

PN-ARK-654

76081

SECOND ANNUAL REVIEW WORKSHOP FOR THE IRRIGATION SYSTEMS MANAGEMENT PROJECT

COLOMBO, SRI LANKA

March 21-24, 1990

ISPAN Activity No. 689C

ISPAN Report No. 29



IRRIGATION SUPPORT PROJECT FOR ASIA AND THE NEAR EAST

Sponsored by the U.S. Agency for International Development



**IRRIGATION SUPPORT PROJECT FOR ASIA
AND THE NEAR EAST**

ISPAN Technical Support Center
Room 1001
1611 North Kent Street
Arlington, Virginia 22209-2111
U.S.A.
Phone: (703) 243-7911
FAX: (703) 525-9137
TELEX: 276532 ISPAN UR

INTEGRATED IRRIGATION MANAGEMENT RESOURCES

Camp Dresser & McKee International Inc. (Prime Contractor)

CAIRE

Cornell University

Development Alternatives, Inc.

Harza Engineering Company

International Science and Technology Institute, Inc.

Training Resources Group

The University of Arizona

ISPAN Report No. 29

**SECOND ANNUAL REVIEW WORKSHOP
FOR THE
IRRIGATION SYSTEMS MANAGEMENT PROJECT**

Colombo, Sri Lanka

March 21-24, 1990

**Prepared for the USAID Mission to Sri Lanka
under ISPAN Activity No. 689C**

by

**Kathy Alison
Steve Joyce
and
Basil Perera**

April 1990

**Irrigation Support Project for Asia and the Near East
Contract No. ANE-0289-C-00-704-00, Project No. 3-7631510
is sponsored by the ASIA/Near East Bureau
U.S. Agency for International Development
Washington, D.C. 20523**

CONTENTS

ACRONYMS	iii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	v
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	vii
1. BACKGROUND AND RATIONALE	1
1.1 Overview of the Project and the Workshop	1
1.2 Scope of Work	3
1.3 Critical Issues	3
2. WORKSHOP DESIGN	5
2.1 Workshop Schedule	5
2.2 Description of Workshop Sessions	8
3. WORKSHOP RESULTS	11
3.1 Policy	11
3.2 Farmer Organizations	11
3.3 Operations and Maintenance	13
3.4 Financial Management	14
3.5 Monitoring, Evaluation, and Feedback	14
3.6 Research	15
3.7 Project Management	16
3.8 Management Expectations	16
3.9 Final Agreements and Next Steps	16
4. EVALUATION OF WORKSHOP	17
5. FACILITATORS' CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	19
5.1 Facilitators' Conclusions	19
5.2 Facilitators' Recommendations	20
Appendices	
A. List of Participants Names and Addresses	21
B. Priority Issues for Discussion	27
C. Summary of Agreements and Next Steps	35
D. Major Project Successes (1989)	43
E. Participant Expectations	45

Group Reports

F.	Policy	47
G.	Farmer Organizations	51
H.	Operations and Maintenance	57
I.	Financial Management	63
J.	Monitoring, Evaluation and Feedback	65
K.	Research	71
L.	Project Management	75
M.	Management Expectations	79
N.	Evaluation Results	81

ACRONYMS

ADB	Asian Development Bank
DAC	District Agricultural Committee
DAI	Development Alternatives, Inc.
DDI	Deputy Director-Irrigation Department
ESI	Essential Structural Improvement
GITI	Galagmuwa Irrigation Training Institute
GSL	Government of Sri Lanka
ID	Irrigation Department
IIMI	International Irrigation Management Institute
IMD	Irrigation Management Division
ISMP	Irrigation Systems Management Project
ISPAN	Irrigation Support Project for Asia and the Near East
ISTI	International Science and Technology Institute
MARD	Mahaweli Agriculture and Rural Development Project
ME&F	Monitoring, Evaluation, and Feedback
MLIMD	Ministry of Lands, Irrigation, and Mahaweli Development
PR	Pragmatic Rehabilitation
SAI	Sheladia Associates, Inc.
SLIDA	Sri Lanka Institute of Development Administration
TEAMS	Consultants in Technology, Management, and Development Studies
TRG	Training Resources Group
USAID	U.S. Agency for International Development

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The facilitators wish to thank all those who made the 1990 ISMP review workshop such a success. This would not have been possible without the commitment, cooperation, and assistance of many individuals and organizations.

We wish first to thank the participants for their valuable contributions before and during the workshop. It was a pleasure to work with everyone again after a year. The dedication shown by the group during the two and one half days was very much appreciated, especially their commitment to work long, hard hours to achieve the tasks.

We would also like to thank the Irrigation Department and Irrigation Management Division, USAID, and Sheladia for their help in implementing this workshop. Special thanks go to G.T. Jayawardena and Ananda Gunasekara, Dan Jenkins, and Warren Leatham.

We also appreciate the thoughtful presentations of Secretary Wijetunga and State Secretary N.G.R. de Silva at the formal opening of the workshop, as well as that of Mr. Ariyaratne.

Finally, we would like to extend a special thanks to TEAMS (Pvt) Ltd—our team behind the scenes, for all their logistical support, including hotel arrangements, training material and supplies, secretarial and duplicating support, and management of the workshop. Professor Wimal Gunawardena and his staff—Paul Rajasekera, Indraka Edirisooriya, Joyce Perera, Chandrika Wijeratne, Prasanna Illukkumbura, and B.G. Sunil Jayaratne—put in long hours to produce the workshop products and always had smiles for us.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The second ISPAN-facilitated Irrigation Systems Management Project (ISMP) review workshop was held in Sri Lanka, March 21-24, 1990. This year the workshop was combined with a mid-point project evaluation. The combination of workshop and evaluation provided a unique opportunity for evaluators and implementers to spend 2 1/2 days together in a workshop setting to focus solely on ISMP successes and critical issues.

