

COMPLIANCE ON
COMMENTS / SUGGESTIONS BY JSYS ON
DRAFT FINAL IMPACT EVALUATION REPORT

Sl. No.	Chapter/ Page/ Para No. / Title as per July 2008 Report	Inconsistencies found in the Report	Action Sought	Action taken Reference to Final Report May 2008
1.	Executive Summary, Difficulties faced by TMCs during the implementation.	It is reported that there has been Inadequate visits and guidance by CFT / DPU staff. Delay in measurement of works by CFT / DPU engineers. Staff strength, underpaid, delayed payments. Not reported by the Consultants. Engineers do not go on time on account of heavy work burden.	Data required Reasons elicited need to be incorporated. This is a serious lacuna. Information needed. How many tanks / engineer reported regarding drawl of amount before commencement of work?	These are qualitative assessments highlighted by the stakeholders during the survey. These deficiencies were observed across different tanks and at different time periods and it is difficult to quantify with reference to any specific time frame. These have already been reported in the respective monthly interactive reports submitted earlier on a regular basis.
2.	Chapter 1, Year of Baseline and Impact Evaluation	Benchmark year was 2003 which was a drought year, whereas the year of study – 2008 was a good rainfall year	There cannot be comparison between the two. How do you say the results can be conclusive? This entire study for this reason may be misleading and futile.	It may please to be noted that as per the PIP the Base Line Survey had to be completed before the implementation of the project, irrespective of the monsoon status of the reference year. Therefore, the consultants in close interaction with JSYS finalized an action plan with pre-determined mile stones to be accomplished during the course of the project implementation. The last mile stone is the final impact study (End of the project impact study) to be completed at the end of the 58 th week of the M & L contract. Accordingly the Final Survey had to be initiated in February 2008 and completed. It was a chance that the reference year for the final impact study happened to be a normal

Sl. No.	Chapter/ Page/ Para No. / Title as per July 2008 Report	Inconsistencies found in the Report	Action Sought	Action taken Reference to Final Report May 2008
				<p>year. There was no choice but to carry out the study. This issue had also been discussed with JSYS and World Bank representatives earlier.</p> <p>Since the Implementation Programme in concurrence with World Bank was to be 5 years from 2003 with baseline, midterm review and final impact assessments fixed, the question of choosing some other reference year did not arise.</p> <p>The research design was prepared and sent to JSYS for their comments and suggestions, if any, on the methodology, sampling and related research issues. After detailed discussion with the concerned specialists from JSYS the methodology was finalized and the survey was initiated and the study was completed. Each and every aspect was discussed and after concurrence proceeded with the study. The programme implementation and attendant milestone finalized at start of project are not open to revision after the completion of the programme.</p> <p>The limitations of longitudinal approach before and after the project in social science research are well known and documented widely. In order to overcome the constraints faced by this approach, a cross sectional approach (with and without project) is normally adopted by comparing the results with the control sample selected from the same agro-climatic zones. All these aspects have been highlighted in the impact study (please see Chapter I). The study, therefore, is neither misleading nor futile. The impact can</p>

Sl. No.	Chapter/ Page/ Para No. / Title as per July 2008 Report	Inconsistencies found in the Report	Action Sought	Action taken Reference to Final Report May 2008
				fairly represent the on-ground situation.
3.	Selection of Sample	Sampling is 10%.	Sampling should have been 20%. 10% sampling may not give acceptable results.	Generally the sample is drawn depending upon the size of the population to be studied. In this context 10% is a good representative sample, based on sound evaluation principles. This has been discussed with JSYS and the World Bank, before finalizing the methodology.
4.	Data collection	<p>The primary and secondary data were collected, using three sets of structured. Initial data- data through satellite images, survey.</p> <p>Collected initial data on cropping pattern and command area.</p> <p>Data have been collected through Focused Group Discussions.</p>	<p>Formats to be appended.</p> <p>Whether collected?</p> <p>Thereafter data on interventions whether collected?</p> <p>What kind of data? Information needed</p>	<p>Appended in the Revised Report.</p> <p>Information (GIS / MIS data sets, environmental and social assessments and other primary data sources) used for the preparation of ITDPs as available were examined and used as per contract obligations.</p> <p>The data on crops grown in selected tank commands in different seasons during the project implementation phase were collected in interactive sessions and reported every month.</p> <p>In respect of agriculture data related to irrigated area, functional wells, cropping pattern, production and productivity of crops as well as net income were collected through FGDs.</p>

