DEVELOPMENT AND SUSTAINABILITY OF USER ORGANIZATIONS IN WATERSHED MANAGEMENT - NILWALA WATERSHED -

L R Perera

(January 1996)

Chapter 1

Introduction

1.1. Background

Experience mostly during the last decade has proved that the peoples' participation is crucial to watershed management. Peoples' participation is the land mark of ongoing watershed management programs in the countries like India (Sing 1995). It is learnt through these experiences that the active user participation will mobilize the available resources productively, equitably and sustainable and by meeting the needs of the people.

The experience in natural resource management in Sri Lanka is so far mostly in the area of irrigation system management. These experiments have clearly shown that the basis for efficient use of resources has to come from organized groups which are linked to coordinating arrangement such as organizations, committees and councils. (IIMI - 1993)

The SCOR Project which is a watershed based development program for improving the management of natural resources, mainly land and water of the country with a view to improving *production along with protection* sees that formation, expanding and strengthening of resource user groups as of vital importance to achieve its project objectives. It is assumed that the user groups thus formed would be progressed in to organizations, service organizations and user companies capable of working with state sector, NGOs and private sector organizations and also compete with the private sector under the present open market policy to provide better livelihood opportunities to the small holding peasant communities. This research is basically an evaluation of the development and sustainability of the resource user groups and the organizations thus formed in the Nilwala Watershed under the SCOR project.

1.2. Nilwala Watershed

Nilwala watershed lies within the southern wet zone of Sri Lanka and the major part of the watershed is in Matara district, while smaller sections fall within Galle and Humbanthota districts. The entire Nilwala watershed covers a total area of 146,280 ha. It comprises of the upper Nilwala watershed and the lower Nilwala watershed. Initial interventions of SCOR in the Phase 1 are limited to the upper watershed. ( )

The main land use types within the upper watershed are highlands, tea, paddy, chena, dense forests, homesteads, water bodies and rock outcrops. Highlands are devoted to tea cultivation and tea is the dominant agricultural crop. Out of that about 40 per

cent belong to tea small holdings ranging from 12.5 ha. to about 1 ha.

Distortion of river flows, as evident from increased flood peaks and reduced base flow distribution accompanied with severe erosion and loss of fertile soils, have become characteristic phenomena in river Nilwala and other streams over few decades. There is consensus among the government officials, NGOs and the users of land and water resources that haphazard exploitation and use of lands including reserved forests, other state forests, large tea plantations and tea small holdings, homesteads, river banks, stream and road reservations is largely responsible for this situation. (IIMI - 1993)

Tea is grown indiscriminately in home gardens, river banks, other reserves, and even in marginal lands in Nilwala watershed. Tea cultivation in some areas has spread right into the natural forest and soil erosion control measures as well as protection against the erosive power of raindrops is inadequate. In addition, the weak cooperation among farmers in discharging excess water causes more soil erosion. Here, soil erosion has assumed very high proportions leading to land degradation. In some hills the tea cultivation is being done on steep lands often exceeding a slope of 60 per cent with improper soil erosion control measures. Clearing of jungles and trees for cultivation of tea led to the drying up of the water courses. As reported by the people, lack of water in the hilly areas has become a major problems. Similar situation has arisen in the case of several areas of abandoned tea lands. The only check on soil erosion in such lands is the re-establishment of vegetal cover, mainly weeds and ferns, which appear after a few showers. During dry seasons the vegetation is set ablaze and the runoff during the subsequent rainy season remove organic matter and part of the top soil.

Clearing and encroaching lands in the stream and road reservations in addition to the highlands is also predominant. In the absence of protective measures such lands are subjected to enhanced degradation. ( )

1.4. SCOR Interventions

Selection of Micro Watersheds

Four micro watersheds have been selected on the basis of topography, ecology, land use, land tenure, production and marketing constraints, and the present status of environmental degradation, homesteads and resource users. Those four micro watersheds selected area:

1. Aninkanda
2. Diyadawa-Tenipita
3. Milla Ela

4. Horagala

Interventions

There are eight intervention areas under the SCOR project to solve the problems identified in the Nilwala watersheds as follows.

1. Forestry Conservation and Development

It had been identified that the attempts made so far by the government and Non-government agencies to combat the threat of fast depleting forest area by implementing reforestation and affrostation and enforcing laws found to be ineffective because of the lack of collective concern of the community participation and support of local people. Under the SCOR interventions it hade been planned for enrichment planting and agro-forestry with the participation of local people on a collective basis in such a way to provide them incentives such as income generating opportunities and userfruct rights under share control arrangements with the government.

2. Soil and Water Conservation and Improvement of Production in Tea Lands

The ignorance and the reluctance of tea small holders for the adoption of appropriate soil and moisture conservation practices has resulted in serious resource degradation in land and water and also yield reductions. It was expected to introduce proper agronomic practices and soil and moisture conservation measures to tea small holdings in order to arrest this problem.

3. Homestead Development

Though some income is derived from homesteads it was identified that this production base can be intensified with the introduction of fruit crops, livestock, animal husbandry, and other income avenues such as apiculture, floriculture, horticultural plant etc.. The SCOR interventions were aimed at soil conservation and promoting new and more income generating productions, establish markets and other service links for primary and value added products.

4. Paddy Land and Production Improvement

The status of both the irrigated and rain-fed paddy cultivation is not very satisfactory due to loss of soil fertility, land fragmentation, neglected maintenance and very low yield. The SCOR interventions include introducing high yield varieties, improving soil fertility, applying better irrigation and drainage practices and consolidating fragmented lands.

5. Conservation and Production in Road and Stream Reservations

The road and stream reservations are subjected to degradation with the clearing and encroaching lands in those reservations aggravating the threat to land and water resources base. The SCOR interventions mainly focus on agro-forestry program in the encroached land in river banks and road reservations.

6. Integrated Planning and Coodination

Integrated planning in any development projects is still not in practice and planning and implementation of these projects are being done in isolation and on ad-hoc assessments of the resources base and resource potentials analysis of constraints with minimal user participation. SCOR project emphasizes the watershed based integrated planning, and proposed to establish organizational and committee arrangements for coordination and integration of planning at subsystems, system, divisional, provincial and national level.

7. Shared Control of Natural Resources

SCOR project assumes that a sense of security of rights to income from land and water resources is essential to users' adoption of sustainable land and water management practices. Therefore, SCOR project proposes interventions to assure user group of guaranteed access to land and water resources and in the process they will come to various kind of contracts, arrangements and agreements with NGOs and private sector in addition to their agreement with the governments for shared control.

8. Organizational Development

Participatory management of land and water resources is the core of the SCOR project and one of its essential requirements is building an effective organizational mechanism for increasing production and improving protection in a sustainable manner. It has two major components in its organizational development program.

1. Building of Resource User Groups (RUGs), Resource User Organizations, Service Organizations and User Companies.

SCOR interventions are basically implemented through resource user groups therefore, development of user organizations starts both from strengthening any existing resource user groups and building them new where necessary. It is expected that these groups thus formed will develop into formal user organizations, service organizations and user companies. (Annex.1)

2. Building a coordination committee system starting from the sub (micro) watershed level up to the national level.

SCOR project envisage to plan and implement from the sub watershed levels contrary to the existing set up based on administrative boundaries. Thereby, the SCOR proposes a coordinating committee system that starts from the sub water level which is called Sub Watershed Resource Management Team (SWRMT) which is comprised of user representatives and field level agency personnel. The next stage is the Watershed Resource Management Team (WRMT) which is comprised of user representatives provincial and divisional level agency officers. The next two stages are the Provincial Working Group and National Steering Committee respectively. (Annex. 1)

In line with these coordinating committees it is expected that the user organizations will be federated into user sub councils and user councils extended up to provincial and national levels.

1.5. Organizational Arrangements before SCOR interventions

There had been two kinds of resource user organizations when the SCOR project was commenced in the Nilwala Watershed built under the guidance of relevant government agencies; the Farmer Organizations (FOs) of the paddy farmers built under the Agrarian Services Act, and the Tea Small Holding Development Societies (TSHDS) of the tea small holders built by the Tea Small Holding Development Authority (TSHDA). They had been formed comprised of all the general membership without any base level groups. Both of these organizations had been linked to respective provincial level committees. More details on these organizations are given in Chapter 4.

1.6. Objectives of the Research

The objectives of this research on Development and Sustainabiliy of User Organizations in Watershed Management are:

1. to evaluate the organizational strength of the RUGs and RUOs in related to management performance, achievements and sustainability, and

2. to evaluate the performance level of the RUGs and RUOs in the SCOR key intervention areas, namely, production and conservation, integrated planing and coordination and shared control of natural resources, and their impact on these areas.

Chapter 2

Literature Review

Community participation in rural development had been evolved gradually for the past 50 years from early conventional rural development strategies of top down delivered development in which those programs were decided by the technocrats and implemented by the national bureaucracies with little or no involvement of the majority of people to the participatory mode of development in which the local participation in planning, implementation and evaluation were essential elements.

With the course of time, interest in participatory development projects increased and experiments were done in line with this approach. However, the increased interest and experiments in participatory projects came mainly in the donor interest in this approach. The donors emphasized on participatory approach for several reasons. First, in the early development projects benefits did not go to the intended beneficiaries. Next, there was growing evidence that one way to increase the effectiveness of a project and make it more apt to continue overtime was to include some form of participation by beneficiaries. If it happens the development projects would be based on better information and next, it would expand resources for the project. Development without participation often meant that poor planning decisions are made, especially when the past experiences and knowledge of beneficiaries are not taken into account in the original formulation of a project. Second, the inclusion of beneficiaries in the process of planning and implementing rural development means that they are more apt to contribute to the process. Such contributions can vary form self help projects to a willingness to maintain a project once it is completed. (Bryant and White - 1986)

A new implementing strategy in rural development of People Centered Development was emerged with the course of action research experiments on peoples' participation and field experiences. The underline concept of this strategy was Social Learning. The social learning approach offered the potential for rural development implementation by empowering communities for active participation in development programs and simultaneously linking them to the political and administrative structures of the larger society. It was emphasized that the empowering of communities as an integral and essential part of development programs designed in the long term to achieve more general regional and national goals. On the other hand the centrally dominated governmental agencies, designed to deliver services from the top down were ill adapted to understand and serve the needs of the communities than the empowered communities. Therefore, the necessity of reorienting governmental bureaucracies also stressed. (Thomas - 1985)

The early experiments carried out on community participation in natural resource management mostly were on the irrigation water management. The experience so far gained in people's participation in this area is very wide. The experiences gained in communal irrigation systems in the Philippines and in the Gal Oya irrigation schemes in Sri Lanka can be given as examples of such experiments on getting the people's participation in the irrigation water management.

The experiments in Philippines were done by the National Irrigation Administration (NIA) in the Philippines starting from four pilot projects of communal irrigation system. The Gal Oya experiment was done by the Agrarian Research and Training Institute with the consultancy assistance by the Rural Development Committee of the Cornell University. Both experiments were aimed at getting farmer participation in improving the physical system and in system management through an appropriate organizational mechanism. The key elements of the approach followed are similar in these two programs as listed below. In fact the Gal Oya experiment was based on the Philippine experiences.

- Following the social learning process approach instead of a blueprint. No single model had been followed but it was allowed to develop a process. The sequence of the activity was bottom up.

- Starting with problem identification and preparation of socio-economic profiles.

- Beginning the organization activities with organizing and strengthening the base level smaller turnout groups which were the building blocks of the organizations. The organizations next built were linked to the federated organizations.

- Employing specially recruited and trained catalysts.

- Bureaucratic re-orientations.

- Following the team approach.

- Organizational activities were not limited to water management. Other agricultural and social activities too were implemented by the organizations.

- The organizational effort was linked to the process of physical rehabilitation rather than a parallel activity.

(Uphoff - 1985. Korten - 1985. Ilo - 1983. Reyes - 1989)

It could be seen that the experiences gained in irrigation water management on peoples' participation had been useful in

getting community participation in watershed management from the early stage. Gibbs (1985) explains in a paper prepared for the Workshop on Integrated Watershed management how critical the organizational aspects in watershed management on the examples taken from the experiences gained in irrigation water management. These lessons were explained by Gibbs grouping them under three headings of: incentives for individual action, incentives for collective action, and incentives for resource conservation.

He explains that effective water management would require:

1. Incentives for watershed occupants individually to adopt practices that are both productive and sustainable.
2. Incentives for groups in the watershed to act collectively to perform tasks that are impossible if individuals act independently.
3. Incentives for resource conservation and the recognition of benefits that will accrue to further generations or downstream occupants of the watershed.
4. Farmer participation in the design and implementation of management strategies and tasks.
5. Incentives for public agencies and their members to support participatory approaches to planning and implementation.
6. Development of procedures that encourage effective long term project management over short term interests in project design and construction.

Uphoff (1986) in his well known analytical source book on local institution building which summarizes the experiences in mini-case studies throughout the third world states that what kinds of local institutions will be effective and sustainable for natural resource management depends on the nature of resources to be managed and on the composition of the community of resource users, in particular whether indeed they constitute an identifiable community.

Watershed management offers weaker incentives to resource users for collective action though it is not impossible for the following reasons: 1. the community of users is only geographically defined and usually does not have any group identity or operative authority structure. 2. benefits are differed and generally accrue to persons who do not bear the costs of watershed management i.e. downstream population, 3. changes in the condition of resources are hard to recognize or measure, so the need for making investments and the return therefrom is generally ambiguous and 4. there is little perceived interdependence among the resource users. He further states that most experience in watershed management indicates that people's cooperation cannot be effectively commanded or compelled from outside.

Similar experiences were gained in the community participation in watershed management as in irrigation water management in many projects. Such similar experiences can be identified in early projects such as in the two hill area development projects of the Sukhomajri and Dasholi Gram Swarajya Mandal in India. (1984 - Hill Resource Development and Community Management)

In Sukhomarji, water user organization had been formed which were later called Hill Resource Management Village Societies and in Chamoli hill the Mahila Mandal become the key village organizations for management of newly generated resources. The involvement of the village communities had been absolute and the women participation had been of key significant.

The lessons learned included: planning must involve the people and the unit of management must be village or a hamlet not an abstract watershed, much greater understanding is required of the rural poor, of class and caste differences and their impact on the kind of organizations that will work well at the village level, efforts to deal with hill areas and backward communities must be comprehensive and long term, the key elements of the success are interrelated and interdependent with bottom up planning strategies that is with the participation of local communities and it is essential to have the involvement of women in the projects.

The experience in four selected watershed management projects on enlisting people participation (Sing - 1991) shows that the most important pre-requisite for people's participation is that the expected private benefits from participation must substantially exceed the expected private costs of participation. Program interventions or measures that seek to enhance the expected benefits to people or reduce the expected costs are likely to elicit more of people's participation than those that do not seek to do so.

Next, people would participate in watershed development and management programs only if they are conscientised, organized and empowered to do so. A great deal of efforts and resources are required for empowering local people and for building people-centered local institutions and organizations and linking them to higher level institutions engaged or interested in similar work.

An important determinant of people's participation in these cases was organizing people into small groups. Good local leadership was also found to be an important determinant. Existence and enforcement of rules for equitable sharing of benefits from collective actions was also found to be another determinant.

The Participatory Rural Appraisal methodologies used by the Aga Khan Rural Support Program to promote and catalyze community participation in natural resources management through village institutions for increased income generation and productivity for rural communities show a more developed form of those early approaches followed in getting community participation in natural resource management. (Shah - 1993). Following are the steps followed under the Aga Khan Rural Support Program.

- Participatory Appraisal and Planning for development of natural resources in the village.
- Formation of village institutions for implementation of a Village Natural Resources Management Plan prepared by the villagers.
- Implementation of the activities identified in the plan prepared by the villagers through local village institutions.
- Technical, financial, training and management support for implementing the plan by village institutions by their own team of village extension volunteers, village institution officer bearers, AKRSP professional support team and external support agencies.
- Development of local, village level and federated support institutions for sustaining the development process.
- Participatory impact monitoring and evaluation of the program by the villagers and the village institutions.
- Ensuring that the villagers' plans are incorporated in the development plans of the government; people raise resources for funding their plans, from government, banks and other development agencies; and village institutions are able to perform most support functions without external catalytic support.
- Influencing government and other NGOs to promote participatory approaches in the development process at various stages and develop policies enabling development of such approaches.

In reviewing the experience in watershed management of the Farmer Centered Agriculture Resource Management (FARM) program in eight membership countries of China India, Indonesia, Nepal Philippines, Sri Lanka, Thailand and Vietnam it could be seen that the different countries are trying to confront the issues in different ways. (Sharma and Dixon - 1995) (WMTUH/FARM RAS/93/063 Field Document No.1 - 1995)

China under the FARM program uses a system of contracts and long term land use titles to farmers, in groups or individually to encourage their participation. It has been quit successful in some waste land area development. (Deyi - 1995)

Peoples' participation is the land mark of all the ongoing watershed projects under the FARM program in India and it takes

at all levels of the project cycles. Mechanisms particularly such as friendly farmer committees at small watershed levels, and self help groups of beneficiaries, exclusive self-help groups of women and cost benefit sharing have been designed for achieving the participation of local farmers. (Sinha - 1995)

Formation of user groups for community participation in soil conservation is a pre-requisite in the villages for community forestry development in Nepal under its FARM program, and it is tried in varied forms. All the activities of soil conservation and watershed management are aimed at sustainability, developing and designing social and community initiatives and self reliance mechanism. (Wagley - 1995)

In Thailand peoples' participation in watershed management was minimal as they are mostly poor subsistence farmers. Farmers' time is mostly spent on finding food to feed their families. The idea of conserving watersheds had not yet occurred to them. (Nalampoon - 1995)

On the above experiences, Sharma and Dixon (1995) propose a farmers' organization network model for FARM watershed management programs starting from base level homogeneous groups. Next it is proposed to form hamlet level farmer committee comprised of leaders of those groups and they are supposed to elect their own board. Next, it is proposed to form farmer organizations at small watersheds at which level they also form an elected joint executive committee or board. These small watershed farmer organizations can be further networked with each other as well as at district and provincial levels.

More insight in participatory watershed management is given by Fiona Hinchcliff (1995) and others who had done a collaborative study coordinated by the Sustainable Agriculture Program of IIED on 22 participatory watershed development projects in Asia, Africa, Latin America and Australia. It was concluded that soil and water conservation practices based on technological interventions have not delivered the environmental or economic benefits they promised. The practice of designing and implementing interventions without involving local people can only succeed with coercion. Such enforced responses may appear technically appropriate but are commonly rejected by local people when external pressure is removed. The experiences gained in some of the countries as explained in this report are given below.

The experience in Guatemala and Honduras after the project completion showed that it is not technologies themselves that are sustainable, rather it is the process of innovations and experimentation by farmers that leads to sustainability. The farmer extensionists and local institutions are continuing to develop new solutions to new problems after the projects ended,

and crop yields and environmental conservation have continued to improve.

In Philippines while extensionists share with other farmers' lessons in soil conservation and farming systems drawn from their own experience in upland conservation assist to form farmers' work groups called 'alayans'. These work groups are a traditional form of mutual labor sharing where farmers form groups and work on each others' farms on rotational basis. These groups have helped to more than double the yields, recuperate environments, regenerate local economies and protect forests.

In Australia more than 2000 community groups called Landcare Groups involving one third of all Australian farmers have been formed in the past five years to tackle the environmental problems that cannot be solved within a single farm boundary. New forms of collective action are emerging, resulting in improvements to the environment and farm profitability. These Landcare Groups are formally linked to existing institutional, including national level policy makers, forming unique partnership between community and government. The development of the Landcare process has required a major shift away from the traditional modes of technology transfer that have dominated agricultural extensions until recent times, with a recognition of the need for more participatory approaches to natural resource management.

In Burkina Faso the inter-agency government program of Land Resource Management on the Central Plateau is working with farmers in 240 villages and its efforts have helped to improve some 10,000 ha of unproductive dry lands with conservation measures. The project's approach is based on action research, appropriate in this context of a diverse and changing environment and the dynamic nature of society. One challenge which the project is currently tackling is how to better integrate pastoralist. Villagers' newly enhanced sense of ownership and responsibility for resources conflict with the needs for more mobile groups.

Pakistan provides an interesting contrast to the above success stories. It clearly illustrates how, despite a 31 year field presence, there has been a critical lack of maintenance of soil conservation technologies because villagers had not participated in what they perceived to be an entirely government run and owned program. An attempt is now underway to reorient the program towards a more participatory approach to joint watershed development.

At a workshop held in 1994 in Bangalore, India which was a forum for the above study team members to meet and discuss the lessons learned from their studies suggested immediate implications for all existing national and international

institutions concerned with agricultural development watershed management, soil and water conservation. Some of those implications are given below.

- Incentives as financial and food inducements should be ceased as when they stop so does the conservation. Instead, incentives should be increasingly directed towards institutional development at the water shed level.

- Capacity of individuals and institutions to innovate and experiment must be actively encouraged since it is impossible to predict the technologies that may be appropriate in a particular time and place.

- Participatory technology development and adaptive research should become integral part of watershed management programs.

- Farmer to farmer extension and experimentation should be an integral part of watershed management programs if they are to be sustainable and are to encourage scaling up. The capacity of farmer and community level organizations for experimentation and extension should therefore be strengthened.

- External institutions must be flexible and responsive, and ready to learn with farmers. Every farm has its own signature. No one can predict what each farm requires and how needs will change over time. A thoroughly designed and pre-planned project is not a good project.

- The pace of program and projects must be slow in order to build innovation, confidence and rapport amongst all the groups involved.

- Self evaluation enriches the learning process in institutions.

- Joint approaches increase the contacts and linkages between farmers and external institutions.

- Sustainable watershed development requires the development of strong inter-village institutions or federations. These institutions can effectively manage a range of activities such as credit, marketing and protection of common lands with limited external support.

Chapter 3

Methodology

3.1. Variables and Indicators

The RUGs and RUOs are evaluated on the following four areas to measure the their organizational management performance and their involvement in the SCOR interventions.

1. Organizational Strength
2. Involvement in Production and Conservation
3. Involvement in Integrated planning and co-ordination
4. Involvement in Shared control of Natural Resources

Indicators under Organizational Strength

The indicators under the organizational strength of the RUGs and RUOs have been decided on the basic requirements necessary to manage their organizational and other activities. The indicators decided to measure the organizational strength are:

1. Structure
2. Membership knowledge on RUG/RUO
3. Membership attitude/ satisfaction on RUG/RUO
4. Member participation
5. Leadership
6. Record maintaining
7. Funding
8 Financial management
9. Investment
10. Legal recognition
11. Affiliations
12. Involvement in Social and cultural work.

Only the RUOs will be evaluated under the two indicators of structure and the involvement in social and cultural activities since they are not much relevant to informal user groups.

Indicators under the Involvement in Production and Conservation

The indicators under the involvement in production and conservation activities have been decided to evaluate the level of the involvement of RUGs and RUOs in these activities. The indicators decided to evaluate the involvement in production and conservation are:

1. The involvement in production and conservation in private lands.
2. The involvement in production and conservation in common lands.
3. Market linkage.

Indicators under the Integrated Planning and Coordination

The indicators under the integrated planning and coordination have been decided to evaluate the level of the involvement of RUGs and RUOs, user representatives and agency officers in planning and M&E. The indicators decided are:

1. Participation in Mini-project planning, implementation, monitoring an evaluation.
2. Participation in planning and monitoring at divisional level.

Indicators under the Shared Control

The indicators decided to eluate the involvement user agreements. The Indicators decided are:

1. Number of user agreements signed with the State over land and water.
2. Number of service and business contracts signed.