The workshop was facilitated by Kathy Alison, Human Resource Development Program Manager for the Irrigation Support Project for Asia and the Near East (ISPAN), and Steven Joyce, Senior Management Trainer for Training Resources Group (TRG). K.L.J.B. (Basil) Perera, Sri Lanka Institute of Development Administration (SLIDA), was the third facilitator. Mr. Joyce was also a member of the evaluation team, serving as the training and institutional development specialist. Ms. Alison and Mr. Perera had co-facilitated the first workshop in 1989.

Fifty-one participants representing the Government of Sri Lanka Ministry of Lands, Irrigation and Mahaweli Development; Irrigation Department; Irrigation Management Division; Agriculture Department; International Irrigation Management Institute; the Asian Development Bank; U.S. Agency for International Development; Sheladia; and the ISPAN evaluation team participated in the workshop. Secretary of Irrigation A. A. Wijetunga, and State Secretary for Irrigation N. G. R. Silva participated in various sessions of the workshop. (See Appendix A for list of participants.)

Workshop goals were to exchange information on current project status; improve the ability of all groups to work together as a team; review progress made since the 1989 ISMP review workshop; identify challenges and opportunities for the remainder of the project and address immediate critical issues; and develop specific agreements and next steps for dealing with these issues.

Critical issues discussed at the 1990 ISMP review workshop included: overall policy implications of ISMP; farmer organizations; operations and maintenance; financial management; monitoring, evaluation and feedback; research; and project management. (See Appendix B for a list of discussion issues and Appendix C for a summary of agreements and next steps.)

Workshop evaluation results showed overall participant satisfaction with the outcomes of the workshop, especially on development of agreements and next steps.

Chapter 1

BACKGROUND AND RATIONALE

1.1 Overview of the Project and the Workshop

The Irrigation Systems Management Project (ISMP) is a USAID/Government of Sri Lanka (GSL) Loan and Grant Agreement signed in August 1986.

The goal of this project is to increase agricultural productivity, expand rural employment opportunities, and raise farm family net income on existing irrigated land. The purpose is twofold: a) to develop MLIMD institutional capacities at national, district (range), and system levels to operate and maintain major irrigation systems on a "sustained renewal" basis, and b) to test different combinations of management and structural improvements carried out in selected irrigation systems.

The project is divided into the following interrelated components:

- farmer organization development
- operations and maintenance (O&M) improvement
- financial management improvement
- monitoring, evaluation, and feedback
- training capacity enhancement
- research

These components are expected to work together closely and cooperatively to initiate and coordinate activities that motivate farmers and government line agencies to work together to achieve ISMP goals.

In the fall of 1989, USAID/Colombo and the Sri Lankan Ministry of Lands, Irrigation and Mahaweli Development (MLIMD) requested that the Irrigation Support Project for Asia and the Near East (ISPAN) conduct a mid-term evaluation and project review workshop in March 1990. This request was based on ISPAN's successful implementation of the ISMP review workshop in April 1989, viewed as a major turning point in the implementation of the project.

The request for a review workshop to be combined with the mid-term evaluation was an innovative approach to helping an evaluation team gather and test its data and to developing concrete, realistic recommendations for mid-point project adjustments in a short time frame.

The four person evaluation team—Bechir Rassas (team leader-ISTI), Steve Joyce (TRG), Mike McGovern (DAI), and S.T. Hettige (University of Colombo)—spent one month evaluating ISMP.

The review workshop, facilitated by Kathy Alison (ISPAN), Steve Joyce, and Basil Perera (SLIDA), was held during the third week of the evaluation assignment. One of the facilitators was the training specialist on the evaluation team. The

other two facilitators had conducted the 1989 review workshop and were familiar with the project.

The workshop served two major purposes: a) to provide ISMP implementers with an opportunity to review their progress since April 1989, and b) to provide the evaluation team with more data for use in its evaluation report.

The workshop facilitators and evaluation team used a collaborative approach to complete the two-stage assignment. During the first two weeks in Sri Lanka, the evaluation team interviewed key project headquarters and field staff from USAID, Irrigation Department and Irrigation Management Division, and Sheladia (SAI); reviewed relevant documentation; visited field sites; and formulated initial findings. At the beginning of the third week of the assignment, the evaluation team and workshop facilitators formulated the review workshop discussion issues based on these initial findings.

During the two-and-one-half-day review workshop, the evaluation team heard report-outs on how ISMP planned to deal with the major issues identified in the team's initial findings, observe the working relationships among the various groups participating in the workshop, and conduct follow-up interviews with those present. For a list of participants at the workshop, see Appendix A.

Two days following the workshop, the evaluation team completed the first draft of its report and submitted it to USAID, MLIMD, and SAI for review. Two days later, a meeting was held to discuss the report and the team then completed the final draft before leaving Sri Lanka.

At the same time, the facilitators completed the first draft of the workshop report, including all of the major agreements made during the workshop.

Reflecting back on this experience, members of the evaluation and facilitation teams felt that the combination of a mid-point evaluation with a review workshop provided an excellent opportunity for interaction between the implementers and evaluators. The evaluators were able to learn more about the strengths and weaknesses of each project component and to hear the approaches being taken by the project staff to solve these constraints. They were also able to get better acquainted with the workshop participants who are involved in ISMP implementation.

Another benefit of the workshop was that senior representatives from the Ministry articulated the government policy on farmer participation in O&M and voiced strong support for the purposes of the project. They noted especially the importance of using the project as a learning laboratory to identify lessons learned and to develop ways of replicating these lessons in other areas of Sri Lanka.