Sl. No.	Chapter/ Page/ Para No. / Title as per July 2008 Report	Inconsistencies found in the Report	Action Sought	Action taken Reference to Final Report May 2008
		<p>The percentage of families below poverty line in the base period is 70 percent for the sample tanks and poverty level of control villages in the base period is 51. Percent. The difference between the two is too much.</p>	<p>Sample cannot be compared with such significant difference. This entire study for this reason may be misleading and futile.</p>	<p>These are established principles of drawing samples and their analysis, which were followed. While drawing the sample, certain parameters like population, No. of households, tank system status, composition of social groups etc., had been taken into account. The differences could be known only when data are analyzed. The variation of 10 to 20 percent is normal between control and project population and it is accepted. This does not lead to any erroneous conclusion. Hence, the question of entire study becoming misleading and futile does not arise.</p>
5.	Chapter 2, Table 2.2	<p>Zone –wise distribution of sample tanks by size of Command Area and Filling Status (2007 -08). As seen from the data presented in table 2.3, the average command area per tank is about 100 ha, and water spread area is 56.6 ha. However, the number of small tanks with less than 40 hectares (ZP tanks) is more, when compared to large tanks (MI tanks). The using of average water spread area per tank is 56.6 ha. It is relatively more in CDZ, with 164 ha and the lowest is in NTZ with 9.8 ha. It is 63.6 in CDZ, followed by 7.9 in NETZ, 33.7 in EDZ and</p>	<p>Explanation needed in this regard. What is the average water spread area of control tanks? How is it compared with sample tanks?</p>	<p>There is clear explanation in the text. The comparison characteristics of sample tanks etc., including water spread area of the control and project tanks are clearly presented Chapter II of the report.</p>

Sl. No.	Chapter/ Page/ Para No. / Title as per July 2008 Report	Inconsistencies found in the Report	Action Sought	Action taken Reference to Final Report May 2008
		11.6 in NEDZ.		
6.	Chapter 3, Table 3.1	None of the 182 sample villages have completed project implementation cycle within the stipulated period of 20 months.	What are the reasons?	The reasons for completing activities on time have been summarized in Table 3.4 which reveals the lack of it in cases where delays had occurred in implementation. (Also refer para 3.2 of the text)
7.	Chapter 3, 16, Para 2	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 table 3.1.	Reasons to be mentioned. The reasons are not specified in the Table 3.1.	The reasons are tabulated and presented in Table.3.4
8.	Chapter 4, Cost Effectiveness	A major deficiency in this assessment study was the absence of real time hydrology monitoring data. Feeder Channel Rehabilitation, Impact on Ground Water Regime in the Command Area of Tanks.	In view of this deficiency, what is the methodology adopted for assessment and analysis	Methodology has been described in paragraph 2 of the chapter. The methodology adopted is consistent with that adopted for the baseline line and mid term assessment studies, as had been discussed and finalized with JSYS and World Bank during their missions.
		Ground water increase highly exaggerated. Aggregate area irrigated by borewell increase for 1025 to 1943 ha (79%) too much. Was the cost effectiveness of the repairs and reconstruction assessed?	Why is it so? If so how?	In the absence of piezometer observations, data regarding ground water levels had been collected from individual Tank User's Groups. This has been corroborated through household survey of individual bore well owner as well. The increase is not exaggerated as tanks in NDZ, parts of CDZ, NTZ, NEDZ have received significant inflows during the period of survey as compared with the period of baseline survey. Refer to Chapter-VI – Economic Evaluations

