

Report of the Sub-Group IV

On CAPART Reforms

Members

Lalit Mathur (Chair)
Ashwani Kumar
Pramathesh Ambasta
S Chatterjee
S Ali Tahir Rizvi
Ved Arya

March 19 2010

Table of Contents

Preface	3
Recommendations for Priority Action	4
1. Perspective and Priorities for CAPART	9
1.1. Perspective for CAPART	9
1.2. Priorities for Revitalising CAPART	9
1.3. Enlarging the role of CAPART	11
1.4. Autonomy and Relationship with the Ministry of Rural Development	12
1.5. Relationship with NGOs.....	12
1.6. Technology	14
1.7. Organisation and Systems	15
1.8. Immediate Action – Priorities	15
1.9. Reviews by the Executive Committee & General Body	16
2. Partnerships with Voluntary Organisations: A Strategic Vision for Change	17
2.1. Background.....	17
2.2. Defining Criteria for VO Partners	17
2.3. Partnership Process Model: The Consortium Approach	18
2.4. Operationalizing the Consortium Model of Partnership	19
3. Strategic HRD Issues including Tenure, Selection, and Regional Committees..	27
4. Human Resource Development for NGOs: Young Professional Scheme and Training	31
5. Monitoring and Evaluation and Vigilance	32
6. Systems: CAPART IT and MIS Deployment	39
7. Recommendations on Pending proposals.....	41
Annexures.....	43

Preface

CAPART has long been seen as a troubled institution. Even so, there is a great deal of goodwill for CAPART in the voluntary sector, and also genuine concern that it be enabled to function effectively to provide the services which it should, and which it also has, in brief spurts in the past. This is perhaps the reason why the prospect of possible reform in CAPART has brought back several of those who had distanced themselves from the organisation and those who have been critical of it as well. There is a mood today to change things.

The present exercise undertaken at the behest of the Executive Committee has been taken up by this subgroup in that spirit. We are more than conscious of the fact that the exercise is not as thorough nor as complete as it could have been – but then the terms of reference for the subgroup have been formidable. We have also been severely handicapped by the time provided to the subgroup, and by the uncertainties of its tenure as well. Perhaps these are symptoms of the times and of the environment in which CAPART is required to function.

Six subgroups were constituted, and while the other subgroups dealt primarily with sectoral programmes, this subgroup was required to examine the organisational structure within CAPART, suggest procedures, assess the staff requirements, examine monitoring and vigilance arrangements and several other issues. Some other matters like the scheme of Young Professionals and several representations received were also referred to the subgroup. It has therefore simply not been possible to do justice to the tasks assigned to the subgroup in this short period. We would have liked to hold consultations with members of the other subgroups before giving our recommendations – their inputs are essential for assessing staff requirements projected for CAPART. Moreover we are aware of the fact that such far-reaching recommendations should not be made without interaction on a much wider scale – there are a large number of people with experience and knowledge of CAPART, who would be able to contribute meaningfully to its revitalisation, and whose inputs would be invaluable. Under the circumstances we can only present at this stage a draft, to be further refined. However a presentation of the important recommendations has been attempted.

The efforts of the members to provide their inputs and to draft the report have been untiring, and this they have done in spite of being extremely busy themselves. As a matter of fact on some occasions participation in the discussions was itself at considerable cost and inconvenience. The fullest cooperation was also extended by the DG CAPART. The nodal officer, Shri Y K Singh and his team were most helpful as well, and provided all the information required to the entire satisfaction of the subgroup. They also made arrangements for very useful interactions with other officers of CAPART whenever necessary. The members of the subgroup would like to record their appreciation to them all. They take this opportunity to especially thank the Chairman EC for having initiated this exercise to reform CAPART – they are aware that without his support it could not have been taken up at all.

It is the hope, and indeed the expectation of the members of the subgroup that the Chairman of the Executive Committee, CAPART and the Ministry of Rural Development will extend their full support for the revitalisation of the institution.

Recommendations for Priority Action

Essential Parameters for Reform

1. CAPART is now rigidly structured and cannot deliver on the mandate spelt out in its Memorandum of Association. CAPART must be reorganised and strengthened to do so. Most importantly it should fulfil its role as the catalyst for rural technologies, as the facilitator for the growth of NGOs, as the nodal point for issues, including right-based issues of the rural poor and as an interface between NGOs, government and other agencies, To begin with, separate divisions must be quickly set up, each for rural technology and voluntary action; this process should be extended as the work evolves.
2. The stature and credibility of CAPART needs to be built up. It will require greater support from the Ministry of Rural Development and should be a member in all bodies in the government relevant for rural technologies and for voluntary action.
3. There is an imperative also to work in harmony with the state governments. The Ministry of Rural Development would need to communicate, and strengthen, the perception in the states that CAPART is an important player in RD programmes – by making the DG CAPART and his representatives, participants in the review of the RD programmes of the states and members of national level committees for policy and planning.
4. CAPART should have complete autonomy. This would mean that there would be no directions or demands from the Ministry of Rural Development either on policies or in day-to-day functioning. The Memorandum of Association and Rules provide adequate and legitimate powers to the government which could be exercised as and when required.
5. The Executive Committee and the General Body have powers to take decisions on most matters being examined by the subgroups. Therefore once the EC or the GB accord approval, there should be no impediment in implementation. They should meet regularly to review progress – so that the recommendations are not cast aside.

NGOs & Partnerships

1. It is important to weed out the NGOs who should not be provided CAPART support; it is equally necessary to identify and support established NGOs without prescribing superfluous procedures. Systems within CAPART must be devised to take these and related aspects into account.
2. CAPART should position itself to spawn 'good' volags through a process of assistance in their difficult initial years. This can be done through a process of partnerships.
3. CAPART's partnerships with VOs must be characterized by three basic principles: (i) mutual respect; (ii) mutual trust; and (iii) mutual accountability.
4. CAPART for its partnerships should adopt a consortium approach in which CAPART acts as a consortium of several outstanding organizations who in

turn anchor several regional consortia, whose members are organizations who have the potential to fulfill the above criteria.

5. Anchor Organisations will build on the experience of SVOs and TRCs and rely on setting up of a consortium. This will act as a collective with respect to important areas of functioning, learning from past experience and building something new.

HRD, Professionalisation & Performance Appraisal

1. It is necessary to professionalise CAPART and to ensure minimum tenures for all personnel. The selection process also needs to be widened.
2. For the higher management positions the following measures should be taken –
 - All leadership positions at CAPART including the Director General should have a five year term. These include Division Heads and Regional Coordinators of RCs.
 - The post of the DG should be filled on the basis of an open process through a Search Committee. As Syeda Hameed committee proposed, DG could be chosen among candidates that are development professionals, academics, or willing bureaucrats with at least 15 years of experience in rural development.
 - An amendment should be made to the Memorandum of Association and Rules of CAPART for the selection of the DG through a Search Committee.
 - In order to make it an attractive proposition for eminent persons to be interested, the level of DG should be equivalent to that of a Secretary to Government of India.
 - The recruitment to other senior posts must be done through an open competition process of a Selection Committee rather than filling them by deputation from government departments.
3. To start the process of professionalisation, as an immediate measure, CAPART should identify and induct on 'deputation' or contract, professionals and persons with experience – from government departments, banks, NGOs, institutions in rural development. A committee for selection should be set up.
4. Simultaneously it is essential to sift out unsuitable staff by offering a VRS if required – but within a short and defined period.
5. Delegate powers and authority to create a work environment which reposes faith and confidence within CAPART – not one which encourages caution, and even fear to take decisions. The DG/DDG should exercise the financial powers already delegated to them.

6. CAPART should install a performance management system. Such a system has been in practice in a number of government projects and para-statal organizations.
7. Performance of contract staff has not been appraised. Contractual staff, irrespective of the level, should be given clear job descriptions; they should know the key result areas and performance goals against which they are to be appraised.
8. A work study should be conducted to clearly identify roles and responsibility of various staff members in a new structure.

Monitoring & Evaluation

A National Standing Committee on Capacity-Building should be set up at CAPART HQ, which will cover both HQ and RCs for carrying out the recommendations of the subgroups. The brief of this Standing Committee should also include

- All vigilance, monitoring and evaluation related issues.
- Review the preventive vigilance steps undertaken at CAPART
- Review the recommendations made as part of the preventive and punitive vigilance exercises carried out by CVO.
- Examine the possibility of introducing new tools of citizen's participation and accountability for better monitoring and evaluation of CAPART and also consider the possibility of setting up Ombudsman at CAPART headquarters.
- Examine the possibility of a concurrent monitoring system in addition to the existing three-tier monitoring system may be examined.
- Consider revamping CIPART for research and training purposes.

Regional Committees

1. The basic rationale for setting up of RCs of CAPART has been decentralization by bringing CAPART within reach of most organizations in the country regardless of their size and profile. They also offer a window for decentralized functioning.
2. The RCs must continue, notwithstanding the somewhat unfortunate experiences that have been witnessed in CAPART – VO partnership. We need to think of reconstituting and reforming RCs rather than shutting them down and a EC member or a GB member could be chosen as Chair. The setting up of additional RCs should be considered based on the workload and coverage area.
3. The Regional Centres (RCs) need in fact to be strengthened and given greater responsibilities so that they can become effective links to the field, and contribute more meaningfully to CAPART's activities.
4. At present, RCs are linked to the HQ through some executive linkage, but there is need for a more comprehensive integration by bringing together RC and HQ programmes on the same platform and ensuring that the two are working in tandem.

5. The CGC Vaishali is not a RC like the others, but for historical reasons has been treated as an important resource of CAPART; there have also been administrative problems. It has potential and should be enabled to play a larger role, in partnership with the Small Farmers Associations which are functioning in several districts of North Bihar.

IT and MIS

1. A web-based application software for file tracking and accounts is already under preparation which will have an integrated accounts and financial management system and will also be integrated with the NGO-PS national portal. The software will have facilities for online application submission by NGOs.
2. This is a step in the right direction. In terms of choice of technology for the web-based software, CAPART has done well to choose free/libre open-source software (foss) tools. CAPART needs to be commended for this effort and should continue its so that the software can be tested at the earliest in 2010 and rolled out subsequently.
3. The software must help CAPART in its drive towards greater transparency and time-saving in all its project divisions. In particular, the MIS should raise pro-active alerts on each at critical points within CAPART and also for its VO partners.
4. A detailed presentation should be made before the EC on its rollout, its technical infrastructure and its programmatic logic so that views and feedback of the members on the proposed rollout are factored in before the finalization.

Young Professionals in CAPART

1. At present a large number of YPs are being posted in the headquarters and RCs; this defeats the very objective of the scheme. CAPART should not engage YPs for such routine work. It could recruit contract staff for its specific work if it so desires rather than engaging YPs.
2. No contribution should be sought from the Voluntary organisation towards the remuneration of the YPs attached with them by CAPART.
3. For several years now very few YPs have availed of the starter package for voluntary work. The reasons for this require to be examined in detail, and the package modified suitably if required.
4. CAPART should formulate a new scheme that assists NGOs to recruit professionals directly according to its requirements and nurture them for two years. Private funding agencies or government projects rarely today address the issue of institution building or nurturing talent, restricted as they are to project related funding. CAPART can step in fill this gap.

Pending Proposals

There has already been considerable delay in processing these cases and urgent steps require now to be taken. The following approach may be adopted –

- All proposals received more than two years ago (received on or before 30.09.2007) and where initial scrutiny has not yet been done, should be closed. A letter as suggested should be sent to the Voluntary Organizations (VO) informing them that their proposal is being closed.
- In all other cases, a small expert group may be constituted to examine and take a decision regarding their further processing. The expert group at Headquarters may consist of two experts, one Sub-Group Member, the HoD of the Project Division and DDG. The Expert Groups for Regional Centres (RCs) may consist of two experts, one Sub-Group Member, concerned RR & MC and DDG.

Perspective and Priorities for CAPART

1.1. Perspective for CAPART

It is important to have a perspective for CAPART, which should in fact determine the functions, approach and methodology for its operations. It has unfortunately begun to be seen primarily as a funding agency, which assists voluntary organizations according to a prescribed and approved pattern for different projects. While funding is certainly a legitimate activity for CAPART, it should not result in other areas being ignored. In the broadest terms the mandate of CAPART is the “advancement”, in every possible manner of voluntary effort on the one hand and Rural Technology on the other hand.

Capart must be so organised that it is equipped to perform the role assigned to it. This can only happen if a pro-active and even ‘aggressive’ approach is adopted. Its responsibilities would include

- Lead role for rural technologies, including specifically traditional technologies; a more aggressive and systematic search for suitable technologies, and their development and propagation (see annexure)
 - Facilitate growth of NGOs, create the environment to start new ones, and nurture them; extend the reach of NGOs particularly to tribal areas and those where they are required – drought prone, hilly regions, naxal prone areas and so on
 - Act as a nodal point for issues of the rural poor (agricultural labour, tenants, small farmers, weavers, fishermen, craftspersons) and the interface with NGOs.
 - Clearing house for rural technologies and for NGOs, civil society.
 - Provide space for discussions and a platform for pursuing policies and issues
 - Capacity building of NGOs and adopting the nodal role to harness the vast experience, talents and resources of the voluntary sector.
 - Evolving people-oriented models of development which can serve as a guide to government for adoption in larger programmes and projects across the country.
 - Take the lead in ushering in the new development paradigm emerging from the NREGA – with partnerships between government, PRIs, NGOs, civil society, village communities and the media.
 - Involvement in policy making processes and participation in various bodies and fora which are set up by the government of India and impact the voluntary sector or rural technologies.
- (Each of these could be broken into ‘component tasks’ to assess HR needs.)