3.1.1 Scoring and Evaluation

The each of the indicator is given a numerical weighage to measure the performance of the overall item. The total score is made up of points given to basic activities or characteristics of an indicator. Different weighing is given to the indicators depending on the level of importance of the each item. However, some of the indicators and basic activities may be specific to Nilwala project and may not be able to replicate into other projects. The evaluations is done on the percentage of points scored out of the total as follows.

Below 25 per cent	Very Weak
Between 25 per cent and 50 per cent	Weak
Between 60 per cent to 75 per cent	Good
Above 75 per cent	Very Good.

Evaluation of Organizational Strength

a. Scores given for Structure indicator

Points are given under the Structure on having sub groups, having executive committee and having a constitution.

institutions concerned with agricultural development watershed management, soil and water conservation. Some of those implications are given below.

- Incentives as financial and food inducements should be ceased as when they stop so does the conservation. Instead, incentives should be increasingly directed towards institutional development at the water shed level.

- Capacity of individuals and institutions to innovate and experiment must be actively encouraged since it is impossible to predict the technologies that may be appropriate in a particular time and place.

- Participatory technology development and adaptive research should become integral part of watershed management programs.

- Farmer to farmer extension and experimentation should be an integral part of watershed management programs if they are to be sustainable and are to encourage scaling up. The capacity of farmer and community level organizations for experimentation and extension should therefore be strengthened.

- External institutions must be flexible and responsive, and ready to learn with farmers. Every farm has its own signature. No one can predict what each farm requires and how needs will change over time. A thoroughly designed and pre-planned project is not a good project.

- The pace of program and projects must be slow in order to build innovation, confidence and rapport amongst all the groups involved.

- Self evaluation enriches the learning process in institutions.

- Joint approaches increase the contacts and linkages between farmers and external institutions.

- Sustainable watershed development requires the development of strong inter-village institutions or federations. These institutions can effectively manage a range of activities such as credit, marketing and protection of common lands with limited external support.

Scoring under the RUOs under member Attitude/Satisfaction

Variables	Scoring	
Attitude/ Satisfaction	Below 50% satisfied with objectives	0
	50% to 75% satisfied with objectives	1
	Above 75% satisfied with objectives	2
	Objectives fulfilled (Below 50%)	0
	Objectives fulfilled (50% to 75%)	1
	Objectives are fulfilled (Above 75%)	2
	Below 50% satisfied with the services	0
	50% to 75% satisfied with the services	1
	Above 75% satisfied with services	2
	Organization is not useful (Below 50%	0
	Organization is useful (50% to 75%)	1
	Organization is useful (Above 75%)	2
Total		8

c. Scores given for Participation Indicator

Points under the participation indicator are given on the percentage of the member participation in the two items of meetings and group works.

Scoring for Participation

Variables	Indicator Ranking	
Meeting participation	Meetings are not held	0
	Meetings are irregular	1
	Regular meetings are held	2
	Participation is below 50%	0
	Participation between 50% - 75%	1
	Participation above 75%	2
	Regular committee meetings with more than 50% participation	1
Group work participation	Group work not conducted	0
	One work conducted	1
	More than one work conducted	2
	Participation is below 50%	0
	Participation between 50% - 75%	1
	Participation above 75%	2
Expected Total points		9

Since holding committee meetings is not relevant to RUGs total points expected of RUGs is 8.

d. Scores Given for Leadership Indicator

Points for the leadership indicator of RUGs and RUOs are given separately. The leadership of RUGs are evaluated on their acceptability to the membership as they represent a small group as well as their tasks are not much complicated as of the leaders of formal organizations. The leadership of RUOs is evaluated not only on the acceptability but on the leadership qualities of each of the OBs. The total points expected to be scored by each of the RUG or RUO again depend on the number of the membership sample.

Scoring under Leadership of RUGs

Variables	Scoring	
Knowledge of leader	Both do not know	0
	One know the leader	1
	Both know the leader	2
Selection of Leader	Both do not know	0
	One knows how selected	1
	Both know how selected	2
	Leader selected by officers	0
	Leader selected by members	2
Frequency of selection	No periodical selection	0
	Select whenever necessary	1
	Periodically selected	2
Knowledge of responsibilities	Leaders do not know responsibilities	0
	Know the responsibilities	2
	Total	10

Scores given under Leadership of RUOs.

Variables	Scoring	
Frequency of OB selection	No periodical selection OBs periodically selected	0 2
OB knowledge of responsibilities	Responsibilities not known Responsibilities known	0 2
Member involvement in OB selection	Involved below 50% Involved between 50% to 75% Involved above 75%	0 1 2
Member Knowledge of OBs	Below 60% do not know chairman Above 60% know chairman Below 60% do not know secretary Above 60% know secretary Below 60% do not know treasurers Above 60% know treasurer	0* 1 0 1 0 1
Member perception of leadership qualities	<u>Quality of Chairman</u> Total positive responses below 50% Total positive responses above 50% <u>Quality of Secretary</u> Total positive responses below 50% Total Positive responses above 50% <u>Quality of Treasurer</u> Total positive responses below 50% Total positive responses above 50%	 0 1 0 1 0 1
	Total	12

* It is expected that all the membership of an organization should know the leaders. Therefore, knowing the OBs by at least 60% of the membership is taken as the lowest point level.

e. Scores for the Quantity and quality of reports indicator

Points are given for the quantity and quality of the reports on the number of records maintained and the quality of them. The lowest number of reports to be maintained by the RUGs is taken as 02 while the lowest number of reports to be maintained by RUOs is taken as five with the understanding that an effective organization should maintain at least 05 records on membership, meetings, member participation, financial, and other records on correspondents, vouchers, investment etc..

Scoring under Reporting

Variables	Scoring	
No. of records*	Reports not maintained	0
	Two reports	1
	Three to four reports	2
	Five and above	3
Quality of records	Bad	0
	Moderate	1
	Good	2
	Very Good	3
Expected Total points		6

*Under the RUOs the points given for the No. of records is as follows:

Five reports	1
Six to Seven	2
Above Seven	3

f. Scoring for Funding Indicator

Points for funding are given for funds availability and funding sources. Separate point levels are given for RUGs and RUOs as the funding sources and fund availability is less in the RUGs than that of the RUOs.

Scoring under funding of RUGs

Variables	Indicator Ranking	
Funds availability	No funds	0
	Have funds	2
	Have funds less than Rs. 5000	0
	Between Rs. 5000 - Rs. 10000	1
	Between Rs. 10,000 - Rs. 25,000	2
	Above Rs. 25,000	3
Funding sources	Total fund is from grants	1
	Funds from grants and self funding sources	2
	Funds from self funding sources are more than from Grants	3
Expected Total Points		8

Scoring under Funding of RUOs.

Variables	Indicator Ranking	
Funds availability	No funds with the RUO	0
	Have funds	2
	Funds below Rs. 10000	0
	Funds between Rs.10,000 - Rs.25,000	1
	Funds between Rs.25,000 - Rs.50,000	2
	Funds above Rs.50,000	3
Funding sources	Funds from SCOR grants only	1
	Funds 50% to 75% from SCOR grants + self earned	2
	Funds below 50% from SCOR + self earned	3
	Self earned	4
Expected total Points		9

g. Scoring for Financial Management

Points are given for financial Management on the level of financial management and transparency.

Scores given under Financial Management in RUGs

Variables	Indicator Ranking	
Financial Management	No proper records	0
	Quality of records is moderate	1
	Quality of records is good	2
	Fund withdrawal procedure is not clear	0
	Fund withdrawal procedure is clear	2
	Budget not presented	0
	Budget presented but no clear date	1
	Budget presented on a given period	2
Transparency	Members do not know funds availability	0
	One member knows funds availability	1
	Both know fund availability	2
	Members do not know how funds spent	0
	One member knows how funds spent	1
	Both members know how funds spent	2
Total		10

Scores Given under Financial Management of RUOs

Variables	Indicator Ranking	
Financial Management	No proper records	0
	Quality of records is moderate	1
	Quality of records is good	2
	Fund withdrawal procedure is not clear	0
	Fund withdrawal procedure is clear	2
	Budget not presented	0
	Budget presented but no clear date	1
	Budget presented on a given period	2
Transparency	Members below 50% do not know funds availability	0
	Between 50% to 75% know funds availability	1
	Above 75% know fund availability	2
	Members below 50% do not know how funds spent	0
	Between 50% to 75% know how funds spent	1
	Above 75% know how funds spent	2
Total		10

g. Scoring for Investment Indicator

Points are given for the investment indicator on number of business ventures, investment, profit earned and re-investment of profits.

Scoring under Investment Indicator

Variables	Indicator ranking	
Business Ventures	Not engaged in business activity	0
	Engaged in one activity	1
	Engaged in more than one activity	2
Investment	Investment (initial) 100% SCOR funds	1
	Between 50% - 75% SCOR funds + Member shares	2
Profit	No profits	0
	Profit is less than 15% of the investment	0
	Profit is between 15% to 25%	2
Re-investment	Profits not re-invested	0
	Profits re-invested	2
Expected total points		8

h. Scoring for Legal Recognition

Six points are given to each RUG or RUO on the legal recognition of them.

i. Scoring for Affiliations to other Organizations

Six points is given to each RUG and RUO on their affiliation to other organizations.

j. Scoring for services and social and cultural activities

Points are given for social and cultural activities indicator on services provided, social and cultural activities implemented.

Scores given for Services and Social and Cultural activities

Variables	Indicator ranking	
Services	No any service provided Short term services are provided Long term services are provided	0 1 2
No. of services	Limited to one service More than one service is provided	1 2
Social and Cultural Work	No any social and cultural work Done social and cultural work	0 1
Expected total points		5

Evaluation of Organizational Strength

The organizational Strength is evaluated on the percentage of the total points received by the RUGs and the RUO. The total points expected to be scored by RUGs and RUOs are as follows.

Total points expected of the RUGs

Indicators	Total points	%
Membership Knowledge	6	8
Member attitude/satisfaction	8	11
Participation	8	11
Leadership	10	13
Reporting	6	8
Funding	8	11
Financial Management	10	13
Investment	8	8
Legal Recognition	6	8
Affiliations	6	8
	76	

However, the final evaluation of the strength of the RUGs will be done together with the performance of the relevant production and conservation activities since the RUGs are formed exclusively with those objectives unlike the RUOs. Therefore the total points to be scored would be more.

Total points expected of the RUOs

Indicators	Total points	%
Structure	4	4
Membership Knowledge	6	7
Member attitude/satisfaction	8	9
Participation	9	10
Leadership	12	13
Reporting	6	7
Funding	9	10
Financial Management	10	11
Investment	8	9
Legal Recognition	6	7
Affiliations	6	7
Services, social/cultural Work	5	6
	89	

Production and Conservation

a. Involvement in Production and Conservation in Private lands

Points are given for the production and conservation in private lands indicator on the involvement in production and conservation, and in achieving targets. The RUGs involved in private land production and conservation are evaluated under the progress in both these areas as they are supposed to be involved in both because private land production and conservation activities come in one package. Next, most of the RUGs formed for private land production and conservation are involved in the two intervention areas of tea land conservation and homestead development whatever the specific activity of theirs. Therefore, more points are given to those involved in both intervention areas. The RUOs are evaluated on their overall involvement in both production and conservation. Providing services and resources too included in evaluating RUOs as it is one of the services expected from them under the production and conservation.

Scoring for RUGs under the P&C in Private Lands

Variables	Sub-variables	
Private land Production	Involved in on activity	1
	Involved in two activities	2
	Targets achieved 50% to 75%	1
	Targets achieved 75% to 100%	2
	100% achieved	3
Private land Conservation	Involved in one activity	1
	Involved in two activities	2
	Targets achieved 50% to 75%	1
	Targets achieved 75% to 100%	2
	100% achieved	3
	Total	10

Scoring for RUOs under the P&C in Private lands

Variables	Sub-variables	
Involvement	Involved in one activity	2
	Involved in two activities	4
Provision of services	Not provided services	0
	Provided services	2
Achievement of targets	Targets achieved 50% to 75%	2
	Targets achieved 75% to 100%	4
	100% achieved	6
	Total	12

b. Involvement in Production and Conservation in Common Lands

Points are given for production and conservation in common lands on the involvement and achievement of targets. Higher scores for variables to bring the total point level as same as of the private lands.

Scoring for RUGs under P&C in Common lands

Variables	sub-variables	
Involvement	Involved in one activity	2
	Involved in more activities	4
Achieving targets	Targets achieved 50% - 75%	2
	Between 75% to 100% achieved	4
	100% achieved	6
	Total	10

Scoring for RUOs under the P&C in Common lands

Variables	Sub-variables	
Involvement	Involved in one activity Involved in more activities	2 4
Provision of services	Not provided services Provided services	0 2
Achievement of targets	Targets achieved 50% to 75% Targets achieved 75% to 100% 100% achieved	2 4 6
	Total	12

b. Market Linkage

Points are given to RUGs and RUOs on their market and supply linkages as follows.

Variables	Sub-variables	
Market linkages	No market Linkages Established Market Linkages	0 4
	No collective supply Started Collective Supply	0 4
	Total Points	8

Integrated Planning and Co-ordination

a. Scoring for Participation in Mini Projects

Points are given to the involvement in mini-projects on planning, implementation and achieving targets and monitoring and evaluation.

Scores given for involvement in Mini-projects indicator

Variables	Indicators	
Planning	Planned by SCOR only	0
	Planned by SCOR and Group	1
	Planned by SCOR + Group + Agency	2
Implementation	Still not implemented	0
	Stopped half way	0
	Project is being implemented	2
Achieving Targets	Targets not achieved	0
	Between 50% to 75% achieved	1
	Between 75% to 100% achieved	2
	100% achieved	3
Monitoring & Evaluation	No proper M&E	0
	M&E by SCOR	1
	M&E by SCOR/Agency and RUO	2
	M&E by RUO	3
Expected total points		10

b. Scoring for Participation in planning & M&E meetings.

Evaluation is done on the average participation of the Agency officers and the user representatives at the planning meetings at divisional level.

Shared Control

Evaluation is done on the number of user right agreements, and the service and business contracts signed by the RUGs versus expected.

Organizational Viability

It is intended to use the Maturity index developed under the SCOR M&E system to evaluate the organizational viability of RUGs and RUOs under this Study. The maturity index developed under the SCOR M&E system is given in the Annex 2. According to this index the RUGs that reached to the status A are regarded as achieved the full maturity level which are more sustainable.

The viability of the RUGs or the RUOs cannot be evaluated on just reaching these steps but on the level of their performance at each of these steps. Therefore, the RUGs and RUOs that received the points between 50% to 75% at each of the steps will be taken as reached the respective step. However, final evaluation of the organizational viability will be decided upon both on reaching the full maturity level and receiving high points level equal to Very Good.

3.2. Research Methodology

Following methodologies were followed in the collection of data in this study.

a. Questionnaire Surveys

Questionnaire surveys were the main methodology used in collecting data from the selected samples of RUGs and RUOs; membership and office bearers on organizational development, management performance and the performance in their involvement in the interventions under the production and protection.

b. Participant observations.

Participant observations were used as frequently as possible as one of the main methodologies apart from questionnaire survey. Participant observations were made in group activities, and particularly in meetings to collect data on farmer officer involvement and their behavior as well as to substantiate and cross checking the data already collected.

c. Structured and Non-Structures interviewing.

Both structured and non-structured interviews were held with the members and leaders of RUGs and RUOs on the formation of groups and organizations, their involvement in them and perception of them. The SCOR personnel who were involved in the building RUOs and RUGs were interviewed on their involvements and on the strategies followed in institution building. Agency officers who were involved in SCOR projects were interviewed on their involvement and attitude, and on planning and implementations and monitoring and evaluation.

d. Secondary data from records

Secondary data necessary was collected from those available with the RUGs and RUOs, with the catalysts and from the SCOR data base.

3.4. Selection of the Samples

a. Sample of the RUGs

There were 49 RUGs in the Nilwala watershed by the time the study was conducted. The figures in the relevant documents maintained by the SCOR on the number of RUGs were somewhat higher than this but it was found some of those RUGs were not existing. Only those existing RUGs were taken for sampling.

Given below is the list of the existing RUGs by the time the study was conducted.

RUG Type	No.
Multi Functional	19
Homestead Development	07
Flori Culture	05
Plant Nursery	05
Forestry	03
Road & Stream Reservation Conservation	03
Tea Land Development	02
Seed Paddy	02
Agro-forestry	01
Animal Husbandry	01
Kitul Production	01
Total	49

Number of the RUGs under each of the four sub watersheds is as follows.

SWS	No. of RUGs
Milla Ela	19
D/Thenipita	12
Horagala	10
Aninkanda	08
Total	48

A sample of 24 RUGs were selected out of those existing 49 using the simple random method. The sample selected was as follows.

RUG Type	No.
Multi Functional	08
Homestead	05
Flori Culture	02
Plant Nursery	03
Road & Stream Reservation Conservation	02
Forestry	02
Seed Paddy	01
Tea	01
Total	24

Number of selected RUGs under the each of the four sub watershed is as follows

SWS	
Milla Ela	08
D/Thenipita	07
Horagala	05
Aninkanda	04
Total	24

b. Sample of RUOs.

The total number of RUOs involved in SCOR activities when the study was conducted was 29 as given below.

RUOs	No.
Farmer Organizations	14
Tea Small Holding Development Societies	6
NGOs	2
Micro-hydro Power	1
Non-wood forest Product	1
Youth Society	1
Service Organizations	4
Total	29

Eleven out of the above 29 RUOs have been newly formed under the SCOR project including the four Service Organizations. Others have been re-vitalized under the SCOR project.

A sample of 14 was selected through the stratified sampling method according the type of the RUOs. Sample was included of those newly formed 06 RUOs of two FOs, one NGO, the Micro Hydro Power Users

organization and two service organizations. Only those two service organizations were functioning after their formation by the time the study was conducted therefore, those two were selected. The non-wood forest product organization and the youth society were not still functioning by the time the sample was selected.

Sample of RUOs

RUO Type	No. of RUOs
Farmer Organizations	07
Tea Small Holding Development Societies	03
NGO	01
Micro Hydro Power	01
Service Organizations	02
Total	14

c. Sample of Membership

Two samples of membership were selected for both RUGs and RUOs. Fifty membership sample of the RUGs was randomly selected two from each.

A membership sample of 130 was selected of the RUOs under stratified sampling method on the total membership of the each RUO. A sample was around 8 per cent of the total membership of the each RUO.

3.5. Data Collection

Data was collected during the three months from August 1995 to October 1995. The questionnaires used in the survey were first field tested before preparing the final format. Data from participant observations, and interviews of officers was collected by the researcher himself. A field assistant was employed to collect data from the membership. Data on the RUGs and RUOs were collected both by the researcher and the field assistant.

Chapter 4

Organizational Development

Resource user participation has become an essential component in watershed management programs. The evidence in many Asian countries show (1995 - Sharma, Dixon) that the effective resource user participation had come through user groups. Organizing groups to have the user participation is regarded as the key to success in production, protection, marketing and other services in the watershed in the SCOR project. (IIMI - 1993). The foremost activity of the SCOR therefore was the formation of user groups and linking them to user organizations and service organizations. In this chapter the organizational strength of the user groups and user organizations formed in the Nilwala watershed is evaluated in related to their organizational management performance. The key indicators in evaluating the organizational strength are the structure, membership knowledge and attitude, membership participation, leadership, reporting, and funding and financial management.

4.1. Overview of the Organizational Arrangement before SCOR interventions

Much details of the organizational arrangements existed before the SCOR interventions are not available since such detailed analysis had not done beforehand. Data on these organizational arrangements was collected mainly through interviews with the office bearers of RUOs and the agency officers.

4.1.1. User Groups

There was no evidence that there had been any user groups before the SCOR interventions. Organizations that existed had not been built on any group concepts, and formed as general membership organizations comprised of all the membership.

Some of the field level officers of the TSHDA said that they had formed some contact farmer groups under the organizations formed of tea small holders similar to those under Training & Visit agriculture extension program but there was no evidence of existence of such groups when the study was conducted. The OBs of those organizations said that they did not have any understanding on the formation of groups before the SCOR intervention. The field officers had mostly paid individual level attentions rather than meeting groups of users.

Therefore, it is clear that there was no any group formation before the SCOR interventions and it was a novel idea put forward under the SCOR project.

4.1.2. User Organizations

According to the information collected there had been two types of user organizations in the Nilwala watershed when the SCOR project was started; FOs formed under the Agrarian Services Act and TSHDSs formed by the TSHDA.

Farmer Organizations

Much details were not available on the level of organizational development and functioning of the farmer organizations prior to SCOR intervention. According to the OBs, most of the FOs had been formed around 1991 by the Grama Sewa Officer of the area. The DO of the DAS had involved in forming some of them but the main responsibility of forming them had been with the Grama Sewa officer. He had formed them in a way of fulfilling a government order.

The evidence available suggests that those FOs were not functional and had remained name sake. Even the membership of them was not clear. Meetings had been held very rarely. Some of the FOs had engaged in organizing the pre-seasonal canal maintenance. Some others had facilitated the provision of spray machines by the DAS. Apart form that the FOs had not involved in much activities.

There had been no any proper maintaining of records by the farmer organizations. According to the evidence available, only some temporary records had been maintained by the farmer organizations. Some of the organizations had been provided with a financial record book prepared by the DAS but they were not maintained. No any fund collection had been taken place other than the initial collection of membership fee.

These farmer organizations had not functioned as the forums for problem solving or decision making. Farmers, if they had any problems related to their cultivation gotten solved them by meeting the relevant officers individually.

Tea Small Holding Development Societies

The TSHDSs had been formed by the TSHDA basically to protect the tea small holders from the middle man. Now the objectives of them have been much broadened. Present TSHDSs are a development of some societies formed before for the collection of tea leaves.

The TIs who are the field level extension officers of the TSHDA is responsible for the formation of TSHDSs. It was learned that most of those societies had been functioned only as a channel for providing services particularly fertilizer and other inputs by the TSHDA to the tea small holders when the SCOR project was started. Even this activity too had been started recently in some of them after the commencement of the SCOR project. The TSHDA

provides several concessions for the TSHDSs to provide those inputs. The foremost and sometimes the only objective of many of the TSHDSs was supplying inputs. Some of them have made some informal arrangements with nearby tea factories for fair prices for tea leaves supplied by their members.

However, one TSHDS out of all others had achieved much progress. It had ventured in to many member benefit activities such as providing credit, housing loans and death donations apart from supplying inputs. It had functioned as a village welfare society rather than a TSHDS. The chairman had worked as a rural leader under the Sarvodaya Movement and is having good leadership qualities. The total development of this TSHDS could be attributed to his leadership qualities, and to the training and experience he gained from the Sarvodaya Movement.

This is one isolated case and the TSHDA cannot have its success to their credit as other TSHDSs were found to be very weak. Some of the TSHDSs had stopped the supply inputs at the first attempt which was the only activity of them. Only the above TSHDS was found to be having some funds. There was no proper record keeping in others except the above which was maintaining over 15 records.

The TSHDSs are not much independent as the TSHDA commands much control on them. This control is clearly visible in the constitution itself which has been prepared by the TSHDA. The decisions of the chairman of the TSHDA regarding the TSHDSs are final in regard to the TSHDSs. The TSHDA can revoke the decisions taken by these societies and even dissolve them. The annual OB selections, anniversary meetings etc.. are conducted as per the instructions given by the TSHDA. The chairman of the TSHDA can call emergency meetings of them and in such meetings he himself should chair such meetings according to the constitution.

The chairman of the Kotapola North (Bodeniya) TSHDS, as his organizations is now developed to a very high level, wants his organizations to be more independent of the controls of the TSHDA.