1.2 Scope of Work

ISPAN was asked to provide facilitators to organize and conduct the 1990 review workshop. The facilitators were to:

- Review project documentation, including the 1989 Project Review Workshop report and project paper;
- Coordinate with TEAMS, a local consulting firm which provided all of the logistical support for the workshop;
- In conjunction with the evaluation team, analyze data collected by the evaluation team and develop critical issues to be discussed at the workshop;
- Design and conduct a two-and-one-half-day workshop aimed at problem solving and forward planning; and
- Develop a workshop report incorporating conclusions, recommendations, and next steps agreed to during the workshop.

1.3 Critical Issues

The workshop facilitators used information collected by the evaluation team during interviews and documentation reviews to identify the critical issues that were discussed at the review workshop.

An analysis of the interview data identified the following major issues that ISMP needs to focus on during the remainder of the project:

- Policy implications
- Farmer organizations
- Operations and maintenance
- Financial management
- Monitoring, evaluation and feedback
- Research
- Project management

These issues were posed as questions for discussion by participants during the workshop (see Appendix B). The responses are summarized in Chapter 3 of this report and a complete record of the responses can be found in Appendix C.

Chapter 2

WORKSHOP DESIGN

On the basis of information collected by the evaluation team in interviews with ISMP project officials and implementers, the workshop facilitators developed a list of priority issues which were reviewed by the workshop steering committee, composed of the ISMP Project Manager, USAID Project Officer, and Sheladia Chief of Party.

The specific goals of the workshop were to:

- Exchange information on current project status
- Improve the ability of all groups to work together as a team.
- Review progress made since the April 1989 review workshop.
- Identify ISMP challenges and opportunities for the remainder of the project and address immediate critical issues.
- Develop agreements and next steps

2.1 Workshop Schedule

Fifty-one individuals from the MLIMD, ID, IMD, IIMI, Agriculture, Asian Development Bank (ADB), USAID, and Sheladia, as well as the evaluation team members, participated in the workshop.

The workshop was held at the Pegasus Reef Hotel near Colombo.

WEDNESDAY, 21 MARCH 1990

5:30PM	Registration/Reception
6:00PM	Opening Session
	- Project Successes
	- Expectations
	- Goals/Schedule/Norms
	- Logistics
8:00PM	Reception and Dinner

THURSDAY, 22 MARCH 1990

Official Opening

8:15AM Participants Assemble

8:30AM Lighting of the Traditional Oil Lamp

8:35AM Welcome Address by

Mr. G.T. Jayawardena, Project Director, ISMP & Additional Director,
IMD

Addresses by

Mr. K. Yoganathan, Director of Irrigation

Ms. Kathy Alison, ISPAN Workshop Facilitator

Mr. J.J. Pinney, Head of Irrigation Division, USAID

Mr. D.M. Ariyaratne, Director, Irrigation Management Division

Mr. N.G.R. de Silva, Secretary to State Minister for
Irrigation

Mr. A.A. Wijetunge, Secretary, Ministry of Lands, Irrigation
and Mahaweli Development

9:25AM Vote of Thanks by Mr. Warren Leatham, Chief of Party, ISMP

9:30AM Tea Break

10:00AM Project Status Panel

G.T. Jayawardena, ISMP Project Director

Dan Jenkins, USAID Project Officer

Warren Leatham, Sheladia Chief of Party

Questions and Answers

12:00PM Introduction of Priority Issues to be Addressed in the Workshop

12:30-
2:00PM Lunch

2:00PM Small Group Discussions

6:30PM Adjourn

8:00PM Dinner

FRIDAY, 23 MARCH 1990

8:30AM Small Group Report Outs
10:30AM Break
10:50AM Report Outs
12:30-
2:00PM Lunch
2:00PM Report Outs
4:00PM Break
4:15PM Report Outs
6:30PM Adjourn
7:30PM Reception
8:30PM Cultural Evening/Dinner

SATURDAY, 24 MARCH 1990

8:30AM Review of 1989 Workshop Management Expectations
- What are we doing now that we should continue to do?
- What did we agree to do that we are not doing and should start doing?
- What new things should we start doing in terms of project management?
10:30AM Break
10:45AM Presentation of Agreements and Next Steps
- Clarification
- Final Agreements/Next Steps
- Appointment of Workshop Agreement/
Next Steps Monitoring Committee
12:30PM Evaluation
1:00PM Closure/Adjourn
Lunch

2.2 Description of Workshop Sessions

Opening Session

The opening session on Wednesday evening provided an opportunity for the group to share some of the major successes of ISMP over the past year (see Appendix D for list generated in the first session).

The group was also asked to identify expectations for the workshop (see Appendix E).

Workshop goals, schedule, and norms were shared before the group adjourned for a reception and dinner.

Official Opening

Thursday morning's session opened with the formal inauguration of the workshop. Special guests from MLIMD, ID and IMD, and USAID participated in the lighting of the traditional oil lamp and the official greetings that followed. (See the official program above for the list of official speakers.)

Project Status Panel

A panel consisting of G.T. Jayawardena, ISMP Director, Dan Jenkins, USAID Project Officer, and Warren Leatham, Sheladia Chief of Party, gave their views on the current status of the project. The facilitators had asked the panel to respond to the following questions:

What is your vision of the overall project goals as you see them?

Discuss progress in meeting overall goals and lessons learned.

What is the current financial status of the project?

What do you see as the major constraints facing ISMP in the coming year(s)?

Ananda Gunasekara, Deputy Director of IMD, joined the panel to clarify the present situation about the legalization of farmer organizations.

A question-and-answer session followed.

Introduction of Critical Issues to be Discussed

The facilitators identified the priority issues and specific questions that would be discussed during the workshop. The main areas were: policy; farmer organizations; operations and maintenance; financial management; monitoring, evaluation and feedback; research; and project management. (See Appendix B for a complete set of questions.)