Sl. No.	Chapter/ Page/ Para No. / Title as per July 2008 Report	Inconsistencies found in the Report	Action Sought	Action taken Reference to Final Report May 2008
		The average cost per hectare of command area varied from Rs.28000 / ha in batch I tanks to Rs. 17000/ ha in batch V tanks. Derived from expenditure. But last batches less expenditure was made. Poor quality of revetment work due to non availability of adequate quantity of size stones.	Why no clear picture given? Data (tank wise) not given. How to improve the same is not given.	The data pertains to period ending March 2008 included tanks which have reported all the civil works. The field data has been compared with the M&L data provided by SPU. Necessary additional data on this aspect has been incorporated in the Revision (Page 37).
		Hemata seeds were of bad quality. Did not germinate.	No feed back given with regard to quality of seeds, their viability, whether treated as per required procedure, whether watered after sowing etc.	The information available with TUGs and CFT is scanty. Also there was lack of appropriate guidelines with the TUGs regarding required procedure for grass turfing. These had been already reported.
9.	Chapter 4	NCCB report not satisfactory as it had given satisfactory compaction for almost all tanks. Soil testing was done but results not given to community. Hence, even unsuited silt is used for bund strengthening. Details of tanks where silt is used for bunds not captured. In how many cases canal lining was provided but not required. Rates given were not workable.	CES also has not reported to JSYS about quality or on NCCB reports. If data available to be incorporated Not reported. Not reflected in the report.	The information available with TUGs regarding NCCB is scanty and these have been reported to JSYS through respective monthly interactive reports. None of the surveyed tanks have reported this aspect. The information available at the field level has been reported in the report.

Sl. No.	Chapter/ Page/ Para No. / Title as per July 2008 Report	Inconsistencies found in the Report	Action Sought	Action taken Reference to Final Report May 2008
		<p>Tank selection process not commented in the report at all. It is a major omission in the report.</p> <p>Problems pertaining to Rehabilitation of canal system, Sluice repair, plug & rod, leakage issues etc were not reported.</p> <p>No clear comments made with regard to need for certain civil works like repair of bunds, length of canal lining, extent of desilting etc. Evaluation for canal lining should have been made with regards to need for appropriate length and the quality of work done. No comments made with regard to workability of sanctioned rates for civil works.</p>	<p>Clarify.</p> <p>Information if any to be incorporated</p> <p>Details to be furnished.</p>	<p>This aspect has been covered in the introductory chapter in a concise manner as all details had been documented in the various reports submitted to JSYS at different periods of time.</p> <p>The required information has been incorporated in the Revised Report (page 40)</p> <p>The ongoing project is a community based one as compared to departmental projects. In this project the scope of work for tank improvement is determined on the basis of detailed ITDPs prepared through a participatory consultation and decision process with Tank Users Groups. The actual activities selected for inclusion in an individual ITDP were to be chosen from a menu of possible candidate physical works.</p>

Sl. No.	Chapter/ Page/ Para No. / Title as per July 2008 Report	Inconsistencies found in the Report	Action Sought	Action taken Reference to Final Report May 2008
		<p>No comments have been made on the ITDP Planning process especially with regard to the need for civil works proposed.</p> <p>In Malur rampant brick-making is in existence. Hence, desiltation not required, but ITDPs have accommodated for the same.</p>	<p>Details to be furnished.</p> <p>The Consultants should have studied who permitted for brick-making, whether TMIs have charged, etc.</p>	<p>Overall perceptions of the tank user community have been presented in the report. The processes related to the civil works have been studied in detail under separate Process Monitoring Studies and the findings of these studies had been already submitted to JSYS. These have been reported in the respective Monthly Interactive Reports submitted to JSYS.</p>
10.	Chapter 4, Page 29	<p>In many cases unsuitable soil have been used for bund.</p> <p>Effectiveness of different types of Turfing not evaluated.</p> <p>Bund strengthening work non-compaction work</p>	<p>Village name to be given in the final report.</p> <p>Evaluation to be done</p> <p>Poor quality. What is to be done to repair and why payment made for poor quality of bund strengthening not ascertained?</p>	<p>There is no technical information available regarding these issues at TUG/CFT/DPU levels hence no comments has been included. This is beyond the scope of the present study.</p> <p>These issues have been discussed through monthly interactive reports and also have been reported verbally to the concerned district officials. It has been conveyed to the consultant that JSYS has taken appropriate actions against poor quality work.</p>