The TIs' control over the TSHDSs emanates from the control of the TSHDA on these societies. It was observed that some TIs were wielding some authority on the TSHDSs. At some of the TSHDS meetings it was observed that the TIs chaired the meetings and answered member questions and took decisions by himself. As the TSHDSs very much controlled by the TSHDA they depend so much on the TIs. The weaknesses of many of the TSHDSs emanated from this dependency itself. Where the TI was much involved in providing his services the TSHDS too was functioning better as a channel for providing some of those services.

It was observed at annual selection of OBs of the TSHDSs some TIs were turning this event in to a caricature of OB selection.

Those meetings are called by the TIs as per the instructions given by the TSHDA and they implement it in a way of performing his duty. It was observed that some TIs named persons by themselves as OBs. It is customary to take oaths by the new OBs that they would abide by the rules and regulations of the constitution apart from fulfilling their duties honestly.

The TSHDA wanted to get approved by all the TSHDSs a new constitution they prepared after a Bill was passed in the Parliament to recognize the tea societies as legal bodies. In some TSHDSs some parts of the constitution were read before the members by the TIs and got it approved while in some societies the members were asked to read it later and got their approval.

The main activity (mostly the only activity) of the TSHDSs is acting as channels for providing fertilizer under the fertilizer credit scheme of the TSHDA. Any problems or matters relating to the tea cultivation are referred to the TIs individually by the farmers. It was interesting to note that after some TSHDS meetings TIs asked the members to stay behind if they had problems to discuss or to forward tea replanting subsidy forms.

4.2. Strategies Followed in Forming RUGs and RUOs

4.2.1. Formation of RUGs

Basically four types of RUGs have been formed in the Nilwala watershed:

1. Single functional RUGs with no affiliations with higher levels. These are some small groups based on one activity like homestead development and stream reservation conservation etc..
2. Mother group comprised of small groups. A mother group have been formed covering an area between two streams and the total community within the area has been divided in to small groups with given specific objectives. Most of the project groups are of this type.
3. Base Groups of organization. Such base groups were found only under one organization.
4. Groups affiliated to higher level organizations but not as the base level groups of them. The Plant nurseries, seed paddy farms are of this type.

Strategies Followed in the Formation of RUGs

Several strategies had been followed in the formation of the RUGs:

1. Convening a general user awareness meetings and forming groups based on specific objectives.
2. Form a group after a group discussion.

3. Divide the total number of users in to groups using maps.
4. Select some users and form a group

The first method had been used at the initial stage of the project. There had been some delay in appointing the IOs and in the meantime the other team members had convened general farmer awareness meetings and asked them to group in to specific objectives they wished. Many of the RUGs thus formed were non-existing when the study commenced.

Next, groups had been formed after holding discussions with the users. They are mostly single functional groups such as those formed under homestead development, forestry, stream reservation conservation etc..

Dividing the total users into groups out of the maps by the IOs themselves had been frequently followed by the time the study was conducted. Under this method the IOs first collect the information of the total community on the geographical unit in between two streams and divide them into groups using a map. Most of the Project Groups had been formed in this manner. During the study IOs formed 23 groups using this method.

The last method used to build RUGs was to select a number of users by the IOs and form a group on a specific objective. Floriculture groups, banana and coconut cultivation groups and some homestead development groups are of this type. Sometimes the leader too had been named by the IO. Low level of membership is a characteristic of these groups.

The strategies followed in strengthening the groups after the formation of them are not much clear apart from providing training to some of the group leaders on financial management.

4.2.2. Formation of RUOs

Both of building new RUOs and strengthening the existing ones had taken place under the SCOR project. The newly formed RUOs can be categorized in to four types.

1. RUOs formed according to the SCOR plan. Four SOs representing the four SWSs have been formed according to the SCOR work plan.

2. RUOs formed under SCOR intervention areas. A NGO named Dotalugala Heritage, an Anthurium Growers' Organization and a Non-wood Forest Product Organization have been formed under the intervention areas.
3. RUOs formed for specific objectives. A Micro Hydro Power Users' Organization have been formed for a specific objective of generating micro hydro power.

4. RUOs formed in support of SCOR activities. A Youth Organization and one FO have been formed with this purpose.

The Anthurium Growers' Organization is the only RUO built upon the user groups. It has been formed by the members of Flori-culture groups of the Watershed mainly for providing marketing facilities for their products. The Micro Power Users Organization is a gradual development of an initial group.

Strengthening of Existing RUOs

The existing FOs and TSHDSs have been strengthened under the SCOR project. Initially, strengthening of them had been mostly limited to those RUOs selected for mini-projects. Later, the IOs have approached the remaining organizations in their areas.

Strengthening the TSHDSs

Initially the involvement of the SCOR personnel in strengthening the TSHDSs had been very limited. Apart from getting the involvement of one TSHDS in SCOR interventions no much attention had been paid to others at the beginning. Possibly there are three reasons for this:

1. There had been some reluctance from the TSHDA particularly from the field level officers to let the SCOR personnel to be involved in the organizations which were under their control.

2) The IOs too were not much confident to be involvement in TSHDSs as most of them were dominated by the TIs. On the other hand TSHDSs were a new organization system for most of the IOs to be involved directly at the beginning.

3) Due to the strict control of the TSHDA on the TSHDSs there had been some limitations for the IOs to be involved in them.

Quite lately mostly at the beginning of 1995 the IOs had approach the TSHDSs when the TIs become receptive to their involvements after development of some mutual understanding between them. It could be clearly seen that those TSHDSs were reviving with the involvement of the IOs. With these involvements both the members and the office bearers became interested in their organizations. But still this involvement was not much intensive in most cases. It was observed some IOs were still not much confident in themselves to be involved much in TSHDSs affairs.

However, the SCOR team had held discussions with the TSHDA on some weaknesses they had identified in TSHDSs such as lack of legal recognition for them. As a result of these discussions the TSHDA had made arrangements recently to pass a bill in the parliament accepting the TSHDSs as legal bodies.

Strengthening the FOs

It could be seen that the IOs had involved in strengthening the FOs with much confident and ease. At each sub-watershed at least there is one better functioning FO. There may be two reasons for this:

1. There was no any constraint for them from the implementing agency of the DAS to their involvement. In one hand, the IOs were able to involve themselves somewhat freely as the involvement of the DOs of the DAS who were responsible for building FOs was very limited. On the other hand, the DOs welcomed the involvement of the SCOR personnel as it eased their work loads.

2. Most of the IOs were involved in building FOs in irrigation systems and they were much confident in their involvement in strengthening the FOs.

The re-organization of the RUOs had begun with the re-election of office bearers. Some training on leadership qualities and financial management had been provided to the OBs of selected RUOs. Guidance had been given by the IOs in some other activities such as in record maintenance.

4.3. Evaluation of Organizational Strength of the RUGs

Organizational strength of RUGs is evaluated on individual performance level and overall performance level. Under the overall performance of the RUGs it is expected to provide a general picture of them in the watershed. The evaluation is done on the indicators of Membership Perception and Attitude, Membership Participation, Leadership, Reporting, Funding and Financial Management, Investment, Legal Recognition and Affiliation with other Organizations.

The sample of 24 RUGs

Name of RUG	Type	SWS
1. Nagoda Athura Flower Growers' Group	Flori Culture	Aninkanda
2. Thisara Flower growers' Group	Flori Culture	Aninkanda
3. Potuwilayaya Homestead Group	Homestead	Aninkanda
4. Nilwala Nursery Group	Plant Nursery	D\Tenipita
5. Forestry Group	Forestry	Horagala
6. Banana Cultivation Group	Homestead	Horagala
7. Coconut cultivations Group	Homestead	Horagala
8. Homestead Demonstration Group	Homestead	Milla Ela
9. Horiyadola Project Group	Multi	Milla Ela
10. Naindawa Tea Land Conservation Group	Tea	D\Tenipita
11. Rambukdeniya Stream Reservation conservation Group	Multi	D\Tenipita
12. Suhada Seed Paddy Farm	Seed Paddy	D\Tenipita
13. Sisilasa Nursery Group	Plant Nursery	D\Tenipita
14. Ambalandola Bemmedola Group	Multi	Milla Ela
15. Kiriwanaganga Stream Reservation Conservation Group	Stream	Aninkanda
16. Nallagawahena Forestry Group	Forestry	Milla Ela
17. Five Acre Project Group	Multi	Milla Ela
18. Morawakkanda Project Group	Multi	Milla Ela
19. Bovitiyadola Production and Conservation User Group	Multi	Horagala
20. Bovitiyadola Nursery Group	Plant Nursery	Horagala
21. Annasidola Group	Multi	Milla Ela
22. Homestead Group	Homestead	D\Tenipita
23. Pahalaegodakumbura Batahira-dola Project Group	Multi	Milla Ela
24. Kirivandola Stream Reservation Group	Road\Stream	D\Tenipita

4.3.1. Evaluation of RUGs under Membership Knowledge

The Membership Knowledge is evaluated under the member knowledge on their membership, group objectives, member responsibilities. The findings under the membership knowledge on the responses given by the sample of 48 RUG members were as follows.

Sub-variables	Yes	%
Know the Group	45	94
Member	36	75
Know how group was formed	29	60
Formed on the instructions of SCOR	18	38
Formed after group discussions	06	13
By the IO himself	05	10
Know the Objectives of the Group	40	83
Know member responsibilities	37	77
Follow instructions given by SCOR	05	10
Do not know	07	15

In four RUGs (17 per cent) the total members did not know how the group was formed, in three (13 percent) the members did not know their responsibilities and in two (8 per cent) the members did not know the objectives. Members have no knowledge in the existence of the group, or the membership in one RUG (4 per cent).

Ranking of RUGs on Membership Knowledge

Points received by each of the RUG on Membership knowledge is given in the Annex 3. Ranking of RUGs on membership knowledge according to the points received is as follows.

Ranking of RUGs on Membership Knowledge

Rating	No. of RUGs	%
<25% - Very Weak	3	12
25% - 50% - Weak	1	4
50% - 75% - Good	4	17
>75% - Very Good	16	67

Overall Evaluation of RUGs under Membership Knowledge

The overall evaluation of the RUGs on the total points received is as follows.

Points received under the membership knowledge

Sub-Variables	Expected	Received	%
Knowledge on the membership	48	36	75
Knowledge on objectives	48	40	83
Knowledge on responsibilities	48	37	77
Total	144	113	78

The overall membership knowledge on the RUGs can be evaluated as very good according to the percentage of the total point received, which is 78 per cent.

4.3.2. Evaluation of RUGs under Membership Attitude/satisfaction

Membership attitude and satisfaction is evaluated on the member satisfaction on objectives and fulfillment of the objectives, provision of services and the usefulness of the group. Findings under the member attitude and satisfaction is given below.

Sub-variables	Yes	%
Satisfied with the objectives	33	69
Objectives fulfilled	26	54
Done some work by the Group	38	79
Satisfied with the work	26	54
Group is useful	34	71

Total members of four RUGs (17 per cent) are not satisfied with any of the aspects of the RUGs. Total members of 09 RUGs (38 per cent) stated that the objectives were not fulfilled. Total members of 04 RUGs (17 per cent) are not satisfied with fulfilling objectives. Total members of 06 RUGs (25 percent) stated that the groups are not useful. Total members of 09 RUGs (38 per cent) are not satisfied with the work done by the groups.

Ranking the RUGs on Membership Attitude/Satisfaction

The points received by each of the RUG under the membership attitude and satisfaction is given in the Annex 3. Ranking the RUGs on the membership attitude/satisfaction is as follows.

Ranking of RUGs on Membership Attitude/satisfaction

Rating	No. of RUGs	%
<25% - Very Weak	7	29
25% - 50% - Weak	2	8
50% - 75% - Good	4	17
>75% - Very Good	11	46

Overall Evaluation of RUGS on Membership Attitude/satisfaction

The overall evaluation of the RUGs can be done as follows on the total points received.

Total Points received by RUGs under Membership Attitude/Satisfaction

Sub-Variables	Expected	Received	%
Satisfied with the objectives	48	33	69
Objectives fulfilled	48	26	54
Satisfied with group work	48	26	54
Group is useful	48	34	71
Total	192	119	62

The points received under the membership attitude and satisfaction is 119 which is 62 per cent of total. Therefore the overall membership attitude and satisfaction can be evaluated as Good.

4.3.3. Evaluation of RUGs under Member Participation

The member participation is evaluated on the percentages of total member participation in meetings and group activities. The average of the attendance in last 03 meetings was taken as the participation in meetings.

The finding under the Participation

Sub-variables	No. of RUGs	%
Regular meetings are held	04	16
Meetings, held irregularly	09	38
Meetings are not held	05	21
Holding meetings not necessary (membership is low)	06	25
Meetings participation more than 75%	03	13
Participation is between 50% to 75%	06	25
Participation between 50% to 25%	03	13
Participation is less than 25%	01	04
Involved in Group work	16	67
Involved in only one group work	06	25
Group participation is more than 75%	04	17
Participation is between 50% to 75%	06	25
Participation is between 50% to 25%	02	08
Participation is less than 25%	04	17

Ranking the RUGs on participation

The RUGs of which holding meetings is not necessary due to their low number of membership were considered as holding their meetings with full member participation if those groups are active. If they found to be not much active points were given as for

holding irregular meetings. The total points received by each of the RUGs are given in the Annex 3.

Ranking of RUGs on Member Participation

Ranking	No. of RUGs	%
<25% - Very Weak	7	29
25% - 50% - Weak	9	38
50% - 75% - Good	8	33
>75% - Very Good	-	

Overall Evaluation of RUGs under Participation

Overall evaluation of RUGs on the total points received is as follows.

Total Points received by RUGs under Participation

Sub-variables	Expected	Received	%
Holding meetings	48	24	50
Participation in meetings	48	19	40
Conducting group work	48	28	58
Participation in group work	48	11	23
Total	192	82	43

Overall points scored is 82 which is 43 per cent of the full points and therefore the overall membership participation in RUGs is evaluated as Weak.

4.3.4. Evaluation of RUGs under Leadership

The leadership of RUGs is evaluated on members' knowledge of the leaders, member involvement in selecting them, frequency of selection, and on leaders' knowledge on their responsibilities.

Findings under leadership

Sub-variables	No.	%
Know the group leader	35	73
Know how leaders selected	20	42

Sub-variables	No. of RUGs	%
Leaders are selected by the group	17	71
Selected by the IO	07	29
Leaders not selected periodically	00	0
Select whenever necessary	02	8
Leaders know their responsibilities	13	54
Leaders know responsibilities to some extent	07	29

In four RUGs (17 per cent) the total of sample members do not know their leaders while in 10 RUGs (42 per cent) sample members do not know how their leaders were selected.

Ranking the RUGs on Leadership

The points received by each of the RUG is given in the Annex 3. On the frequency of selection of leaders those groups newly formed are given one point even it is not decided yet the time period to select the leaders.

Ranking of RUGs on Leadership

Ranking	No. of RUGs	%
<25% - Very Weak	2	8
25% - 50% - Weak	9	38
50% - 75% - Good	7	29
>75% - Very Good	6	25

Overall Evaluation of RUGs on Leadership

The overall evaluation of the RUGs on the total points received is as follows.

Total Points received by RUGs under Leadership

Sub-variables	Expected	Received	%
Knowledge of leader	48	35	73
Involvement in selection	48	20	42
Selection of leaders	48	34	71
frequency of selection	48	13	27
Knowledge of responsibilities	48	33	69
Total	240	135	56

According to the total points received the overall leadership of RUGs can be evaluated as Good as the percentage of the points received is 56 per cent.

4.3.5. Evaluation of RUGs Under Maintaining Reports

Under the maintaining reports the RUG are evaluated on the quantity and the quality of the necessary records maintained.

Findings on reporting

Sub-variables	No. of RUGs	%
Reports are maintained	19	79
Seven reports maintained	01	04
Five reports maintained	05	25
Three reports maintained	04	17
Two reports maintained	07	29
One report maintained	02	
Quality of reports very good	01	04
Quality of reports moderate	14	58
Quality of reports bad	04	17

Ranking of RUGs on Maintaining Reports

The points received by each of the RUG are given in the Annex 3. The ranking of them according to the points received is as follows.

Ranking RUGs on Maintaining Reports

Ranking	No. of RUGs	%
<25% - Very Weak	09	38
25% - 50% - Weak	06	25
50% - 75% - Good	08	33
>75% - Very Good	01	4

Overall Evaluation of the RUGs

The overall evaluation of RUGs on the total points received is as follows.

Total points received by RUGs on Maintaining reports

Sub-Variables	Expected	Received	%
No. of reports	72	33	46
Quality of reports	72	16	22
	144	49	34

According to the percentage of the total points received overall evaluation of RUGs on maintaining reports is Weak.

4.3.6. Evaluation of RUGs under Funding

Under Funding the RUGs are evaluated on the funds availability and funding sources. Only 10 RUGs (42 per cent) are having funds out of the total. Two RUGs are having the highest collection of over Rs. 50,000 and Rs. 25,000 respectively. One RUG is having a collection of about Rs 15,000 and another about Rs. 5000. Two is having funds about Rs. 2000. Three others are having funds below Rs. 1000. One RUG has spent almost all the funds.

The major contribution for funds has come from SCOR grants. Total of 07 RUGs (70 per cent of those having funds) have raised funds solely through SCOR grants. Funds of the rest too mainly have come from those grants.

Ranking of RUGs on Funding

The total points received by the RUGs under funding is given in the Annex 3. The ranking of RUGs under funding according to the points received is as follows.

Ranking the RUGs on Funding

Ranking	No. of RUGs	%
<25% - Very Weak	14	58
25% - 50% - Weak	08	33
50% - 75% - Good	02	08
>75% - Very Good	-	

Overall Evaluation of RUGs under Funding

The overall evaluation of the RUGs under finding on the total points received is as follows.

Total Points received by RUGs on Funding

sub-variables	Expected	Received	%
Have funds Total funds	48 72	20 09	42 13
Funding Sources	72	10	14
Total	192	39	20

Total points scored by the RUGs is 20 per cent of the total therefore overall evaluation of RUGs under funding is Very weak.

4.3.7. Evaluation of RUGs under Financial Management

Financial Management is evaluated on two variables of level of financial management and degree of transparency. The level of financial management is evaluated on proper record keeping, clarity of fund withdrawal procedure and presenting the budget. Transparency is evaluated on the membership knowledge on fund availability and fund utilizations. Only the 10 RUGs which are having funds will be evaluated under the financial management.

Findings under Financial Management

Variables	No. of RUGs	%
Quality of financial records is good	0	
Quality of financial records is moderate	5	50
Financial records are not maintained	5	50
Funds withdrawal procedure is clear	6	60
Budget is presented periodically	2	20
Budget is presented but no clear date	6	60

Finding under transparency (member knowledge)

Variables	No. of members	%
Know the funds availability	16	80
Know the funding sources	14	70
Know the amount	11	55
Know how funds utilized	05	25

Ranking of RUGs on Financial management

The points received by each of the RUG on financial management is given in the Annex 3. The ranking of RUGs on financial management is as follows.

Ranking of RUGs on Financial management

Ranking	No. of RUGs	%
<25% - Very Weak	2	20
25% - 50% - Weak	4	40
50% - 75% - Good	3	30
>75% - Very Good	1	10

Overall Evaluation of RUGs on Financial Management

The overall evaluation of the 10 RUGs which are having funds is as follows.

Total Points Received by RUGs on Financial management

Sub-Variables	Expected	Received	%
Financial Management	60	27	45
Transparency	40	21	53
Total	100	48	48

The total points scored under financial management is 48 which is 48 per cent of the full points. Therefore, the overall financial management of those RUGs having funds is evaluated as Weak.

4.3.8. Investment, Diversity of Enterprises, business turnover and profits, and equity in distribution of profits.

There is no such investment or involvement in business by the RUGs.

4.3.9. Legal Recognition

There are some limitation for the RUGs to get legal recognition as many requirements as of a formal organizations are to be fulfilled for getting qualified for such recognition. Therefore, RUGs which are having any institutional recognition other than from the SCOR are also taken as having legal recognition.

Altogether 09 RUOs (38 per cent) are having institutional recognition as follows.

Institution	No. of RUGs	%
Department of Agriculture	03	13
Department of forest	03	13
Department of Agrarian Services	01	4
Tea Small Holding Authority	01	4
Private Agency	01	4
No recognition	15	62

Six point are given to a RUG which is having legal recognition. Points received are given in the Annex 3. Total points received by the RUGs under the Legal Recognition is 54. It is 38 per cent of the expected total points of 144, therefore evaluated as weak.

4.3.10. Affiliations to other Organizations

The RUGs which are directly affiliated to RUOs are given 6 points each while those affiliated through the mother groups are given 03 points. Total of 21 RUGs (88 per cent) are having affiliations with other organizations. However, 06 of them (25 per cent) are having affiliations through their mother RUGs. Twelve 12 (50 per cent) are affiliated to the RUOs while three others are affiliated to service organizations.

Points received by each of the RUGs are given in the Annex 3. The total points expected to be scored by all the RUGs is 144. The points scored is 105 which is 73 per cent of the total therefore the overall affiliations of RUGs can be evaluated as good.

4.3.11. Summary of the Organizational Strength of RUGs

Summary of the organizational strength of the RUGs under the each of the indicator is as follows.

Organizational Strength of the RUGs

Indicators	Ranking			
	Very Weak	Weak	Good	Very good
Member knowledge	3	1	4	16
Member Attitude	7	2	4	11
Participation	7	8	9	-
Leadership	2	9	7	6
Maintaining Reports	9	6	8	1
Funding	14	8	2	-
Financial Mgt.	2	4	3	1*
Investment	-	-	-	-

*Financial management of the RUGs having funds.

Overall Strength of RUGs under each of Indicators

Indicators	Status
Member knowledge	Very Good
Member Attitude	Good
Participation	Weak
Leadership	Good
Reporting	Weak
Funding	Very Weak
Financial Mgt. (of 10)	Weak
Investment	Very Weak
Legal recognition	Weak
Affiliations	Good

Overall Evaluation of Individual RUGs

The overall evaluation of the RUGs on organizational development according to the total points received by each of them is as follows. The total points received under the organizational development by each of the RUG are given in Annex 3. However, the RUGs should be evaluated together with the point they received under their involvement in production and conservation activities in order to get the overall performance level of them since they have been formed specifically under SCOR interventions.

Ranking of RUGs on Organizational Development

Ranking	No. of RUGs	%
<25% - Very Weak	6	25
25% - 50% - Weak	8	33
50% - 75% - Good	10	42
>75% - Very Good	0	

Ranking	Name of the RUG	Type	SWS
Very Weak	1.Ambalandola Bammedola Group	Multi	Milla Ela
	2.Kiriwanaganga Stream Reservation Group	Stream	Aninkanda
	3.Morawakkanda Project Group	Multi	Milla Ela
	4.Five Acre Project Group	Multi	Milla Ela
	5.Pahala Egodakumbura Batahiradola Group	Multi	Milla Ela
	6.Kiriwandola Stream Reservation Group	Road/Stream	D/Tenipita
Weak	1.Potuwilayaya Homestead group	Homestead	Aninkanda
	2.Forestry Group	Forestry	Horagala
	3.Banana Cultivation Group	Homestead	Horagala
	4.Coconut Cultivation Group	Homestead	Horagala
	5.Horiyadola Project Group	Multi	Milla Ela
	6.Naindawa Tea Land Conservation Group	Tea	D/Tenipita
	7.Nallagawahena Forestry Group	Forestry	Milla Ela
	8.Homestead Group	Homestead	D/Thenipita
Good	1.Nagoda Athura Flower Growers' Group	Flori-	Aninkanda
	2.Thisara Flower Growers Group	Flori-	Aninkanda
	3.Nilwala Nursery Group	Nursery	D/Thenipita
	4.Homestead Demonstration Group	Homestead	Milla Ela
	5.Rambukdeniya Stream reser/cons. Group	Multi	D/Thenipita
	6.Suhada Seed Paddy Farm	Seed Paddy	D/Thenipita
	7.Sisilasa Nursery Group	Nursery	D/Thenipita
	8.Bovitiyadola Produc./cons. Group	Multi	Horagala
	9.Bovitiyadola Nursery Group	Nursery	Horagala
	10.Annasidola Group	Multi	Milla Ela

4.4. Evaluation of Resource User Organization on Organizational Strength

Organizational strength of the RUOs are evaluated on structure, membership knowledge and attitude, membership participation, leadership, reporting, funding and financial

management, legal recognition, affiliations and investment. The RUOs are evaluated on the individual level and on the total RUO level according to the total points received. The sample of the RUOs selected is as follows.