Working Groups/Small Group Task

Seven working groups were assigned to discuss and develop practical, realistic recommendations about the major critical issues facing the project. The groups were asked to discuss the issues, write their responses on flip charts, and be prepared to present their findings the next morning.

Working Group Report Outs

The all day session provided an opportunity for each of the seven groups to present their findings and recommendations, and for the large group to recommend next steps needed to implement the tasks. The complete copy of group responses to each topic area can be found in Appendices F to L.

Review of Management Expectations developed at the 1989 Workshop

On Saturday morning, the group was asked to divide up by agency or institution (ID, IMD, Sheladia, USAID, IIMI). Each small group was asked to answer the following questions: 1) Based on your expectations for working together that you developed last year, what did you agree to last year that you are not doing now, but should be doing? 2) What new expectations do you have for working together more effectively in the next year? Each group put its responses on flipcharts and presented its ideas to the entire group. Final agreements were then reached. (See Appendix M for a complete list of management expectations.)

Presentation of Agreements and Next Steps

The facilitators reviewed all of the recommendations and agreements made the day before and presented them to the group for final agreement. Each agreement called for a next step, specific dates, and someone to take lead responsibility. At the end of the session a Workshop Agreement Monitoring Committee was established to monitor the progress of the agreements made during the workshop.

Evaluation

The group members were asked to complete an evaluation form to provide feedback to the facilitators and organizers on goal achievement, facilitation, areas that could have been improved, and arrangements and accommodations. (See Chapter 4 and Appendix N for the evaluation results.)

Chapter 3

WORKSHOP RESULTS

This chapter summarizes the specific agreements and recommendations about the critical issues that were discussed by the working groups at the 1990 review workshop. For a copy of all workshop recommendations and who is responsible for implementing them, refer to Appendix C. This summary does not include minor agreements made during the workshop. See Appendices F - L for these specifics.

3.1 Policy

The policy group identified the following effects of ISMP on Sri Lankan national irrigation policy (present and future):

- Recognition of the need for farmer participation in decision-making;
- The desirability of strengthening farmer organizations' capability to take responsibility for O&M, including construction;
- Recognition of the need for some process of legalization of farmer organizations;
- Development of a mechanism for setting priorities for construction schedules; and
- Recognition of the need for guaranteed funding by Treasury for sustained renewal/maintenance of the irrigation system.

The major recommendation from the policy working group focused on the need for a top level Ministry policy decision in the near future on government funding for 'sustained renewal.'

The policy working group recommended that a meeting be arranged in the near future between the Secretary/MLIMD and project representatives from USAID, SAI, ID, and IMD to discuss the importance of and necessity for government funding for sustained maintenance and what next steps are required to assure this funding.

3.2 Farmer Organizations

The farmer organization working group identified several major learnings from their work with farmer groups:

- The acceptability of organizing farmer groups on an hydrological basis,

- The benefits of selecting institutional organizers from local area to act as catalysts for organizing farmer organizations,
- The effectiveness of secret ballots to select farmer representatives and DCO officers,
- The need for expanding membership of DCOs to include all farmers,
- The need for comprehensive (technical and management) training programs for farmers, farmer representatives, and field-level officers.

Major agreements reached at the workshop about ISMP's role in farmer organizations are as follows:

- ISMP will study the issues of federation and self-management of farmer organizations. ISMP will not facilitate the federation process, but will work to strengthen farmer organizations who will then decide themselves whether they want to federate.
- ISMP will develop education and training programs to help farmer organizations undertake their new responsibilities after legalization and gain skills in interpreting and executing their new legal powers.
- Pilot water courts will be established by project managers to help resolve water conflicts using social rather than legal sanctions. A code of ethics for farmer groups will be developed with input from the DCOs.

After a great deal of discussion about this component, the participants agreed that a "Think Tank" focusing on issues relating to farmer organizations should be formed.

The Think Tank concept will provide ISMP with a mechanism for reflecting on the specific issues facing farmer organizations in terms of legalization, federation, resolution of water conflicts, contracting, O&M responsibilities, and the like. It will also provide an opportunity to identify the role of government agents in the development of farmer organizations and the kind of training these agents need to help farmer groups take over their new responsibilities.

Since Sri Lanka is on the cutting edge in the development of farmer organizations, information about the impact, problems, and implications of farmer organization development will be extremely useful to Sri Lanka and other countries grappling with this issue. The Think Tank will provide a forum for the identification and dissemination of lessons being learned about farmer groups by ISMP as well as other projects, i.e., MARD and ADB.

3.3 Operations and Maintenance

ISMP has introduced two O&M concepts: Essential Structural Improvement (ESI) and Pragmatic Rehabilitation (PR). The O&M working group defined both concepts as methods of improving an existing irrigation system to a proper functional level using cost effective and economic methods. The only difference between ESI and PR is the level of financial input into this improvement. For example, PR, the higher level of input, provided new water measurement structures in Gal Oya, while ESI, on the other hand, provided modifications to existing structures for water measurement in Polonnaruwa.

At the same time these construction improvements in the irrigation system are being made, ISMP is to prepare farmer organizations to operate and maintain the D and F canals so that the systems can be turned over.

Most major agreements in the O&M group centered on the need for training for farmer organizations, Irrigation Department technical assistants (TAs), and work supervisors to help in this transfer of responsibilities.

Agreements were reached on the following training issues:

- ISMP will modify/develop training modules in O&M, financial management, institutional development, and contract management to train farmer organizations to effectively handle their new responsibilities for O&M of D and F canals.
- Irrigation Department technical assistants and work supervisors will be trained in management and development of D channels and participatory management practices.
- DDIs and Irrigation Engineers will select qualified TAs to participate in training-of-trainer programs provided by the Galagmuwa Irrigation Training Institute (GITI) to strengthen the TAs' ability to train Distributory Canal Organizations (DCOs). While the TAs are being trained, project managers and irrigation engineers will be responsible for training DCOs.