Today this does not seem either a plausible or a realistic expectation from CAPART. Yet, this is the change which we must at least attempt to make – and enable CAPART to perform a ‘larger’ role.

1.2. Priorities for Revitalising CAPART

For any discussion on CAPART reforms, it is essential to have a clear perspective about CAPART itself, because that must determine its role and functions. The Memorandum of Association states that:

- ‘The vision of CAPART is to play a dynamic and catalytic role within the various government agencies and NGOs, influence public policy and contribute its share towards the many sided development of rural India.’ – Article 2(ii)

- 'The mission of CAPART is to work in close coordination with the rural NGOs and empower them, (inter alia), by engaging them in dialogue; respecting their thoughts and ideas; listening to their voice; harnessing their resources; funding their activities and strengthening their hands, particularly the women, the weaker sections of rural society and the disabled and other underprivileged sections of rural society' – Article 2(iii)
- The objectives are set out in Article 3 and its nineteen 'objects' (Annexure III); these encompass the advancement in every possible manner, of voluntary effort on the one hand and rural technology on the other. The Memorandum even speaks of intellectual property rights and escort services to NGOs.

Unfortunately, over the years, we seem to have got so accustomed to the fact that CAPART is primarily, and even exclusively a funding agency, that we do not expect it to do anything else. Even the present exercise of reforms focuses on guidelines for funding projects. Funding is certainly a legitimate activity for CAPART but it should not result in the exclusion of every other activity mandated to be its responsibility. Further, there are clear limitations to the scale and reach of direct funding. India is vast and varied and a single institution located in Delhi simply cannot serve the requirements of NGOs spread across 6 ½ lakh villages and 2 ½ lakh gram panchayats. It can however make a significant difference to strengthen and support the growth of NGOs, the quality of their interventions and the areas of their impact. This it must proactively seek to do.

None will argue that CAPART does not need reform. It is beset by several problems, has a very poor reputation and is even accused of largely attracting NGOs of dubious merit. Among the perceptions based on experience:

- There are unacceptable delays, unchecked corruption which persists despite a Chief Vigilance Officer, ineffective and sometimes damaging monitoring and no remedy or channel for the redressal of grievances.
- There are unpredictable and sudden changes in schemes and uncertainties of timely and continuing support – which threatens the survival of small NGOs and drives away the finest groups.
- CAPART has virtually ceased to matter for Rural Technologies which has become a low priority.
- There is no autonomy, very little delegation and hardly any professional competence – with Young Professionals now the mainstay.

The quick 'turnover' of Directors General (24 in 25 years, with several only in temporary charge) has been disastrous, and most unfair to Capart and also to the entire NGO sector. Worse, the Directors Generals have often had no passion or aptitude for this kind of work and are invariably happy to move to another posting. These are all serious concerns.

And yet, in spite of this disillusionment and near collapse of confidence, there are great expectations from CAPART – particularly from the NGO sector, which cannot call any other organisation its own.

All seem to agree that Capart needs to be revitalised. Several committees have given their reports over the last decade, and the functions of Capart have also been modified from time to time – in terms of the programmes it implements, the procedures it adopts and the systems it has in place. Yet these appear to have

made little difference. If changes are to happen, therefore, we need more than recommendations – required also is the manner of ensuring that they are implemented.

1.3. Enlarging the role of CAPART

CAPART is now rigidly structured in such a way that almost the entire energies of its staff are directed in providing project finance and in efforts to ensure its proper utilisation. It cannot realistically be asked to deliver on its mandate. Capart must be reorganised and strengthened in a manner which equips it to perform the role it has been assigned.

One of the first tasks must be for CAPART to take up activities and initiatives in areas which are its responsibility but which, in recent years, it has not been involved in – and to do so in a pro-active and even ‘aggressive’ manner. These should include:

- Lead role for rural technologies, including specifically traditional technologies; a more dynamic and systematic search for suitable technologies, act as catalyst for their development and adoption
- Facilitate growth of NGOs, create the environment to start new ones, to nurture them; extend the reach of NGOs particularly to tribal areas and those where they are required – drought prone, hilly regions, naxal prone areas and so on
- Act as a nodal point for issues, including right-based issues, of the rural poor (agricultural labour, tenants, small farmers, weavers, fishermen, craftspersons), SCs, tribal communities and their interface with NGOs. Such issues could include those relating to land, access to common property resources, fair wages, cases in courts, harassment by state functionaries, exploitation by middlemen, money lenders.
- Coordinate efforts to work toward solutions for such issues for the empowerment of the rural poor, and to build support through workshops, media, meetings at different fora and so on.
- Provide space for discussions and a platform for pursuing policies and issues.
- Clearing house for rural technologies and information exchange for NGOs, civil society.
- Capacity building of NGOs and adopting the nodal role to harness the vast experience, talents and resources of the voluntary sector.
- Evolving people-oriented models of development which can serve as a guide to government for adoption in larger programmes and projects across the country.
- Take the lead in ushering in the new development paradigm emerging from the NREGA – with partnerships between government, PRIs, NGOs, civil society, village communities and the media.
- Involvement in policy making processes and participation in various bodies and fora which are set up by the government of India and impact the voluntary sector or rural technologies.

(Each of these would have implications for the organisation of the office and tasks.)

It may be necessary to think of separate teams of sensitive and competent individuals which will pursue some of the distinctly non funding operations. The work would comprise elements of planning and operations, of policy and field

issues and the teams should be given the flexibility and authority to initiate interventions and incur expenditure. To begin with there could be one each for rural technology and voluntary action but more could be constituted as the work evolves. However an immediate start must be made at all costs. If this is not done, CAPART could be condemned for years to the very limited role of a funding agency.

Each sectoral division will also be required to think beyond project finance. They should also identify those issues, concerns and opportunities in their sectors which have wider implications, feed the teams concerned and work in tandem with them. To encourage initiative each division could be given an Innovation Fund. The constitution, number and work distribution in the sectoral divisions must specifically reflect these aspects—and support must not be at clerical levels but at that of managers since initiative and intellectual inputs will be required.

1.4. Autonomy and Relationship with the Ministry of Rural Development

However, CAPART cannot deliver on its mandate simply by enlarging its role and providing additional support staff. It will also require to be strengthened by the Ministry of Rural Development and indeed by the Government of India. The Ministry should associate CAPART with policy and decision making processes and with its programmes and initiatives. The stature and credibility of CAPART also needs to be built up – it should be a member in all bodies in the government relevant for rural technologies and for voluntary action.

At the same time it is essential that CAPART should have complete autonomy. This would mean that there would be no directions or demands from the Ministry of Rural Development either on policies or in day-to-day functioning. The Memorandum of Association and Rules provide adequate and legitimate powers to the government which could be exercised as and when required.

There is a need also to work in harmony with the state governments, which are closely involved with every field level intervention impacting the rural poor, and which have continuous contact with the NGOs as well, especially at the district level. There is no formal channel for associating CAPART although state-level counterparts were set up in some states several years ago. The Regional Committees have not made any impression but could be built up as meaningful instruments in this process. The Ministry of Rural Development would need to communicate, and strengthen, the perception in the states that CAPART is an important player in RD programmes. This could be done by making the DG CAPART and his representatives, members of national level committees for policy and planning, participants in the review of the RD programmes of the states (like NREGA, SGSY, watersheds, land reforms – which emphasise NGO partnerships); for Rural Technologies CAPART should be represented on the state-level Councils for Science and Technology. The issues of NGOs, their protection, their feedback on RD schemes, their support for the training of PRIs etc should be taken up for discussion with the States and reviewed periodically by the Ministry of Rural Development.

1.5. Relationship with NGOs

In the nineteen eighties there were a limited number of NGOs in rural development and fewer still involved in rural technologies. In its initial years therefore, Capart had considerable flexibility in its interaction with and support to different groups. The

situation has changed entirely since then – there has been a mushroom growth of NGOs, a staggering increase in the number and range of funding agencies and organisations, a decline in the quality and integrity of the NGOs in general and a big rise in the compensations for those working in the sector, competing with salaries given by international funding agencies.

There is now a problem of numbers and of differentiating between a ‘good’ group, and an ‘unreliable’ one. A system is certainly required to screen the NGOs which come to Capart for any kind of assistance.

Just as it is important to weed out the NGOs who should not be provided CAPART support, so also it is necessary to identify and support those which do not require detailed screening and which can straightaway be assisted by Capart.

We would need 3 categories (at least) of groups which come to CAPART –

1. The ‘established’ ones like the TRCs, the support organisations (identified for watershed programmes), the Nodal Voluntary Organisations and so on.
2. NGOs with some experience which can take up small interventions but which also need to stabilise.
3. The relatively new groups which come to Capart for the first time, or which have not had any sustained association with Capart.

The approach and criteria for providing support to each category will need to be different. What is required is a perspective for the NGOs based on the likely patterns of evolution and stage; and then to provide suitable interventions at appropriate points in time. Thus the initial support for a new NGO would be more process oriented with no programme content in the sense of project finance, but of support to the organisation to establish itself in its area of work. The NGO with some experience would think of project interventions, look for stability and an assurance of being able to continue work over the next years. It may therefore need assistance for improving its own skills and for training in accounts, planning and project formulation, support to encourage activist-facilitators from the village finance for projects and so on. Well established and reputed organisations may need assurances of a longer-term arrangement for support for the activities in their area and also for identifying and encouraging more individuals to set up to community organisations in rural areas. While details would need to be worked out, the interventions can include a long-term growth plan for support organisations which may be encouraged to provide fellowships and guidance to new entrants (similar to that for Young Professionals of CAPART), qualitative support also to reasonably experienced partner groups to strengthen their presence in the area of work, to provide for interaction on concerns of the NGOs in the field, for organising need-based training and so on.

Procedures within CAPART will also need to vary with the NGO. Thus Technology Resource Centres, Support Voluntary Organisations and reputed NGOs would have simpler procedures, and more individual and personalised assessments. Their proposals could all be dealt with at the head office regardless of the size of assistance and they would be accountable through a transparent and regular process of audit rather than the routine system of monitoring. They could also be called upon by CAPART to work with the Regional Committee concerned and pool resources for any larger effort for training, innovations and the like. These

'established' groups may require completely open-ended support, without the constraints and air-tight stipulations for general schematic projects. CAPART should be in a position to ensure the flexibility, judgement and maturity to enable this to be provided.

There is also a very widespread and genuine surge of individuals and the community who want to participate in development. This energy is to be harnessed and channelised through organised voluntary effort into meaningful activity. CAPART should position itself to spawn 'good' volags through a process of assistance in their difficult initial years. There will be dropouts and even 'failures', but these require to be seen in perspective.

It is a critical responsibility of CAPART to facilitate this process and build a base of genuine NGOs who can work with the government, the PRIs, the community, and who have the competence to handle finances and who function in a transparent and democratic manner. It is in a unique position to do so – for it has access to all of government, and more, for as a society it has far greater flexibility, and its reach can and does extend to institutions and individuals beyond government. And perhaps the most fortunate circumstance is that we have the NREGA, which provides an unrivalled opportunity for the growth and regeneration of genuine and participative voluntary action.

An important concern that has emerged in recent years is that of protection and harassment of the NGOs and their personnel – often from officials of the state departments and the police. This is aggravated when the issues relate to empowerment and the assertion of the legitimate rights of the rural poor – even through programmes like the NREGA. CAPART would need to address this and provide meaningful support to all NGOs. This should become a significant element in its partnerships.

1.6. Technology

Rural technology has been a victim of relative neglect in CAPART and therefore some comments are being given even though another group is looking at this area – there are implications for the reorganisation of CAPART as well.

There is a continuous refrain that Capart has not been able to support relevant and proven technologies. This is only because, for several years now, Capart has not seriously attempted to do so; even though its charter specifically states that it should.

The process of technology transfer depends on the status of each technology but Capart's interventions would include several activities – identifying potential technologies, supporting them in the initial stages, facilitating their demonstration in appropriate environments; pilots to validate the technology, dissemination of information through TRCs; introduction in ongoing schemes and projects of government. This will require several steps to be taken and suitable skills and competencies will need to be brought within CAPART so that pro-active initiatives to be taken.

At present the Rural Technology division of CAPART deals with all matters, with general guidance from the DG and the DDG. It is essential to carefully assess the manpower requirements, the experience and professional qualifications, the role and the specific responsibilities to be assigned to the personnel dealing with Rural

Technology. The present volume of work is neither a correct nor true reflection of the work; in fact it reveals the degeneration and neglect that has sadly, afflicted the organisation. The Memorandum of Association (Article 3) should in fact set the tone for the tasks before CAPART.