Sl. No.	Chapter/ Page/ Para No. / Title as per July 2008 Report	Inconsistencies found in the Report	Action Sought	Action taken Reference to Final Report May 2008
		<p>It is reported that in the sample of 187 tanks from I to V batch, the cost of works for improvement for tank civil works range from Rs. 5 to 75 lakhs / tank and the cost varied between Rs. 13000, to 26000 / ha command area.</p>	<p>In the sample of 187 tanks the details of how many MI tanks and ZP tanks could not be observed.</p> <p>In the analysis conducted by JSYS with the available data of 1200 tanks (comprising of 983 ZP tanks and 307 MI tanks from I to VI batch) the cost /tank varies from 6.8 lakhs to 14.21 lakhs batch-wise details are enclosed (Annexure – A). This is also compared with the costs considered in the PIP which ranges from Rs.7.24 to 44.29 lakhs per tank. The consultant should have given their opinion as to whether the cost arrived at is less or high and secondly there is vast difference in the cost / tank when compared to the reports of consultant and the JSYS. Since this being the final Impact study report, the figures furnished by the</p>	<p>The detailed data had been provided in the earlier chapters.</p> <p>As per Table 4.1 costs per tank varies from Rs.6.25 lakhs to 9.10 lakhs and cost per hectare varies from Rs.15000 to Rs.29000 which are comparable with the JSYS figures. However there are tanks having higher costs because of site specific interventions or due to excess desilting costs which cannot be taken as reflecting overall project realities. Moreover it is not appropriate to compare the output of analysis of data from 1200 tanks with that from a sample of 189 tanks because of larger variations in the size of tanks and the scope of civil works undertaken among 1200 tanks, as compared to 189 tanks.</p>

Sl. No.	Chapter/ Page/ Para No. / Title as per July 2008 Report	Inconsistencies found in the Report	Action Sought	Action taken Reference to Final Report May 2008
			consultants on the sample tanks reflects on the entire project. Clarification required on the above raised issues.	
11.	Chapter 4, Page 35		Cost per ha in the report it is mentioned that the cost /ha varies from Rs 13000 to 26000/- ha. As per the analysis done in JSYS for 1290, tanks the average cost /ha varies from 17180/ha in case of MI tanks to Rs. 41300 in case of ZP tanks. The figures reported by the consultant also do not reflect the overall project realities in this aspect.	Same as for item 10.
12.	Chapter 4, Page 36	With regard to Quantity of desiltation/tank – The average quantity of desiltation in the sample of 187 tanks are with lead 5980 cum/tank and without lead is 8689 cum/tank.	As per the analysis conducted in JSYS for 1652 tanks the average quantity of desiltation with lead is 7018 cum/tank and without lead is 8281 cum/ tank. Copy of the analysis done for I to VI batch tanks is enclosed for reference. (Annexure-B)	As per Table 4.4 the average quantity of desiltation with lead is 7309 cu.m/tank and that without lead is 9662 cu.m/tank which is comparable to that planned in ITDP in various zones as per Annexure – B.
13.	Chapter 4, Page 42	Bund strengthening cost in the sample, 187 tanks varies between 78000/tank to 1,22,000 /tank. The main comments are on the	Analysis is done in JSYS for 1613 tanks from I to VI batch and the average cost per tank as planned was Rs. 99,950/ tank and	As per Table 4.6 the average cost of bund strengthening per tank is Rs.1.07 lakhs which is comparable to Rs.0.99947 lakhs as planned in ITDP as per Annexure – C. The achievement figures for tanks under Bagalkot