Non-training agreements reached by the O&M group include the following:

- Technical assistants and work supervisors will be encouraged by the Irrigation Engineers to participate in farmer organization meetings, in order to develop better relationships.
- The Irrigation Department will assure final and retention payments are made to DCOs within one month after construction is completed.
- DCOs will receive first priority for all construction materials requested from the DDIs and receive this material within three days, if available.

3.4 Financial Management

The financial management work group defined the objective of the ISMP financial management component as enhancing the competence of ID and IMD personnel, district staff, and DCO representatives in accounting which would lead to the development of a sound financial management system.

Major agreements about financial management included:

- ISMP will study and clarify how financial management will be defined by the project.
- ISMP will review the entire question of financial management in terms of collection of O&M fees.
- After clarification of definition and approaches, all ISMP personnel will receive awareness training about financial management systems and approaches.
- ISMP will continue to investigate alternatives to institutionalizing financial management, since additional permanent staff is not an option.

3.5 Monitoring, Evaluation, and Feedback

The following definitions were given for these terms (ME&F) within the ISMP context:

monitoring: identification of the status of activities under different components of ISMP at a given time.

evaluation: analysis of information and comparison with set targets and goals.

feedback: passing the results of monitoring and evaluation to beneficiaries and to all levels of management to improve performance.

Throughout the project, this component has been faced with major problems which were identified by the ME&F working group. These problems are lack of clarity about the objectives and needs of ME&F; identification of too many indicators; collection of too much data; lack of ability to analyze the data; and major time lags in getting analyzed data to users. In order to solve some of these issues, ISMP held a special ME&F workshop in February 1990 to reduce the number of questions on the forms.

The following major agreements about ME&F were made during the 1990 project review workshop:

- ISMP will continue to clarify the monitoring requirements of the project on an on-going basis, to meet the needs for management information.

- ME&F staff will complete work begun at the February workshop
 - Revised ME&F questionnaires will be completed and translated into Sinhala and Tamil.
 - Training will be conducted about the new ME&F system for institutional organizers and ME&F assistants.
 - ME&F report format will be refined.
 - The data analysis computer model will be refined.

3.6 Research

Major concerns from the research working group centered on the late start of the activity and the lack of integration of the research component into the rest of the project. IIMI has the lead responsibility for this component.

Discussion of this issue centered on the need for feedback from the Ministry about research results and the need for the Ministry to develop implementation mechanisms for utilization of the research results.

Identification of research priorities was also discussed. Now that the project is several years old, it is easier to identify relevant research priorities. Project managers and others working in the field can be a source of research ideas relevant to the project. The need to disseminate research results was also discussed.

Many of the research topics identified earlier in the project are not as important as some of the new concerns being raised, but budget constraints may prevent the project from studying some of these problems.

The need to strengthen the working relationships among the Research Advisory Committee, IIMI, and the rest of the project was also stressed.

Major agreements around research included the following:

- When research results are received, ID and IMD will provide written comments about the usefulness of the research and implementation plans for integrating the findings into project and Ministry activities.
- Project managers will be able to submit research proposals for project funding to the Research Advisory Committee.
- ISMP will conduct a field level workshop to identify relevant research ideas and priorities.
- A Sri Lankan institute will be identified to produce and distribute a nationally available research results newsletter. The newsletter will be produced in both Tamil and Sinhala.

3.7 Project Management

The project management issue covered a broad range of topics, including project extension, crop diversification, permanent status of institutional organizers, management support requirements of project managers, the role of the Irrigation Department technical assistants in dealing with farmer organizations, and coordination between institutions and departments working on ISMP.

Five major agreements were reached on these topics:

- A project extension will be requested, and a group will study the length, budget, and technical assistance requirements of the extension.
- Crop diversification as an ISMP component will continue to be seen as a project priority.
- Permanent status for institutional organizers will not be requested.
- ISMP will reassess the management support requirements of project managers after the new Provincial Council Administrations are in place and operating.
- ID technical assistants will be assigned new job responsibilities including participation in farmer organization activities and training of farmer organizations in O&M.

3.8 Management Expectations

During the 1990 review workshop, the various project groups (USAID, SAI, ID, and IMD) formulated their expectations for working together. The agreements made last year were reviewed this year to see if there were a) any agreements from last year that were not being done and needed to be done, and b) what new agreements needed to be made to improve project management. (See Appendix M for revised/additional management expectations.)

3.9 Final Agreements and Next Steps

The last session of the workshop reviewed all of the agreements made by the workshop participants and identified who would take responsibility for next steps needed to start implementation. (See Appendix C.) A Workshop Agreements Monitoring Committee was identified and charged with the task of monitoring the progress of these agreements. The monitoring committee members are Mr. M.F.M. Falleel, USAID Engineer, and Mr W. Ellawala, ID Deputy Director/ME&F.

Chapter 4

EVALUATION OF WORKSHOP

In evaluating the workshop, the participants rated it as being very successful. On a scale of one to five points with five being most satisfied, the group scored overall goal achievement at four.

The group rated each of the workshop goals as follows:

- Exchange information on current project status (4.0)
- Improve the ability of all groups to work together as a team (4.1)
- Review progress made since the 1989 project review workshop (3.9)
- Identify ISMP challenges and opportunities for the remainder of the project and address immediate critical issues (3.9)
- Develop agreements and next steps (4.3)

When asked what they considered the most important benefit of the workshop, most of the responses focused on building team spirit, sharing ideas, developing plans, and discussing project activities.