Sample of the RUOs

Name of the RUO	Type
1. Dotalugala Heritage	NGO
2. Horagala East FO	FO
3. Nawalahena FO	FO
4. Tenipita Service Organization	Ser. Org.
5. Beralapanathara TSHDS	TSHDS
6. Nilwala Anthuriuam Growers' Organization	FO
7. Micro-hydro Power Users' Organization	Hydro-power
8. Kotapola North (Bodeniya) TSHDS	TSHDS
9. Aninkanda Service Organization	Ser. Org.
10. Pathawita TSHDS	TSHDS
11. Pathawita FO.	FO
12. Ihala Millawa FO	FO
13. Kotapola North Mahasen FO	FO
14. Bata Andura North FO	FO

Six in the sample, the Dotalugala Heritage, Nilwala Anthurium Growers' Organization, Micro-hydro Power Users' Organization, Ihala Millawa FO, and the two Service Organizations have been built with the involvement of SCOR.

4.4.1. Evaluation of RUOs under Structure

The structure of the RUOs is evaluated on the composition of the organization and on its constitutional arrangements.

Findings under Structure

Sub Variables	No. of RUOs	%
Have a executive committee	13	93
Have groups (RUGs)	7	50
Groups cover the total members	6	43
Have constitutions	13	93
Constitutions formulated by the RUO itself	04	29
Constitution approved by members	10	71

The constitutions have been formulated by the organizations themselves under the guidance of SCOR personnel in three RUOs and one SO. All the FOs use the sample constitutions provided by the Department of Agrarian Services prepared under the Agrarian Service (Amended) Act 1991. However, many of them are only the

constitutional guidelines. All the TSHDSs are provided with a set constitution formulated by the TSHDA. One RUOs, the Dotalugala Heritage has no constitution.

Ranking of the RUOs under Structure

Total points received by each of the RUG are given in Annex 4. The ranking of RUGs under the Structure is given below.

Ranking RUOs on Structure

Ranking	No. of RUOs	%
<25% - Very Weak	1	7
25% - 50% - Weak	2	14
50% - 75% - Good	5	36
>75% - Very Good	6	43

Overall Evaluation of RUOs on Structure

The overall evaluation of the RUGs on the total points received is as follows.

Total Points received under Structure Indicator

Sub-Variables	Expected	Received	%
Composition	28	20	71
Constitution	28	23	82
Total	56	43	77

The total points scored is 44 (77 per cent) and therefore the RUOs can be evaluated as Very Good under the Structure.

4.4.2. Evaluation of RUOs Under Membership Knowledge

The membership of RUOs varies from the lowest number of 40 in the Nilwala Anthurium Growers Organizations to the highest of 526 in the Bodeniya TSHDS. In the two service organizations the number of the membership is not known. The office bearers of the Thenipita SO do not know at least the membership criteria.

The Membership knowledge on their RUOs is evaluated on the knowledge on their membership, objectives and responsibilities.

Findings on Membership Knowledge

Sub Variables	No	%

Know the membership Pay membership Fee	120 69	92 53
Know objectives well Know objectives to some extent	77 38	59 29
Know member responsibilities well Know member responsibilities to some extent	54 53	41 41

Ranking of RUOs on Membership Knowledge

The points received by each of the RUG are given in Annex 4. Those who stated that they know the objectives and responsibilities to some extent too were included as knowing them in the scoring. However, full points were not given if the number of those who know to some extent is more than the who knows them well.

Ranking RUOs on Membership Knowledge

Ranking	No. of RUOs	%
<25% - Very Weak	-	
25% - 50% - Weak	1	7
50% - 75% - Good	4	29
>75% - Very Good	9	64

Overall Evaluation in Membership Knowledge

The overall evaluation of the RUOs on the membership knowledge according to the total points received is as follows. Expected total points of all RUGs are as follows.

Total Points Received under Membership Knowledge

Sub-variables	Expected	Received	%
Knowledge on membership	28	24	86
Knowledge on objectives	28	23	82
Knowledge on responsibilities	28	19	68
	84	66	79

As the percentage of the total is 79 per cent the membership knowledge of the overall RUGs can be evaluated as very good.

4.4.3. Evaluation of RUOs under Membership Attitude/Satisfaction

Membership attitude and satisfaction is evaluated on membership satisfaction on the objectives, fulfillment of objectives, services provided, and on the necessity of organization.

Findings on the membership attitude/ satisfaction

Sub variables	No.	%
Satisfied with the objectives	103	79
Objectives are fulfilled	39	30
Objectives are fulfilled to some extent	63	48
Services are provided	104	80
Satisfied with the services	70	54
Organizations are necessary	108	83

Ranking of RUOs on Membership Attitude/Satisfaction

Points received by each of the RUO under membership attitude/satisfaction are given in the Annex 4. Under the fulfillment of the objectives, full points are given to those fulfilling of objectives to some extent. However, full points were not given if the total number is more than those said that the objectives were fulfilled. Ranking of RUGs on membership attitude/satisfaction is given below.

Ranking RUOs on Membership attitude/satisfaction

Rating	No. of RUOs	%
<25% - Very Weak	2	14
25% - 50% - Weak	4	29
50% - 75% - Good	5	36
>75% - Very Good	3	21

Overall evaluation of RUOs on membership attitude/satisfaction

The overall evaluation of RUOs on membership attitude/satisfaction on the total points received is as follows.

Overall points received under Membership Attitude/satisfaction

Sub-variables	Expectd	Rcvd.	%
Satisfaction of objectives	28	21	79
Satisfaction of fulfilling objectives	28	12	43
Satisfaction of services	28	9	32
Organization useful	28	22	79
Total	112	64	57

The percentage of the total points received is 57 per cent therefore, the membership attitude and satisfaction of overall RUOs can be evaluated as Good.

4.4.4. Evaluation of RUOs Under Participation

Participation of the members in organizational activities is evaluated on the percentage of the participation in meetings and group activities. Average participation in three consecutive meetings was taken for member participation in meetings. The average of participation in group work conducted was taken as the participation in group work.

Findings of the Member participation

Sob variables	No.of RUOs	%
Regular RUO meetings are held	4	29
RUO meetings held irregularly	7	50
RUO meetings not held	3	21
Regular committee meetings are held	6	43
Participation in meetings more than 50%	3	21
Participation in meetings less than 50%	9	64
Group work done	9	64
Participation in group work more than 75%	3	14
Participation in group work more than 50%	2	14

Ranking the RUOs on Participation

The points scored by each of the RUO under participation is given in the Annex 4. The ranking of RUGs on participation is as follows.

Rating of RUOs on Participation

Ranking	No. of RUOs	%
<25% - Very Weak	6	43
25% - 50% - Weak	3	21
50% - 75% - Good	4	29
>75% - Very Good	1	7

Overall evaluation of RUOs on Participation

The overall evaluation of the RUOs on participation is as follows on the total points scored.

Total Points Received by RUOs Under Participation

Sub-variables	Expected	Received	%
Participation in meetings	70	25	36
Group work participation	56	24	43
Total	126	49	39

The percentage of the points scored under Participation is 39 per cent of the total. Therefore, participation of overall RUOs can be evaluated as Weak.

4.4.5. Evaluation of RUOs under Leadership

Leadership of RUOs is evaluated on the frequency of selecting Office bearers (OBs), knowledge of OBs of their responsibilities, member knowledge of the OBs, member participation in selection of them and members evaluation on the leadership qualities.

Leadership qualities were ranked in to twelve areas of honesty, impartiality, devotion, modesty, better financial controlling, openness, solving member problems, political impartiality, better conduction of meetings, suitable educational background and good conduct.

Findings on Leadership

Selection of OBs and knowledge of responsibilities

Sub-variables	No.of RUOs	%
OBs selected periodically	09	64
No periodical selections	05	36
Know OB responsibilities	11	79

Decisions for periodical selection of OBs is still not taken in 05 RUOs (36 per cent). Annual selection of OBs is made a requirement under the constitution of the TSHDSs, and TSHDA itself decides the dates for selection of them. The OBs' responsibilities are not decided yet in three RUOs.

Knowledge of the sample members of their leaders

Responses	No. of Members	%
Attended OB selection	42	32
Know the Chairman	107	82
Know the Secretary	81	62
Know the Treasurer	75	55
Know the Vice-chairman	22	22*
Know the Asst. Secretary	15	14*
Know the Committee members	42	36*

* In some RUOs these OBs are not selected.

Leadership Qualities

The totals of the positive member responses given on twelve leadership qualities of the OBs of all RUOs are as follows. Number included only of the OBs known to the members.

OB	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
CH	97	77	65	95	45	48	35	29	86	45	95	94
SC	74	60	47	73	54	42	26	23	69	35	71	75
TR	68	58	52	68	55	44	32	21	62	36	66	67

CH: Chairman, SC: Secretary, TR: Treasurer

1. Honesty
2. Impartiality
3. Devotion
4. Modesty
5. Consider others views
6. Better financial controlling
7. Openness
8. Solving member problems
9. No political biases
10. Ability to conduction of meetings
11. Educational background
12. Good conduct

However, some of the sample members could not comment on the some qualities of their OBs. The highest number of positive responses was received for OBs' honesty while the lowest number of positive responses was received for solving member problems.

Ranking of RUOs on Leadership

Points received by the each of the RUGs under leadership is given in the Annex 4. The ranking of RUOs under the leader is as follows.

Ranking RUOs on Leadership

Rating	No. of RUOs	%
<25% - Very Weak	3	21
25% - 50% - Weak	6	43
50% - 75% - Good	1	7
>75% - Very Good	4	29

Ranking on the Knowledge of OBs

Ranking	Know Chairman		Know Secretary		Know Treasurer	
	RUOs	%	RUOs	%	RUOs	%
Very Weak	-	-	3	21	2	14
Weak	1	7	2	14	8	57
Good	5	36	3	21	-	-
Very Good	8	57	6	43	4	29

Ranking the RUOs on the Leadership Qualities

Ranking	Chairman		Secretary		Treasurer	
	RUOs	%	RUOs	%	RUOs	%
Very Weak	1	7	4	29	5	36
Weak	5	36	1	7	3	21
Good	3	21	6	43	2	14
Very Good	5	36	3	21	4	29

Overall Evaluation of RUGs on Leadership

The overall evaluation of the RUOs on the total points is as follows.

Total Points Received by the RUOs on Leadership

Sub Variables	Expctd.	Rcvd.	%
Periodical selection	28	18	64
Knowledge of OB responsibilities	28	22	79
Involvement in OB selection	28	4	14
Knowledge on OBs	42	28	67
Quality of OBs	42	17	40
Total	168	89	53

According to the percentage of the total points received the leadership of overall RUOs could be evaluated as Good.

4.4.6. Evaluation of RUOs on Report Maintaining

Maintaining reports is evaluated on the quantity and the quality of necessary records maintained. It is considered that at least five necessary records e.g. on membership, meetings, member participation, financial and other records on correspondents, vouchers, investment etc.. should be maintained by an organization.

Findings under Record Maintaining

Sub-variables	No. of RUOs	%
Necessary records are maintained	10	71
Quality of records are very good	02	14
Quality of records are good	03	21
Quality of records are moderate	05	36

Ranking of RUOs on Maintaining Reports

The total points scored by each of the RUO is given in Annex 4. Given below is the ranking of RUOs on maintaining reports.

Ranking of RUOs on maintaining reports

Rank	No. of RUOs	%
<25% - Very Weak	4	29
25% - 50% - Weak	2	14
50%- 75% - Good	6	43
>75% - Very Good	2	14

Overall Evaluation of RUOs on maintaining reports

The overall evaluation of RUOs on the total points scored is as follows.

Points received by the RUOs under Records

Variables	Expctd.	Recvd.	%
Number of necessary reports	42	23	54
Quality of records	42	17	40
Total	84	40	48

The percentage of the total points scored under maintaining reports is 48 per cent therefore, the report maintaining of overall RUOs can be evaluated as Weak.

4.4.7. Evaluation of RUOs on Funding

Funding of RUOs are evaluated on the availability of funds and on funding sources. Total of 12 RUOs (86 per cent) are having funds. Findings on funding of those 12 RUOs are given below.

Collection of funds

Amount	No. of RUO	%
Above Rs. 100,000	03	25
Between Rs. 50,000 - Rs. 100,000	01	8
Between Rs. 25,000 - Rs. 50,000	01	8
Between Rs. 10,000 - Rs. 25,000	01	8
Between Rs. 2,000 - Rs. 5,000	04	33
Below Rs. 2,000	02	17

Funding Sources

Sources	No. of RUOs	
Only from SCOR grants	05	42
Between 50% to 75% SCOR grants + shares and profits	03	25
Below 50% SCOR grants + shares and profits	01	08
Collection by the RUO itself	03	17

However, the fund collected by the RUOs themselves is not much significant just around Rs. 2000.

Ranking of RUOs under Funding

Total points scored by each of the RUO is given in the Annex 4. Full points were not given to the RUOs which are having small amount of fund even it is self collected. Ranking of RUO on funding is as follows:

Ranking of RUOs on funding

Rank	No. of RUOs	%
<25% - Very Weak	5	36
25% - 50% - Weak	4	29
50%- 75% - Good	3	21
>75% - Very Good	2	14

Overall Evaluation of RUOs on Funding

The overall evaluation of RUOs on funding one the total points scored is as follows.

Total points received by RUOs under funding

Sub-Variables	Expected	Received	%
Fund availability	70	36	51
Funding sources	56	18	32
Total	126	54	43

The percentage of the total points scored under funding is 43 therefore the RUOs under funding can be evaluated overall as Weak.

4.4.8. Evaluation of RUOs under Financial Management

The RUOs are evaluated under the Financial management on quality of financial records, clarity of fund withdrawal procedure, presenting budget, membership knowledge on fund availability and use of funds.

Finding under financial management

Sub-variables	No. of RUOs	%
Quality of records good	04	33*
Quality of records moderate	05	42
Quality of records is weak	03	25
Fund withdrawal procedure is clear	09	75
Present budget on a given date	06	50
Budget presented without clear date	04	33

* Percentage is out of the RUOs having funds

Sub Variables	No. of members	%
Know the availability of funds	66	56*
Know the amount	14	12
Know how funds utilized	32	27
Know the presentation of budget	35	29

* Percentage of the sample members of RUOs having funds.

Ranking the RUOs on Financial Management

Only those RUGs which are having funds are evaluated under financial management. The points scored under financial management by each of the RUO are given in Annex 4. Ranking of RUOs on financial management is given below.

Ranking of RUOs on financial management

Rank	No. of RUOs	%
<25% - Very Weak	-	-
25% - 50% - Weak	7	58
50%- 75% - Good	4	33
>75% - Very Good	1	8

Overall Evaluation of Financial Management of RUOs

The overall evaluation of the RUOs on financial management of RUOs is given below.

Total points received by RUOs under Financial Management

Sub-variables	Expctd.	Rcvd.	%
Quality of records	28	13	46
Clarity of funds withdrawal procedure	28	18	64
Presenting budget	28	16	57
Member knowledge on fund collection	28	11	39
Member knowledge on use of funds	28	06	21
Total	140	64	46

According to the percentage of the total points received the financial management of overall RUGs can be evaluated as Weak.

4.4.9. Evaluation of RUOs on Investment by Organization

If an RUO is engaged in any profit making activity continually for some time that activity was taken as a business venture for evaluating the investment in business. The evaluation is done on whether they have any such business activities, the shares of the organization, whether a profit was earned and whether the profit has been re-invested.

Sub-Variable	No. of RUOs	%
Involved in business activities	5	36
Engaged in one activity	3	21
Engaged in two activities	1	7
Engaged in more than two activities	1	7
Investment only from SCOR funds	2	14
50% to 75% SCOR funds + member shares	3	21
Profit earned	5	37
Profit is less than 15% of investment	3	21
Profit is more than 15% of investment	2	14
Profit re-invested	4	29

Providing input supplies, mainly fertilizer is predominant in the business activities. One RUO, the Horagala East FO is engaged in diversified business activities ranging from a retail shop, tea leaf collection and transport, collection of agro-products and input supplies. Next, the Ihala Millawa FO is involved in plant nursery and fertilizer supplies. Plant Nursery is taken as a business activity as they have signed agreements with some agencies to provide plants. The other RUO the Bodeniya TSHDS is involved in many activities but they are mainly services though some profits are earned and therefore, only the input supply is taken as the

business activity of them. The fourth RUO the Bata Andura North FO is engaged in input supply. The last of the five RUO, the Aninkanda SO is engaged in providing inputs. The Thenipita SO is not included in doing business activities as those activities they started have stopped half way.

All those five RUOs are funded by the SCOR under mini-projects. Three RUOs have invested the member shares along with the funds provided by the SCOR.

All the five RUOs have earned profits from their business activities. However, the profits earned in one of the RUOs is not much significant.

The details of the profits earned are clear and up-to-date only in two RUOs. In others, the evaluation was done on the verbal details given by the OBs. Three RUOs have earned profits around 18% of the total investments according to those details provided. Still those profits are not divided among the members in any of those RUOs mainly because these business activities have been started recently. Four RUOs have reinvested the profits earned.

Ranking the RUOs on Investment

The points scored by each of the RUOs are given in the Annex 4. The ranking of RUOs under investment is as follows.

Ranking of RUOs on Investment

Rank	No. of RUOs	%
<25% - Very Weak	9	64
25% - 50% - Weak	2	14
50%- 75% - Good	1	7
>75% - Very Good	2	14

Overall Evaluation under the Investment

The overall evaluation of the RUOs on investment under the total points received as follows. It was assumed that all the RUOs should be involved in business activities.

Total Points Received by RUOs under Investment

Sub Variables	Expected	Received	%
No. of business	28	8	29
Investment	28	8	29
Profit earned	28	4	14
Re-investing profit	28	8	28
Total	112	28	25

According to the percentage of the total points scored the investment by overall RUOs can be evaluated as Very Weak.

4.4.10. Legal Recognition

Under the legal recognition the RUOs are evaluated on receiving the formal legal recognition. Total of 12 RUOs (86 per cent) have received legal recognition by getting registered with relevant government agencies. Eight RUOs (57 per cent) including those two SOs are registered with the DAS under the Clause 56A of the Agrarian Services Act. TSHDSs (29 per cent) are registered with the TSHDA. One RUO, the Dotalugala Heritage is registered with the Central Environmental Authority.

Under the legal recognition the total points expected to be received by the RUOs is 72 with six points to each. The total points scored is 72 which is 86 per cent of the total and therefore evaluated as Very Good.

The RUO which has not received legal recognition is the Micro-hydro Power Users' Organization. However, they are having much institutional recognition from the Divisional Secretariat, the IRDP and some other NGOs. Therefore, in the final evaluation this RUO will be taken as having institutional recognition.

4.4.11. Affiliation with other Organizations and Higher Level Committees

Under this indicator the RUOs are evaluated on their affiliations with other organizations. Total of 10 RUOs (71 per cent) are affiliated to higher level organizations or committees. Eight RUOs (57 per cent) said that they are affiliated to respective Service Organizations. Three FOs (21 per cent) said that they are affiliated to the Agrarian Services District Committee. All three TSHDSs (1 per cent) are affiliated to the TSHDSs' District Committee while one is affiliated up to the National level committees.

The total points expected to be received under affiliations with other organizations with six points to each is 84. Total points received is 60 which is 71 per cent of the total. Accordingly the RUOs are evaluated under affiliations as Good.

4.4.12. Member Beneficial Services, Cultural and Social Activities

Under this indicator the RUOs are evaluated on their involvement in providing member benefit services and doing other social and cultural activities which are necessary for the long term sustainability as community organizations.

Total 09 RUOs (64 per cent) are involved in member benefit services. Seven RUOs (50 per cent) out of them are engaged in long term member beneficial services such as provision of inputs on easy terms, transporting farmer products at reduced transport charges and collecting tea leaves etc.. The Horagala East FO provides the members inputs on credit, transport tea leaves on reduced charges, and collect a road development fund. The Bodeniya TSHDS provides various services to its members including providing fertilizer on credit, death donations and housing loans. Two other RUOs (14 per cent) have facilitated the supplying of coconut plants, spray machines on easy terms etc..

Only 05 (36 per cent) RUOs have involved in any social or cultural activities and they are limited to religious activities.

Evaluation of RUOs on providing member benefit services and doing social and cultural work

The points received by each of the RUO on providing services and doing social and cultural work are given in the Annex 4. Ranking the RUOs on this indicator is as follows.

Ranking of RUOs on providing services and doing social and cultural work.

Rank	No. of RUOs	%
<25% - Very Weak	5	36
25% - 50% - Weak	2	14
50%- 75% - Good	4	29
>75% - Very Good	3	21

Overall evaluation under the member beneficial activities, and cultural and social work of the RUOs.

The of RUOs are evaluated on doing member benefit activities and social and cultural activities on the total points received by them as follows.

Points received services, cultural and social activities

Variables	Expected	Received	%
Services	56	28	50
Social and Cultural work	14	5	36
Total	70	33	47

On the percentage of the total points received the services and social and cultural activities of overall RUOs can be evaluated as Weak.

4.4.13. Summary of Organizational Development of RUOs

Summary of the evaluation of all RUOs under the each indicator according to the above findings is as follows.

Strength of Organizational development of RUOs under Each Indicators

Indicators	Ranking			
	Very Weak	Weak	Good	Very good
Structure	1	2	4	7
Member knowledge	1	-	3	10
Member Attitude	2	4	5	3
Participation	6	4	3	1
Leadership	3	6	1	4
Maintaining Reports	4	2	6	2
Funding	5	4	3	2
Financial Mgt.	-	7	4	1*
Investment	9	2	1	2
Services, Social & Cultural work	5	2	4	3

*Financial management of the RUOs having funds.

Evaluation of Overall RUOs

Indicators	Status
Structure	Very Good
Member knowledge	Very Good
Member Attitude	Good
Participation	Weak
Leadership	Good
Reporting	Weak
Funding	Weak
Financial Mgt. (of 10)	Weak
Investment	Very Weak
Legal recognition	Very Good
Affiliations	Good
Services	Weak

Ranking the RUOs on Total Points Scored

The total points received by each of the RUO are given in the Annex 4. Ranking of the RUOs on the total points scored is as follows.

Ranking RUOs on Organizational strength

Rank	No. of RUOs	%
<25% - Very Weak	1	7
25% - 50% - Weak	5	36
50%- 75% - Good	4	29
>75% - Very Good	4	29

Individual Ranking of RUOs

Rank	RUOs	Type
Very Weak	1. Pathawita FO	FO
Weak	1. Thenipita SO 2. Nilwala Anthurium Growers' Organization 3. Pathawita TSHDS 4. Nawalahena FO 5. Kotapola North FO	SO FO TSHDS FO FO
Good	1. Dotalugala Heritage 2. Beralapanathara TSHDs 3. Aninkanda SO 4. Ihala Milla FO	NGO TSHDS SO FO
Very Good	1. Horagala East FO 2. Micro-hydro Power Users' Organization 3. Kotapola North TSHDS 4. Batandura North FO	FO Micro-Hydro Power TSHDS FO

4.5. Conclusions

4.5.1. Organizational Development of RUGs

Under the organizational development of RUGs, 42 percent of the total sample is ranked as good, 33 per cent is ranked as weak and 25 per cent is ranked as very weak according to the total points received by each of them. None of the RUGs received the points up to the level of very good.