Sl. No.	Chapter/ Page/ Para No. / Title as per July 2008 Report	Inconsistencies found in the Report	Action Sought	Action taken Reference to Final Report May 2008
		increase of Water retaining efficiency.	achieved as on 30.06.2007 was Rs.74,550/tank. The works are still under progress (Annexure –C) Clarification required on the above raised issues.	& Raichur DPUs as mentioned in Annexure – C is very low as most of the tanks in these districts are large MI tanks. JSYS may reexamine their figures.
		The rise in the water table – In the sample of 187 tanks it is reported that there is rise of water level from 2 to 10 metres in case of open wells and 20m to 90 metres incase of borewells.	Although the subject matter pertains to Hydrologist, the figures reported appear to be very ambitious. If this is the achievement there is no need to study the project impact on other aspects at all. This is more than sufficient to show the success of the project. Clarification required on the above raised issues.	Certain discrepancies in the baseline data have been checked up and Table 4.8 has been modified. Under the on-ground situation of non-availability of piezometer data, the methodology adopted is the most pragmatic one for the assessment of the rise in the water table. It would be necessary to identify observation wells in different talukas covered under this project and monitor the water levels in these wells on a monthly/quarterly basis to ascertain actual impact on the ground water table, which would be a continuing process. Nevertheless, the contribution to rise in GW Levels due to desilting operations in tank and apparent filling up to full capacity as a result of the project intervention cannot be missed as they are significant as corroborated by the beneficiaries.
14.	Chapter 5	Although, agro climatic zone wise project villages were covered, the supporting rainfall data was not provided or considered for the study of agro ecological analysis.	This needs to be complied with.	The rainfall data in respect of all the nine districts for pre-monsoon, south west monsoon, and north-east monsoon for the base year 2003-04 and the end of project year 2007-08 are presented in the Table 5.2., which clearly provides insight into the differential agro-climatic situations which existed in the two years of comparison (Pages 55 – 57).

Sl. No.	Chapter/ Page/ Para No. / Title as per July 2008 Report	Inconsistencies found in the Report	Action Sought	Action taken Reference to Final Report May 2008
15.	Chapter 5, 53, Para below list of impact indicators considered	Data was collected from 187 sample tank commands and catchment areas and from 35 control tank commands from six zones covering nine districts.	186 actual - data varies. Needs Accurate data.	The data were collected on all agricultural related impact indicators in respect of 187 sample tank commands and catchment areas; but data related to 186 sample tank commands were only analyzed as the data in respect of one tank command in CDZ was incomplete (Page 55)
16.	Chapter 5, 99, 5.11.1.1 Water management demonstrations	The crops grown in these demonstrations include: paddy, ragi, hybrid maize, sunflower, groundnut, tomato, brinjal, onion, etc.	Page 100, Table 5.11.1.1 does not provide information on demonstrations pertaining to tomato, brinjal.	With regard to water management demonstrations the yield data in respect of tomato and brinjal have been added in Table 5.12.B (Page 101)
17	Chapter 5, 104, Farmers Field School (FFS),Para 2	In each school 30 farmers are enrolled in general, but in a majority of the sessions participation was to the extent of only 20 to 22.	Are the reasons elicited with reference to participation?	The reasons for lack of participation in FFS by the farmers were elicited and presented in Chapter-5 (para 5.12.5)
18.	Chapter 5, Table 5.2 A	Functional Borewells and Open wells in tank commands.	Source doubtful. Clarification needed.	The data were collected about the wells directly from TMI office bearers and stake holders and so are reliable
19.	Chapter 6, 112	ERR and Cost Benefit Analysis has not been compared with PIP and PAD already proposed.	Comparison may be given.	ERR figures from PAD are incorporated for comparison in Table 6.3
20.	Chapter 6, Page 112, Fisheries component	Fisheries component is neglected.	Include salient findings, key learning's, limitations and suggestions.	Incorporated in Chapter – VIII (please refer para 8.13.2 to 8.13.7 and Table 8.13).
21.	Chapter 7, 123, Para 1	The reasons for relatively less members per WIG in EDZ are not clearly known.	The study should give clarity.	This depends upon the proactive role taken by the concerned CFT/DPU and cannot be quantified.