1.7. Organisation and Systems

There are historical reasons for the unwieldy structure in CAPART which date back to the merger of CART and PADI, but several measures will now need to be taken. These include:

- The selection and appointment of the top management in such a manner as to ensure an optimal combination of experience and professionalism. This requires to be taken up immediately.
- Streamline the organisation with greater delegation of responsibility and powers, including financial powers. An internal work study particularly will be required.
- Introduction of ICT systems which will also provide inbuilt checks to monitor and highlight delays; at the same time introduce transparency in decision making. Fortunately such a process is already underway.
- Create a climate of trust and confidence within CAPART. Instances of corruption must of course be swiftly finalised, but the officers should be encouraged and motivated to take initiative and be pro-active.
- Put in place a system for monitoring which, to be effective, should also provide inputs for the better implementation of projects.
- The Regional Centres (RCs) need to be strengthened and in fact given greater responsibilities so that they can become effective links closer to the field, and contribute more meaningfully to CAPART's activities. The setting up of additional RCs should also be considered based on the workload and coverage area.

The other sections in the report will deal more elaborately with these aspects as also with the arrangements for monitoring, vigilance, HR, training, and Young Professionals.

1.8. Immediate Action – Priorities

The various committees now set up will no doubt come up with useful recommendations. Many will be difficult of course, but several might be troublesome as well; others could simply not be feasible even when there is a will to act. In this situation it will be appropriate to set out a phased but definite schedule of action for implementing the recommendations, so that results begin to be seen and a process of regaining credibility commences. It is inevitable, however, that this will take time, no matter how prompt the action.

Therefore some measures should be taken immediately, which are consistent with the recommendations, which in fact will complement them, but which need not wait for the formal action on them.

Among the steps which would be immediately practical a few could be

- Identify, and induct on 'deputation' or contract, professionals and persons with experience and interest to work in Capart – from government departments, banks, NGOs, institutions in rural development.

- Sift out unsuitable staff by offering a VRS if necessary – but within a short and defined period.
- Delegate powers and authority to create a work environment which reposes faith and confidence within CAPART – not one which encourages caution, and even fear to take decisions. At present even the delegated financial powers are not being exercised by the DG/DDG.
- Take concrete and specific measures to bring back a focus on Rural Technology and on People's Action in the wider sense. Two additional teams/divisions should be appointed for the purpose, with suitable persons, adequate delegation and a directive to be pro-active.
- Finalise a strategy for Capart to initiate the process of bringing NGOs to the most exploited and troublesome parts of the country – the naxal belt (including Jharkhand, Chhatisgarh, Orissa, Bihar, parts of Maharashtra), J&K, some states in the north east, tribal and himalayan belts. In this process the support from Capart would need to respond to the complex environment of each area and be completely flexible.
- In a select few sectors (NREGA, water conservation, productivity on lands of small and marginal farmers) CAPART take the lead to finalise the specific interventions required – in a partnership mode.
- Take up a few priority issues for the most vulnerable groups (Dalits, tribal communities, migrant labour, leather workers), identify the critical interventions required and support groups to initiate action – which could range from legal assistance to campaigns to highlight the concerns.

There would be some others which will be suggested during the course of discussions in the EC, and based on the recommendations of the other groups. An empowered task force could be set up to decide upon the modalities to be adopted and to take action on these matters.

1.9. Reviews by the Executive Committee & General Body

If changes are to happen, we need also a method of ensuring that the decisions taken are implemented. The Executive Committee and the General Body have the requisite powers, and once approval is accorded, there should be no impediment. It will, therefore, be necessary for these bodies now to meet at more frequent intervals to review the progress in implementation – so that the recommendations are not cast aside, as has been the experience in the past.

2. Partnerships with Voluntary Organisations: A Strategic Vision for Change

2.1. Background

CAPART's partnerships with VOs must be characterized by three basic principles: (i) mutual respect; (ii) mutual trust; and (iii) mutual accountability.

Over the years, despite the good work done by several CAPART partners, there has been a tendency for bad eggs and fly-by-night operators in the voluntary sector to gain a foothold into CAPART. This has been aided and abetted by unscrupulous elements within CAPART, who have struck deals with such VOs and evaluators and ensured that bad practices find their way in.

The result has been a mutual erosion of trust and respect, with good voluntary organizations staying away from CAPART on the one hand and CAPART adopting a more cautious/fearful approach to the issue of partnership with voluntary organizations on the other. It has also had the impact of creating an over-cautious or fearful atmosphere within CAPART. This atmosphere of mutual mistrust and suspicion has had a spiralling effect over the years and perhaps can be summed up as a twin malaise of very low quality VO partners being serviced by very low quality CAPART staff.

Professionalization of staff and change in work culture on the one hand and strengthening of monitoring, evaluation and vigilance systems on the other will go a long way to check this unfortunate trend¹. This note attempts to go into some aspects of how CAPART should re-invent its vision of partnerships in order to get the best out of them.

2.2. Defining Criteria for VO Partners

In this respect it is important to understand that the norm of eligibility, viz., organizations should have been registered for a minimum of 3 years, and should have a bank account etc., are the "minimum" criteria. So rather than interpret the norm as "anyone satisfying this criterion is eligible for CAPART assistance", it should be seen as a minimum qualification for prospective VOs to avail of CAPART support². The following positive criteria need to be adopted in addition to the minimum criteria to clearly define CAPART's expectations of itself³:

- Partner VOs must have commitment and experience of working with rural communities, gram sabhas, vulnerable groups, disadvantaged and marginalized sections of society

1 These and related aspects have been discussed in the relevant sections on HR and M&E.

2 See CAPART: *Policy Guidelines*, 2001, New Delhi

3 These criteria are also an attempt to mirror the divergent foci, strengths, streams and styles which have characterized voluntary action in India, a diversity which must be respected as much as nourished

- Partner VOs must have worked in partnership with the rural poor to put in place development interventions (sustainable livelihoods, watersheds, convergence micro-plan implementation and so on) which can be treated as models for their area and for the country as a whole;
- or partner VOs must have demonstrated commitment to/experience of mobilizing the rural poor on issues of their rights and entitlements⁴, or for bringing them together for issues related to their lives
- VOs must have a rapport and a transparent relationship with the village communities with whom they are working
- VOs must have proper systems in place for record keeping and accounts

2.3. Partnership Process Model: The Consortium Approach

While the above criteria are good, the question still remains: *what is the process by which such partners will be inducted into the CAPART fold and how will they be sustained therein?*

For this it is proposed that CAPART for its new partnerships adopts a consortium approach. Broadly speaking the consortium approach means that CAPART acts as a consortium of several outstanding organizations who in turn anchor several regional consortia, whose members are organizations who have the potential to fulfill the above criteria.

The voluntary organizations chosen to play the anchor role will henceforth be referred to as *Anchor Organizations* (AOs), who will set up in their chosen fields of work and in their states/regions of work consortia of committed VO partners. Such AOs should be selected and mandated to function for each scheme of CAPART – Watershed Development, Micro-Finance, Convergence Planning for Sustainable Livelihoods based on NREGA, Advocacy Programmes on NREGA, RTI, FRA and FSA, Disability and so on. The AOs chosen for each of these areas will help CAPART to identify and screen partners, and select them. They will help and handhold VOs in a variety of tasks from proposal preparation, proposal screening and desk-appraisal to plan preparation, execution and monitoring. Once selected, the partner VOs will be linked formally with the concerned AO, who will provide them capacity building and field support inputs. Within a definite time-frame, the AOs and partner VOs together will knit themselves into a regional consortium around the theme of work. The consortium's first and foremost call will be to together carry out high quality work on the ground in their own area of operation which can act as examples for the rest of the country. Its second important task will be to engage with and act as a pressure group w.r.t local government, whether at district or state level, sharing experiences and learnings and pressing for desirable social change. Its third important task will be to provide an interface with institutions such as banks, research agencies, laboratories, technology development centres, experts and so on.

These AOs will represent to CAPART the interests and concerns of VO partners while at the same time act as the arms, eyes and legs of CAPART. Such a model, comparable to a business process outsourcing model will help to keep the human resource requirements at CAPART at the minimum necessary, since a lot of functions will be taken care of by the AOs in the initial stages. At the same time,

⁴ It is clear that none of these criteria are mutually exclusive

AOs will build the necessary credibility and social capital for CAPART amongst the VOs. Finally, AOs through their very conception and design, will also ensure that more AOs are created, i.e. anchor nuclei creating more anchoring nuclei, each leading to greater empowerment of the poor and cascading redundancy of voluntary effort over time, as the rural people take on the leadership of the development process in their own areas.

Such a chain of nested partnerships has the potential to bring about a revolutionary change in CAPART. This is because CAPART will pro-actively seek out excellent organizations who have the potential to play the anchor role. Once these AOs are chosen and brought on board, the battle for regaining credibility and mindshare (or building “social capital”) amongst the voluntary sector will definitely begin to be won. As the partnerships between the AOs and VOs get strengthened and shaped into a consortium which is working together on specific issues, credibility of the process is likely to grow.

Indeed, it would not be an exaggeration to state that no matter how many internal reforms are carried out within CAPART, until CAPART is seen as a desired destination by reputed and excellent organizations, its mandate will not be fulfilled. Therefore, within the voluntary sector, such a partnership with anchor organizations will also send the strongest possible signal of change. This is because, most credible voluntary organizations (small or big) will have greater faith and lesser apprehension in dealing with another voluntary organization, with whom they will be able to share and exchange learnings, express difficulties and shortcomings freely and who will also be able to guide them.

Thus, rolling out the anchor-based consortium model of partnership is among the most important recommendations of the present Sub-Group.

2.4. Operationalizing the Consortium Model of Partnership

2.4.1. Identification of Anchor Organizations:

The first task that needs to be undertaken to put this process in motion is to select AOs for each CAPART scheme. Given the urgency of this task and the need to ensure the highest quality and transparency in selection of AOs, it is recommended that a search committee of the CAPART EC is set up comprising senior CAPART EC members, DG and/or DDG CAPART. The search committee can invite more members to join from the voluntary sector or can seek the opinion of experts from the voluntary sector if needed. The composition of the search committee should be such as to bring in members who can give insights on potential AOs for each of CAPART's schemes and programmes. CAPART should shortlist all organizations who have partnered with it and with whom the partnership has proven to be of high quality. The search committee should take the inputs of CAPART and the other co-opted members into consideration and provide their own inputs, drawing upon their vast experience in the sector and their knowledge of organizations and agencies who have the potential to play the anchor role. These deliberations should result in a shortlist of potential anchor organizations. These AOs should be written to by CAPART, inviting them to for an expression of interest in playing the role of AO. CAPART may also decide to send the letter in the name of the Chairperson of the search committee (since this is likely to have a greater impact).

2.4.2. Criteria for Selection of AOs

An indicative list of criteria for selection of VOs to become AOs is as follows:

- Length of time for which organization has been working in the field
- Vision of the organization, especially in terms of having a decisive pro-poor and pro-women thrust
- Stability of organization in terms of personnel and core leadership
- Annual budget and quantum of funds handled
- Adequate support staff for finance and administration and ability to handle accounts, documentation and reporting and manage projects
- A minimum of at least 5-7 years of experience of working on the area for which they are being invited to be AOs, as also the the area and population covered and the expenditure on such programmes
- Quality of work done in its technical and other aspects (particularly relevant for livelihoods, convergence and watershed programmes)
- Institutional arrangements put in place for management and sharing of benefits and local people's institutions created
- Organisation's presence in the field and its credibility and reputation among the communities it is working with
- Organisation's links and relationships with PRIs at different levels
- Organisation's relationship with local government at the block and district level
- Presence of qualified and experienced team with social workers, mobilisers, technical personnel and grassroots "barefoot" activists
- Presence of team members with requisite communication skills, capable of becoming trainers and support personnel
- Reputation of organization within its own peer group – how is it viewed as a friend which is capable of mutually supportive co-existence, or as an organization which is promotes itself and tends to take on an undemocratic or dominating role
- Ability of potential trainers to work in genuine partnership with other VOs, CBOs, CSOs and grassroots agencies without taking on a "big brother" type of role or viewing the relationship as one involving power rather than responsibility

2.4.3. Meeting of Potential AOs

The AOs who respond positively to the search committee's invitation should be invited to a special meeting (or meetings if required) to be hosted by CAPART. This meeting should act as a briefing for what they are expected to do. The search committee members and other resource persons deemed fit by the search committee should be the expert panel presiding over this meeting and should brief potential AOs about their roles and the expectations of CAPART from them. Potential AOs should also be invited to make presentations on their work and capabilities, keeping in mind the criteria outlined above.

2.4.4. Final Selection of AOs

This meeting will be the preliminary round of screening on the basis of which organizations will be shortlisted to play the AO role. The expert panel will then invite

AOs may apply formally to CAPART. The application should be followed by a field review and evaluation by selected CAPART monitors. This should help narrow down the selection of AOs to the number needed so that the best are selected for the task. Once the AOs are selected, CAPART must enter into a formal MoU with them spelling out the expected outcomes and inputs from each side, while also clearly spelling out time-frames and redressal measures in case of problems.

