG/G/S If no=P (..)	Score may be given depending on Y or N and the quality of information and document
Production System enhancement plan with timeline prepared	Y	N	If yes =E/VG/G/S If no=P (..)	Score may be given depending on Y or N and the quality of information and document
Consolidated action plan (perspective plan) is prepared	Y	N	If yes =E/VG/G/S If no=P (..)	Score may be given depending on Y or N and the quality of information and document
DPR is prepared as per the framework	Y	N	If yes =E/VG/G/S If no=P (..)	Score may be given depending on Y or N and the quality of information and document
DPR is integrated in the District Perspective Plan	Y	N	If yes =E If no=P (..)	
Convergence Plan included/prepared	Y	N	If yes =E/VG/G/S If no=P (..)	Score may be given based on the quality of plan , level of involvement and inclusion
Has the plan been discussed for convergence and to what extent	Y	N	If yes =E/VG/G/S If no=P (..)	Score may be given based on the extent of involvement
Approved by SLNA	Y	N	If yes =E If no=P (..)	
Uploaded in website	Y	N	If yes =E If no=P (..)	
AAP is part of DPR	Y	N	If yes =E If no=P (..)	
Net Planning/ Patch (Mapping unit) has been done	Y	N	If yes =E If no=P (..)	
Year wise and month wise physical & financial target and achievement record is entered	Y	N	If yes =E If no=P (..)	
DPR is integrated and updated with the IWMP-MIS (Monitoring Information System)	Y	N	If yes =E/VG/G/S If no=P (..)	Also mention if there is any deviation in MIS

6. Watershed Work				
Watershed work identified in the DPR	Y	N	If yes =E If no=P (..)	
Implementation of Works initiated	Y	N	If yes =E If no=P (..)	
Details of watershed works initiated /completed <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Land development ▪ Water harvesting structures ▪ Drainage line treatment ▪ Plantation ▪ Livelihood ▪ others 	Target	Achievement	If yes = E/VG/G/S If No= P (..)	Score may be given based on the target and achievement
	Target	Achievement	% utilized	
7. Fund Utilization: Percentage			E/VG/G/S/P	Score may be given based on the target and achievement
Total Score				
Average Score	Total Score/50			
8. Comments/suggestions	on overall performance of the preparatory phase			

Evaluation team should comprise of preferably 3 members. The team members should preferably have the understanding of common guidelines, various processes and with the knowledge of evaluation/research/studies. Team should have members possessing knowledge of NRM works, production systems improvement - agriculture, livestock, fisheries, etc; micro enterprises, livelihood development etc. The PIA office is also expected to facilitate and mobilize the WCs, SHGs, UGs, WDT members and beneficiaries. The PIA should make sure that the WDT members, WC members and direct beneficiaries are present during the visit of evaluation team to watershed villages. It also should keep all the reports, records, account books, etc ready for verification by the team at the time of visit.

4. Deliverables

1. Evaluation reports for each cluster/project with photo documentation
2. Consolidated Evaluation Report for submission to DoLR

The entire evaluation process for evaluating a particular batch of projects may be completed within a specific time period as per the size of the batch of projects. The evaluation process should be completed within six weeks period or the timeline mutually agreed by two parties based on the size of the Project.