Sl. No.	Chapter/ Page/ Para No. / Title as per July 2008 Report	Inconsistencies found in the Report	Action Sought	Action taken Reference to Final Report May 2008
22.	Chapter 7, 124, Participation and Gender Sensitivity Para	After the formation of an institution, majority of the members tend to become passive with hardly any participation in decision making, because of lack interest for themselves or due to the marginalization by the members belonging to economically and socially dominant groups.	Suggest measures to have participation.	It is only a hypothesis stated after field interaction. However, subsequent analysis on participation of women, revealed that their participation has been very encouraging. (Para 7.6 of Chapter VII gives details).
23.	Chapter 7, 125, Para 2	Some of the TMIs have not maintained the minutes systematically.	How many TMIs have not maintained? Data needed.	It was seen to be around 10 percent.
24.	Chapter 7, 126, Para 2.	After realizing who gets what, the interest to participate in the meetings might have come down, particularly for the indirect stakeholders.	The reason for not participating should be very clear. The words “might have come down” make an assumptive statement. How many indirect stakeholders opinion is elicited?	All the representatives of indirect stakeholders have been interviewed. Lack of immediate incentives appears to be the reason for lack of interest and hence reduced participation.
25.	Chapter 7, 126, Para 3	Depending upon the agenda kept for discussion, some interested and invited members from SHGs, panchayat members also attend these meetings. Because of such instances, the participation rate is found to be more than their membership ratio in the committee.	By virtue of being members of responsible institution they have shown keen interest in the meetings whenever there was agenda related to them. The same was not true with the core members of the committee.	This is an observation on a factual situation. Any effective participation, depends upon the ability of members to talk and deliberate on the issues and their literacy level.

Sl. No.	Chapter/ Page/ Para No. / Title as per July 2008 Report	Inconsistencies found in the Report	Action Sought	Action taken Reference to Final Report May 2008
			This is conveying that quantitative membership is participation. How about the broader definition of participation.	
26.	Chapter 7	While coming to participation, they become passive, and are marginalized due to domination of economically, socially well off groups.	How to strengthen this component? What measures are to be adopted?	This is a gradual and slow process and depends upon the economic and social empowerment of the poor over a period of time.
27.	Chapter 7, 129, Para 1	The rate of participation of weaker sections, like others which was relatively more in pre-planning phase, has tapered off in the subsequent phases, more prominently after handing over. This should not happen.	Reasons for tapering off of participation as elicited and suggestive measures for ensuring consistent participation.	The details given under Para 7.7 are self explanatory (Pages VII-14 to VII-19).
28.	Chapter 7, 129, Para 3	After handing over, only 9 TMIs have conducted G.S., essentially to discuss crop planning and water distribution.	9 TMIs how many tanks?	It is nine tanks only. All of them have one tank each.
29.	Chapter 7, 130, Table 7.7	Table 7.7. Participation in Grama Sabha – Gender and Phase –wise.	Table 7.7 is not giving information on tanks. Eg. 974 meetings in how many tanks?	Upto implementation phase meetings in all the 182 sample TMIs.
30.	Chapter 7, 132, Para 1	A wide range of income generating opportunities through participation for taking up some of the construction activities, apart	A table should have been provided based on your sample on income generating activities. List out different	Supplemented in the concerned para in the revised report.

Sl. No.	Chapter/ Page/ Para No. / Title as per July 2008 Report	Inconsistencies found in the Report	Action Sought	Action taken Reference to Final Report May 2008
		from social safeguards through monetary support, are provided.	opportunities.	
31.	Chapter 7, 133, Para 1	The reasons for less number of meetings are not clear. Perhaps, women may think that their interests will be taken care of by the respective SHGs in which they are members.	There should be clarity in the study. There is no scope for assumptions.	Because of peak of activities during implementation stage maximum number of meetings had to take place, and hence with lesser activities in post-implementation and later phases the number of meetings had apparently come down.
32.	Chapter 7, 136, Para 3	Functional literacy programme Rs.60.00lakh allocation, Rs.36 lakh spent. To women illiterate, 3368 beneficiaries 15 persons minimum members.	Comments on usefulness of the programme, best timings for holding the classes, response from the beneficiaries, volunteers' selection and monitoring by the CFTs to be given.	CFTs have taken it as an additional burden and out of their contracted obligation (Refer to Pages VII-21 & VII-22).
33.	Resettlement Action Plan	The encroachment per se does not seem to be a major problem, except a few stray cases. Otherwise, majority have surrendered the encroached lands voluntarily.	Number of stray cases, and how many have surrendered the encroached voluntarily?	See page VII-23
34.	Chapter 7,149, Para 2	Employment opportunities provided for the vulnerable women in the civil work, percentage of equal wages provided to women for equal effort, opportunities provided to women SHG's in taking up civil work, benefits is not there in the report.	Need to be included	Please refer to Table 7.14.