2.4.5. Process Cycle of Consortium Formation

2.5.1. Identification of Partner VOs and Proposal Preparation

Once the AOs are nominated, they have to attend to the task of selecting and getting on board the best VOs to form the consortium that they will anchor. It is proposed that a time frame of 6 months is reserved for the first round of this task. The tasks under this head are as follows:

- identification of promising partner CSOs
- seeding, promotion and orientation of potential partners on the theme of work and the consortium approach through special promotional workshops
- proposal preparation – support is provided by AOs for preparation of proposals by the VOs for soliciting funds from CAPART
- these proposals are subject to a preliminary desk appraisal

2.5.2. Pre-Funding Appraisals and Final Selection of VOs

- Pre-funding appraisal of the organisation by CAPART through a field visit which assesses its capabilities, strengths and presence among its target communities along with the feasibility/desirability of work
- While the PFA will be conducted by monitors nominated by CAPART from its expert panel, to make the process transparent and to ensure that the consortium principle is strengthened, the AO must be involved. This can be done by sending AO personnel to the field area of the VO who is under evaluation
- Selection of VO partners on the basis of this PFA. The AO must decide the scale of partnerships that it can handle for the CAPART programme. As an indicative figure, we recommend that at any given point of time a minimum of 25 organizations must be catered to by the AO

2.5.3. Post-Selection

- MoU between CAPART and VO regarding the project that the VO must undertake. The MoU must clearly mention that the VO is part of a consortium and will be anchored by the AO selected for the purpose
- sanction and release of funds by CAPART

2.5.4. Training and Field Support

- training on technical and social aspects of the theme in a Basic Training Course (BTC) held at AO
- Monitoring of work done by the partner in the process of action plan preparation through email/phone etc.

- field-based support in their own areas of operation for
- baseline survey
- action plan formulation
- once action plans are ready, field based support to partners for action plan execution and impact assessment
- specialised training from time to time
- on-going interface support vis a vis government and funding agencies
- on-going dissemination of research and training material
- on-going awareness generation

2.5.5. Annual Consortium Meet

- An annual consortium meet will be convened every year by the AO and which will be mandatory for all partner VOs to attend. It should also be made mandatory for CAPART officials of the concerned project division to attend this meet.
- Such a meeting can be visualized on the one hand as a “Group Monitoring Workshop” where each partner presents the work done by it, the challenges faced, the issues that need addressing at the level of policy and so on.
- On the other hand, it is also a valuable platform to bring together a wide range of partner institutions or collaborative organizations such as banks in the case of SHG-Bank Linkage programme, Employment Guarantee Commissioners and district collectors in the case of NREGA, Supreme Court Commissioners and their Advisors in the Right to Food Case and so on. Such a meet will help iron out several issues where government or third-party interface is essential.
- Finally, for officials of CAPART, the meeting will offer a way to come face-to-face with the organizations that they are funding and the work done by them. It will also be a wonderful opportunity to get mutual misapprehensions, concerns and problems out of the way and will go a long way to creating greater trust.

2.6. Funding Support to AOs

Funding support to AOs in the first year of setting up of AOs will comprise the cost of 4 three-day promotional workshops and 4 three-day application finalization workshops. It is estimated that with a participation of about 40 persons, the cost of one such workshop will be around Rs.1.25 lakhs. This means that in a year CAPART will have to earmark Rs.10 lakhs for the AOs promotional efforts.

This amount will be released in two instalments every 6 months. It is expected that the first cycle of promotion-> proposal preparation->sanction can be effectively completed in 6 months time.

In addition, CAPART should provide Rs.2 lakhs per annum for hosting the two-day partner meet in which all members of the consortium will gather to review their progress and plan their future course of action. This budget will also take care of any experts that the consortium may want to call for the meeting to guide their work.

All subsequent costs of training and support should be part of the partner VO budget and should be paid by the VO to the AO.

2.7. Monitoring and Evaluation of AOs

It needs to be stated clearly and unambiguously that the principle of separation of evaluation and execution functions must be strictly adhered to. Thus, while concurrent monitoring of partner VOs work will be part of the AO's functions, the evaluation of the work of both partners and AOs will and must be done through external agencies or institutions empanelled by CAPART to carry out the function.

The training and capacity building effort of AOs will have to be evaluated against the outputs it delivers. Here, we can say that there are different layers of output:

- the training programmes, promotional efforts, orientations and exposures are activities which lead to the direct output of enhanced capacities
- the institutions supported and brought on board are also a direct output of the AO process
- Putting 1 and 2 above together results in the work done in the field by the partners supported which is an indirect output of the AO process
- The support that these AOs provided to their partners is an indirect output of the AO process
- The work done by the partners supported by these AOs is also an indirect output of the AO process
- The policy advocacy work done is a direct output of the AO process
- Any research material, IEC material, films etc. produced as part of the consortium are direct outputs of the AO process

Given the above framework, appropriate metrics can be devised in each case to evaluate the outputs. The indicators can be both qualitative and quantitative. The quantitative indicators are easily measured – in terms of courses conducted, trainees who have attended, the VOs supported, training infrastructure created and so on. Given the timeline and the specific quantitative targets, monitoring of achievements against these targets is simple to do. The more important questions are qualitative. VOs may be inducted in the right number but is their work on the ground of good quality? Is the work of the organisations anchored by the AO of a good quality? Trainings may be conducted as per target but have capacities of trainees really been enhanced? What is the quality of processes initiated?

Given the above concerns, it is proposed that we have a multi-pronged approach to the issue of monitoring and evaluation:

2.8. Training and Capacity Building of VOs

For the training and capacity building efforts, the first set of indicators relate to the number of programmes conducted, the number of participating organisations and individuals etc. The methodology is simply to compare the quantitative achievements against the targets at the end of each period.

The second important indicator is the performance assessment of the trainee. The methodology for performance assessment is 3-pronged:

- an examination at the end of the course (in the BTC) which assesses the trainee's grasp of what has been taught;
- concurrent evaluation by trainers and resource persons who interact through the length of the course with the trainees and assess their understanding of technical as well as social issues, their attitude and behaviour as well as their interaction with co-trainees and co-team members; and
- concurrent peer-review of the trainee

The above information is pooled together by the trainers at the end of the course and for each trainee a grade should be arrived at giving appropriate weightage to examination score, trainer evaluation and peer-review. Disadvantage points for trainees from a very poor or disadvantaged background should also be factored in before arriving at the grade. On the basis of the grade, a certificate is issued to the candidate. This certification system ensures that the quality of training is kept uniformly at a high level and the trainees and the trainers take the course seriously. The trainee certificate is a fairly good indicator of the quality of training imparted by SPS.

- After the training, the trainees go into their field area and start surveys and plan preparation activities, if required. The quality of the training imparted is reflected in the quality of these surveys and the action plans prepared; and
- After action plan preparation, the plan is implemented. During implementation, the quality of training is assessed through the works executed, the books maintained, the social processes adopted and the institutions set up

2.9. VO Induction and Support Process

The methodology for the field-based impact of training and capacity building can be understood from the VO Support Process outlined below.

The quality of VOs selected is an issue which is perhaps more important than the number of VOs inducted into the programme. In order to ensure that the highest quality is maintained, the whole process of VO induction goes through several stages:

- Promotional Workshops: The first stage of evaluation/screening takes place in promotional workshops, where VOs are required to make presentation on their work. The presentation covers the following points: (i) Experience of the organization in working on natural resources; (ii) Experience of the VO in community based projects; (iii) Perspective and commitment of the VO; (iv) Competence (in terms of team, technical expertise, leadership); and (v) Infrastructure and personnel available to handle large grants.
- A screening committee is set up comprising AO and CAPART resource persons. The committee grades each VO on the basis of the presentation. In particular, the grades are given on the committee's observations on: Perspective, Experience and Competence of the VO and the need for the project in the proposed area. The committee's brief is to make a preliminary assessment, as accurate as possible, on the capabilities of the VO to undertake a complex project in the concerned theme. The committee's recommendations help to shortlist prospective partner VOs.

- Proposals and concept notes from the partners will be invited on the work they propose to do, the area where they propose to do it and the details of the gram panchayats and local institutions with which they propose to work. The note will also include a profile of the organisation and its work experience along with profile of main team members and a copy of the last 3 years' audited statement of accounts and the registration certificate.
- On the basis of the proposals, the VOs shortlisted will undergo a Pre-Funding Appraisal (PFA). The PFA will be conducted by senior experts with requisite experience in the theme of work.
- The PFA will look at the following points closely with respect to the VO: (i) verify the documents of the organisation – the registration certificate, accounts books etc. will be verified in the original; (ii) the status and credibility of the VO in its area of operation will be assessed through field-level meetings with village communities and panchayat members; (iii) the track record of the organisation will be looked at in terms of the work done, the impact of this work on the lives of people and so on. Field visits will be conducted to assess the type and quality of work done by the VO; (iv) Team members and key personnel will be met and the capacity of the organisation to implement concerned projects be assessed; (v) the possibilities and problems of the work proposed to be done will also be assessed.
- On the basis of the PFA report's recommendations, a decision will be taken as to whether the organisation should be inducted or not.
- Once a positive decision is taken regarding the organisation's entry into the stream, an MoU is signed between the AO and the partner VO. The MoU specifies all the work that each partner to the MoU is expected to do, along with the outputs and milestones they are expected to achieve and against which they will be evaluated.
- The organisation begins its activities by sending its team for a BTC at AO. The team undergoes training and subject to its successfully completing the training, is issued certificates. If the team is not up to the mark, the organisation is either advised to make substitutions or is eliminated from the stream.
- The preparatory round of activities are village meetings, meetings with panchayats and mobilisation campaigns around the theme area
- After this, the participatory technical and social surveys start running up towards formulation of the action plan. At this time a support team from AO visits the organisation. They look at the work done, assess the quality of the work done by the team and suggest modifications/changes etc. that may be needed. If there are serious problems with the organisation and its work, the AO can recommend that CAPART mounts an evaluation to consider whether they should continue in the stream or not.
- On the basis of the support team's visit and the mid-term report of the organisation, the next tranche is released.
- The next visit of the support team is in the implementation stage. At this stage, the implementation of the action plan is reviewed. If found satisfactory and subject to utilisation of at least 80% of the amount released thus far, the last tranche of funds is released.

2.10. Role of Regional Committees

As explained in detail in the separate section on Regional Committees (RC), the Consortium approach will be extended to the functioning of RCs as well. Once a consortium has been set up, the VO partners in it will broadly fall into two categories: those working on a larger scale and falling outside the funding ambit of RCs; and those working within the scope of RCs. A consortium by itself will “belong” to CAPART, not to HQ or RC. However some consortium partners, depending on the scale of operations, will be funded through RCs and others (again depending on the scale) through HQ.

The presence of the consortium cutting across RC and HQ will serve a very important implementation integration of CAPART:

- Thus, all projects will have a cohesive strategic vision and objectives which will be formulated at the level of CAPART and will inform activities of CAPART across the board.
- The working of RCs will also be mainstreamed
- The concepts of group monitoring, peer review etc. through the consortium approach will be extended to the RC as well paving the way for an overall healthier culture and atmosphere and greater transparency in RC functioning
- The integration at the execution level will supplement the integration at the governance and the vigilance levels (proposed elsewhere in the report of Sub-Group 4)

3. Strategic HRD Issues including Tenure, Selection, and Regional Committees

Broadly, there are two sets of recommendations, one to do with strategic Human Resource Development (HRD) and the other to do with detailed Human Resource Planning (HRP). But at this juncture we restrict ourselves to the first one, namely strategic HRD.

3.1. Frequent changes at the top leadership Level and the need to fill all leadership posts through a process of open competition

CAPART must have a leadership that is stable, dynamic and pro-voluntary action if it has to play “a dynamic and catalytic role with various governmental agencies and NGOs, influence public policy and contribute its share toward the many-sided development of rural India”, as envisioned in Policy Guidelines of March 2005, which still remain valid (please refer to Article 2(ii) in the Memorandum of Association).

Sadly, there have been frequent changes at the top. One has to only look at the roster. There have been 24 DGs in the space of 25 years (quoting Dr. Syeda Hameed Committee Report). With only one person serving for a reasonable period of three years, average tenure turns out to be less than a year.

Frequent changes in the top management result in sudden and unwelcome shifts in policies and priority areas. The division heads avoid taking initiatives because they are not sure if such efforts would be appreciated by the top management (next DG). As a result, there has been a serious lack of strategic and long term planning at CAPART. Without having a stable, dynamic, and futuristic leader at the top, it would be naive to expect one.

One or perhaps the main factor behind high frequency seems to be that these posts (DG as well as DDGs) are filled up **only** by civil servants who often think it is not a place to spend a long time at or they are awaiting their next post in Delhi. Thus there is little interest in them to build a strong foundation at CAPART.

3.2. Mindset of Leadership that has resulted in “Donor-Grantee” Relationship with NGOs

CAPART leadership has to pro-actively engage and partner with the NGOs in the interest of finding solutions to current development challenges. In complete contrast, the mindset of the leadership has apparently been such over the years that CAPART’s relationship with the NGOs. is that of “Donor-Grantee,” rather than that of partnership.

3.3. Staff Capacity is Low on Designing and Nurturing New Programs and Learning from Its Grantees’ Experience

Staff members seem to lack the ability to grasp the challenges of development in this diverse country from desert in western Rajasthan to north eastern states and

vast swath of tribal communities coming under Maoists' influence, how could an agency like CAPART assume a single size fit all solutions. Schemes are unimaginative and pre-structured rather than promoting innovative solutions.

