



3.0 PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION CYCLE – PHASE-WISE

3.1 Approach

The approach for tank systems improvement and rehabilitation under KCBTMP is participatory, need-based and community-Centric. It is the responsibility of the community to identify the interventions and strategies required for restoring the tank system. This is done during the PRA exercise by involving the entire village community, facilitated by the members of the Cluster Facilitation Team (CFT). The project implementation plan, which includes diverse range of activities right from the community mobilization to form the TUG, upto the completion of post-implementation activities, has been divided into four distinct, but inter related phases, namely, pre-planning, planning, implementation and post-implementation. The activities and processes to be followed have been clearly articulated and guidelines provided for timely implementation within the given time frame. The time frame given for completion of each phase is as follows:

- Pre-planning - 4 months
- Planning - 4 months
- Implementation - 8 months
- Post-Implementation - 4 months

The data were collected about the actual time taken for completing the tasks, processes and activities, from the records of the TMIs and CFTs. The reasons for delay in completing the targeted works within the stipulated period have been collected from the TUC members of the respective villages. The details are presented in the Table 3.1



Table 3.1



3.2 Performance in Phases of Implementation

- The survey data presented in table 3.1 shows that the 1st batch tanks/villages have taken relatively more time for completion of the project implementation cycle. Because, it is a learning process for the agencies involved and also to the community, since it is the first time this kind of project has been taken up. Furthermore, the initial teething troubles to keep the operational systems in place, also contributes to time over-runs. The time over-run has, however, gradually come down in the subsequent batches. For example, the time over-run in 1st batch tanks was 114 percent, which has come down to 109 percent in 2nd batch followed by 90 percent in 3rd batch and 64 percent in batch IV. Since some of the 5th and 6th batch sample tanks have not yet completed all the four implementation phases, the figures presented represent the status as on the date of survey. Keeping this trend as a backdrop, it is important and necessary to examine whether the period stipulated for completion of different phases of implementation is realistic or not, by taking the ground realities and experiences so far into account. For instance, the time over-run in the implementation phase is enormous. Though it has come down in the subsequent batches, it is still high. This needs a fresh look in the context of the proposed follow-on project.

3.2.1 The **pre-planning phase** is very crucial to mobilize and orient the community to take up the works or processes stipulated in the subsequent phases. Stakeholder analysis has to be done carefully to identify their interest in taking up the tank management. This is a time consuming process. For, the community will have no clear cut understanding of the project objectives, and the potential benefits from it. It is therefore, necessary to explain their roles, responsibilities and the possible potential benefits from the project. Because of the initial problems, the time over-run for the first batch tanks was relatively more for implementation of this phase. The time over-run has, however, come down from 32.5 percent in the 1st batch to 27.5 percent, in the 2nd batch, 12.5 in 3rd, 20 in 4th, 15 in 5th and only 7.5 percent in the 6th batch. This indicates clearly the



lessons learnt in the 1st and 2nd batch tanks have helped to complete the pre-planning phase in relatively lesser time. The same trend is observed in other phases also.

- The time over-run in implementation phase is very high, when compared to other phases, across the batches. It was as high as 197.5 percent in the 1st batch tanks, which has marginally come down in the subsequent batches. There must be some strong reasons for such delay in the implementation phase. Some of the reasons given by the community during the Focused Group Discussions are: factions in the community, lack of properly estimated procurement plan, lack of timely advice on certain technical matters, withdrawal of money and the delay in re-release of funds, to mention a few.
- The time over-run in the post-implementation phase is relatively lesser than the implementation phase. Though it was reported that this phase has been completed in many of the sample tanks the processes have, however, not been systematically followed as brought out in the process monitoring studies, where a detailed analysis was done.
- The timely and effective implementation depends upon a number of factors. Some of them include, cooperation and cohesiveness of the community, leadership and timely facilitation by the concerned agencies. In such villages, the implementation was timely, qualitatively better, and indications of sustainability are visible. Quite a few sample villages had completed the tasks in different phases on time the details of which are presented in Table 3.2 & Figure 3.1.



Table: 3.2 - Distribution of Sample Villages which have completed the implementation phases with in the stipulated time - frame - Batch-wise

Batch	No. of villages covered	No. of villages completed within the stipulated time			
		PP	Planning	Imp	P. Imp
I	15	7 (46.7)	6 (40.0)	0	0
II	17	7 (41.2)	7 (41.2)	0	6 (23.5)
II	24	11 (45.8)	13 (54.2)	4 (16.7)	2 (8.3)
IV	33	19 (57.6)	24 (72.7)	1 (30.)	13 (39.4)
V	69	37 (53.6)	36 (52.2)	7 (10.1)	25 (36.2)
VI	24	9 (37.5)	12 (50.0)	1 (4.2)	3 (12.5)
Total	182	90 (49.5)	98 (53.8)	13 (7.1)	47 (25.8)

Note: Figure is parentheses are percentages

- It could be seen from the survey data presented in Table 3.2, almost 50 percent of the sample villages have completed the preplanning phase on time (4 months period) followed by 53 percent planning phase. Surprisingly only 7 percent of the sample villages have completed implementation phase on time. It is 25 percent in the case of post-implementation phase. The learning in the 1st and 2nd batches seem to have helped the completion of stipulated activities on time in the subsequent batches. For example, the percentage of 1st batch sample villages completing **pre-planning phase** on time was about 46 percent, which has increased to 57 percent in the 4th batch and 53 percent in 5th batch.