Sl. No.	Chapter/ Page/ Para No. / Title as per July 2008 Report	Inconsistencies found in the Report	Action Sought	Action taken Reference to Final Report May 2008
35.	Chapter 7, 139, Para 3	Management aspects of revolving fund/IGA amount by women members/role of WIG in it, effectiveness of assisting through SHG's is missing. Page 135 missing. One or two case studies may be incorporated in the report to know the success or failure of RAPs.	Data needed To be included. Case Studies needed	The concept of revolving fund itself is yet to seep in effectively in the project villages. Included in the Revised Report. As the study is already over, it may not be possible to include such case studies at this stage.
		The required data have been collected from the TMI records and a sample of beneficiaries were interviewed to collect primary data regarding the assets required, income generated and other related information.	What is the percentage of sample interviewed? This is to know acceptability sample.	Ten percent of the actual beneficiaries as per established / well recognized norms.
36.	Chapter 7, 139, Para 4	The financial assistance per family provided by the project is Rs.2000/- In order to get a viable productive asset, the assistance given by the project may not be adequate.	How it is evaluated?	Based on the focus group discussions and the interactions with individual beneficiaries selected.

Sl. No.	Chapter/ Page/ Para No. / Title as per July 2008 Report	Inconsistencies found in the Report	Action Sought	Action taken Reference to Final Report May 2008
37.	Kitchen Garden, 145 -146	What is disturbing is, in some places, particularly in Bagalkot DPU, the concerned DPU staff have not properly utilized funds provided and deprived the benefits, even if limited, to the community. Disturbing because, the community was not given proper information, when they asked for money; they were snubbed or went on postponing under some pretext or the other, and finally never gave that money to the community, though it is shown in records as distributed.	Supplement the proof of statements.	This has been reported to JSYS in monthly reports and appropriate steps had been initiated, as reported by the concerned executives of JSYS.
38.	Employment Generation,146, Para 3	The total number of person days of employment generated through various activities has been aggregated and presented in the following table.7.14.	Missing table 7.14 to be incorporated.	Incorporated in the Revised Report.
39.	Employment Generation, 147, Para 3	The reasons for such wide variations in employment creation are not clearly known. Membership in TUG. TUC - Multiple tank system problems not covered.	Clarity and authenticity of information is the need. GP Committees not given. Information needed.	It is clearly stated that reasons are not known, as even the interaction with target groups did not reveal this. Only one sample village from Bagalkote DPU was GPSC. No specific problems are found.

Sl. No.	Chapter/ Page/ Para No. / Title as per July 2008 Report	Inconsistencies found in the Report	Action Sought	Action taken Reference to Final Report May 2008
		Perceptions of the beneficiaries about trainings.	Whether surveyed and report submitted?	Yes, in Table 8.11 Page VIII-29 & VIII-30
40.	Chapter 8, 168, Para 2	The survey data reveals that only 70.4% of the households have taken membership. There is need to motivate the remaining 30% households to take membership in the future. Enough efforts seem to have not been made to enroll the remaining households.	Has this been derived through structured format as you have mentioned? If so what are your suggestive efforts? In a research study the statements need to be specific and there is not much scope for the words like seems etc.	Since the mandatory requirement is met already satisfactorily, apparently it was not considered essential to put in additional efforts.
41.	Chapter 8, 169, Para below the table	About 81% of the sample TMI's have maintained correct records with all the details. Inadequate training and the consequent lack of proper skills seems to have contributed to improper or lack of maintenance of registers.	List of the lacuna of the training.	Provided in Table 8.11 (Pages VIII-29 & VIII-30)
42.	Chapter 8, 173, Para 3	As reported by the community, it happened due to the inability of the community and also the TUC members to pay the contribution money. This perhaps is not a healthy trend. The reality of 6% kind contribution provided by the TMIs and if not possible for what reasons?	Does inability refer to poverty or any other constraint? Explain. What is the solution?	It is only due to poverty. It depends upon the local leadership, initiative taken and the motivation of the community (Refer Chapter VIII).