The membership knowledge and the attitude on the RUGs are at a better level. Total of 94 per cent of the members knew the existence of the groups, while 83 per cent knew the objectives. Next, 71 per cent still believe that the groups are useful though only 54 per cent are satisfied with the work done by the RUGs.

Next, the leadership of the RUG also at a better level. Leadership of 06 RUGs was ranked as very good and in 7 RUGs it was ranked as good totalling up to 54 per cent. This may be due to the possibility for a small group to identify a suitable leadership with the involvement of all members as well as more opportunities for the IO to involve in selecting them.

Apart from the above two, most of the other areas of organizational development particularly the member participation, reporting and funding in the RUGs were weak. Member participation was at the level of good only in 08 RUGs (33 per cent). Under reporting only 09 RUGs (42 per cent) received points above 50 per cent. Total 07 RUGs (29 per cent) did not have any reporting

system. Only two RUGs (8 per cent) received points above 50 per cent under funding.

All the 10 RUGs those ranked as good received high points for leadership. Six RUGs received 80 percent of total points, 03 received 70 per cent of the total points, and one received 60 percent of total points for leadership. Nine out of those 10 RUGs had received grants from the SCOR project. Eight of these RUGs had been formed with the initiation of the IOs. Membership of six of those RUGs was below 10. Six RUGs out of those were single production groups.

Very low points were scored under the Leadership by all the six RUGs ranked as very weak: two RUGs received 40 per cent, another two received 30 percent, one received 2 per cent and the other received 10 per cent. None of those six RUGs had received grants under the SCOR project. Five out of the total six that ranked as very weak were multi functional groups. Four of them are those Project Groups built out of the maps by the IOs. However, five RUGs had been formed recently during the first three months of 1995.

When both the RUGs that ranked as good and very weak are compared together it can be seen that the factors conducive to the success of the groups are better leadership, concentrating on to single production oriented activity, low membership, provision of grants and the strategies followed in forming the groups. Particularly, it is noteworthy that none of the 10 groups which were ranked as good had been formed out of maps. Being somewhat new is not a reason for receiving low points since one of the RUGs which were ranked as good had also been built new. Those ranked as very weak had remained idling after they had been formed.

Having 42 per cent of the RUGs ranked as good cannot be taken as much progress in regard to the organizational development of RUGs not only because there is no any group above the level of good but also there is a gradual decrease of the number of existing RUGs. When the study was commenced only 49 RUGs existed out of the recorded 80 odd groups. It is possible that those ranked as very weak out of the existing RUGs would also be defunct and disappeared. One can find that this is mostly due to the strategies followed in building and developing the RUGs.

While getting the participation of users is one of the most difficult problem confronted both planners and implementers in watershed management the SCOR team members in the Nilwala watershed had taken it as a simple exercise. According to the experience learned in elsewhere all the key people involved in the project had spent much time learning from the villagers, earning their confidence and respect before they could experiment and introduce new methods going against traditional ways of doing things. Next, efforts to deal with hill areas and backward communities must be

comprehensive and long term. (1984 - India. Planning Commissions' Working Group on Hill Area Development.).

According to the discussions held with the users, and other evidences the SCOR team members had initially built the groups by calling general meetings of users without adequate dialogues or creating much awareness in the users. When looking at some groups thus formed such as Soil Conservation Groups formed solely for soil conservation, Milk producers groups of those who had not engaged in animal husbandry before, and numerous api-culture groups with fancy names it is clear that the users had formed them without much understanding. None of such groups exists now.

. Next, the easier but most vulnerable strategy of creating big hopes among the users in order to get the participation had been used by the SCOR team members. Mostly the groups were given idea that they would be provided with funds. It was learned that some agency personnel too had given this idea to users. The group thus formed had high expectations of getting funds and many of them were idling till the funds were provided. This resulted in forming of highly fragile groups.

Sending the IOs to the communities beforehand to move closely with them, and to understand social and economic factors of the community, local institutional capacities and local leaders was one of the strategies followed in building irrigators associations. (1983- Illo, Javier. 1985 - Uphoff, 1989 - Reyes). Though there had been such experience in Sri Lanka and many other countries, the IOs had been sent to the project area some time later. By the time they were sent already the group had been formed and according to the IOs they were given the files opened of those groups formed to continue with. Prior understanding of the community was particularly important for the IOs as they were new to this social set up as almost all had worked in the dry zone irrigation systems.

When many of the RUGs were gradually become defunct and some did not exist any longer, the IOs on the pressure of building more groups had used methods such as grouping the community by using maps and in some instances group leaders themselves had been named by IOs. But as seen above only the number of the weak groups was increased.

Following a clear strategy in strengthening the RUGs cannot be seen afterwards the formation of the groups. The IOs mentioned that they could not meet the groups frequently after they had been formed due to the workload they had. Need for continuous identification of training needs and provision of necessary training had not given much thought. Some IOs said that they were not even aware of the availability of allocations for training.

4.5.2. Organizational Development of RUOs

Under the organizational development of the RUOs, 04 were ranked as very good (29 per cent) and another 04 (29 per cent) were ranked as good which were 57 per cent of the total organizations. Only one RUO (7 per cent) was ranked as very weak.

The RUOs recieved high points under structure, membership knowledge and attitude. Though overall leadership of the RUOs was ranked as good, in compared to the RUGs the leadership of the RUOs were not as better as the RUGs. The leadership was ranked as good only in 05 RUGs (36 per cent). The large memebrship, low level of involvement of OB selections, difficluty for IOs to involve more are some of the reasons for this.

The member participation was weak in the RUOs as in the RUGs. Member participation was ranked as good only in 05 RUOs (36 per cent) with one ranked as very good. Total of 06 RUOs (43 per cent) the member participation was ranked as very weak. Regular meetings had been held only in 04 RUOs (29 per cent).

The reporting of the RUOs at a better level with total of 08 RUOs were ranked as good in reporting with two ranked as very good. The assistance of SCOR presonnel had recived many of these RUOs in report maintaining. The report maintaining of some of the RUOs wasat a very high level. Though almost 12 RUOs were having funds their overall funding and financial management were weak. Under the overall evaluation, the areas such as investment was ranked as very weak and most of those who had invested in business ventures had invovled with the assistance from the SCOR proejct.

Organizational Development of the RUOs Formed under the SCOR

Out of the total sample, five RUOs have been formed under the SCOR project as direct user organizations which include the Dotalugala Heritage, Nilwala Anthurium Growers' Organization, Micro-hydro Power Users' Organization, and the two service organizations. Apart from that one FO had also been formed with the initiation of the SCOR personnel. Rest of the others were those existing organizations built for other purposes.

As mentioned above only the Anthuriuam Flower Growers' organization had been formed based on user groups. The Dotalugala Heritage had been formed comprised of all members while the Micro-hydro Power Users organization can be regarded as one developed from a user group.

The Micro-hydro Power Users' Organization received the ranking of Very good, Dotalugala Heritage and the Aninkanda SO received the ranking of Good, and the Nilwala Anthurium Growers' organization received the ranking of Weak under the organizational development. The FO which was formed with the initiation of the SCOR personnel

too received the ranking of Good under the organizational development.

Micro-Hydro Power Users Organization

Micro-hydro Power Users' Organization have been formed with the initiation of the SCOR personnel for the purpose of providing electricity to its 48 members by constructing a Micro-Hydropower plant with a capacity of 5.25 KW in the Horagala SWS. The organization have been formed by the potential users. By the time the study was over the total construction of the micro-hydro power house was completed. The project was supported by the SCOR, IRDP, ITDG and the Provincial Administration.

The total cost of the project was Rs. 642,146 and 56 per cent of it had been provided by the IRDP. Seventeen per cent had been provided by the SCOR as a revolving fund. The ITDG had provided equipment worth of 2 per cent while the rest of 25 percent had been borne by the organization. Each members had contributed cash of Rs. 1500 while all the construction work had been implemented through group works.

The SCOR had coordinated the other agencies for their assistance and it was observed that the organization was under the close guidance and instructions of the SCOR personnel. Initially it had been formed as a group but soon developed to a formal organization having permanent members, specific objectives, goals, rules and regulations.

The organization received high points under each of the indicators in the organizational development. Particularly high points were received under leadership, knowledge, satisfaction and participation of members, and financial management.

Progress of this organization could be attributed to many factors such as:

1. Building on visible benefits and a felt need.
2. Better leadership
3. Provision of financial and material support by other agencies.
4. Guidance and assistance and moral support given by the SCOR.
5. Building of a high level of group consciousness.
6. Coordinated support of different agencies.
7. Homogeneous community
8. Better community acceptance of the Agency Officers.

Since the access roads to Horagala SWS were not motorworthy there was no much contact with this community by the Agency officers before the commencement of the SCOR project. There was much acceptance from the community when they were approached by the officers of different agencies for the first time under the SCOR project and it made the mobilization of the community easy.

However, due to the heavy dependant on SCOR support a development of some dependency of this organization on the SCOR personnel could be seen.

Dotalugala Heritage

The Dotalugala Heritage is a NGO exclusively formed for common land conservation with the initiation of the SCOR team. The major components of their activities were reforestation of the Dotalugala hill, and road and stream reservation conservation.

Most of the possible planned activities of the organization had been completed when the study was completed through extensive group works participated by the members, school children, members of nearby RUOs and RUGs. Participation of the school children had been at a very high level. The officers attached to the provincial administration and the FD together with the SCOR team members had involved in these activities. At one time the activities under the common property conservation of SCOR had been concentrated mainly to Dotalugala. The organization is having a very clear financial records and a better reporting system.

However, it was observed during the study that after the completion of almost all of its activities the organization was gradually declining. It received very low points under leadership and membership attitude under the evaluation of the organizational development. The total points scored by the Dotalugala Heritage under the organizational development were just above the level of weak. There are several reasons for the decline of this organization.

Formation of the organization on a weak base. It could be seen that the Dotalugala Heritage had been formed on a very weak base. Though it was a registered organization still there was no constitution when the study was conducted. There was no executive committee for the organization. The total membership was not clear let alone the membership criteria. The members had been enrolled very recently by imposing a condition by the IO when distributing some coconut plants supplied through SCOR involvement. The coconut plants were given only to those who become the members of the Dotalugala Heritage!

Lack of activities to continue. After the completion of the planned activities the functions of the organizations had been stopped as there was no other main activity to be continued. The only activity the organization engaged in at the time the study was conducted was guarding the trees planted by hiring a watcher from the grants provided by the SCOR according to the project plan. The people of the area said that person responsible for guarding the planted trees was not doing his job properly and described it as a waste of money. The grants provided by the SCOR to the organization were idling at the moment.

Not paying much attention by SCOR personnel. The organization had been almost neglected by the SCOR personnel after the completion of the all possible work. The organization needed further assistance as it functioned mostly with the assistance provided by the SCOR and other Agency officers. It was observed that there was a total absence of monitoring of organizational activities by the SCOR team when the study was conducted.

Losing the popularity of the OBs. It was observed that the OBs of the organization were gradually becoming unpopular among the members. The leadership was not accepted to most of the present members as they had not involved in the selection of OBs. On the other hand the OBs were strong supporters of the previous government and disliked by many who supported the present government.

Nilwala Anthurium Growers' Organization

Nilwala Anthurium Growers' Organization is the only organization built on groups out of the sample. Also, it has been formed on the initiation of the members themselves. The main objective of the organization is to provide marketing facilities for the products of the members. Other than that it is expected to provide facilities such as provision of inputs.

The total points received by this organization under the organizational development were little beyond the level of very weak. This organization was not still functioning and remaining at its inception level when the study was conducted. There are several reasons for this situation.

Low level of production. The production of anthuriuam flowers was still at a very low level due to some agricultural and organizational problems.

Difficulty to make marketing arrangements. The organization was still not able to make worthwhile marketing arrangements for whatever the products of its members. The organization was not strong enough to arrange such marketing facilities on their own without some outside assistance.

Not receiving adequate assistance. The organization was not receiving sufficient assistance and guidance yet from the SCOR personnel for its organizational development as well as for planning other activities such as making marketing arrangements. As an organization at its inception level it required lot of assistance and guidance. The assistance given by SCOR personnel was not adequate enough. Next, the organization was still not established among its members. It had been formed initially with 10 group leaders and still not gone in to the general membership.

Service Organizations

Building SOs is a unique component in the institution building program of the SCOR project. By the time the study was commenced all the 04 SOs had been formed in the four SWSs. Two SOs formed in the Aninkanda SWS and Thenipita SWS had started their activities after preparing mini-projects and receiving the SCOR grants. Those two SOs which had commenced their activities were selected for the sample. The main activities initially started by these two SOs were collecting of minor crops and the provision of the input such as fertilizer.

According to the total points scored under the evaluation of the organizational development the Aninkanda SO was ranked as good and the Thenipita SO was ranked as weak. However, the total points received by the Thenipita SO were just above very weak while the total points received by Aninkanda SO were just above weak.

The Thenipita SO did not receive any points under membership satisfaction and participation and received very low points under the membership knowledge, leadership and reporting. However, maintaining of financial reports in the Thenipita SO found to be at a better level.

The Aninkanda SO received low points under membership participation, reporting and financial management. However, it received high points under the leadership. It was found that the financial records were not up to date in the Aninkanda SO.

The two SOs were fast declining by the time the study was started. All the activities of the Thenipita SO were stopped and become almost defunct while the functions of the Aninkanda SO were limited to just the provision of fertilizer. The are many reasons for the present status of these two SOs. Some of them are similar to both the SOs.

Preparing the project without identifying users' real needs. The OBs particularly of the Thenipita SO said that the project proposals were prepared mostly according to the suggestions of the SCOR personnel. However, this was refuted by the SCOR team members stating that the projects had been prepared with the users after discussing together. What the OBs said seemed to be true since the projects of both SOs are similar. It was observed that the SCOR personnel had developed participatory planning skills very much later.

Low level of guidance and involvement of SCOR personnel. It was observed that there was no much involvement of SCOR personnel after the SO had started their activities. Particularly no one from the SCOR had monitored the progress of their activities at least even the handling of finance. It was observed that the OBs had almost

forgotten many of the project plans and it took some time for them to find the copies of the proposals for us.

Low level of awareness among the community of the SOs. According to the OBs there was no much awareness among the community about the SOs and the benefits of them. For example the community members had no much understanding on the arrangements of the collection of minor crops by the SOs. Lack of awareness is particularly true with the Thenipita SO since the SWS covers a large area.

Formation of the SOs pre-mutually. It seems that the SOs had been formed pre-mutually when there was no such a need since other RUGs and RUOs were not developed to a level of requiring such services. The other RUGs and RUOs were still gradually developing and were not ventured into any substantial production activities. The SCOR personnel themselves said that the participant at the planning discussions of the SO had no much idea on the services they needed. It seems that the SOs had been formed to fulfill a requirement of the SCOR project plans.

There are some particular reasons relevant to Thenipita SO for its present status.

Weak Leadership. The OBs of the Thenipita SO were found to be very weak. Any devotion to fulfill their responsibilities could not be seen in them. They had accepted those positions expecting personal gains such as financial benefits. The chairman had once tried to misappropriate grants given by SCOR for a coconut plant nursery. On the other hand these OBs were found to be not much popular among the community.

Next, the office bearers live in distant places from each other and meeting together frequently to discuss the matters relating to the SOs was difficult for them. It could be seen some influence of SCOR personnel in selecting them with some wrong notions about the leadership qualities of them.

On the other hand the Aninkanda SO had progressed better than the Thenipita SO almost due to the better leadership of it. The OBs of the Aninkanda SO was found to be very much devoted and recognized by others.

Organizational Development of FOs

Out of the total 06 FOs selected for the sample, one was ranked as very good, 02 was ranked as good, another 02 was ranked as weak and one was ranked as very weak according to the total points received. The FO formed with the initiation of the SCOR personnel was among those ranked as good.

As mentioned before, all the FOs existed in the Nilwala watershed were very weak when the SCOR project was commenced. The

IOs had involved in strengthening the FOs more freely. The OBs of those better functioning FOs said that their organizations were developed to the present level after the involvement of the SCOR personnel.

Batandura North FO

The Batandura North FO which was ranked as Very Good received high points in all the indicators under the organizational development. Particularly, it received 92 percent of the total points under the leadership. The leadership of this FO was found to be very devoted.

Horagala East FO

The total points received by the Horagala East FO which was involved in many activities were little less than that required for the rank of very good. It received low points both under leadership and financial management. It was learnt that the chairman was losing his popularity among the members. Next, the financial records of this organization were not up to date and found to be very unclear by the time the study was conducted. Most of the activities were implemented by the Project Assistant appointed under the Mini-project of the SCOR. It was found that there was no much monitoring by the SCOR personnel on the affairs of this organization though substantial funds had been provided to them.

Though this organization had been formed by the DAS under the Agrarian Services Act most of its activities and services were relevant to tea cultivation. This was particularly because there was no TSHDS in the Horagala SWS. On the other hand almost all those activities and services were implementing under the mini-project of the SCOR project.

Ihala Millawa FO

The Ihala Millawa FO which had been built under the SCOR initiation was at a moderate level and received good points under most of the indicators. But under the leadership and financial management it received only half of the expected points. Much of its activities had started recently after a fresh selection of office bearers and some of the activities had just begun. High level political involvement could be seen in this FO.

Kotapola North FO

Though the SCOR personnel had been involved with the Kotapola North FO for some time the progress was slow due to the poor leadership qualities of the OBs particularly of the chairman. The chairman was expecting personal gains with his involvement in the FO activities. He had even made attempt to misappropriate some funds granted from the SCOR project for a coconut nursery. The OBs

had been changed recently and the FO was gradually progressing. The total points it received was just below the level of good.

Nawalahena FO

The Nawalahena FO which was ranked as weak had been approached by the SCOR personnel recently and was gradually progressing.

Pathawita FO

The Pathawita FO which was ranked as very weak had been approached by SCOR personnel very recently. This FOs is a fine example for those existed before the SCOR project. This FO was existing just namesake and highly politicized. It did not receive any points under reporting, funding and financial management as still these areas were not developed. The points it received under the member satisfaction and participation, and leadership was below 25 per cent of the expected totals.

Organizational Development of TSHDSs

Out of the total TSHDSs selected under the sample, 01 was ranked as very good, one was ranked as good and the remaining one was ranked as weak according to the total points received under the organizational development.

Kotapola North (Bodeniya) TSHDS

The Kotapola North (Bodeniya) TSHDS which was ranked as very good scored the highest points out of the total RUOs under the organizational development. It received high points under the membership knowledge and satisfaction, reporting, funding, investment and social and cultural works.

The Kotapola North TSHDS had the total membership of 526 which was the highest among all the RUOs. This organization functions more like a welfare society. Its welfare activities were: functioning as a death donation society, provision of housing loans, provision of functional equipments such as tents, chaired etc.., and matrimonial contributions. The activities of this TSHDS for the development of tea cultivation was mostly limited to the provision of fertilizer and other inputs under a fertilizer credit scheme of the TSHDA.

This organization had the highest collection of funds among the RUOs which was around Rs. 600,000. The main funding sources were member shares, profits from inputs supplies, interests from credits provided to members and SCOR grants. The number of records it maintained was about 20 and they were very systematic.

This organization was having its own office and a meeting place. There was a paid office assistant to help the office work of the organization.

The progress of this organization could be totally attributed to the efforts and hard works of its chairman. He had developed his leadership qualities and community development capacities by working as a rural leader under the Sarvodaya Movement. So much leadership qualities and devotion could be seen in this leader.

Because the organization was developed to the present level through the energetic efforts of the chairman it was found that the organization was totally depending on him. The chairman himself admitted the possible collapse of the organization if his leadership was withdrawn. As the chairman was the most important figure of the organization the positions of the rest of the OBs had become insignificant. This situation had been further aggravated due to the large number of membership of the organization since many of the members had not involved in OB selections and were not having direct contacts except with the chairman. According to the questionnaire survey results of the Study 98 per cent out of the total sample knew the chairman while only 33 per cent knew the Secretary and 40 per cent knew the Treasurer.

However, the points received under the financial management by this organization was only half of the total. The financial records were not up to date when the study was conducted and the details in the reports were complicated. The chairman himself admitted that the safety of the funds of the organization depend on the honesty of the chairman.

Apart from implementing some of the activities under the intervention areas of the SCOR project through this TSHDS, inputs for organizational development had not been required from the SCOR personnel as the organization was functioning at a very good level.

Beralapanathara TSHDS

Beralapanathara TSHDS was ranked as good according to the points received under the organizational development. It received moderate points under each indicator and high points for its leadership. This organization which had been idling for sometime had been revived with the involvement of the IO of the SCOR project.

Beralapanathara TSHDs is an example for a typical good Tea Society. The OBs are traditional village leaders and they command some respect from the members. Some little funds had been collected as membership fee. They had just started the provision of fertilizer under the fertilizer credit scheme of the TSHDA which is the main objective of the TSHDs. Members were satisfied as they too were not expecting more than providing them fertilizer under

this scheme. However, the members and OBs were expecting that they would be assisted under the SCOR project such as providing them grants. This had created some new expectations among the members to make the organization somewhat lively.

Pathawita TSHDS

Pathawita TSHDS was ranked as weak according to the total points received under the organizational development. It received low points under each of the indicators except the membership knowledge.

This TSHDs had been inactive for sometime and revived with the involvement of the IO. However, the involvement of the IO was recent.

There was little interest of both the members and the OBs in the organization. The OBs had tried to provide fertilizer recently after the approach of the SCOR personnel but stopped at the first attempt. It was observed at a selection of OBs there was a difficulty find someone to fill some positions as all those who were proposed were reluctant to accept them.

Chapter 5

Performance in Production and Conservation

5.1. Introduction

The need for simultaneous production and conservation is now well accepted in watershed management programs (1995 - Sharma, Dixon). Production and conservation in related to the utilization of land and water is the core of the SCOR interventions. The RUGs have been formed covering all the production and conservation activities in the SCOR interventions areas either on single purpose or on several purposes. The RUOs are supposed to cover the total production and conservation activities within the areas under them. The RUGs and RUOs are expected to mobilize the resources for production and conservation, enhance the production capacities of their members, establish marketing links for acquisition of inputs and marketing of their products and develop the investment capacities. It is expected in this chapter to evaluate the performance of the sample RUGs and RUOs in production and conservation activities on achievements of targets, and on establishing market links.

5.2. Involvement of RUGs in Private land Production and Conservation

Out of the total 24 RUGs, 18 (75 per cent) were involved directly in private land production and conservation activities as their main activity. As both the production and conservation in private lands are included in one package RUGs invariably involved in both.

The two major areas that the RUGs involved in private production and conservation were the Homestead Development and Tea Land Production and Conservation. Apart from a RUG built to conduct a seed paddy farm there were no other RUGs formed in the intervention area of Paddy. Six RUGs have been formed with specific objectives; three for Flori Culture, one for Banana Cultivation, one for Coconut Cultivation and one for Seed Paddy. The first five have been built under the Homestead development.

Fourteen out of the total RUGs (58 per cent) were involved in Homestead Development. The total number of RUGs involved in Tea Land Production and protection was 10 (42 per cent). Seven out of them were involved both in the intervention areas of Tea and Homestead.

Ten RUGs (56 per cent) of those 18 RUGs which were involved in private land production and conservation were having clear targets. But the targets were monitored only in 05. Achievement of targets was not clear in others.