3.2.2 In the case of **planning phase**, the success rate of timely completion has increased from 40 percent in the 1st batch villages to 50 percent in the 6th batch. The highest success rate of 72.7 percent has been reported from the 4th batch villages.



Figure 3.1



3.2.3 On the contrary, the success rate of timely completion of **implementation phase** has been very poor. Not even a single sample village from the 1st and 2nd batches could complete the implementation phase on time. There has been marginal success in 3rd and 4th batch villages with 16 percent and 3 percent, respectively, followed by 10 percent in 5th batch and 3 percent in 6th batch. The reasons for poor success rate of timely completion of the implementation phase are many and varied, some of them have been cited earlier.

3.2.4 The scenario of completing the **post-implementation** on time is more or less same as that of implementation phase. None of the 1st batch villages had completed post-implementation on time. The success of timely completion had, however, started from the 2nd batch villages on-wards. The success rate in the 2nd batch tanks was 23 percent followed by 8 percent in 3rd, 39 percent in 4th, 36 percent in 5th and 12 percent in 6th batch villages. Of course, some of the 5th and 6th batch sample villages have not yet reached the post-implementation phase. The success rate reported at percent, is based on the number of villages which have completed post-implementation phase. The processes to be followed in this phase do not seem to have been systematically followed, even in those villages where it was reported that the completion was done on time. This phase needs to be given proper and adequate attention to ensure institutional sustainability. Because, the norms to be followed for conducting Annual General Body Meetings, registration renewal of the TMI and the members, O & M plan, crop planning, institutional linkages and other associated activities have to be clearly told to the TMI members. But, in majority of the sample villages, this has not been clearly articulated.

Based on the available data, it is found that in about 10 to 15 percent of the sample villages, the post-implementation processes have properly been implemented, at least a small group of TUC functionaries, like president, secretary, and treasurer are aware of the post-implementation needs. For many, completion of implementation phase is generally construed as the completion of



the project implementation cycle. This kind of attitude tends to give an impression that community participation in the tank management is essentially construction-induced, leaving the sustainability to a questionable validity. The need for annual renewal of the TUG membership is not explained to the TMIs. None of the sample villages, except one-Kamandrahalli under Kolar DPC, have gone for renewal of the society membership, which is mandatory as per the societies Act. The communities should have been properly oriented and trained to take care of some of the mandatory requirements essential for intuitional sustainability.

The status of timely implementation across the zones has been analyzed. Major factors which determines the effective implementation, among others, is the role played by the CFT. Wherever the CFT functionaries had taken proactive measures to motivate the community with timely advice, and the required technical and operational support the activities were completed on time, with qualitatively better works in place. The zone wise analysis of the performance reflects, indirectly, the quality of services and support provided by the CFTs in the respective zones. The survey data has been analyzed and presented in Table 3.3.

The survey data presented in Table 3.3 shows wide variations across the zones, in completing the implementation phases on time. For example, majority of the sample villages from NEDZ, CDZ and NDZ have completed the Pre-planning phase on time. While 63.6 per cent of the sample villages, from NEDZ have completed pre-planning phase on time, it is 59.5 per cent in CDZ and 50 per cent in NDZ. Where as in other zones it is less than 50 per cent, lowest is in the NETZ, where only 25 per cent of the sample villages have completed on time. In the case of EDZ and NTZ it is 46 per cent and 42.9 per cent respectively. The same trend is observed in the implementation of planning phase also. It is, however, interesting to note that the performance of NEDZ, which was better than all other zones in implementation of pre-planning phase, has been very poor in the planning phase with only 18 per cent completion on time.



Table 3.3 Distribution of Sample tanks according to the status of works completed Zone-wise

Zone	No. of Villages covered	No. of Villages completed with the stipulated time / Time over run							
		Pre-Planning		Planning		Implementation		Post-Implementation	
		OT	TO	OT	TO	OT	TO	OT	TO
CDZ	37	22 (59.5)	15 (40.5)	24 (64.9)	13 (35.1)	0	37 (100.0)	5 (13.5)	32 (86.5)
EDZ	89	41 (46.1)	48 (53.9)	52 (58.4)	37 (41.6)	8 (9.0)	81 (91.0)	25 (28.1)	64 (71.9)
NDZ	20	10 (50.0)	10 (50.0)	10 (50.0)	10 (50.0)	1 (5.0)	19 (95.0)	4 (20.0)	16 (80.0)
NEDZ	11	7 (63.6)	4 (36.4)	2 (18.2)	9 (81.8)	0	11 (100.0)	1 (9.1)	10 (90.9)
NETZ	4	1 (25.0)	3 (75.0)	1 (25.0)	3 (75.0)	0	4 (100.0)	0	4 (100.0)
NTZ	21	9 (42.9)	12 (57.1)	9 (42.9)	12 (57.1)	4 (19.0)	17 (81.0)	12 (57.1)	9 (42.9)
Total	182	90 (49.5)	92 (50.5)	98 (53.8)	84 (46.2)	13 (7.1)	169 (92.9)	47 (25.8)	135 (74.2)