Sl. No.	Chapter/ Page/ Para No. / Title as per July 2008 Report	Inconsistencies found in the Report	Action Sought	Action taken Reference to Final Report May 2008
43.	Chapter 8, 175, Para below the Table 8.3	The works carried out and the number of person days contributed is mostly based on recall memory of the TUC functionaries. Because, no where NMR registers are maintained.	Number of the sample where NMR registers is not maintained. Is it in all 182?	Yes, they have made adhoc entries without details and the registers are not having full information.
44.	Chapter 8, 175, Para below the table 8.3	Since it is mandatory to contribute voluntary labour, they have built-up the records accordingly, though the works were executed through paid labour.	The statement has to be substantiated.	These views have been expressed by different community groups in Focus Group Discussions and also during the course of interviews with individuals on different aspects of project implementation.
45.	Chapter 8, 179, Para 1	It is surprising, as to how the TMIs could remain functional without renewing the society. There is a need to examine the renewal procedures at present and make necessary changes or amendments to suit the newly emerging local institutions.	Reasons for not renewing the society need to be spelt. What are the suggestive changes to be made for the procedures?	They do not know the need for and importance of renewal in the institutional context. Awareness, facilities and hand holding assistance is necessary. Perhaps an IEC (Information, Education and Communication) campaign for TMIs by JSYS will be useful.
46.	Chapter 8, Page 196, Resource mobilization	The average income generated per effective TMI from Fisheries is Rs.23,677 (Analysis from 51 tanks) is correct.	Verify an income of Rs. 540 per ha. WSA. For the increase in house hold income shown, was the dearness factor taken into account?	The figure given is correct. Not considered.

Sl. No.	Chapter/ Page/ Para No. / Title as per July 2008 Report	Inconsistencies found in the Report	Action Sought	Action taken Reference to Final Report May 2008
		<p>How is that the extent of increase in water storage capacity of the tanks after desiltation about 25% -30% on an average was directly proportional to the increase in crop irrigated areas.</p> <p>No Clear data case-wise for increase in water availability.</p> <p>Only 1 – 2 mts improvement is possible. 20 mts is impossible.</p> <p>Borewell depth given by farmers is vague.90 m increase in level is shown which is impossible.</p> <p>The suggestions on the qualitative improvement of the project activities like, On the areas of desiltation and providing lead, Capabilities of CFT Engineers to handle the project etc.</p>	<p>Needs explanation.</p> <p>Justification needed.</p> <p>Data needs verification.</p> <p>Should have suggested some alternative methods for improvisation.</p>	<p>The increase in water storage capacity has facilitated to take more than one crop. This has also led to crop cultivation even in the tail-end areas, where it was not possible to take even one crop before the project intervention.</p> <p>The discrepancies in data have been verified and revised table presented in Table 4.8. Depth of ground water table in open wells and bore-wells have been verified from collected data and presented in Table 4.8.</p> <p>It was reported in detail in monthly interactive reports.</p>
	Annexure- I, II, III	<p>CES field staff did not attend any meeting to find out how it was conducted</p> <p>Several typing errors and grammatical mistakes noticed.</p> <p>For the increase in house hold income shown, was the dearness factor taken into account?</p> <p>Annexure I – List of sample Villages is 174.</p>	<p>Sub committee how these worked?</p> <p>Needs to be rectified.</p> <p>The sample villages number varies.</p>	<p>Details are in Table 8.8</p> <p>Taken care of in the revised Report.</p> <p>Annexure is verified and appended.</p>