Staff members are not up-to-date with the latest happenings and challenge of rural development. The latest example seems to be that of climate change issues or for that matter challenge related to implementing NREGA more effectively or distress migration from rural areas.

Internal Learning Systems don't exist. There is lack of feedback loop. Again it shows staff members' inability to learn from experience. They don't hold workshops where all grantees could come and share their experience. There are no cross-learning forums, and there is no research that would bring out data-based findings based on which the programs could improve. There are no publications for sharing lessons from its grants with the rest of the world.

3.4. Lack of Decentralisation at the Headquarters

There is also lack of decentralisation and delegation of financial powers to division chiefs leading to lack of autonomy and low staff morale.

3.5. Need to Revitalize Regional Committees

Regional committees are essential to address the diversity of development issues, to encourage and promote small NGOs and voluntary action, and to serve as a testing ground for new ideas through small grants. RCs need high quality professional resources in order to achieve this objective.

However, RCs are largely seen as "outposts" where people not desired at the HQ are banished. However, once an RC acquires a bad reputation, "good people" are sent to fix it. This is perhaps not the best professional way to develop RCs. Further as they begin to show signs of "murky" reputation, eminent persons of the voluntary action are reluctant to take over the functioning of RCs, choice then falling on mediocre people, who then succumb to pressure.

The subgroup could not discuss issues relating to the Consultative-cum-Guidance Centre Vaishali, which has had a continuing relationship with CAPART. It has been receiving programme support from CAPART and has been meeting the salary costs of the Director. The CGC is not a RC like the others, but for historical reasons has been treated as an important resource of CAPART; there have also been administrative problems. It has been a resource centre for the approximately 20 Small Farmers Associations functioning in several districts of North Bihar for many years. This model has a potential and the CGC should be enabled to play a larger role.

3.6. Recommendations

There is an urgent need to devise certain new principles and new norms for leadership and staff qualifications, tenures, recruitment and selection and powers of decision making.

- a. We recommend that all leadership positions at CAPART including the Director General should have a five year term. These include what are currently called Division Heads at the Head Office.
- b. We strongly recommend that DG post should be filled on the basis of an open competition. As Syeda Hameed committee proposed, DG could be chosen among candidates that are development professionals, academics, or willing bureaucrats with at least 15 years of experience in rural development (recommendation # 4.1.3). Candidates could also be those with experience in donor agencies and foundations, and even possibly those who have worked on social responsibility projects in the private sector
- c. In order to have an open competition, we propose setting up a Search Committee (also recommended by Syeda Hameed Committee). However it would require an amendment in the constitution of CAPART. Such a Search Committee will invite worthy candidates and recommend at most three candidates to the Government (Honorable Minister of Rural Development). The final name will be approved by the Cabinet Committee on Appointments. Details of the proposed amendment regarding the search process and composition of the search committee are given in Appendix 1.
- d. In order to make it an attractive proposition for eminent persons to be interested in it, we recommend that the government must raise the level of DG to that of a Secretary to Government of India.
- e. CAPART should recruit competent people for division head positions, hereby proposed to be called Programme Directors or Deputy Director Generals. It would result in a flat structure. Number of Programme Directors would be as many as number of programmes, as per the recommendations of other subgroups. Administrative Functions of human resource development and finances could be dealt with by having Director (HRD) and Finance Controller. Vigilance Function needs to be handled by Director (M&E) supported further by an Ombudsman.
- f. Each Regional Committee must be headed by a member of the Executive Committee and its program team is headed by a Programme Director level person, to be called Regional Director.
- g. Development professionals, willing civil servants, and academics, all could apply as candidates for the posts of Programme or Regional Directors, having at least 10 years of experience in the relevant field of rural development. Finance Controller however ought to be selected from a government ministry.
- h. Entire recruitment of Programme Director level posts must be done through an open competition process rather than filling them by deputation from government departments. For this, EC will set up a **Selection Committee**. Please see Appendix 1 for further details.
- i. The Programme Directors should serve a term of five years.
- j. All other recruitments for the posts below the Programme Director should be outsourced to a reputed HR agency.
- k. Salary scale may be out of line with market trends to attract professionals. Good professionals either stay with the NGO or join a donor agency. Why should they come and join CAPART? When recruiting, therefore, the Search Committee and Selection Committee must ask for latest salary trends in the relevant universe of candidates comprising of qualification, expertise, and experience.
- l. Yet salary alone would not be enough incentive for good professional to join CAPART at the level of Program Directors/DDGs. They must be given adequate autonomy (read financial powers) to decide on the grant proposals.

3.7. Ensuring Accountability through Performance Management System

One strongly feels a lack of accountability in the current set up either for outcomes regarding the goals set out for CAPART or in terms of taking action against those who are responsible for making decisions.

There is a complete lack of role clarity resulting in lack of focus and commitment among staff. Reporting relationships are ambiguous. There are no job descriptions and there are limited avenues for career progression. Having people on deputation from other departments and ministries actually makes it more difficult, given their accountability and further growth depending largely in the parent department or ministry. At the same time, question can be raised about accountability of people who are recruited from the market.

Recommendations

m. While having a fixed term solves the problem partly, we propose CAPART should install a **performance management system. Such a system has been in practice in a number of government projects and para-statal organizations.**

Governments of Tamil Nadu and Bihar have evolved a system for their World Bank aided poverty alleviation projects and NDDDB has it for a number of years. They are working satisfactorily. Performance management system would clearly lay out key result areas and the process of annual appraisal.

n. We recommend that CAPART adopt elements of 360 degree appraisal rather than the ACR system. The 360 degree appraisal, well established in the organizations named above ensures feedback from peers as well as subordinates/juniors, not just from the "boss." This promotes team work too.

o. Performance of contract staff has not been appraised. We recommend that contractual staff, irrespective of the level, should be given clear job descriptions; they should know the key result areas and performance goals against which they are to be appraised.

p. It would be useful to conduct a work study that would clearly identify roles and responsibility of various staff members in a new structure.

q. It should be of great use to engage an outside agency to develop a performance management system including identifying key result areas, quantifying performance parameters and then devising a process of assessing performance and installing performance-linked rewards/incentives. Such an agency could handhold the process for a couple of cycles so that these new ideas are internalized.

4. Human Resource Development for NGOs: Young Professional Scheme and Training

4.1. Young Professional Scheme: Improve it as well as give HRD Support to NGOs

The intent behind the YP scheme was to bring highly qualified professionals to the development sector. Placing them in NGOs and then in government offices was seen as a way to give them adequate positive practical experience and exposure to grassroots reality to prepare them for the long haul in the sector.

Young Professionals (YPs) are recruited for three years. They are however being treated as appendix in the CAPART organizational structure, doing “odd” jobs including vetting proposals from NGOs at the CAPART HQ even though they neither have the requisite qualifications nor the experience to do so.

They work here while waiting for a job opportunity. Neither there is a career planning or counseling offered to them to work in the rural development sector, nor is there any skill development for the three years (or two years now) they are expected to give to the sector.

NGOs too treat YPs merely as a subsidized human resource. Further survey with some of the YPs reveals that they aren't keen to invest in YPs since the latter spend only a year. While it is true that NGOs would like to retain good YPs and make every effort to do so, YPs too come with the conditioning that they are there to gain some “grassroots” experience and then they would work with a government agency to gain that experience too. Survey reveals that this second leg in the government office is not often well planned and YPs end up being only “babus”. This kind of career shift hasn't really worked in many cases.

Recommendations

r. Sub Group recommends following modifications for Improving the Current YP Scheme:

- CAPART should not engage YPs for its routine work. It could recruit contract staff for its specific work if it so desires rather than asking YPs to do it.
- YP should be given support for two years.
- No contribution should be sought from the Voluntary organisation towards the remuneration of the YPs deputed at them by CAPART
- It was a matter of concern that for several years now very few YPs have availed of the starter package for voluntary work. The reasons for this require to be ascertained, and the package modified if necessary with a view to encourage YPs.

s. Sub Group strongly recommends that CAPART should formulate a new scheme that assists NGOs to recruit professionals directly according to its requirements and nurture them for two years. Private funding agencies or government projects rarely today address the issue of institution building or nurturing talent, restricted as they are to project related funding. CAPART can step in fill this gap.

- Such HRD support should be available only to NGOs working in backward regions.

- The HRD Support scheme would take into account the salary expectations of the graduates of professional colleges both in management as well as in technical disciplines.
- Apart from salary, the HRD support scheme should encourage NGOs to develop a two year program of induction and skill development for its professional staff. Skills that are badly required relate to community mobilization, community institution development and working with PRIs on the one hand, and theme or sector related on the other (such as dairy, horticulture, watershed, and so on). This will enable the NGOs to also fruitfully participate in the programs such as National Rural Livelihood Mission.
- It could invite proposals from NGOs based on their program profile and CAPART could sanction certain amount of support specifically to underwrite the cost of HRD.

5. Monitoring and Evaluation and Vigilance

5.1. Objective of Monitoring & Evaluation

The objective of Monitoring & Evaluation is to ascertain project's implementation periodically and systematically so as to ensure that the benefits reach the target group.

5.2. Functions of Monitoring & Evaluation Division (MED)

Functions of MED are the following:

- Dealing blacklisted cases for recovery of the funds from the concerned VOs.
- Keeping records of the VOs blacklisted by other Ministries informed to CAPART.
- Dealing with complaints against voluntary organizations.
- Empanelment of Monitors.

5.3. Diagnosis

Based on discussions with various stakeholders of CAPART and judging from the public perceptions about the functioning of CAPART, it is quite clear that CAPART's ME division has been suffering from reputational, operational, performance, compliance and accountability risks at all levels of existing system of monitoring and evaluation. The pernicious climate of bureaucratic mode of policing of VO and lack of social capital among stakeholders of CAPART has resulted in a crisis of legitimacy in ME division!

It is also interesting to note that CAPART has been institutionally so heavily dependent on the Central Government that it has become largely opaque and mostly non-transparent in its key decision-making areas especially monitoring and vigilance division. This has been noted by Public Accounts Committee of the Parliament and also several studies including Sayeda Hamida Report of the Planning Commission and the report of TCS on CAPART. It is common knowledge that CAPART's ME division has been in a sort of 'comatose' because of policy paralysis generated by 'principal-agent conflicts' in areas of funding and policing of voluntary organizations. It is in this sense, CAPART's current malaise is rooted in too much governmentalization and too little participation from civil society organizations in decision-making processes relating to monitoring and evaluation.

The existence of a long list of black listed voluntary organizations at the CAPART headquarters is ironically not a symbol of 'quality compliance model' at CAPART but actually a symptom of deeply rooted crisis of 'accountability' in the upward and downward streams of relations between CAPART and VOs. Moreover, the crisis of accountability at the CAPART is further accentuated by largely unorganized, non-transparent nature of the voluntary sector especially 'fly-by the night' Voluntary Organizations. Though it does not justify but explains CAPART's obsession with 'policing' of voluntary organizations at each stage of proposal for funding; it is this way CAPART officials earn benefits from their monopoly over resources, discretion and ability to silence the dissenting voices from the Voluntary sector. Characterized by varying, conflicting self-interests and goal perceptions, CAPART officials and civil society stakeholders have often compromised on realising the rights of citizens and failed to ensure greater accountability from public –officials and service- providers. A cursory analysis of functions of ME division clearly shows that there is deficiency at both supply and demand side of monitoring. From this has stemmed the phenomenon Douglass North called "path dependence", i.e., the heavy weight of accumulated rules and regulations, formal and informal, and the resulting constraints on the scope and speed of institutional change for effective and efficient ME at CAPART. Since CAPART is essentially a government mandated 'donor agency', it is important that we need to reinvent ME division with new ideas, tools, technologies of 'participatory governance' structures. Therefore, the success of CAPART crucially hinges not only on effective and efficient operational/management processes but also on institutionalizing innovative means of transparency and accountability especially in view of CAPART's reliance on the centralized, opaque bureaucratic norms of decision-making, the nature of funds, (which are essentially in the forms of 'grants'), and the poorly defined and managed decentralized relations between headquarters and regional centres of CAPART. In short, a participatory, transparent, iterative management and accountability framework for monitoring and evaluation is need of the hour. For this, we must recommend changing focus of ME division from 'project's implementation' to multilevel accountability to ensure that all the major stakeholders in CAPART work in tandem to achieve the goals of ME.

5.4. Recommendations for policy changes in M&E

Strengthening existing provisions of monitoring and evaluation by identifying organizational integrity of both CAPART and its key stakeholders to hold organizations accountable for achieving publicly stated standards of fiduciary responsibility and corruption control must be core concerns of ME division. Therefore, the first task of ME division is to identify vulnerable operational points, processes where leakage of funds can be tracked in multi-faceted monitoring of projects and also facilitate organizational learning for ME officials regarding "why integrity works". Enhanced ME systems need to be coupled with effective, efficient multi-level accountability arrangements-converging top-down and bottom up approaches of monitoring, for assessing the performance and analyzing impact of works undertaken by VOs/civil society organizations. Following steps may be taken immediately:

- Need to move away from "policing of VOs" to Development Evaluation by focusing on outcome analysis of interventions of VOs. The outcome analysis ought not be guided by 'crime and punishment' perspective but capacity building of VOs and bench marking integrity norms in the execution of CAPART projects.