5.3. Progress of RUGs in Production and Conservation in Private Lands

The progress achieved by the RUGs in the three areas of homestead development, tea land production and conservation and seed paddy production that they were involved is given below. Since there was no much documentation practice among the RUGs on the progress they achieved, information provided by the group leaders was taken in evaluating the progress.

5.3.1. Progress under the Homestead Development

Progress in homestead development both according to the information provided by the group leaders is as follows.

Progress under Production Activities in Homestead Development

Target Achievement	No. of RUGs	%
Below 25% of the target	7	50
Between 25% - 50% of the target	2	14
Between 50% - 75% of the target	3	21
Above 75% of the target	-	
100% of the target	2*	14
Total	14	

* The two RUGs that achieved the full targets were those two built for banana cultivation and coconut cultivation. It was their only activity.

Progress under the Conservation Activities under the Homestead Development

Target Achievement	No. of RUGs	%
Below 25% of the target	6	43
Between 25% - 50% of the target	5	36
Between 50% - 75% of the target	3	21
Total	14	100

5.3.2. Progress under the Tea land Production and Conservation

The progress achieved by the RUGs in tea land production and conservation is given below. Both the production and conservation is evaluated together as both are included in one package unlike in homestead development.

Progress under the Tea Land Production and Conservation

Target Achievement	No. of RUGs	%
Below 25% of the target	9	90
Between 25% - 50% of the target	1	10
Total	10	

5.3.3. Progress under Seed Paddy Farm

The RUG formed for seed paddy production has achieved 52 per cent of the target.

5.4. Involvement of RUGs in Common Property Production and Conservation

Total of 12 RUGs (50 per cent) were directly involved in common land production and conservation activities. RUGs formed under Plant Nurseries are included under the common property production and conservation as they too were involved in common property conservation activities.

The Activity that the RUGs were most frequently involved under common property was stream reservation conservation. The frequency of the involvement of RUGs in common property production and conservation activities is as follows.

Activity	Total no. of RUGs
Stream Reservation Conservation	8
Road Reservation Conservation	4
Plant Nursery	3
Forestry	2
Agro Forestry	1

Apart from the 12 RUGs directly involved in the common property production and conservation another 07 RUGs had involved in those activities. Thereby, the total of 19 RUGs (79 per cent) were involved in common land production and conservation activities. Mostly they had participated in the group works conducted for road and stream reservation conservation activities.

Seven RUGs were directly involved both in private and common property production and conservation as their main activities. Four of them were those Project Groups. Two other Stream Reservation conservation groups were involved in private land production and conservation.

Eleven RUGs (46 per cent) were having clear targets in their common land production and conservation activities. Targets had been monitored only in 05 (21 per cent) of them.

5.5. Progress of RUGs in Common Land Production and Conservation

The activities under the common land production and conservation are almost related to conservation therefore, the progress is evaluated taking both in one package. Since there was no much documented data with the RUGs, information given by the group leaders was taken in the evaluation of the progress in some cases.

5.5.1. Progress in Stream Reservation Conservation

The progress achieved by RUGs in the stream reservation conservation is as follows.

Progress under Stream Reservation Conservation

Target Achievement	No. of RUGs	%
Below 25% of the target	2	25
Between 25% - 50% of the target	2	25
Between 50% - 75% of the target	2	25
Above 75%	1	12.5
100% achieved	1	12.5
Total	8	100

5.5.2. Progress in Road Reservation Conservation

Progress achieved by each of the RUGs under the Road Reservation Conservation is as follows.

Progress under Road Reservation Conservation

Target Achievement	No. of RUGs	%
Below 25% of the target	2	50
Between 25% - 50% of the target	1	25
100% achieved	1	25
Total	4	100

5.5.3. Progress in Plant Nursery

All three RUGs that conducted plant nurseries had achieved the full targets.

5.5.4. Progress in Forestry

One forestry groups of the sample had achieved the full target while the other had achieved 60 percent of its target.

5.5.5. Progress in Agro Forestry

The achievement targets by the RUG involved in agro-forestry was below 25 per cent.

5.6. Evaluation of RUGs under the Private Land Production and Conservation

RUGs are evaluated under the Private Land Production and Conservation on their involvement, and the achievement of targets. Achievement of targets of their total activities is taken in the evaluation.

Findings under the involvement in Private Land Production and Conservation

Variables	No.of RUGs	%
Involved in Private land Production	18	75
Involved in one activity	10	56
Involved in Two activities	8	44
<25% of target achieved in production	11	61
25% - 50% of targets achieved in production	02	11
50% - 75% of targets achieved in production	03	17
100% of targets achieved in production	02	11
Involved in Private land Conservation	18	75
Involved in One activity	11	61
Involved in Two activities	7	39
Total Target Achievement <25%	11	61
Total Target Achievement 25% - 50%	05	28
Total Target Achievement 50% - 75%	02	11

Ranking the RUGs on their involvement in Private land Production and Conservation

Points are calculated together for production and conservation as RUGs are expected to be involved in the both under the private land as it is one package. On the other hand points are given in their involvement in two activities as most of the RUGs whatever their main objective was had involved both in the intervention areas of tea land and homestead. In fact such division cannot be made in many cases as homestead is part of the tea cultivation. Points received by each of the RUG is given in the Annex 5. Ranking them according to the points received is as follows.

Ranking the RUGs on Private Land P&C

Ranking	No. of RUGs	%
<25% - Very Weak	7	39
25% - 50% - Weak	11	61
50% - 75% - Good	-	
75% - 100% - Very Good	-	
	18	

Overall Evaluation under the Private Land Production and Conservation

The overall evaluation of the RUGs on their involvement in private land production and conservation according to the total points received is given below.

Total points received under the Private Land Production and Conservation

Sub-variables	Expected	Received	%
Involvement in Productions Achievement of Targets	36 54	21 09	58 17
Involvement in Conservation Achievement of Targets	36 54	21 03	58 06
Total	180	54	30

According to the percentage of the total points scored the involvement in private land production and conservation of overall could be evaluated as Weak.

5.7. Evaluation of RUGs under Common Land Production and Conservation

Findings under the Common Land Production and Conservation indicator are as follows.

Variables	No.of RUGs	%
Involved in Common land P&C Involved in one activity Involved in Two activities	12 08 04	54 67 33

Total Target Achievement <25%	02	17
Total Target Achievement 25% - 50%	03	25
Total Target Achievement 50% - 75%	02	17
Total Target Achievement 75% - 100%	01	8
Total Target Achievement 100%	04	33

*Total targets had been achieved in the RUGs built for one production activity such as Plant Nursery and Forestry etc..

Ranking of RUGs on Common Land Production and Conservation

Total points received by each of the RUG is given in the Annex 5. Ranking of RUGs under private land production and conservation on the points received is as follows.

Ranking RUGs on Common Land Production and Conservation

Ranking	No. of RUGs	%
<25% - Very Weak	3	25
25% - 50% - Weak	3	25
50% - 75% - Good	1	8
75% - 100% - Very Good	5	42
	12	100

Overall evaluation of the RUGs on Common Land Production and Conservation

The overall evaluation of the RUGs on their involvement in the common land production and conservation according to the total points received is given below.

Total points received under the Common Land Production and Conservation

Sub-variables	Expected	Received	%
Involvement in Common land P&C	48	32	67
Achievement of targets	72	32	44
Total	120	64	53

According to the percentage of the total points received the involvement in common land production and conservation by overall RUGs could be evaluated as Good.

5.8. Ranking of the total RUGs on the points received under Production and Conservation

Ranking of the total RUGs on the points they received in production and conservation is as follows. The average of the total points were taken of those RUGs which involved both in private and common land production and conservation as their main activities.

Ranking of RUGs on the points received under total Production and Conservation

Ranking	No. of RUGs	%
<25% - Very Weak	8	33
25% - 50% - Weak	10	42
50% - 75% - Good	3	12.5
75% - 100% - Very Good	3	12.5
	24	100

Overall evaluation of RUGs on their total Involvement in Production and Conservation

The total points expected to be received by the RUGs in their involvement in production and conservation activities is 290. The total points scored by them is 114 (39 per cent). According to the percentage of the total points received the overall progress in their involvement in production and conservation can be evaluated as Weak

5.9. Venture Viability and Market Linkage

The sample RUGs were not involved in such activities.

5.10. Involvement of the RUOs in Production and Conservation

The two Service Organizations and the Dotalugala Heritage are excluded from evaluating under the private land production and conservation. The service organizations are supposed to provide only the services while the Dotalugala Heritage has been formed exclusively for common land conservation.

Total of 08 RUOs (73 per cent) out of the remaining 11 RUOs were involved in private land production and conservation activities. However, only 04 RUGs (50 per cent) were involved directly as their main activities with some targets. Two out of them had been involved under their mini-projects. Total of 07 RUOs (64 per cent) had provided services for private land production and conservation.

The involvement of the RUOs in private land production and conservation is as follows.

Activity	Total RUOs
Tea Land P&C	8
Homestead development	5
Paddy land P&C	3

It was the RUOs (FOs) that had directly involved in the intervention area of paddy land production and conservation, not the RUGs. Involvement of the RUGs was limited to production of seed paddy and they too were under the control of the respective FOs. Other activities related to paddy cultivation such as canal cleaning, land consolidation etc.. had been organized and implemented by the FOs. Some temporary groups had been formed under one FO for land consolidation but they were not regarded as RUGs even by the IO responsible.

Much progress was not achieved by the RUOs under the tea land production and conservation and homestead development. Two RUOs had achieved about 40 per cent of progress in their tea land production and protection activities.

Two RUOs were involved in production of seed paddy under paddy land production and conservation. One out of them had achieved about 60 per cent of the target. The same RUO has achieved 100 per cent of the target under land consolidation of 7 acres of paddy land.

Land Consolidation

Consolidation of some paddy lands cultivated by 28 farmers under Thattumaru system in under the Bata Andura North FO with the initiation of the IO was remarkable in the mannar it had been planned and implemented together with the farmers. Some farmers had to wait for several years till their turn comes for cultivation under the Thattumaru system. There had been many problems because of the thattumaru system such as:

- Difficulty for timely cultivation.
- Land degradation due to erosion, salinity etc... as no one was directly responsible to take conservation measures
- Low level of productivity.
- Difficulty to apply new technologies.

The process followed in the land consolidation was as follows:

- Initial discussions with farmers by the IO.
- Formation of a group of Thattumaru land holders
- Deciding the area of land for each land holder under consolidation
- Interchanging one another to have each one's land in one place

- Mutual agreement under the land area and location
- Land surveying
- Acceptance of the new land holdings by farmers and the DAS.

This process was followed together with the DO of the DAS and some other relevant SCOR personnel such as one engineer assigned as a WMC.

5.11. Involvement of RUOs in Common Land Production and Conservation

The two Service Organizations and the Nilwala Anthurium Growers' Organization are excluded from evaluating under the common land production and conservation. Nine RUOs (82 per cent) out of the rest had involved in Common Land Production and Conservation activities. However, only 05 (45 per cent) had directly involved in common land production and conservation as their main activity. The frequency of their involvement is as follows.

Activity	Total RUOs
Road Reservation Conservation	05
Stream Reservation Conservation	04
Forestry	02
Agro-forestry	01
Plant Nursery	01

Two RUOs had achieved full targets in Road and Stream reservation conservation. One RUOs had achieved full targets in forestry. Total of 07 RUOs (67 per cent) had facilitated in providing services.

5.12. Evaluating the RUOs under the Private land Production and Conservation

The RUOs are evaluated in their involvement in private land production and conservation on the involvement, provision of services and achievement of targets. The two Service Organizations and the Dotalugala Heritage are not evaluated under this indicator. Rest of the eleven RUGs are evaluated under the private land production and conservation as all of them are supposed to be involved in these interventions.

Ranking of RUOs on the Involvement in the Private Land Production and Conservation

Points received by the each of the 11 RUO in their involvement in private land production and conservation are given in the Annex 6. Ranking them under this indicator is as follows.

Ranking RUGs on Private Land Production and Conservation

Ranking	No. of RUGs	%
<25% - Very Weak	4	36
25% - 50% - Weak	6	55
50% - 75% - Good	1	9
75% - 100% - Very Good	-	
Total	11	100

Overall Evaluation of RUOs on Private Land Production and Conservation

The overall evaluation of RUOs on their involvement in private land production and conservation according to the total points scored is given below.

Total points received under private land production and conservation

Sub-variables	Expected	Received	%
Involvement in P&C	44	22	50
Provision of Services	22	16	73
Achievement of targets	66	02	3
Total	132	40	30

The percentage of the total points scored under the private land production and conservation is 30, therefore, the overall involvement of the RUOs in private land production and conservation could be evaluated as Weak.

5.13. Evaluation of RUOs on Common Land Production and conservation

Total of 11 RUOs except those 02 Service Organizations and Nilwala Anthurium Growers' Organizations are evaluated under the common land production and conservation. They are evaluated on their involvement, provision of services and achievement of services.

Ranking of the RUOs on the involvement in common land production and conservation

The points received under the common land production and conservation by each of the RUOs are given in the Annex 6. Ranking them on the points received is as follows.

Ranking the RUOs on the common land production and conservation

Ranking	No. of RUGs	%
<25% - Very Weak	3	27
25% - 50% - Weak	4	37
50% - 75% - Good	1	9
75% - 100% - Very Good	3	27
Total	11	100

Overall Evaluation of RUOs on the common land production and conservation

The overall evaluation of the RUOs on their involvement in common land production and conservation is given below according to the total points received.

Total points received under common land production and conservation

Sub-variables	Expected	Received	%
Involvement in P&C	44	30	68
Provision of Services	22	14	64
Achievement of targets	66	16	24
Total	132	60	45

According to the percentage of the total points received the involvement of overall RUOs in common land production and conservation could be evaluated as Weak.

5.14. Ranking of RUOs on Their Total Involvement in Production and Conservation

The RUOs can be ranked on the overall points scored under the total production and conservation activities they were involved. Averages of the total points were taken if they were involved in more than one activity.

Ranking of RUOs on the Total Involvement in Production and Conservation

Ranking	No. of RUGs	%
<25% - Very Weak	4	36
25% - 50% - Weak	2	18
50% - 75% - Good	4	36
75% - 100% - Very Good	1	9
	11	

Overall Evaluation of RUOs on their total Involvement in Production and Conservation

The total points expected to be scored by the RUOs in their involvement overall involvement in production and conservation is 264. The total points received by all the RUOs are 100 which is 38 per cent of the expected full points. Therefore, the overall involvement of the RUOs in production and conservation can be evaluated as Weak.

5.15. Market Linkages

Under the market linkages the RUOs are evaluated on the establishment of market linkages and on collective supply.

Three RUOs (21 per cent) had established market linkages: the Horagala East FO with some tea factories for selling tea leaves collected from its members, the Ihala Millawa FO with the Department of Minor Export Crop to provide minor export crop plants and the Bata Andura North FO with the DAS to supply seed paddy. However the latter was an informal arrangement.

Out of these only the Horagala East FO had started collective supply of farmer products as per their agreements with tea factories. Apart from that this FO collect minor export crops from the farmers but no firm market arrangement had been made yet. The supply of minor export crop plants by the Ihala Millawa FO had not started yet as the plant nursery was still in progress. The Bata Andura FO had not still started to supply seed paddy to the DAS.

The two SOs are supposed to collect farmer products but still no such activity is started. The collecting of minor export crops by the Thenipita SO had stopped half way.

The Nilwala Anthurium Farmer Organization was still not able to establish any market links to sell the products of their members.

Evaluation of RUOs on Market Linkages

The points received by each of the RUO under the market linkage is given in the Annex 6. Points received by the total RUOs under the market linkages are as follows.

Points received under market linkage

Sub variables	No. of RUGs	%
No any points received	11	79
Received 04 points	02	14
Received full points	01	7

5.16. Conclusions

5.16.1. Progress of RUGs in Production and Conservation

The RUGs which involved in private land P&C had achieved more progress in the activities related to production than the progress in those related to conservation. On the other hand progress of the RUGs in common land P&C is higher than in the progress in private land P&C.

Out the 18 RUGs involved in private land production two RUGs (11 per cent) had achieved 100 per cent of their production targets while another 03 (17 per cent) had achieved targets between 50% and 75% of the production targets.

On the other hand only one RUG (6 per cent) had achieved at least the targets between 50% to 60% in the private land conservation activities. The involvement in the private land conservation activities by the RUGs which were built on single production activities was very little except one.

Therefore, it can be concluded that the RUGs based on single activities that bring direct and visible benefits had been progressed than others. Involvement of the RUGs in the conservation work in private lands was little possibly due to lack of much visible and direct benefits. Next, the single production activities are not much complicated for the users, and the targets can be set and achieved easily. The total production and conservation package for both the tea lands and homestead was found to be included of so many technologies and achieving the targets of the total package was difficult. Farmers had selected some technologies easy for them implemented. Above all the SCOR team members had not taken much attempt to get the involvement of the RUGs which built mainly on private land production in the conservation activities.

Out of the total 12 RUGs that involved in common land production and conservation, four (33 per cent) had achieved 100

per cent of their total targets, one (8 per cent) had achieved between 75% to 100% of their total targets and two (17 per cent) had achieved their total targets between 50% to 75%.

The three plant nursery groups in the sample had achieved 100 per cent of their targets in the plant nurseries. Again, the main reason for this better progress was the visible and immediate benefits from these activities. Out of the two forestry group, one had achieved 100 per cent of their targets while the other had achieved 60% per cent of their targets. The incentive for the forestry groups to be involved in re-forestation was the food rations provided by the Department of Forest under their participatory forestry programs. By time of the study was conducted the forestry group that achieved 60% per cent of targets had stopped their re-forestation activities as there was some delay in providing the food rations as promised.

Some reasons for the better progress in common and conservation activities are clear thought there was no much visible or direct benefits. First, those activities had been implemented through the group work organized with the assistance of the IOs. On the other hand, the activities such as road and stream reservation conservation were simple as in most cases they were limited to tree planting and could be completed through few group works.

5.16.2. Progress in Production and Conservation in Related to Organizational Development of RUGs

Two RUG out of those 10 groups ranked as good in organizational development received points up to the level of very good under the involvement in production and conservation. They were those plant nursery groups. Another two RUGs which were ranked as good in organizational development received points up to the level of good under their involvement in production and conservation. One of them was a group built under the stream reservation conservation while the other is a nursery group. Rest of the six RUGs ranked as good in organizational development received points below the level of good in their involvement in production and conservation. Particularly, total points of two were in the range of very weak and one of them is a flori-culture group while other was a homestead group. Achievement of targets by flori-culture groups was very little (around 30 per cent of the targets) except one which had received 60 per cent of the targets. The reasons for this slow progress were some production and marketing problems.

The involvement of the plant nursery groups in conservation work was very little except one groups though their progress was high in their production activities. Again the possible conclusion is that there was no program to make the single production activity groups to be involved in other conservation work. It was same with

some of the flori-culture groups. The overall objective of formation of flori culture groups was homestead development. However, their involvement in homestead development was very little except one.

5.16.3. Progress of RUOs in Production and Conservation

Out of the total 14 RUOs, only 02 (14 per cent), the Dotalugala Heritage and Nilwala Anthurium Growers' Organization had been formed under production and conservation. Others, apart from the two SOs and the Micro-hydro Power Users Organizations were existing organizations formed with other objectives. Production and Conservation had been included as one of main activities in the two organizations of the Horagala East FO and the Kotapola North (Bodeniya) TSHDS through mini-projects.

Only the Bata Andura North FO had achieved some significant progress under the private land production and conservation. It had achieved 100 per cent of the total targets under paddy land consolidation and 60 per cent of the total targets under a seed paddy farm. The Horagala East FO and the Kotapola North TSHDS achieved only around 40 per cent of their total targets in the private land production and conservation. The progress received by other RUOs was very insignificant. On the other hand private land production and conservation was still not one of their main activities.

As mentioned before only 05 RUOs had directly involved in Common Land Cultivation and Production. There was no proper program to involve the RUOs in these activities except for the three RUOs of Dotalugala Heritage, the Horagala East FO, and the Kotapola North TSHDS.

Dotalugala Heritage had achieved 100 per cent of its targets under re-forestation, agro-forestry and stream reservation conservation. The Kotapola North TSHDS had achieved about 80 per cent of their targets under the common land conservation while the Horagala East FO had achieved about 60 per cent of their targets under common land conservation. The remaining two RUOs had achieved 100 per cent of the targets in stream reservation conservation.

However, it could be seen that the production and conservation activities had still not become the a main objective of the two RUOs of Horagala East FO and the Kotapola North TSHDS. This was mainly because there was no progress monitoring of these activities by the SCOR team. The Kotapola North TSHDS was too busy even to think about these activities among their various other activities.

Though the Micro-hydro Power Users' Organization was functioning as an effective organization in achieving the objective of providing electricity for its members their involvement in both

the private and common land production and conservation was very low. There was no clear program for them to be involved in such activities under this organization. However, they had involved in some of the group works organized by other groups for production and conservation activities.

Chapter 6

Integrated Planning and Coordination

6.1. Introduction

SCOR project emphasizes watershed based integrated planning. Therefore, it is a key requirement to establish organizational arrangements for coordination and integration of planning at various sub systems and system level within the watershed. Since the existing planning is based on administrative boundaries a major change in the existing arrangements for coordinating and integration arrangements need to be introduced. Therefore, project initiates user level, sub watershed, watershed provincial and national level committee system to meet this requirement.

SCOR approach for planing is participatory. Therefore, the participation of beneficiaries and their representatives and the relevant agency officials at various level of planning implementation, monitoring and evaluation in regard to watershed resource management is emphasized. Under the SCOR organizational structure this is facilitated at the watershed level by the formation of WRMT and Sub WRMTs. The WRMT is comprised of relevant provincial and divisional level agency officers, user representatives and SCOR team members. Sub WRMTs that represent the four sub watersheds are comprised of divisional and field level agency officers, user representatives, and SCOR team members.

In this study it is expected to study the involvement of RUG/RUOs and the agency officials in planning, monitoring and evaluation of mini-projects, and planning and monitoring at sub system and system levels. The impact of the total integrated planning in related to mini-project will be evaluated on the overall assessment of their planning, implementation, achieving targets and monitoring and evaluation.

6.2. Involvement in Mini-Projects

6.2.1. RUG Involvement in Mini Projects.

RUGs are evaluated under the involvement in mini-projects on their involvement in planning, implementation of the projects, achieving targets, and the involvement in monitoring and evaluation. Such an overall evaluation is made since these mini projects are the detailed activity plans (IIMI - 1993) prepared together with users agency personnel and SCOR team.

Total of 14 RUGs (58 per cent) were involved in mini-projects. However, mini-projects in 04 RUGs (17 per cent) had been planned recently and not implemented yet awaiting the approval for the plans. Therefore, only the rest of the 10 RUGs would be evaluated.

Findings under Mini-projects implemented by RUGs

Variables	Sub variables	No.of RUGs (Mn-proj.)	%
Planning	Mini-projects planned	14	58
	Planned by SCOR	01	7
	Planned by SCOR + Users	06	43
	Planned by SCOR + Users + Agencies	07	50
Implemented	Not implemented	04	29
	Implemented	10	71
Achieving Targets	Achieved <25%	02	20
	Achieved between 25% - 50%	04	40
	Achieved between 50% - 75%	02	30
	Achieved between 75% - 100%	-	
	Achieved 100	02	10
M&E	No M&E	06	60
	M&E by SCOR	01	10
	M&E by SCOR + Group	02	20
	M&E by Group	01	10

The 10 mini-projects which were being implemented were as follows.

Flori-culture	2
Homestead	2
Plant Nursery	2
Production\conservation	2
Seed Paddy	1
Stream Reser. Conservation	1

Four mini-projects (40 per cent) had been planned together by the SCOR team and the users. Six mini projects (60 per cent) had been planned by the Agency officers, SCOR team and the Users together.