Some specific responses included:

- Forward planning for future implementation and better understanding by all parties
- To understand the enormous problems that are yet to be tackled in the project
- Getting together several disciplines, grades, and cadres
- To identify the constraints in the present work plan and take corrective measures

When asked what activity could have been done better, most of the group thought the workshop had gone well. There were several suggestions about what could have been added to this workshop, such as a review of what had been agreed to during the last workshop and what has been achieved.

Several participants commented that they needed more time to focus on given issues and that discussions were rushed.

The group identified several unresolved issues, including:

- A contradiction between project objectives of institution building and project implementation, which focuses on construction targets.
- Earth works in field canals to be executed free by farmers
- Training materials, research studies, O&M activities
- Other key problems faced by farmers have not been touched... cultivating loans, agricultural instructions, stray cattle, poor canal clearance by farmers
- Policy and the flow of information

Everyone was pleased with the hotel accommodations and workshop arrangements. Finally, the group was very pleased with the performance of the facilitators. (See Appendix N for the complete set of evaluation comments.)

Chapter 5

FACILITATORS' CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Facilitators' Conclusions

The time frame for the workshop was short (2.5 days in 1990 compared to 3.5 days in 1989), the issues were more complicated because another year of the project had gone by, and the presence of the evaluation team added stress to the workshop environment.

Despite these constraints, this second review workshop was successful, especially in the frank and open discussions about critical issues facing the project; the problem-solving approach taken to resolving these issues; and the opportunity to present project positions and conclusions to the evaluation team.

The workshop provided an excellent opportunity for the implementers to come together again after one year to review project accomplishments and discuss current implementation problems. This annual workshop, with many of the same team members participating, provided an excellent opportunity to reflect back on what was learned in 1989, what issues were still unresolved, what new issues had arisen, and what strategies could be adopted to deal with these critical concerns over the next year.

Attendance and active participation of so many key decision makers from the Ministry, ID, IMD, Agriculture Department, IIMI, and USAID again this year were critical to the workshop's success. Decisions could be made in the room, without having to go back to higher authorities for approval. Field staff also had direct access to these senior decision makers for a 2-1/2 day period which focused solely on ISMP. Open, frank discussions were encouraged, listened to, and responded to openly and honestly by these decision makers.

The workshop also provided a unique opportunity for the evaluation team to gather more data for the final report. Using information provided by the evaluation team to formulate the issues statements brought more depth to the discussions and allowed workshop participants to grapple with specific problems that had been identified by the evaluation team, even before the final report was completed. (However, the lack of opportunity for two of the three facilitators to participate in any interviews before the workshop was a constraint because there was not enough time for them to feel comfortable with the content.)

Finally, the professional, high quality logistics support provided by TEAMS allowed the facilitators to focus on preparation of the substance of the workshop, rather than having to deal with arrangements in the short time frame before the workshop began. The quality of work by the TEAMS staff was excellent during the workshop, especially in their ability to type accurately and quickly from difficult-to-read flipcharts and handwritten notes and provide quick response to the need for multiple copies of workshop-generated documents.

5.2 Facilitators' Recommendations

1. A third review workshop, using the same methodology, should be scheduled for March/April 1991. Because of their experience with the project, the same facilitators should be used again. Facilitators should be allowed at least one week of preparation time before the workshop to gather data and design the workshop.
2. The workshop should be scheduled for at least three full days, plus the opening evening, to allow for ample discussion of the issues and development of appropriate, realistic recommendations.
3. TEAMS should be used again next year to provide logistics support for the workshop.

Appendix A

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

**Ministry of Lands, Irrigation &
Mahaweli Development
Project Review Workshop**

**Irrigation Systems Management Project
21-24 March 1990**

MINISTRY OFFICE

A.A. Wijetunga
Secretary, M/L.I & M.D.
500, T.B. Jayah Mawatha,
Colombo 10.
Tel: 545396

N.G.R. de Silva
Secretary to the Minister of
State for Irrigation
500, T.B. Jayah Mawatha,
Colombo 10.
Tel: 434781

Ananda Weerasinghe
Director, Planning
T.B. Jayah Mawatha
Colombo 10.
Tel:

S.B. Bandusena
Director, Water Resources 500,
Development
500, T.B. Jayah Mawatha
Colombo 10.
Tel:

IRRIGATION DEPARTMENT

K. Yoganathan
Director
Irrigation Department
Buddhaloka Mawatha
Colombo 7.
Tel:

W.N.M. Boteju
Additional Director
Irrigation Department
Buddhaloka Mawatha
Colombo 7.
Tel: 586839

L.T. Wijesuriya
Senior Deputy Director
Irrigation Department
Buddhaloka Mawatha
Colombo 7.
Tel: 588127

D.W.R.M. Weerakoon
Senior Deputy Director
Irrigation Department
Buddhaloka Mawatha
Colombo 7.
Tel: 588128

S. Piyadasa
Deputy Director
Irrigation Department
Polonnaruwa
Tel: 027-2361/2215

S. Senthinathan
Deputy Director
Irrigation Department
Ampara
Tel: 063-2276

H.A. Wijedasa
Irrigation Engineer
Irrigation Engineer's Office
Ampara
Tel: 063-2055/2011

D. Wijenayake
Irrigation Engineer
Irrigation Engineer's office
New Town, Polonnaruwa
Tel: 027-2330

S. Senaratna
Irrigation Engineer
Irrigation Engineer's Office
Hingurakgoda
Tel: 027-6270

P.A.K.R. Theodore
Irrigation Engineer
Irrigation Office
Kaudulla Div., Minneriya
Tel: 027-6341

G.I. Wijetunga
Irrigation Engineer
(Procurements)
Irrigation Department
Bauddhaloka Mawatha
Colombo 7.
Tel: 586326