- There should be a National Standing Committee (NSC) on Monitoring and Evaluation (and Vigilance) related matters including empanelment of Institutional Monitors. The selection of monitors should be on specified norms and done in a transparent manner. Credible organizations all over India may be included in the present system of Institutional Monitors. The possibility of a concurrent monitoring system in addition to the existing three-tier monitoring system may be examined.
- Investment and Improvement in current institutional capacity for a better 'financial accounting' and 'record book keeping' of CAPART projects. This will require tailoring and adaptation of the organizational architecture of current M&E division to the new and more efficient and participatory accountability rules and incentives for VOs. A strict time-bound appraisal and accounting system needs to be designed in consultation with VOs. ME division needs to invest in supply of requisite skills, tools and technologies for both ME division at CAPART and also VOs. The ME (monitoring & evaluation) division is currently too much preoccupied with 'supply-side' monitoring and account-based compliance systems. We need to develop a new framework for integrating 'supply-side' into 'demand-driven' mechanisms of monitoring from the grassroots. Therefore, institutionalising social accountability interventions in ME division has become mandatory and obligatory. We need to recommend experimenting with new tools of citizen's participation and accountability in the monitoring and evaluation of internal functioning of CAPART and the projects sponsored by it. Some of the popular accountability tools in voluntary sector include *participatory budgeting*, *public expenditure tracking*, citizen monitoring of public service delivery, citizen advisory boards, community score card, lobbying and advocacy campaigns, development compact etc.
- The members felt that there is a need for greater transparency as also to ensure prompt and effective action in all cases of corrupt practice. The possibility of introducing an ombudsman in addition to the CVO may be examined. The present CVO could become member-secretary to proposed Ombudsman; the selection criteria and other issues for establishing Ombudsman could be evolved by a task-force of EC of CAPART. The current system of Chairman, CAPART as the 'highest appellate authority' would continue to remain in place and would act on the basis of reports/recommendations of "Ombudsman". Ideally, Ombudsman must come from civil society having experience in law and governance. However it would need to be borne in mind that, on the one hand CAPART is a relatively small organisation with a limited number of employees and a large structure for vigilance could be unwieldy, and on the other, that it has an interface with thousands of NGOs across the entire country. Regular meetings with NGOs in different regions rather like 'jan sunvais' could be considered to bring in transparency. A *National Standing Committee on vigilance, monitoring and evaluation*, which would review the system could also be considered.
- Since CAPART is mostly a supply driven service-delivery organization, it is important that we focus on "Project Appraisal, Evaluation, and Sanction", a major source of CAPART's poor, inefficient and corrupt image. Therefore, we need to create 'strategic alliances' among champions of integrity in the government and civil society to develop an effective institutional partnership model that goes beyond typical 'donor-donee' perspective. The current practice of Appraisal and Evaluation at CAPART seems to have been influenced by TCS report (1996). CAPART has adopted three tier monitoring system which consist of Pre-funding Appraisal, Mid-term Evaluation & Post Evaluation. Earlier, individual Monitoring System was in practice. Now, CAPART has introduced Institutional Monitoring System in place of

individual monitors in which National/State level reputed Institutions have been identified. Though 206 'Institutional Monitors' have been identified, the timely compliance record has not been satisfactory. Therefore, we recommend remapping 'Institutional Monitors' and find out their level of involvement with ME division. It would also be worthwhile to examine to return to identifying some eminent "Individual Monitors"; **constitution of "National Standing Committee" would be the first step** and also members from EC and General Body could also be urged to assist CAAPRT with ME works. All members of EC need to perform at least one project monitoring in a year; suitable modalities in this regard may be worked out by DG, CAPART. We have already made some progress in this regard; eminent people from civil society, academia and think tanks have already been identified in the meetings of Subgroup. Since the institutionalized participation of unofficial members of EC in the identification and sanctioning of project proposal is absent in the existing architecture of bureaucratic decision making, it will be a good idea to make 'National Standing Committee' a perfect institutional platform for partnership between public officials and civil society members in the area of M&E. The proposed new structure of National Standing Committee must immediately frame new guidelines for pre-funding appraisal, system of collection of information, empanelment policies for appointment of monitors, parameters for assessing the effectiveness of voluntary organisation, suitability of monitors etc.

- Post project impact assessments may also be considered as part of the M&E framework. The guidelines should also be reviewed from time to time to bring in transparency and participation by the stakeholders.
- To avoid the delays in submission of reports of the evaluation by Institutional Monitors (IMs), one Young Professional should also be deputed to assist the IM. The current practice of a four stage process of evaluation of projects has become cumbersome and sub-optimal in many cases; it needs to be made 'single-window' system at the level of sanctioning and the monitoring of projects must be supported by a rigorous system of post-project impact assessment; once a projects gets approval, 75% of the money ought to be released. Pending 25% of the money needs to be released only after post-facto impact or outcome assessment of the project.
- The new guidelines wrt to Project Appraisal, Monitoring and Evaluation must focus on enabling institutional environment for promoting entrepreneurship and innovation in the voluntary sector as we know that various flagship development programs of UPA government such as NREGA have created a new opportunity space for innovation in the voluntary sector. A separate 'Innovation Fund' at the disposal of CAPART for nurturing and supporting innovative civil society programs and actions would be essential for facilitating new initiatives of accountability for ME . For a beginning, this can be started in areas of NREGA, NRLM and preventing carbon emission.
- One of the weakest areas of CAPART's ME division is proper documentation and scrutiny of application for project; in most cases of blacklisting of VOs, the role of grant sanctioning and monitoring authorities have been noted and criticized. (Ref. Public Accounts Committee reports). Therefore, along with verifying the eligibility, credibility, professional competence of the VO, it is also important to strengthen the vertical and horizontal structures of vigilance at CAPART.

- Like NREGA, CAPART needs to develop a sophisticated MIS system that works in tandem VOs. Each recipient of CAPART's grant willingly agrees for social audit of their programs and projects by their key stakeholders. A comprehensive and continuous system of public vigilance of CAPART's projects will help deal with complaints against rogue/fly-by-the-night operators in the Voluntary sector and enhance the reputation of government and civil society; mechanisms and processes for implementing social audit of NGOs receiving CAPART's grant can be developed by a high-powered committee of EC in consultation with DG, CAPART.
- CAPART also must use more rationally and efficiently CIPART as an 'incubation centre' for developing standard benchmarks for ME and also for training of officials from government/ PRIs and VOs in the supply and demand side of ME. CIPART needs to become a nodal knowledge and training centre for monitoring and evaluation studies. For this, we need to alter the existing structure of leadership and functional processes of CIPART; a full time Director from the civil society/academia/Social work/ Public Administration having experience in development and governance should be given autonomous responsibility to run the institute. The 'Professional Network of Institutes' (PIN) for institutional monitoring and evaluation of CAPART related projects needs to be anchored at CIPART.
- According to Byelaws-31 of Service Byelaws of CAPART, CCS (Conduct Rules), 1964 and CCS (CCA), 1965 have been made applicable to the CAPART employees. The Vigilance Division of CAPART is also functioning within the parameters/rules laid down by the CVC. Therefore, it would be appropriate to continue the existing arrangements in CAPART.
- In addition, Vigilance Division should be linked with ITD Control system of CAPART in such a way that Vigilance Division can control over the delays in sanctioning/releasing the projects by giving a timeline to the concerned project division or RCs so as to reduce the number of complaints and VOs grievances as a part of preventive Vigilance.
- A scan of vigilance cases at CAPART establishes that often the award of penalty depends on whims and fancies of competent authority. Second, there is no timeframe for awarding penalty or altering penalty; this leads to subversion of natural justice. Third, it is interesting to note that CBI was involved in investigating a case of fraud/cheating to the tune of Rs, 27,500 whereas large cases of fraud is audited Internally without CBI enquiry. Is there a clear-cut guideline for referring cases to CBI? We need to fix this issue and follow a more rational and transparent system of referral. Therefore, a thorough reappraisal of all 'vigilance cases' by a high-powered committee comprising DG and select members of EC for preparation of guidelines of fair and rational norms of holding enquiry and awarding penalty must be formed. The report of the committee would be submitted to the chairman of CAPART within a time-frame of 8 weeks. While conventionally, the term vigilance has come about to mean post-facto or punitive vigilance, the current practice sets great store by "preventive vigilance". Indeed, the GoI view is clear: "While surveillance and punitive action for commission of misconduct and other malpractices is certainly important, the 'preventive measures' to be taken by the CVO are comparatively more important as these are likely to reduce the number of vigilance cases considerably"⁵. Broadly speaking, "preventive vigilance" involves review of existing procedures to find out the causes of delay, review of regulatory functions from the point of view of improvement/augmentation, devising adequate

⁵ See for instance, *Vigilance Manual*, Central Vigilance Commission, 2005, Government of India

methods of control on the exercise of discretion, “identify areas in an organization which are prone to corruption and to ensure officers of proven integrity only are posted there”⁶,

- It is recommended therefore that a Standing Committee of the EC or a National Standing Committee on Monitoring and Vigilance be set up at CAPART HQ, which will cover both HQ and RCs. The brief of this committee should be to:
 - review the preventive vigilance steps undertaken at CAPART
 - to review the recommendations made as part of the preventive and punitive vigilance exercises carried out by CVO
 - Recommend to CAPART actions that need to be taken
 - examine the Action Taken by CAPART on recommendations
- It is also recommended that action on the recommendations of the Standing Committee on Monitoring and Vigilance is made mandatory and is taken out of the purview of the discretionary powers bestowed on the CAPART Executive. This is in order to ensure that there is a separation of the implementation and vigilance functions within CAPART.
- Further the integration of RC into the above Vigilance Standing Committee will ensure the third level of integration of RCs with HQ, with the EC-RC linkage and programmatic linkages forming the other two⁷

- While CAPART has blacklisted several voluntary organizations whose functioning was in doubt, it is unfortunate that the same commitment does not seem to have been shown in the matter of strong deterrent penal action against those within the system who have also contributed to bringing about this sad state of affairs. It is in the best interest of CAPART therefore, to set up a vigilance system as outlined above and widely publicize the action it has taken in each case on its website so that justice is not only done but is also seen to be done

- The current transfer and posting policy needs to be made rational and performance –oriented. A major overhauling of transfer and posting will add to better and efficient ME and vigilance at CAPART. DG needs to be asked to prepare a policy recommendation in this regard.

- It is also the considered view of this Sub-Group that a system of partnerships as outlined in the section on partnership when put in place will go a long way in ensuring participatory facilitation of partner VOs, which is what the true goal of any monitoring exercise should be. The consortium approach will guarantee peer group review, group monitoring, concurrent monitoring through field support. It will also provide a multi-stakeholder platform for reciprocal monitoring of CAPART functioning, especially the annual consortium meet proposed under the model

- It needs to be stated that CAPART partners are working very often at loggerheads with local power configurations in their areas, aided and abetted by vested interests in the local bureaucracy who align with anti-poor forces to preserve and nurture the status quo. Under such circumstances, it may be found that these vested interests get together to make “complaints” to CAPART regarding one of its partners. This should be used as a positive opportunity by CAPART to review the work of its partner, in case CAPART so desires. However, the review must be carried out within the parameters and norms set out by CAPART for review of its projects and should not be influenced by the articulated pressures of local power groups.

⁶ Vigilance Manual (op.cit)

⁷ See section on partnerships for a discussion of this

- Even more so, once the review is carried out, it is imperative that CAPART reposes faith in its own system of monitoring and evaluation rather than undermine it. There have been cases where acting upon complaints of the district administration (SP, Collector etc.), CAPART has mounted a review of its partner. When a thorough and impartial review has found the partner to be innocent of malpractices, CAPART has still sought the opinion of the district administration on the review report. What is worse is, when such a feedback has not been forthcoming within a stipulated time-frame, CAPART has taken recourse to stalling release of instalments rather than unequivocally taking the side of its own partner. Examples such as this illustrate the fact that CAPART needs to go by its own system of evaluation rather than review the system simply because someone from the government has filed a complaint. CAPART would do well to remember that it is mandated to function in an autonomous space and its activities should create the space for voluntary action to take place.
- There needs to be an orientation and training programme of CAPART evaluators on the way they should conduct themselves in the field. Very often, evaluators are seen to adhere to rigid notions of what “participatory” should mean, showing insensitivity to the local power dynamics. At other times, some may behave loosely in the field area, coming across as inspectors who have come to investigate a crime rather than people who are part of a facilitation process⁸. Of course, if the evaluation process naturally throws up facts and evidence suggesting that all is not well with the VO partner, action should be taken against the partner. However, in the absence of this, behaviour such as the above can actually send the wrong signals to the vested interests in the village. In order to build capacities of monitors to undertake thorough and transparent reviews and yet preserve the delicate balance in the partner's work area, a series of training programmes may be devised by the Steering Committee/NSC on M&E which orient monitors to function as facilitators rather than as crime investigators.
- Such a step will be facilitated by a clear enunciation of what CAPART considers best practices balanced by a nuanced and sensitive view of VO work, where in several cases there may not be very simple black and white distinctions in terms of practices which must be adopted. Rather, the realities of voluntary action in remote areas with very little support and against all odds, can force committed grassroots groups not to adhere to simplistic text-book definitions of “proper” conduct. However, this may be done very often to streamline functioning and ensure best results rather than from the objective of foul play. Such cases merit an unbiased review based upon which functional inventories of best practices need to be developed.
- Equally important in monitoring and evaluation is a clear statement of outputs and indicators hard-coded into the project proposal itself. These indicators should be used to monitor the project. This in turn implies that an exercise of outlining clear outputs, impacts, processes and activities must be undertaken at the very outset. This is all the more so because several “awareness generation” projects can have such a wide and sweeping ambit that they may lose focus and become difficult if not altogether impossible to monitor without clear and transparent indicators to assist monitoring. Thus CAPART must make it a policy not to entertain proposals which are ambiguous with respect to the deliverables they are supposed to deliver. It is not a difficult task to set out indicators for quantitative achievements or impacts. Likewise, it is also not impossible to set out clear indicators for qualitative aspects of any programme which are not meant to yield physical results

⁸ This is reflected in statements made in village meetings inviting sarpanchs or other community members to state if they have “complaints” against the VO and the funds will be stopped immediately

in the field (such as those in asset creation or livelihoods projects). Such indicators should be worked out and built into the project proposal at inception.