Total targets had been achieved in one mini-project of a Plant nursery group. Progress was monitored and evaluated only in 04 mini-projects: one flori-culture project, one homestead project, one production conservation project and one plant nursery project. Progress was monitored: in one mini-project by the group leader, in two together by the IO and the group leaders and in one only by the IO.

Ranking RUGs under Mini-projects

Only the 10 RUGs where mini-projects were implemented are evaluated. The points received by each of the RUG is given in Annex 5. Ranking of the RUGs is as follows.

Ranking of RUGs on Mini Projects

Ranking	No. of RUGs	%
<25% - Very Weak	-	-
25% - 50% - Weak	06	60
50% - 75% - Good	03	30
75% - 100% - Very Good	01	10

Overall evaluation on Mini-projects

The overall points expected to be scored by the total 10 RUGs under each of the variable is as follows.

Total point Scored under mini-projects are as follows.

Variables	Points expected	Points received	%
Planning	20	16	80
Implementation	20	20	100
Achieving targets	30	08	23
Monitoring	30	08	27
Total	100	52	52

The percentage of the total points received under involvement of the RUGs mini-project is 52 percent, therefore, evaluated as Good.

6.2.3. RUO involvement in Mini-Projects

Under the involvement in Mini-projects the RUOs are evaluated on their involvement in planning, implementation achievement of targets, and monitoring and evaluation of mini-projects.

Mini-projects had been planned with total 10 RUOs (71 per cent), however, mini-projects in 03 RUOs (21 per cent) had been planned very recently and waiting till the necessary approval comes. Two seed paddy farm projects which were not coming under specific RUGs and implemented by the RUOs were also included as mini-projects implemented by RUOs. Only those 07 RUOs where the mini-projects had been implemented are evaluated.

Mini-projects implemented in the 07 RUOs were as follows.

Production and Conservation	03
Marketing and input supply	02
Seed paddy farm	02

The three production and conservation projects were implemented by the three RUOs of Dotalugala Heritage, Horagala East FO and the Kotapola North TSHDS. Marketing and inputs supply projects were implemented by two SOs. The two seed paddy farms were implemented under the supervision of the two FOs of Bata Andura North FO and the Ihala Millawa FO.

Finding of RUOs under Mini-projects

Variables	Sub-variables	No.of RUGs	%
Planning	Planned by SCOR + Users + Agency	10	100
Implementation	Still not implemented Stopped half way Implemented	03 02 05	30 20 50
Achieving Targets	Achieved below 25% Achieved 25% - 50% Achieved 50% - 75% Achieved 75% - 100% Achieved 100%	02 02 02 01 -	29 29 29 14
M&E	No proper M&E	07	100

All the mini-projects were said to be planned together with the users, SCOR team members and the Agency officers. The activities of the mini-projects implemented by the Thenipita SO and the Kotapola North TSHDS were almost stopped by the time the study was conducted.

The Dotalugala Heritage had achieved nearly 100 per cent of its targets. The Horagala East FO and the Bata Andura North FO had achieved around 60 per cent of their targets.

By the time the study was conducted the progress of any of the mini-projects was not monitored.

Ranking of RUOs under Mini Projects

The points received by each of the 07 RUOs are given in the Annex 6. The Dotalugala Heritage is given full points under achieving the targets as they had achieved full targets 03 out of

five activities. The other two activities seemed to be difficult targets.

Ranking the RUOs under Mini-projects

Ranking	No. of RUOs	%
<25% - Very Weak	02	29
25% - 50% - Weak	04	57
50% - 75% - Good	01	14
75% - 100% - Very Good	-	

Overall Evaluation of RUOs under mini-projects

The overall evaluation of the RUOs on the total points scored is as follows.

Total point Scored by RUOs under mini-projects are as follows.

Variables	Expected Points	Points Received	%
Planning	14	14	100
Implementation	14	10	71
Achieving Targets	21	05	36
Monitoring	21	00	-
Total	70	29	41

According to the percentage of the points received, the RUOs under their involvement in the Mini-projects is evaluated as Weak.

6.3. Participation in Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation at WRMT and SWRMT Levels

Participation in planning, monitoring and evaluation by the agency officers, Users and the SCOR personnel is evaluated on the percentage of their attendance at SWRMT and WRMT meetings on the same criteria on the percentages.

6.3.1. Holding the WMRT meetings

Details of only two WMRT meetings were available at the SCOR office. According to the SCOR team members, holding of this meeting gradually become less important as SWRMT meetings were found to be more effective particularly in monitoring.

The participation of the Agency officials and users in the two meetings of the WMRT was 78 per cent and 100 per cent respectively.

6.3.2. Holding the SWRMT meetings

Frequent SWRMT meetings had been held in each of the sub watershed. However, details of some of the meetings held were not available. According to the details available at the SCOR office the participation of agency officers, user representatives and the SCOR personnel in the SWRMT meetings held in each of the SWS is as follows.

Aninkanda Sub Watershed

Expected participation: Agency Officers 17
Use representatives 27
SCOR officers 05 or 06

Participation in SWRMT meetings of Aninkanda

Date	Participation					
	Agency	%	Users	%	SCOR	
10.03.94	06	35	12	44	06	100
08.04.94	08	47	13	48	03	60
12.05.94	06	35	12	44	07	100
14.07.94	08	47	-*	-	03	60
07.08.94	06	35	14	52	04	80
08.09.94	09	53	12	44	-	
12.12.94	05	29	11	41	-	
Average	07	41	12	44	23	92

(*Figures not available)

According to the available details the highest participation of Agency officers was 53 per cent while the highest participation of users was 52 per cent. The lowest officer participation was 29 per cent while the lowest user participation was 42 per cent. The average participation of both the officers and the users was at the level of Weak.

Details of the meetings held in 1995 were not available. However, during the study it was observed in one of the meetings the officer participation was 65 per cent while the user participation was 100 per cent.

Diyadawa Thenipita Sub Watershed

Expected participation:

Agency Officers	18
User Representatives	18
SCOR	05 or 06

Participation in SWRMT meetings in Diyadawa/Thenipita

Date	Participation					
	Agency	%	Users	%	SCOR	%
07.03.94	07	39	05	28	07	100
10.05.94	07	39	17	95	04	80
24.01.95	05	28	10	56	06	100
05.04.95	12	67	08	44	03	60
11.07.95	08	44	19	100	06	100
11.08.95	16	89	19	100	-	-
18.09.95	15	83	13	72	06	100
Average	10	56	12	72	05	100

Holding meetings in Diyadawa/Thenipita was less frequent the during 1994. However, the number of the meetings held during 1995 had increased. The number of the officer and user participation too had gradually increased in 1995. The highest number of officer attendance was 89 per cent while the highest number of user participation was 100 per cent. The lowest officer participation was 28 per cent while the lowest user participation was 44 per cent. The overall average participation of the officers and users in total meetings was at the level of Good.

Horagala Sub watershed

Expected participation:

Agency Officers	10
Users	14
SCOR	05

Participation in SWRMT meetings in Horagala

Date	Participation					
	Agency	%	Users	%	SCOR	%
07.03.94	05	50	09	64	04	80
10.05.94	06	60	08	57	03	60
07.10.94	10	100	07	50	-	

07.12.94	10	100	06	43	-	
17.01.95	11	100	06	43	02	40
Average	08	80	07	50	03	60

The highest number of officer participation was 100 per cent while the highest number of user participation was 64 per cent. The lowest number of officer participation was 50 per cent while the lowest number of user participation was 43 per cent. The Officer participation had been gradually increased up to the highest level while the user participation had remained static. The officer participation in the meetings was higher than the users. On the other hand the participation of SCOR personnel too was low in compared to the other Sub watersheds.

The average officer participation was very good while the average user participation was Weak.

Milla Ela Sub Watershed

Expected participation: Agency officers 17
Users 12
SCOR 05 or 06

Participation in SWRMT meetings in Milla Ela

Date	Participation					
	Agency	%	Users	%	SCOR	%
08.04.94	08	47	08	67	04	
14.06.94	09	52	11	91	04	
15.11.94	09	52	06	50	-	
18.01.95	13	76	09	75	-	
31.03.95	-		-	-	-	
09.08.95	05	29	16	100	-	
09.10.95	07	58	14	100	-	
Average	09	53	10	83	4	80

The highest participation of Agency officers in SWRMT meetings was 76 per cent while the highest user participation in those meetings was 100 per cent. The lowest participation of Agency officers was 29 per cent while the lowest user participation was 50 per cent. The average of the overall user participation was at the level of Very good while average overall officer participation was at the level of Good.

6.4. Conclusions

Mini Projects

The percentage of the total points received under the planning of mini-projects implemented by the RUGs was 80 per cent. Six mini-projects (60 per cent) had been planned together with agency officers, while 04 mini-projects (40 per cent) had been planned together by the SCOR team and the users.

However, the percentage of the total points received under the monitoring and evaluation of the mini-projects was only 27 per cent. Though the planning was at a better level the progress monitoring of the implementation of the mini-projects was at a weak level as only 04 mini-projects (40 per cent) had been monitored and evaluated. Agency officers were not involved in monitoring and evaluation of any of the mini-projects.

The progress achieved in two plant nursery mini-projects was 100 per cent. However, the progress had been properly monitored only in one project. The continuation of the other mini-project after sharing the initial profits was doubtful in the lack of proper monitoring. In another mini-project of which the progress was not monitored the progress was 60 per cent and it too was a profit oriented seed paddy project. However, there had been some informal monitoring of these projects by the group leaders.

When the progress of these mini-projects was considered the monitoring and evaluation alone had not brought out the expected outcome. Quick visible benefits were also a contributory factor for the progress.

Full points were received by the RUOs under the planning of the mini-projects. All the mini-projects under the RUOs were said to be planned together by the users, agency officers and the SCOR personnel. Those were big projects with detailed activity plans therefore, the discussions with all the relevant parties had been required.

However, by the time the study was conducted field level monitoring of all the mini-projects of the RUOs was totally stopped. However, there had been better monitoring of the activities of the Dotalugala Heritage when the main activities were implemented. But the implementation of the remaining activities were not monitored.

The progress of the mini-projects implemented by the RUOs was low than that of the RUGs. Achieving targets of the mini-projects of the RUOs was more difficult than that of the RUGs since most of them were related to total package of production, conservation and marketing, and much more complicated.

On the other hand monitoring of the mini-projects was easy for the group leaders as they were mostly limited to one or two activities. Monitoring of the mini-projects of the RUOs was more difficult at least for the OBs.

It was found that the almost all activities that started under the mini-projects were stopped halfway in the two RUOs of the Thenipita SO and the Kotapola North TSHDS. Part of the activities of the Aninkanda SO too were stopped. Further, it was found that the progress of implementing the production and conservation activities of the Horagala East FO was decreasing.

The main reason for the slow progress in many of the mini-projects both in the RUOs and the RUGs was the lack of progress monitoring. The IOs said that they did not have much time for monitoring of mini-projects particularly of RUOs together with their other activities.

None of the RUGs or RUOs except the Dotalugala Heritage had systematic collection of progress data. The progress data had been collected by the IOs for official purposes. The OBs of the Horagala East FO and the Kotapola North TSHDS had no much understanding on the progress of the production and conservation activities though those mini-projects were among the biggest. On the other hand collecting information such as extent of area of conservation was somewhat complicated for them. Next, they did not see much usefulness of collecting such data.

With regard to the planning process of mini-projects, it was observed that proper participatory planning methodologies were followed in planing the mini-projects much later particularly from the time of the study with the assistance of the research staff of the project. Many of the agency officers said that the early plans of mini-projects were first prepared by the SCOR team and then discussed with them. Particularly, 06 officers out of the total 08 officers of the different agencies interviewed said the mini-projects were first prepared by the SCOR team and then discussed with them. Two of them said that they had no any idea how they were planned at all. Only one DO and one TI said that they were involved in planning the mini-projects. However, some mini-projects had been planned discussing together with users.

Planning and Monitoring at meetings

When the Study was conducted the WMRT meetings had not been held for a long period and the attention was on holding SWMRT meetings. Though the SCOR team members mentioned that holding this meeting had become less important some agency officers held view that holding such meeting which covered the overall watershed was important at least for the coordination among the officers of different administrative units.

The frequency of holding of SWMRT meetings and the officer user participation in them are at a good level. The SCOR team had paid more attention to attend the SWMRT meetings held in the Aninkanda and D/Thenipita than in the other two SWS.

A clear increase in the participation of agency officers and users in the SWMRT meetings could be seen during 1995. This was due to the pressure on SCOR team during this period to increase their level of performance. During this period not only more efforts were taken but also new participatory strategies were followed to get more agency and user participation. The new strategies followed included the formation of task forces under each of the intervention area comprised of the respective agency personnel and members of the SCOR team for planning, implementing and monitoring and evaluation. Increased participation in SWMRT meetings was a reflection of these new developments.

It was observed that the SWMRT meetings were functioning more as a place of progress monitoring rather than of planning. Planning was taken place at the two levels of mini-projects and task forces. Formation of task forces took place at a later stage just few months before the study was conducted. Evidence suggests that planning before was mostly done by the SCOR team and discussed later with users and agency officers.

All the IOs said that the early plans had been prepared by the SCOR team themselves with no involvement of agency officers and therefore, they had much difficulties in getting the involvement of the agency officers in implementing the plans with the users. Even after they received the involvement of officers they had another problem of disparity between the plans prepared by the SCOR personnel and those of the agencies. Such differences still existed even during the period of study. For example, some field level officials of the DA directly said that it was not possible to implement the targets given by the SCOR team. The plans prepared under the intervention area of forestry were not acceptable to the FD. Separate discussions had to be held with the FD to get their acceptance as the areas decided by the SCOR team were not regarded as needing re-forestation by the FD. Therefore, mobilizing the users to implement some plans let alone achieving the targets was difficult particularly for the IOs. Six out of 08 agency officers interviewed said that the planning were done by the SCOR team till the task forces were formed recently.

The user participation in planning had been very little in some cases. The OBs of one RUO said that the plans were first prepared by SCOR personnel and given to them. They said the targets set in those plans were difficulty to achieve but agreed as they had little understanding on them. One DS said that if the land degradation and soil erosions were identified together with users and not alone by the SCOR team the progress would have been more.

It was observed that the progress monitoring and evaluation took place at the SWMRT was not much systematic. The same progress data was repeatedly presented by the user representatives without referring to any target. Since they were not much prepared, it was observed that the SCOR personnel were reminding them of some progress made. One user representative said that he was fed up with repeating the same details at every meeting. He said that he was presenting them only to satisfy the officers since they were not beneficial to them. It was observed that there was no better time management of the meeting procedures and there was no much time left for some user representatives to present the progress. The SCOR personnel dominated in conducting the meetings and in taking decisions though the respective DSs were supposed to chair the meetings. However, gradual development of the presentations of the progress data could be seen in later meetings with some guidance from the IOs.

Participation in Shared Control of Natural Resources

The RUGs and the RUOs were expected to be evaluated on their involvement in shared control of natural resources on the number of formal agreements they signed in related to water rights, land rights and service and business contracts. Since such agreements were not still signed when the study was conducted the RUGs and RUOs are not evaluated under this component.

Chapter 7

Organizational Viability

7.1. Introduction

The organizational viability of RUGs and RUOs is evaluated on the Maturity Index developed under the M&E system of the SCOR project. This maturity index is given in the annex 2. According to this index the RUGs that reached to the status A are regarded as achieved the full maturity level and they considered to be more sustainable. Though there are some limitations in using such an index to evaluate informal group since they should necessarily pass each of the steps in sequence to reach to the highest level even if some steps may not be relevant to some this can be regarded as a good index to evaluate the viability of the RUGs in the context of SCOR concepts.

The viability of the RUGs and RUOs cannot be decided merely on reaching the steps of the maturity index but on the performance at each of these levels. On the other hand the points received in some of the indicators under the scoring system may be low though the total points are at a higher level. Therefore, it is more appropriate if RUGs and the RUOs are evaluated both on the maturity index and the total points received under relevant indicators. The RUGs and RUOs that received the points above 50 per cent under those steps will be taken as reached up to the respective step.

7.2. Ranking RUGs and RUOs on the overall total points received under each of the indicator

Ranking of RUGs on the total points scored

Ranking the RUGs according to the total points received under the each of the indicator is as follows. The total points expected to be scored and points received by the each of the RUG is given in Annex 5.

Ranking	No. of RUGs	%
<25% - Very Weak	6	25
25% - 50% - Weak	8	33
50% - 75% - Good	10	42
>75% - Very Good	-	

Ranking of RUOs on the total points scored

Ranking the RUOs according to the total points received under each of the indicator is as follows. Total points expected to be scored by each of the RUO and the point received by them are given in the Annex.6.

Ranking	No. of RUGs	%
<25% - Very Weak	1	7
25% - 50% - Weak	4	29
50% - 75% - Good	6	42
>75% - Very Good	3	21

7.2. Ranking the RUGs and RUOs on the status of maturity

Ranking of RUG and RUO on the status of maturity according to the points they received under each of the steps is given below. The indicators considered as similar to the steps of the index are as follows.

Steps of the Maturity Index	Indicators used
1. Forms the group for better resource use*	1. Formation of the group*
2. Has a recognized form of leadership/core	2. Leadership
3. Meets regularly with participation rate greater that 60%	3. Participation
4. Records minutes of meetings and status of group action	4. Reporting
5. Has a group fund	5. Funding
6. Has agreed targets to achieve*	6. Targets*
7. Invests money, labor and time on activities for production and protection of land and water resources	7. Involvement in P&C
8. Monitor own activities though self monitoring and assessment	8. Monitoring targets
9. Has institutional/legal recognition	9. Legal recognition
10.Has affiliation with other organizations	10.Affiliation

* No particular indicators

Ranking of RUGs and RUOs on the status of Maturity

Status	Status D				Status C		Status B		Status A	
Steps	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
RUGs	24	13	6	4	1	1	1	-	-	-
RUOs	14	5	4	2	2	2	2	2	2	2

RUGs

Only 13 RUGs out of the total 24 reached to the second step as only they received points above 50 per cent under the leadership. Out of those 13 RUGs, only 6 received points above 50 per cent under member participation to reach the step 3. Next, only 04 RUGs out of those six received points above 50 per cent on reporting to reach the step 4 which is the full maturity level of status D. Only one RUGs out of those 04 received point above 50 per cent under funding and reached to the maturity level of Status C. Thus RUG reached up to the step 7 of the status B which is investing money, labor and time on activities for production, protection of land and water resources and stopped there since there was no self monitoring of its activities.

RUOs

Only 05 RUOs out of the total received points above 50 percent in leadership to reach the step 2. Four RUOs out of those 05 received points above 50 per cent in member participation to reach the step 3. Only 02 out of them received point above 50 per cent in reporting to reach the step 4 and the maturity level of status D. These two RUOs reached to the full maturity level of the status A.

Conclusions

In related to the performance level of the RUGs under each indicators, none of the RUGs reached at least to the maturity level of Status B. Though the leadership of 54 per cent of the RUGs was at a better level the remaining steps of member participation, reporting, and funding were weak.

The member participation in meetings and group work which is a very crucial area was weak (point received below 50 percent) in total of 16 RUGs (67 per cent) therefore the number of the RUGs that reached the step 3 dropped by 54 per cent from those reached to the step 2.

The reporting and funding were the two other particular weak areas of the RUGs. Total of 18 RUGs (75 per cent) received points below 50 per cent under the reporting. Maintaining reports had still not become a necessity in many of the RUGs. There was no any reporting system in 07 RUGs (29 per cent). The IOs had prepared reports and given to other RUGs. Total of 22 RUGs (92 per cent) received points below the 50 per cent under funding. The RUGs still totally depend on SCOR grants to raise their funds.

In regard to the RUO, the Micro-hydro Power Users' organization and the Bata Andura North FO reached to the full maturity of Status A. Though the Kotapola North TSHDS received the highest points under the overall evaluation of the RUOs it could not go beyond the step 4 as membership participation in meeting and group work was only 44 per cent. The particular reason for this was the very large membership of it. If some more attempts were

taken to have more member participation this RUO would have reached to the full maturity level of Status A. Next, the Horagala East FO of which the overall points were at a high level could not go beyond the step two due to the low points it received under leadership. The members were getting disappointed with its chairman and if this situation was remedied this organization too would have reached to the full maturity level.

The main weak areas of the RUOs were the leadership and member participation. Nine RUOs (64 per cent) received points below 50 per cent in leadership. In regard to the member participation total of 09 RUOs (75 per cent) received points below 50 per cent. But many could not go beyond the initial steps of the maturity index since the leadership and membership participation were weak.

Chapter 8
Conclusions and Recommendations

8.1. Conclusions

Group concept in organizational development is a novel experience introduced in to the Nilwala Watershed under the SCOR projects. There had been some notions about group formation among some of the agency personnel but it had not been exercised. The organizations existed by the time the SCOR project was commenced were general member organizations comprised of the total membership. The experience gained in elsewhere on group formation by the DAS had not incorporated in to the farmer organizations they had built in the Nilwala Watershed. The TSHDA was having some ideas on building such groups but such necessity did not arise with the limited objective of forming TSHDSs. However, some inventive TIs had made attempts to form some contact farmer system though it had been already discarded but those idea had not gone off the ground.

Though the formation of user groups was a novel idea, much success was not achieved in the formation of user groups under the SCOR project for several reasons. These reasons can be broadly categorized into two: strategic and organizational.

The weaknesses in the strategies followed included: formation of groups without having much understanding of the community, without gaining their confident and without much dialogues with the users and awareness creation in them, sending the IOs later to the project, creating big hopes in the users, formation of groups out of maps or by the IOs themselves etc.. Weaknesses in the strategies followed continued even after the formation of groups such as not giving much attention to organizational development, not providing necessary guidance and assistance and not monitoring of their activities. The organizational weaknesses are those identified under the organizational development, such as low member participation, weaknesses in reporting, not having own funds etc.. However, the weaknesses of both of these areas are interrelated, particularly some weaknesses in organizational developments were the results of the weaknesses of the strategies followed.

However, when the RUGs which were ranked as good were concerned the factors contributed to their success were clear. Apart from the better strategies followed, the other factors contributed were the better leadership, concentrating in to single production oriented activity which brought out some direct and visible benefits, low number of membership and provision of grants.

However, in most cases the RUGs were taken for granted after the formation of them that they would involve in the production and conservation activities automatically. They were not provided much assistance and guidance in organizational development. It was found that some of the RUGs had been almost neglected after the

formation of them. Some of the qualities of the RUGs as indicated under the matrix index such as member participation, reporting, better financial control etc.. too were not taken as necessary until very recently. For example, there was no any reporting in many of the RUGs and only when the progress evaluations of RUGs took place separately IOs prepared those reports themselves and given to some RUGs.

It could be seen that the IOs were burdened with many of other activities that limited the time for institution building work. Particularly, when their performance was evaluated on the achievements of the physical targets though some of them seemed to be very much unrealistic the IOs almost become field level extension workers and implementors. As the involvement of the field level agency officers was low at the beginning implementing of P&C activities almost had become the responsibility of the SCOR personnel and the IOs said that they had to learn those technologies in order to implement them in the field. These tasks became more difficult when many of the technologies were not considered to be necessary by the users. On the other hand, getting the involvement of the field level officers too had become the responsibility of the IOs. For example six field level officers of different agencies said that they were coordinated by the IO, and one of them said that he was not aware what the responsibilities of the WMC at all. One DO said that it was only the IOs made contact with him from the very first date. The IOs were having some more problems as they were embroiled in some internal conflicts of the other SCOR team members. These conflicts had affected the progress of the project too as low attention had been paid to SWSs which were regarded as under the others unofficially. For example very low attention had been paid for a long time for the two SWSs of Milla Ela and Horagala.