Note: Figures in Parentheses are percentages

OT-On Time

TO- Time over run

As mentioned already, timely completion of implementation phase has been very poor. Across the zones, none of the villages from CDZ, NEDZ, and NETZ could complete the implementation phase on time. The performance of NTZ and EDZ has been relatively better, where 19 per cent and 9 per cent of the sample villages in the respective zones have completed on time. While the reasons for time over-run have been briefly mentioned earlier, the factors responsible for timely completion of implementation phase in a few villages (13 out 182 sample villages) have been ascertained from the respective TMIs. They have been analyzed and presented in Table 3.4.



Table 3.4- Factors Responsible for Timely completion of Implementation phase.

Batch	No. of villages	Reasons for completing the Activities on Time
III Batch	4	(1) Good leadership (2) Unity among the TMI members (3) Education background of the President and secretary (4) Proper guidance of CFT (5) Experience in Dairy and faith in office bearers (6) More interest in restoring the storage capacity and improve agriculture.
IV Batch	1	Exposure of the community to Dairy and Secretary's education back ground and committed leadership to implement the project within the time.
V Batch	7	(1) Unity among TMI/TUC members (2) Good and commanding leadership (3) Proper guidance of CFT (4) Good cooperation among TMI members (5) All the members sharing equal responsibility while implementing the works (6) Good action plan (7) Less number of civil works identified. (8) Secretary's interest and others cooperation and support (9) Works entrusted to contractors.
VI Batch	1	Most of the families in the village having land in the command area. All the members have taken interest and shared the responsibility while implementing the works

The most common factors figured in all the villages is good and committed leadership which has created confidence among the community, resulting in spontaneous cooperation. Educational background of the office bearers, especially, the secretary and president, has been equally important. Most importantly proper and timely guidance from the CFTs has played a major role in ensuring cooperation from all the stakeholders for completion of the works. In the villages where the community has experience in and exposure to Dairy farming, the cooperation was found to be good. Because, they have already seen the benefits of cooperative venture in the dairy activities. Another



noteworthy feature is, sharing the responsibility of supervision, implementation and construction of various works by the sub-committees and other members for timely completion. This will not only ensure qualitatively better works, but also avoids distrust and consequent allegations against the office bearers leading to disfunctioning of the TMI. In some of the villages, particularly in NTZ, the works were entrusted to the contractors. Naturally, the contractors will be interested in completing the works quickly, to realize their expected profit. But it is not the correct way of doing, as the works which can be managed by the community should not be given to the contractors. This may give scope for rent-seeking by some of the TUC functionaries. Entrusting works to the contractors should, therefore, not be encouraged. These are some of the emerging indicative factors which need to be given adequate attention, to ensure productive and sustainable institution in place.

3.3 Implementation Status of Tanks-Batch-wise

- Keeping the survey results on the status of completing the project implementation cycle within the stipulated time-frame presented so far as a backdrop, a brief account of the implementation status of all the project tanks identified is presented in what follows. The relevant data are presented in Table 3.5.
- According to the available data 56.8 percent of the total tanks (2005) identified for project implementation have been handed over to the respective communities (TMIs). The progress does not seem to be upto the required level. Because, over a period of 6 years, little over 50 percent of the tanks only have been completed. As reported by the communities during the survey, in some of the tanks, purportedly handed over, quite a few works, both civil and non-civil are yet to be completed. The communities feel, unless all the works identified and included in the ITDP are completed to their satisfaction, they may not be competent enough to take up the management



Table 3.5



and sustain. Keeping in view the time frame for completion of the 1st phase i.e January, 2009, the task ahead appears to be difficult, if not impossible. It is more so, in the wake of starting the follow-on project; which calls for additional human resources. A realistic action plan, with required human and technical resources, needs to be prepared and kept in place to move on war footing. Otherwise it may not be possible to meet the target.

- It is surprising to note that some of the tanks from 2nd batch on-wards are still in the implementation and post-implementation phases. As pointed earlier, it is in the implementation phases, where enormous times over runs have taken place. The reasons for such extended time over runs need to be found on priority basis and remedial measures have to be initiated with out further delay. Among others, withdrawal and re-release of funds has been the main reason for the delays in implementation. This aspect has to be looked into and necessary steps have to be taken to expedite the re-release of funds to facilitate the completion of works pending during the implementation phase.
- The reasons for delay in different phases of implementation have been brought out in M & L submitted reports earlier. It may be necessary to take note of them while preparing action plans to expedite the implementation processes across the project tanks.