- Needless to say, these indicators should also not become a bureaucratic stick to beat the partner with. Rather, an understanding is required as to why certain deliverables could not be delivered. This understanding must locate itself in the context of the work and activities of the partner outside of the present project to assess whether there are systemic failures at work or specific problems which can be worked out.
- It needs to be emphasised that just like partner VOs, monitors also need to be concurrently evaluated for their work and those who are not performing should be shown the door. Such an exercise will require inputs and review from the standing committee on M&E and should be mandated into the ToR for the committee
- Finally, it needs to be stated that overall positive changes in the internal work environment and the partnership model will work wonders in helping CAPART re-invent itself. For this, the consortium approach has merits in terms of allowing greater interaction between stakeholders, group reviews, reciprocity between CAPART and partners and so on. It will also facilitate concurrent and constant field-based review by field-based anchor organizations so that the evaluation component of CAPART work is greatly strengthened.

Following immediate steps may be initiated for M&E:

A National Standing Committee on Capacity-Building should be set up at CAPART HQ, which will cover both HQ and RCs for carrying out the recommendations of the subgroups. The brief of this Standing Committee should also include

- All vigilance, monitoring and evaluation related issues.
- Review the preventive vigilance steps undertaken at CAPART
- Review the recommendations made as part of the preventive and punitive vigilance exercises carried out by CVO.
- Examine the possibility of introducing new tools of citizen's participation and accountability for better monitoring and evaluation of CAPART and also consider the possibility of setting up Ombudsman at CAPART headquarters.
- Examine The possibility of a concurrent monitoring system in addition to the existing three-tier monitoring system may be examined.
- Consider revamping CIPART for research and training purposes.

6. Systems: CAPART IT and MIS Deployment

The Sub-Group reviewed the Information Technology systems at CAPART and plans for changing the same. Members were informed that a web-based application software for file tracking and accounts was already under preparation. The application is proposed to have the following architecture:

- Database (running PostgreSQL)
- Application server (running Tomcat/JBoss)
- Presentation layer (JSP , HTML, JAVA Script, JSTL)
- Business layer (Beans & Servlets)

Further, the software will have an integrated accounts and financial management system and will also be integrated with the NGO-PS national portal. The software

will have facilities for online application submission by ngos and for tracking of files and their status.

It was felt by the sub-group that this was a step in the right direction. In terms of choice of technology for the web-based software, CAPART has done well to choose free/libre open-source software (foss) tools given their advantages particularly in terms of problems of vendor lock-in and rigidities and inflexibilities associated with proprietary solutions.

CAPART needs to be commended for this effort and it is recommended that CAPART continues its efforts in this direction so that the software can be tested at the earliest in 2010 and rolled out subsequently.

The sub group was particularly concerned that the software rollout must help CAPART in its drive towards greater transparency and time-saving in all its project divisions. In particular, it was necessary for the MIS to raise pro-active alerts on each file most importantly for the decision-makers within CAPART and also for its VO partners. The sub group was informed by CAPART that this indeed was what the MIS was proposing to do.

In the light of the above, it is further recommended that a detailed presentation is made before the EC by CAPART on its rollout, its technical infrastructure and its programmatic logic so that views and feedback of the members on the proposed rollout are factored in before the finalization. CAPART's submission that the feedback of the sub group should not be such as to completely derail the ongoing effort by suggesting an ab-initio type of change, was taken seriously by the sub group and members concurred that suggestions from the EC or the present sub group should be based on the spirit of carrying forward the ongoing efforts through suitable modifications rather than re-inventing the wheel.

With the above software rollout, the backend/backoffice operations will be taken care of. With respect to the front-end or front office, it is recommended by the sub-group that CAPART moves decisively in favour of FOSS software, OS, etc. for their corporate desktops. These solutions are low cost, time-tested, secure and stable and safeguard CAPART from wasting precious financial resources on proprietary software formats with associated vendor lock-ins. A considered view can be taken on this whereby particular divisions or individuals working in very specific roles which require non-foss tools and software and for whom no FOSS substitute exists, may use such software. However, for the vast majority of desktop users in CAPART, the normal requirements are office productivity (word-processing, spreadsheets, presentations), email, web-browsing etc. Which are part and parcel of any foss desktop offering. These users should be moved on to using foss software solutions as fast as possible. The sub-group was informed by CAPART that since proprietary software platforms are purchased along with new hardware (desktop computers) as a package deal, such a move would have to wait until the next hardware purchase is made. It is the considered view of this sub-group however, that the move should be made now (notwithstanding any hardware and associated software purchased) so that the benefits of the change start accruing fast. If necessary, some consultants/agencies may be identified for the initial handholding of CAPART staff as they make this transition who can impart the necessary training and handholding support. It needs to be remembered that such support is a one-time cost which, once undertaken will not need to be repeated.

Recommendations of Sub-group IV relating to Pending Proposals

The 49th Meeting of the Executive Committee (EC) of CAPART was held on 24th August, 2009. One of the Agenda Items was Performance Report of CAPART up to 30th June, 2009. In this report it was mentioned that a total of 3209 proposals were pending at various stages at the Headquarters and the RCs. The Chairman and the members expressed serious concern about pendency of such large number of proposals and sought detailed information such as:

- a) How old were bulk of these proposals?
- b) How come that 727 proposals have not gone through even initial scrutiny?
- c) What are the main reasons for such delay?
- d) What is the average time by which a decision is taken on a proposal?

The information on committed liabilities amounting to Rs. 94.52 crores was also discussed at length. The Chairman, taking into consideration the suggestions of the members, directed that "One of the subgroups will be assigned the task of looking into the pendency of 3209 proposals and suggest ways and means so that not only these large number of projects could be disposed off timely on the basis of the nature of innovativeness in the proposals, but also all such proposals which do not contribute to innovation and convergence with flagship programmes get weeded out". Chairman also felt that unless these pending proposals are disposed off and the matter relating to committed liabilities sorted out, there should be no further release of project funds by the RCs until these matters are reviewed by the sub-committee or subgroup(s) concerned. Based on these decisions taken at the 49th meeting of the EC, CAPART completely suspended release of funds both at Headquarters and RCs in respect of all proposals whether new or ongoing.

Subgroup 4 was assigned the responsibility to look into the entire lot of pending proposals and recommend measures to clear these expeditiously.

However, during the 50th meeting of the EC held on 30th September, 2009, many members argued that at least for those proposals which have been appraised and found to be performing satisfactorily, further installments should not be held up. The EC, therefore, approved setting up of a separate "internal technical committee" to look into ongoing projects particularly reporting time overrun. The technical committee has since submitted its report and the same is likely to be discussed in the 51st meeting of the EC scheduled to be held on 25th January, 2010.

The subgroup 4, therefore, confined itself to examining only new proposals which were pending at Headquarters and also at RCs.

As reported at the meeting of the Executive Committee (EC), there are a total of more than 3000 pending proposals at the Headquarters and also the Regional Committees (RCs) awaiting decision regarding funding. The Sub-Group was of the view that of the several issues before it, the matter of these pending cases required immediate attention since this has affected the day to day functioning of CAPART. Therefore, in its first three meetings, the Sub-Group obtained detailed information from officers of CAPART regarding various stages of pendency of these proposals both at the Headquarters and the RCs. Formats were suggested for submission of such information and for ease of scrutiny the data was compiled in six monthly periods dating back to two years. There were some variations between the figures available with the Computer Division (ITD) and those with the functional heads, and these were asked to be reconciled. The distribution of these pending cases over the period of last two years was also obtained. The Sub-Group held discussions with

the Division Heads and other officers; in this entire process the Nodal Officer Shri Y.K. Singh extended the fullest support and cooperation.

On examination of the detailed figures, the Sub-Group observed that the pendency both at Headquarters and in the Regional Centres is not as large as initially anticipated. The Sub-Group found that in many cases it was actually possible to take quick decisions regarding disposal of the proposals. However, to ensure that each and every proposal is evaluated on merit and also in an earliest possible time frame, the Sub-Group recommends that:-

1. All proposals which were received more than two years ago (received on or before 30.09.2007) and where initial scrutiny has not yet been done, should be closed. A letter should be sent to the Voluntary Organizations (VO) informing them that their proposal is being closed; however where a VO feels that the same proposal should be processed, it can request a review giving justifications with regard to costs, areas of operation, benefits, etc. (A draft letter has been suggested by the Sub-Group).

2. In all other cases, a small expert group may be constituted to examine and take a decision regarding their further processing. There are about 180 such cases in Headquarters; the pendency in Regional Centres is uneven but Lucknow, Hyderabad and Guwahati account for the bulk of the cases. The expert group at Headquarters may consist of two experts, one Sub-Group Member, the HoD of the Project Division and DDG. The Expert Groups for Regional Centres (RCs) may consist of two experts, one Sub-Group Member, concerned RR & MC and DDG. The Sub-Group identified certain experts for the expert group at Headquarters and the same is given at Annexure-I. The Sub-Group is of the view that for the RCs, knowledgeable individuals (persons preferably members of the General Body of CAPART), who are familiar with the region may be co-opted. A list of such individuals identified by the sub-group is at Annexure-II. It was further felt that for assured results Dr Mihir Shah be requested, and he has accepted, to write to these experts and request them to spare their time for this exercise.

3. To facilitate the groups to examine the cases, an information sheet for each proposal would be prepared for each case. A format has been suggested to enable the Division Heads and Regional Centres to do so.

The Sub-Group feels that decisions on the pending cases should not be delayed and therefore the process of examining them should be taken as quickly as possible. This was also a concern expressed at the meeting of the Executive Committee on September 30 2009.

The Sub-Group, therefore, had made interim recommendations which were immediately actionable before the final report is given. Action on these interim recommendations could have been initiated by CAPART much earlier.

Annexure 1. CAPART's Role in Promoting Rural Technologies

Technologies

There is a continuous refrain that Capart has not been able to propagate relevant and proven technologies. This is only because, for several years now, Capart has not seriously attempted to do so; even though its bye-laws specifically state that it should.

The process of propagation will depend on the status of each technology but this will need to move through distinct stages. Capart's interventions would then include several areas – identifying the environments in which it is suitable; facilitating its demonstration in such environments; dissemination of information and awareness creation; introduction in ongoing schemes and activities of government, quasi-government and private sector institutions; assisting in evolving an appropriate marketing strategy.

There are a host of technologies, already identified and accepted as suitable, which need a thrust for propagation – a few are listed here. These will each require a technology-specific approach for which CAPART must take the lead role – for handholding, mentoring, support through different stages.....

Bamboo board	Board from Water Hyacinth
Banana Stem Pulp Board	Treadle Pump
Electronic Resistivity Meter	Geodesic Dome for Storage
Low Cost Tissue Culture Laboratory	Farm level water harvesting

To illustrate the tasks and the nature of work which would be involved, these have been set out for 'technologies' in the following table – these will clearly have several implications for the way CAPART is to be organised

Task/Function	Activities	Attributes & Experience	
Search, Selection of technologies.	For each 'area' research & shortlist. Visit, assess, consult with experts. Prepare presentations, perspectives, papers on each technology	Capacity to understand technologies, their potential. Experience in interaction with field level scientists, institutions, NGOs.	There could be different levels of staff, but with specific responsibilities. A team to be built up.
Strategy for the propagation of each technology selected	Identify experts, experienced persons, organisations, industry. Hold brainstorming workshops, tours. Prepare concept papers.	Understanding of the process of technology transfer. Capacity to hold intelligent discussion with persons across sectors. Experience of writing notes, papers.	Mentoring, handholding, troubleshooting are some areas which will need to be examined and supported
Demonstrations of tech through NGOs, TRCs, Institutions	Drawing up a demo 'package' with costs, institutional contribution, and timelines. Prototype development for new technologies		.
Pilot Projects for	Eg Decentralised solar		

propagation	lighting – with MNRE, RGGVY		
Training and Extension coordination			
Integration with Programmes/Existing Activities – beyond pilots	Eg Filler slab, Conical tiles, roof water harvesting – with IAY and Rural Housing		
Media, Publicity			
Networking with S&T agencies – govt, quasi govt, Volags, pvt sector	Set up institutional arrangements. Space for interaction and exchange.		