In regard to the RUOs except for very few the existing organizations were very weak and were remained namesake when the SCOR project commenced. They had been revitalized under the SCOR project. However, the SCOR team had approached some selected RUOs at the beginning and they had progressed much initially with their involvement. The rest of the others had been approached by the IOs recently and some of them too were seen gradually progressing. The IOs had involved more freely in the FOs. Their involvement in the TSHDSs had been somewhat limited until recently.

Unlike the RUGs, those RUOs formed under the SCOR project had been organized on identified requirements. Some of them had progressed much with the guidance and assistance of the SCOR team. However, in regard to the organizational development under the institutional building program of the SCOR project it seems that the SOs had been formed prematurely when the other RUOs were not developed to a level of requiring much services from them. It seems that they had been formed to fulfill the targets of the project plan.

The factors contributed to the progress of some of the RUOs are similar to those of the RUGs which were found to be effective such as better leadership, close involvement of the SCOR personnel, visible benefits, grants and assistance from the SCOR projects. On the other hand that where the SCOR personnel were more involved the RUOs had functioned better.

The most contributing factor for the progress of some RUOs is the better leadership. This is evident in the Micro-hydro Power Users' Organization, Kotapola North TSHDSs, Bata Andura North FO. The progress of the RUOs where the leadership was weak was very slow.

In regard to the Micro-hydro Power Users' organization the other reason for the success of it was building it on a felt need. The Anthurium Flower Growers' Organization was built on a assumed need when the production was at a low level and its progress was very low. The SOs of which the progress was decreasing cannot be regarded as built on a felt need.

However, progress achieved in some RUOs was declining while expected progress was not achieved in some. The reasons were many for this situation such as weak leadership, building the RUOs on weak bases, not receiving sufficient assistance and guidance and from the SCOR team, preparing the projects without identifying real needs of the users, and lack of monitoring by the SCOR personnel on the RUO affairs.

Except in very few cases the progress achieved in production and conservation both by the RUGs and RUOs was low. On the other hand the progress achieved in the common land P&C was more than that in the private lands. RUGs that were formed on single production activities which had brought quick and visible benefits both under private or common land production and conservation had succeeded in achieving their targets.

The progress achieved both by the RUGs and RUOs in private land P&C was very low. Those RUGs which were built only for private land P&C were very weak except some built on single production activities. On the other hand the involvement of the RUGs built on single production activities in the other P&C activities was very low. The private land P&C did not require much of a group action and it was a major constraint to the development of the RUGs built on private land P&C.

Next, there was no incentive for the users to follow the private land P&C activities as they were not bringing any visible and direct benefit in a short period. Some of these measures in fact had not been felt as necessary by the users in some areas. For example, according to some agency officers, the land degradation in some reservation lands which were recently brought under

cultivation such as in Milla Ela was not seen as serious by the users needing conservation methods.

Whether this may be true or not the packages prepared for tea land and homestead development with full of technologies of about 10 under each were not much attractive for the users. These packages had been decided by the SCOR team and then introduced to the users. Initial dialogues had not been held with users in preparing them. On the other hand according the users there had been difficulties in finding necessary planting materials for conservation work in private lands even if they were willing.

Progress in common land P&C was more and there were instances of achieving 100 per cent targets both by RUGs and RUOs. Though there were not visible immediate benefits in the involvement in these activities several reasons for the better progress in common land conservation activities are clear. First, most of those activities had been implemented through the group works and the assistance of the SCOR team and agency officers had been received for organizing group works and in providing planting materials. Next, the activities such as road and stream reservation conservation were simple enough and in most cases they were limited to tree planting and could be implemented through few group works. Apart from that already some awareness had been created among the general public particularly on forest conservation as there is much propagation by many groups and organizations. The foremost contributing factor in some cases was the food rations provided by the FD.

However, implementation of these activities through group work was not contributory to build up group consciousness enough for making the groups more viable and strong. The users had involved not as a particular group but under programs prepared for the area. Dotalugala Heritage is an example for this. Though so many group works had been conducted under this organization it was not helpful to make the organization better progressed afterwards.

The progress in RUOs in P&C activities except for the Dotalugala Heritage was very low. Except for Dotalugala Heritage which had been formed exclusively for conservation the P&C activities had still not become one of the main activities of the RUOs though much assistance such as grants had been provided under the SCOR project. Therefore, unlike the RUGs, the RUOs were not affected with the low progress in P&C as they had been formed with other objectives. However, the slow progress in P&C had affected the RUOs which were formed exclusively for under P&C activities such as the Anthurium Flower Growers' Organization.

There was no clear program to involve the single production activity groups in other related conservation activities. This is true with the RUOs as well when the Micro-hydro Power Users' Organization is concerned.

The planning of mini-projects was said to be done together by the users, agency officers and the SCOR team. However, it was doubtful whether the planning had done using proper participatory planning methodologies since it was observed that such methodologies were used much later. Some users and agency officers said some of those plans were first prepared by SCOR team and discussed with them later. However, some of the mini-projects mostly those under the RUOs might have planned together by those three parties.

Unlike the mini-projects, the planning of activities under the given interventions had been done by the SCOR team themselves until recently. The difficulties faced by the IOs in implementing them, low level of involvement of field level agency officers, conflicting targets with those of the agencies provide ample evidence that the planing had done by the SCOR team themselves initially.

However, some new developments could be seen in the planning process after the formation of task forces, and next in mini-projects planing which was done together with the involvement of research staff at a later stage particularly when the study was conducted. Involvement of the different agency officers in planning and next gradual building up of coordination among them could be seen during this period after the formation of task forces. Planning of mini-projects was done together with the users in participatory manner.

The weakest area in the implementation of the project was the progress monitoring and evaluation. The progress monitoring was at a very low level except for in some mini-projects in RUGs and there was no much involvement of the agency officers in it. Progress monitoring of the mini-projects under the RUOs had been just neglected after some time. There was no proper monitoring on the financial control of the grants provided under the mini-projects. Some IOs came to know about some grants provided only when they were asked about them under the data collection of the study.

Very few RUGs and RUOs had a systematic collection of data. Among the RUOs, only the Dotalugala Heritage had such practice. Though substantial funds had been provided to the RUOs under mini-projects those OBs could not find easily the copies of the project plans provided to them let alone referring their targets. The IOs said that they did not have much time for progress monitoring of RUGs and RUOs. Ironically many of them depended on the data provided by user representatives for official progress evaluation but still had much doubts on the accuracy of them.

The collection of progress data as per the mini-projects seemed to be complicated for the users. On the other hand some user representatives said that they could not see much use of collecting data.

The progress monitoring and evaluation took place at the SWMRT meetings was not much systematic. The same progress data was repeatedly presented by the user representatives without referring to any target. The users were presenting them only to satisfy the SCOR team. On the other hand they had some obligations to give some progress details because of the funds they received.

However, some developments in the progress discussions could be observed later at SWMRT meetings. The IOs had taken the initiation of it as they saw there was no much use of existing progress discussions. However, how long this trend would be continued is doubtful unless there is a proper data collection, monitoring and feed back system is developed. On the other hand it depends on how other members of the SCOR team are willing to improve more on this initiation.

2. Recommendations

There is no need to take examples from outside on building effective groups and organizations as the Micro-hydro Power Users' Organization itself provides sufficient evidence on the contributing factors. Those factors contributed for the better progress of this organization are: building on visible benefits and a felt need, better leadership, provision of financial and material support by other agencies, guidance and assistance and moral support given by the SCOR, building of a high level of group consciousness, coordinated support of different agencies, homogeneous community, better community acceptance of the Agency Officers. Where many of these conditions were not fulfilled the progress of the RUGs and RUOs was low.

Though building of groups for natural resource management on visible benefits and on felt needs had been a major challenge faced by the SCOR team, it had not been addressed well. The groups formed just for P&C had not progressed while those formed for production activities had performed better. If the conservation efforts were combined with some other user beneficial activities the groups would have been formed better and more effective. It was seen that conservation efforts are more likely to succeed if combined with other activities like supply of production inputs, development of transportation facilities, or provision of social services (Uphoff - 1986). This was evident when the users said that their immediate necessity was not conservation of their homestead but repairing the village road at one of planning discussion held in the Aninkanda SWS. We believe that the situation in the Nilwala Watershed is still not much worse and fresh dialogues can be started with the users to identify their felt needs and combine them with other production and conservation activities.

The other problem faced by the SCOR team in the lack of visible benefits was not having much incentives for the users to participate in P&C in the lack of visible benefits. In the lack of

such visible benefits many instances the users had been motivated on the provision of grants. The RUOs were expecting grants to increase their funds while the RUGs were expecting grants as individual incentives. Giving material incentives is not new in watershed management efforts. Experience in other water management programs showed that the incentives should be at the level not to create dependency syndrome. The best incentive is the short term on-farm benefits (Sharma, Dixon - 1995). Stopping the re-forestation when the subsidies were not provided by one forestry group shows that they had involved in these activities only for material incentives. Temporary subsidies tend to build local institutions on a fragile and unsustainable basis (Hanadle, VanSant - 1985). Userfruct agreements might have become a good incentive for users as the SCOR planners expected but this program was still at the stage of holding discussions to get agreements of FD officers on the P&C plans prepared. Instead of motivating the users on the promise of grants or other subsidies their local capacities should be identified and used.

The groups and organizations particularly built on the initiation of the outsiders need the guidance and assistance for some time till they become self sustaining. This practice was mostly lacking in the particularly in regard to the RUGs. According to the lessons learned in natural resource management it had taken a long time evolve and sustain such social and management mechanisms (Planning Commissions' Working Group on Hill Area Development - 1984). But in the SCOR project soon after the formation of groups they were expected to be involved P&C activities. This is one of the reasons given by the IOs too for the low level of organizational performance of the RUGs. Therefore, the IOs work should be made relaxed in order to make them more involved in organizational activities by giving other implementing responsibilities to those really responsible for them. IOs' progress should be evaluated on a combination of production targets and institution building targets. Evaluation of the groups and organizations should be made on the quality of them not on the quantity. Attention should be made to strengthen the identified weak areas of the RUGs and RUOs.

It is not necessary to emphasize the importance of better leadership. Examples are many in the necessity of identifying local leadership and bringing them forward in the local institution building particularly in related to water management. (Uphoff - 1986). Worthwhile attempts had still not made to identify suitable local leadership and bringing them up by the SCOR team rather than depending on existing leadership.

The experience in the land consolidation exercise shows that in a given opportunity the IOs are quite capable of organizing farmers in a necessity. The present situation of calculating their progress only on physical targets does not provide much room for such experiments. On the other hand a mechanism was still not built

to share the experiences of the IOs among each other let alone with the rest of the team members. However, it was observed that some of the IOs need some guidance as they were not confident enough.

The planning process had taken a new turn recently particularly with the involvement of the research staff. Time had come to use Participatory Rural Appraisal methodologies intensively in the planing processes. We believe that the present P&C packages developed by the SCOR team members should be re-considered. New packages should be decided together with the users incorporating their experiences and needs.

Creating of task forces is a good progress in the planning process however, what is more important is the continual holding of its meetings. The SCOR team should act in a low profile now giving more sense of responsibilities to the agency personnel. This should be followed in the SWMRT meetings too by letting the agency personnel to conduct them. The dominating role of some of the SCOR team members in these meetings should be immediately changed if the agency personnel are to take more responsibilities. In a situation where there is some improvement in integrated planning not holding WRMT meetings maybe unwise as one Agency officer said it is should be the center of integrated planning and monitoring in related to the total watershed.

The monitoring system should be made simple so as to make it easy enough for the users to monitor their activities by themselves. This should be done discussing together with them and making such a monitoring system necessary for them. However, users cannot be made to monitor these activities unless they feel those activities are important and most of all until the group or the organization become very effective. Next, special attention had to be paid to remedy the serious lapse of lack of monitoring of the activities of the RUGs and RUOs especially by the IOs.

Annex. 3

Scoring of RUGs under organizational Strengh

RUG	Memb know.	Memb Atti.	Particip.	Leader ship	Reporting	Funding	Fin. mgt.	Legal recog.	Affiliation	Investment	Total	%
1	6	8	5	8	2	3	6	6	6	0	50	68
2	6	8	6	8	4	3	8	0	6	0	49	66
3	6	3	6	7	2	0	0	0	6	0	30	40
4	6	8	6	8	4	3	2	6	0	0	43	58
5	6	8	6	4	3	0	0	0	3	0	30	40
6	4	6	3	4	2	0	0	0	3	0	22	30
7	5	8	3	6	0	0	0	0	3	0	25	34
8	6	8	4	8	1	3	5	6	6	0	47	63
9	5	1	1	5	2	0	0	0	6	0	20	27
10	4	7	5	5	3	0	0	0	3	0	27	36
11	5	5	6	7	5	6	3	6	6	0	43	58
12	5	6	5	7	4	4	5	6	6	0	48	65
13	6	8	4	7	3	0	0	6	6	0	40	54
14	1	0	3	3	0	0	0	0	6	0	13	18
15	6	1	0	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	12	16
16	6	8	0	5	0	0	0	0	6	0	25	34
17	0	1	4	2	0	0	0	0	6	0	13	18
18	2	0	2	4	0	0	0	0	6	0	14	20
19	6	8	2	8	4	4	6	6	3	0	47	63
20	6	5	1	6	3	3	4	6	6	0	40	54
21	6	4	4	8	4	6	7	6	6	0	51	69
22	6	8	3	6	1	4	2	0	0	0	30	40
23	1	0	1	4	0	0	0	0	6	0	12	16
24	4	0	4	1	0	0	0	0	3	0	12	16

Annex 3.1

Name of the RUGs

1. Nagoda Athura Flower Growers' Group
2. Thisara Flower growers' Group
3. Potuwilayaya Homestead Group
4. Nilwala Nursery Group
5. Forestry Group
6. Banana Cultivation Group
7. Coconut cultivations Group
8. Homestead Demonstration Group
9. Horiyadola Project Group
10. Naindawa Tea Land Conservation Group
11. Rambukdeniya Stream Reservation conservation Group
12. Suhada Seed Paddy Farm
13. Sisilasa Nursery Group
14. Ambalandola Bemmedola Group
15. Kiriwanaganga Stream Reservation Conservation Group
16. Nallagawahena Forestry Group
17. Five Acre Project Group
18. Morawakkanda Project Group
19. Bovitiyadola Production and Conservation User Group
20. Bovitiyadola Nursery Group
21. Annasidola Group
22. Homestead Group
23. Pahalaegodakumbura Batahira-dola Project Group
24. Kirivandola Stream Reservation Group

Annex 4

Scoring of RUOs under Organizational Development

RUO No.	Struc.	Memb. Know.	Mem. Atitud.	Partic.	Leader ship	Reporting	Funding	Fin. Mgt	Investment	Legal Recog.	Affiliations	[illegible]
1	0	4	4	5	2	6	6	6	0	6	6	[illegible]
2	4	5	6	5	6	4	7	4	8	6	6	[illegible]
3	2	5	3	4	4	0	4	6	0	6	0	[illegible]
4	3	2	0	0	3	2	6	5	0	6	0	[illegible]
5	4	6	7	2	10	4	4	6	0	6	6	[illegible]
6	3	6	5	2	6	0	0	-	0	6	0	[illegible]
7	3	6	8	8	10	4	6	9	0	6	6	[illegible]
8	4	6	7	4	7	6	8	5	7	6	6	[illegible]
9	4	4	6	1	10	2	3	3	4	6	0	[illegible]
10	3	6	3	2	6	0	2	3	0	6	6	[illegible]
11	2	5	1	1	3	0	0	-	0	0	6	[illegible]
12	4	6	5	5	6	4	2	5	3	6	6	[illegible]
13	3	4	4	3	5	4	2	4	0	6	6	[illegible]
14	4	4	5	6	11	4	5	7	6	6	6	[illegible]

1. Dotalugala Heritage
2. Horagala East FO
3. Nawalahena FO
4. Thenpita Service Organization
5. Beralapanathara TSHDS
6. Nilwala Anthuriuam Growers' Organization
7. Micro-hydro Power Users' Organization
8. Kotapola North (Bodeniya) TSHDS
9. Aninkanda Service Organization
10. Pathawita TSHDS
11. Pathawita FO.
12. Ihala Millawa FO
13. Kotapola North Mahasen FO
14. Bata Andura North FO

Scoring of RUGs under Production and Conservation and Intergrated Approach

RUG	Priv.land P&C	Comn.land P&C	Mini-project	Full total	Total Expect.	%	
1	2	-	3	55	94	58	
2	3	-	6	58	94	62	
3	4	-	-	34	84	40	
4	-	8	7	58	94	62	
5	-	8	-	38	84	45	
6	4	-	-	26	84	31	
7	4	-	-	29	84	34	
8	2	-	4	53	94	56	
9	0	-	-	20	84	24	
10	2	-	-	29	84	34	
11	2	8	3	56	104	54	
12	4	-	5	57	94	61	
13	-	8	-	48	84	57	
14	4	-	-	17	84	20	
15	2	2	-	16	94	17	
16	-	4	-	29	84	34	
17	4	8	-	25	94	27	
18	0	2	-	16	94	17	
19	4	4	7	62	104	60	
20	-	6	9	55	94	59	
21	3	4	4	62	104	60	
22	4	-	4	38	94	40	
23	4	-	-	16	84	19	
24	-	2	-	14	84	17	

Annex 6.

Scoring of RUOs under Private Land P&C, Common Land P&C, Mini Porjects and Total points Scored

RUO No.	Private P/C	Common P/C	Mini-Projcts	Expected Points*	Total Recieved	%
1	-	10	7	111	69	62
2	6	8	5	123	93	76
3	0	2	-	113	41	36
4	-	-	2	99	32	32
5	4	0	-	113	69	61
6	2	-	-	101	33	33
7	2	4	-	113	84	74
8	4	10	2	123	99	80
9	-	-	4	99	56	57
10	4	4	-	113	52	46
11	0	0	-	113	20	18
12	6	10	4	123	82	67
13	4	6	-	113	58	51
14	8	6	5	123	95	77

*Expected Total Points = The total points expected to be scored under all the indicators by each RUO.

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

DAS	= Department of Agrarian Services
DO	= Divisional Officer
FD	= Forest Department
FO	= Farmer Organization
IIMI	= International Irrigation Management Institute
IO	= Institutional Organizer
IRDP	= Integrated Rural Development Project
ITDG	= Intermediate Technology Development Group
M&E	= Monitoring and Evaluation
NGO	= Non Governmental Organization
OBs	= Office Bearers
P&C	= Production and conservation
RUG	= Resource User Groups
RUO	= Resource User Organizations
SCOR	= Shared Control of Natural Resources
SO	= Service Organization
SWRMT	= Sub Watershed Resource Management Team
SWS	= Sub Watersheds
TI	= Tea Inspector
TSHDA	= Tea Small Holding Development Authority
TSHDS	= Tea Small Holding Development Societies
WMC	= Watershed Management Coordinator
WRMT	= Watershed Resource Management Team

References

Bryant, Coralie and Louise G. White. 1984. Managing Rural Development with Small Farmer Participation. Kumarian Press.

de los Reyes, Romana P. 1989. Development of Process Documentation Research. The Decade of Process Documentation Research. Institute of Philippine Culture. Ateneo de Manila University. pp. 21-43.

Deyi, Wu. 1995. State of Arts and Status of Watershed Management in China. Sharma, P.N., Wagley M.P. (Eds). The Status of Watershed Management in Asia. WMTUH/FARM RAS/93/063 Field Document No. 1. UNDP/FAO.

Gibbs, Christopher J.N. 1985. Institutional and Organizational Aspects of Watershed Planning and Management: Lessons from Irrigated Water Management in Asia. Paper prepared for the Workshop on Integrated Watershed Management. Environment and Policy Institute. East West Center.

Hill Resource Development and Community Management: Lessons Learnt on Micro-watershed Management from Cases of Sukhomajri and Dasholi Gram Swarajya Mandal. 1984. Report submitted to the Planning Commissions' Working Group on Hill Area Development. India.

Hinchcliffe, Fiona et el. 1995. New Horizons: The Economic, Social and Environmental Impacts of Participatory Watershed Development. London. UK. Gate Keeper Series No. SA50. IIED.

Honadle, George and Jerry VanSant. 1985. Implementation for Sustainability. Lessons from Integrated Rural Development. Kumarian Press.

IIMI. 1993. SCOR Work Plan 1993 - 1995.

ILLO, Jeanne Frances I and Choing-Javire, MA, Elena. 1983. Organizing Farmers for Irrigation Management. The Bui-Lalo Experience. Research and Service Center. Ateneo de Naga. Naga City.

Korten, Frances F. A Participatory Approach to Irrigation Development in the Philippines. 1985. Jean-Cluade, Garcia-Zamor (EDs). Public Participation in Development Planning and Management. Case from Africa and Asia. Westview Press. pp 179-186.

Nalampoon, Anan. 1995. Status of Watershed Management in Thailand. Sharma, P.N., Wagley M.P. (Eds). The Status of Watershed Management in Asia. WMTUH/FARM RAS/93/063 Field Document No. 1. UNDP/FAO.

Nilwala Watershed: Present Status and Proposed Interventions under the Shared Control of Natural Resources (SCOR) Project. 1995. Land Use Policy Planning Division. Colombo.

Shar, P. 1993. Participatory Watershed Management in India: The Experience of the Aga Khan Rural Support Program. International Institute for Environment and Development. Rural People's knowledge, Agricultural Research and Extension Practices. pp. 38-67

Sharma, P. N. and Dixon, John. 1995. Farmers' Organization Networks for People's Participation in Watershed Management in Asia. Sharma, P.N., Wagley M.P. (Eds). The Status of Watershed Management in Asia. WMTUH/FARM RAS/93/063 Field Document No. 1. UNDP/FAO.

Sharma, P. N. and Dixon, John. 1995. Watershed Management Policy Issues in Asia. Sharma, P.N., Wagley M.P. (Eds). The Status of Watershed Management in Asia. WMTUH/FARM RAS/93/063 Field Document No. 1. UNDP/FAO.

Singha, Malti S. 1995. Review and Status of Rainfed Farming and Watershed Management in India. Sharma, P.N., Wagley M.P. (Eds). The Status of Watershed Management in Asia. WMTUH/FARM RAS/93/063 Field Document No. 1. UNDP/FAO.

Singh, Katar. 1991. Determinants of People's Participation in Watershed Development and Management: An Exploratory Case Study. Indian Journal of Agriculture and Economics - Volume 46, No 3. July-Sept. pp 278-285.

Sinha, Malti S. 1995. Review and Status of Rainfed Farming and Watershed Management India. Sharma, P.N., Wagley M.P. (Eds). The Status of Watershed Management in Asia. WMTUH/FARM RAS/93/063 Field Document No. 1. UNDP/FAO.

Thomas, Theodore. 1985. Reorienting Bureaucratic Performance: A Social Learning Approach to Development. Jean-Cluade, Garcia-Zamor (EDs) Public Participation in Development Planning and Management: Cases from Africa and Asia. West View Press. pp 13-27.

Uphoff, Norman. 1987. Activating Community Capacity for Water Management in Sri Lanka. Korten, David C. (ED). Community Management. Asian Experience and Perspectives. Kumarian Press. pp. 201-217.

Uphoff, Norman. 1986. Getting the Process Right: Improving Irrigation Water Management with farmer Organization and Participation. Working paper prepared at Cornell University for Water Management Synthesis 11 Project.

Uphoff, Norman. 1986. Local Institutional Development. An analytical Sourcebook with cases. Kumarian Press.

Wagley, Mohan P. 1995. Status of Watershed Management in Nepal. Sharma, P.N., Wagley M.P. (Eds). The Status of Watershed Management in Asia. WMTUH/FARM RAS/93/063 Field Document No. 1. UNDP/FAO.