AGRICULTURE DEPARTMENT, AGRARIAN SERVICES DEPARTMENT, etc

W.G.D.A. Wimalaratne
Assistant Director
Agriculture (Polonnaruwa)
A.D.A. (Extension)
Polonnaruwa
Tel: 027-2019

W. Ratnayake
Addl. Deputy Director
(Extension)
Extension Division
Department of Irrigation
Peradeniya
Tel: 08-88124

V. Kandiah
Assistant Director of Agriculture
ISMP Office of the
Deputy Director of Irrigation
Ampara
Tel: 063-2276

IRRIGATION MANAGEMENT DIVISION

D.M. Ariyaratne
Director, Irrigation
Management Division
Irrigation Secretariat
Colombo.
Tel: 587435

P. Senarath
Project Director, MIRP
Irrigation Management Div.
Irrigation Building
Buddhaloka Mawatha
Colombo 7.
Tel: 580683

G.T. Jayawardena
Project Director, ISMP
Irrigation Management Div.
P.O. Box 1138
Colombo
Tel: 587435

W.H.E. Premaratne
Addl. Director (Agronomy)
Irrigation Management Div.
Irrigation Secretariat
Buddhaloka Mawatha
Colombo 7.
Tel: 587435

A.S. Gunasekera
Deputy Director/IMD
Irrigation Management Div.
Irrigation Building
Colombo 7.
Tel: 589919

S.S. Ranatunga
Deputy Director/IMD
Irrigation Management Div.
Irrigation Secretariat
Colombo 7.
Tel: 589919

U.N.S. Wickramarachchi
Deputy Director
Irrigation Management Div.
M/L.I. & M.D.
Buddhaloka Mawatha
Colombo 7.
Tel: 589919

W. Ellawala
Deputy Director/IMD
Irrigation Management Div.
M/L.I. & M.D.
Buddhaloka Mawatha
Colombo 7.
Tel: 580683/589919

S. Danansooriya
Assistant Director/IMD
P.O. Box 1138
Colombo
Tel: 589919

G.B.M.M. Moragolla
Assistant Director/IMD
P.O. Box 1138
Colombo
Tel: 589919

U.G. Abeygunawardena
Project Manager
Parakrama Samudra Project
New Town, Polonnaruwa
Tel: 027-2198

P.K. Sugunapala
Project Manager, Minneriya
Project Manager's Office
Hingurakgoda
Tel: 027-6248

W. Kuruppu
Project Manager, Kaudulla
Project Manager's Office
Medirigiriya
Tel: 027-2162

J. Jayalath
Project Manager, RBE
Project Manager's Office
A.S. Centre, Nikaweratiya
Tel:

W.D. Tilakaratne
Project Manager
Project Manager's Office
Gai Oya (LB)
Ampara
Tel:

K.M.M. Sheriff
Project Manager
Project Manager's office
A.S.C. Building (West)
Akkareipattu
Tel:

W.L.W. Premadasa
Project Manager
Giritale Scheme
Jayanthipura
Tel: 027-2290

U.S. AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

J.J. Pinney
Chief of Engineering Office
USAID
44, Galle Road
Colombo 3
Tel: 421271

Dan Jenkins
ISMP Project Manager
USAID Colombo
Washington D.C.
20520
Tel: 421271

M.F.M. Falleel
Engineer
USAID
44, Galle Road
Colombo 3.
Tel: 421271

SHELADIA

Warren J. Leatham
Chief of Party
C/o DDI
Polonnaruwa
Tel: 027-2374
BMICH-Sheladia

Charles F. Leonhardt
Deputy Chief of Party
Irrigation Engineer
Sheladia Associates Inc.
c/o Deputy Director of
Irrigation
New Town, Polonnaruwa
Tel: 027-2215/6

D.F.A. Kulasekera
Irrigation Engineer, SAI
c/o DDI Polonnaruwa Range
Polonnaruwa
Tel: 027-2215/2216

S. Ganawatte
Institutional Development
Specialist
SAI, ISM Project Office
Office of the DDI
Polonnaruwa
Tel: 027-2215

P. Periyasamy
MEF Specialist
SAI, DDI's Office
Polonnaruwa
Tel: 027-2215/2216

S. Samarakoon
Agronomist/Farming Systems
Specialist
SAI, DDI's Office
New Town, Polonnaruwa
Tel: 027-2215

S. Balasingam
O&M Engineer
SAI, DDI Office
Ampara
Tel: 063-2276

N. Adikaramge
Institutional Organization
Specialist
Sheladia Ltd.
DDI Office
Ampara
Tel: 063-2276

ASIAN DEVELOPMENT BANK

T.H. Karunatileke
Project Coordinator/Consultant
ADB/SDC/UNDP Project on
Institutional Strengthening of the
Irrigation Department and Irrigation
Management Division.
Tel: 502922

IIMI

Douglas J. Merrey
Head, Sri Lanka Field
Operations
IIMI
P.O. Box 2075
64, Lotus Road
Colombo 2.
Tel: 546561/544580

R. Sakthi Vadi Vel
Senior Irrigation
Specialist
64, Lotus Road
P.O. Box 2075
Colombo 1.
Tel: 546561/544580

M. Kikuchi
Irrigation Specialist and
Agricultural Economist
64, Lotus Road,
P.O. Box 2075,, Colombo
Tel: 546561/544580

ISPAN FACILITATORS

Kathy Alison
Irrigation Support Project
for Asia and the Near East
1611 N. Kent Street
Rm 1001
Arlington, Virginia 22209
Tel: (703) 243-7911
Fax: (703) 525-9137

Steven D. Joyce
Training Resources Group
1021 Prince Street
Alexandria, Virginia
Tel: 548-3535