At present the Rural Technology division of CAPART deals with all matters, with general guidance from the DG and the DDG. It is essential to give some thought to the manpower requirements, the experience and professional qualifications, the role and the specific responsibilities to be assigned to the personnel dealing with Rural Technology. The present volume of work is neither a correct nor true reflection of the work-load for Rural Technology in CAPART; it in fact reveals the degeneration and neglect that has sadly, afflicted the organisation.

There are two examples of areas where a difference can immediately be made – and an impact quickly seen. Solar lighting for remote villages through a decentralised model is one. MNRE is already providing funds for this under the RGGVY and this can be a big thrust area, particularly relevant in the context of Climate Change and Copenhagen. This will encompass technology, the voluntary sector, the Govt of India, the State Governments, the village community, NREGA and SGSY or NRLM, the self-employment programme of poverty alleviation. Capart already has participated in this sector.

Housing technology is a second thrust area – there are several construction technologies which are suitable for public buildings and houses but are not being adopted in the large, and expanding, construction sector. A great deal can be done including training of govt engineers and architects, changing the syllabus in engineering and architecture colleges, modification of guidelines to include appropriate designs, reviving local skills using local construction materials, reorienting the network of nirmiti kendras, coordinating with NHRM and SSA and so on.

Annexure 2. CAPART Regional Committees: The Way Forward

Background

The basic rationale for setting up of RCs of CAPART has been decentralization. Such decentralization enables greater outreach and coverage of voluntary organizations across the country and has the potential to enable good work to take place by making CAPART within reach of most organizations in the country regardless of their size and profile. It needs to be noted that this must serve still as the prime reason why RCs must continue, notwithstanding the somewhat unfortunate experiences that have been witnessed in CAPART – VO partnership particularly with respect to RC funding. For the idea of decentralization is a sound one, what has gone wrong is its operationalisation.

The other major reason why RCs need to continue is that they offer a window for decentralized functioning. Conceived as such, the RCs have an extremely important role to play in encouraging voluntary organization in their incipient stages.

RCs also have the potential to act as the ears and eyes of CAPART in the field, gathering information and getting to know CAPART partners and potential CAPART partners more intimately by building proper bridges with the voluntary sector.

Finally, the establishment of RCs has generated unprecedented expectations among the voluntary sector across the country and as such it may be infeasible to conceive of a closure of these RCs.

Given their potential, it is indeed unfortunate that RCs have not lived up to their expectations. Largely, the problem seems to be not with the idea of vision but with the operationalisation of this vision especially with regard to:

- high quality professional resources to act as the executive arm of the RCs. Indeed, the RCs are seen largely as "outposts" where people not desired at the HQ may be banished. Once however, the RC acquires a bad reputation, then "good" people are sent to apply the brakes. Neither of these criteria are good to decide the quality and quantity of human resources required there
- Very eminent persons of the voluntary sector being reluctant to take over the running of these RCs, very often the choice is poor or mediocre
- Poor vigilance and grievance redressal systems
- Poor peer review of RCs by members of the voluntary sector in the

CAPART EC/GB

The Way Forward

Reconstitution of RCs

We therefore need to think of reconstituting and reforming RCs rather than shutting them down. For this names should be invited from all EC and GB members of CAPART of people of eminence and proven track record who can be inducted into the RCs. This exercise should be commenced at the earliest.

Integration of RCs and their Mainstreaming

At present, RCs are linked to the HQ through some executive linkage, but there is need for a more comprehensive integration. Such integration needs to be made at the following levels:

a. Governance Level: To achieve this, it is proposed that one EC member or a senior CAPART GB member should be chosen to Chair each RC. This must become a policy decision of CAPART to ensure better standards and practices.

b. Programmatic Level: This can be achieved by rolling out the Consortium model enunciated in the Strategic Vision for CAPART Partnerships (elsewhere in this report). As part of this vision, setting up of consortia of voluntary organizations is proposed, each consortium being anchored by selected voluntary organizations of impeccable credentials. Depending on the nature of the programme, it is possible that organizations working on a small scale on a particular theme are part of the consortium as well as those working on a larger scale. Organizations within a consortium may be supported by the RC or HQ depending on the scale of operations and funding support. This framework has the merit of bringing together RC and HQ programmes on the same platform and ensuring that the two are working in tandem towards a common vision of implementing CAPART “Flagship” Programmes

c. Monitoring, Evaluation and Vigilance Level: Given the consortium approach, the evaluation and monitoring roles will be integrated at the RC and HQ level. What is required further is integration at the vigilance level. For this it is recommended that a Standing Committee of the EC on Vigilance at CAPART HQ be set up, comprising senior EC members, CVO and Director Finance CAPART. One very important brief for this Standing Committee is to monitor and review on the basis of "preventive vigilance"⁹. Essentially this means that rather than wait for vigilance

9 See the section on Monitoring, Evaluation and Vigilance of this Sub-Group's report

disasters to take place, the committee should seek to identify loopholes and problems and pro-actively ensure seek that action is taken by the concerned departments at HQ and the concerned RCs to plug these loopholes. It is necessary to ensure that strong action is taken swiftly and is also widely seen to be taken within CAPART as soon as vigilance issues are unearthed or encountered. Such action will send a strong deterrent signal to all within CAPART who have the wrong intentions and have largely got the impression that "they can get away with it".

Human Resource Review

Apart from the above specific measures, it is also proposed that the human resource review and ensuing recommendation exercise proposed by Sub-Group 4 should make specific recommendations for RCs so that the problems of low quality human resources within CAPART is addressed from the point of view of reform

Pendency in RCs

The Sub Group also looked into the issue of pending proposals at RCs. A system was proposed by it for disposal of these cases which has been described in detail in the section on pending proposals.

Annexure 3: Setting up Search and Selection Committees (reference to Ch. 3)**Appendix 1 to Chapter 3****Search Committee for Recruiting Director General in an Open Competition and Terms and Conditions of Appointment**

1. Rule 39 states “[Director General] will be appointed by the Executive Committee with the prior approval of the Government of India.” It doesn’t lay down the procedure of recruitment and selection. It also doesn’t specify that DG has to be from Indian Administrative Service.
2. To address this gap, we recommend an amendment to rule 39. It could be inserted as clause 39 (a). It will read as “Search Committee will be set up by the Chairman of the Society consisting of four members, Member (RD), Planning Commission, Secretary Rural Development, Government of India, two non-governmental eminent leaders in the field of rural development or poverty alleviation.”
3. Rule 39 also doesn’t specify the relative equivalent position of DG in the Government. We recommend another amendment. It could be inserted as clause 39 (b). It will read as “Director General shall receive such salary and emoluments as equivalent to Secretary, Government of India, and his term will be five years.”

Appendix 2 to Chapter 3**Selection Committee for recruiting Programme Directors, Regional Directors, Finance Controller and Director (M&E)**

4. We recommend that Selection Committee should be headed by a Member of Executive Committee, and other members would be Director General of CAPART and another member of the Executive Committee.
5. Selection Committee would search out candidates as per the requirement and conduct the selection process as it sees fit.
6. In order to do a thorough job, we recommend that it should take help of an independent HR agency while it could conduct interviews of the candidates based on the shortlist.
7. It would recommend the final list to be approved by the entire EC headed by the Honorable Minister of Rural Development.

Annexure 4. Use of IT to make functioning of CAPART more transparent, accountable and efficient

Information Technology Division (ITD) is playing a vital role as technical efficiency driver to accelerate the functionality and performance of the Council. ITD is maintaining a database of all the Projects received from Voluntary Organisations (VOs) since inception. A software package namely Project Information and Monitoring System (PIMS) was developed in-house in 1997 to act in a stand-alone environment independently at HO and Regional Offices.

To make funding pattern of CAPART more transparent, the process for development of Integrated, centralized Web Base application software for project monitoring, online Receipt and dispatch and accounting software has been initiated which shall be completed by Mar, 2010.

Project Monitoring System

NGOs would be registering themselves online on the National Portal (NGO-PS) and submitting for grants through this system. NGO-PS would function as front end and CAPART's web based monitoring system will be integrated with this in such a way that additional information of NGO and project details will be stored in our database. Status of the project would get automatically updated on NGO-PS. NGOs would be submitting documents, queries, progress report etc online through our website and real time status would be available on CAPART's website as well as on NGO-PS. Automatic alerts (Email/SMS) would be generated in case of any delays both at VO and CAPART end.

Financial System (FA-GL)

This module will have centralized database of Financial Accounts (General Ledger). Uniform Accounts heads would be created by Head Office and RCs would be creating vouchers against Project / Other expenses online. Real time information on Cash Book / Bank Book / Journal Voucher etc will be available at any point of time. This system would be integrated with Project Monitoring System for project payments.

Online R&D System

This is primarily a file tracking system which will have a feature of online submission of requests and will also capture the details of DAK received manually. System will have a feature to track the movement of all requests and facilitate Requestor to check status – Online. This system would be integrated with project monitoring system for project related queries by NGOs.

Technology

Architecture	J2EE based MVC
Database	PostgreSQL
Application Server	Tomcat/ Jboss
Presentation layer	JSP , HTML, JAVA Script, JSTL
Business layer	Beans & Servlets

Present Status and Timelines:

The work has already been awarded to NICSI. Accounting software is under testing and R&I module is scheduled to be delivered on 14th December. Software The complete software will be ready by March 2010 and security audit will be done through NICSI. All officers will start using this web based software for all the three modules by June 2010.

Annexure 5

POSSIBLE EXPERTS FOR
SPEEDY DISPOSAL OF CASES AT HEADQUARTERS

1	Shri P.M. Tripathi AVARD 5(FF), Institutional Area Deen Dyal Upadhyay Marg, New Delhi – 110002	3314678 3314678 (F) avard@sdalt.ernet.in avard@vsnl.com
2.	Shri Soumen Biswas Executive Director 3, Community Centre Niti Bagh, New Delhi – 110049.	241640611 soumenbiswas@pardhan.net
3.	Shri Achintya Ghosh 3, Community Centre Niti Bagh, New Delhi – 110049.	26518619 achintyaghosh@pardhan.net.in
4.	Dr. Ajay Mehta National Foundation for India India Habitat Centre, Zone-4A, UG floor, Lodhi Road, New Delhi – 110003	24641864 2469473 ajay_s_mehta@nfi.org.in www.nfi.org.in
5.	Shri D. Raghunandan Centre for Technology and Development D/158, Lower Ground Floor Saket, New Delhi – 110017	9810098621 ctddsf@vsnl.com
6.	Prof. P.S. Ramakrishnan 107, School of Environmental Sciences JNU, New Delhi – 110067	9958514140 26704326 psr@mail.jnu.ac.in
7	Prof. RN Sharma, Center for Development Studies School of Social Sciences, Tata Institute of Social Sciences, PO Box: 8313 Mumbai, Deonar-400088	Email:rns@tiss.edu Office no: 91-22-25525000 (Board Number) Phone no; 09819916630(m)
8	Prof. M.H. Suryanarayana, Indira Gandhi Institute of Development Research Gen A.K. Vaidya Marg, Santosh Nagar, Goregaon (East)Mumbai 400 065	Email: surya@igidr.ac.in Mobile:0-9765290045 Tel.: +91-22-28416515 (O) +91-22-28416215 (R) Fax:22-28416399

9.	Dr. Raman Kataria Jan Swasthya Sahayog 1-4, Parijat Colony Nehru Nagar Bilaspur, Chattisgarh – 495 001	07752-247966 jss_ganiyari@rediffmail.com
----	--	---

Annexure 6**POSSIBLE EXPERTS FOR
SPEEDY DISPOSAL OF CASES IN REGIONAL COMMITTEES**

Regional Committees	Status	Expert from the Voluntary Sector
Ahmedabad	Maharashtra Gujarat Daman and Diu Dadra Nagar Haveli	Himanshu Kulkarni Neeta Hardikar Dinesh Reddy
Bhubaneswar	West Bengal Orissa Chhattisgarh Andaman Nicobar	Achyut Das Shyam Sunder Saraswati Swain
Chandigarh	Haryana Himachal Pradesh Jammu and Kashmir Punjab Chandigarh	Rajeswari Raina Iqbal Singh
Dharwar	Karnataka Kerala Lakshadweep Goa	T.Pradeep Viren Lobo Sriram Ramaswamy Gita Sen
Hyderabad	Andhra Pradesh Tamil Nadu Pondicherry	Jagdish Puppalla Snehlata
Lucknow	Uttar Pradesh Uttarakhand	Madhavan Anil Joshi
Jaipur	Rajasthan Delhi Madhya Pradesh	Neelima Khetan Arun Tyagi
Patna	Bihar Jharkhand	B. Mishra Sanjay Dixit
Guwahati	Arunachal Pradesh Assam Meghalaya Nagaland Tripura Sikkim Manipur Mizoram	Monisha Behl Carmo Noronha