K.L.J. Basil Perera
Sri Lanka Institute of
Development Administration
28/10, Longden Place
Colombo 7.
Tel: 582181-5

ISMP MID-TERM EVALUATION TEAM

Bechir Rassas
ISTI
1129 20th Street N.W.
Washington D.C. 20036
Tel: (202) 785 0831

Steve Joyce
Training Resource Group
1021 Prince Street
Alexandria, Virginia
Tel: 548-3535

Mike McGovern
Civil Engineer
Development Alternatives, Inc.
624 Hinthsi, NW
Wash, D.C. 20002, USA

S.T. Hettige
Department of Sociology
University of Colombo
Colombo 3
Tel: 583108

WORKSHOP LOGISTICS

TEAMS (Pvt) Ltd.
55, Rosmead Place, Colombo 7.
Tel: 686479/692056/686429

Wimal Gunawardena
Paul Rajasekera
Indraka Edirisooriya
Joyce Perera
Chandrika Wijeratne
Prasanna Illukkumbura
B.G. Sunil Jayaratne

Appendix B

PRIORITY ISSUES FOR DISCUSSION

IRRIGATION SYSTEMS MANAGEMENT PROJECT REVIEW WORKSHOP

MARCH 21-24, 1990

POLICY

1. What has been the effect of ISMP on national irrigation policy to date? What is the anticipated impact of ISMP on national irrigation policies by the end of the project?
2. In what specific ways has ISMP helped increase farmer participation in decision making?
3. Impact of ISMP on Institutional Development:
 - a. In what specific ways has ISMP improved the working relationships between ID and IMD?
 - b. In what specific ways has ISMP improved the working relationships between ID/IMD on one hand and other government agencies (eg Ministry of Agriculture and Cooperatives, Ministry of Finance)?
 - c. In what specific ways has ISMP improved the working relationships between government and farmers?
 - d. What can be done to facilitate greater cross-learning between ISMP and MARD?
4. In what specific ways is ISMP providing opportunities for increased dialogue and interactions between farmer organizations representing different ethnic groups?
5. In what ways is ISMP serving as a laboratory, identifying lessons that can be applied beyond the project to strengthen such things as farmer organizations, financial management, etc.?

FARMER ORGANIZATIONS

1. What progress has been made in Farmer Organization development since the last workshop?
2. What has been learned about Farmer Organizations and how have these lessons been applied to the project?
3. How will legalization affect Farmer Organizations?
 - a. What support will farmer organizations likely need after legalization?
 - b. How can these needs be further clarified?
 - c. What role should ISMP play in providing this support?
 - d. How can Government policy on farmer organizations be further clarified?
4. What mechanisms should be created to resolve water conflicts?
 - a. How can ISMP assist in the development of these mechanisms?
 - b. What next steps are needed to provide this assistance?
5. Should farm organizations be federated?
 - a. If yes, what specific steps should be taken to federate organizations at the scheme level?
 - b. Which of these steps can ISMP facilitate and how?
6. What should ISMP do to help develop self reliance of farmer organizations?
 - a. What are the implications when DCOs are not ready to take over canals?
 - b. What can ISMP do to decrease the dependency of farmer organizations on project managers?
 - c. When farmer organizations are legalized, what should the relationship be between Technical Assistants and farmer organizations?
 - d. What should be the role of the Institutional Organizers?
 - e. In your opinion, what conditions should be met before D&F canals are handed over, to assure sustainability? Why?

OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE

1. What has been learned to date about O&M and Essential Structural Improvement/Pragmatic Rehabilitation in this project and how has this been applied to the implementation of ISMP?
2. The GSL is implementing a phased turn-over of the D&F canals to Farmer Organizations, which means that eventually there will be no further GSL funds for operations and maintenance of the D&F canals.
 - a. What can ISMP do to foster a sense of total responsibility within the Farmer Organizations for O&M of the D & F canals?
 - b. How should farmer organizations be involved in design and construction of the D&F canals?
3. What does sustained renewal mean?
 - a. What progress has been made to achieve sustained renewal?
 - b. What specific tools (ie computer models, maintenance plan) will be provided by ISMP to achieve sustained renewal?
 - c. How will these tools be integrated into the existing O&M routine to achieve sustained renewal?
4. How can relationships between Technical Assistants and Farmer Organizations be strengthened?
 - a. in contract management
 - b. in training
 - c. in water allocation decisions (adequacy, equity, scheduling/timeliness)
 - d. What can ISMP do to build more trust in the Technical Assistance/Farmer Organization relationship?
 - e. How can trust be developed between Farmer Organizations and Supervisors
5. What other major O&M issues are facing ISMP?
6. Why has progress been slow on F-channel rehabilitation and what can be done to assure the completion of this work?

FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT

1. How is ISMP defining Financial Management?
2. What has been learned about financial management, what are the implications and how have these specific lessons been applied to the implementation of ISMP to date?
3. How can ISMP accelerate the full scale implementation of the Financial Management system?
4. What specific steps need to occur to make financial management operational?
5. How will the financial management system be institutionalized (ie sustained beyond ISMP) in terms of staffing, training, reporting, etc., at the:
 - a. Irrigation Department
 - b. Irrigation Management Division and
 - c. Distributory Canal Farmer Organization levels?
6. After legalization, what changes should be made within the Financial Management System (bank account, record keeping requirements, other?)
7. What other major financial management issues are facing ISMP?

MONITORING, EVALUATION AND FEEDBACK

1. How should the project define Monitoring?
2. How should the project define Evaluation?
3. How should the project define Feedback?
4. What have been the past problems with the ME&F?
5. What has been done to address these problems? What problems still remain to be solved?
6. How is this system going to benefit:

Project Managers
Irrigation Engineers
Farmer Organizations
Technical Assistance Team
Research Advisory Committee
Irrigation Department/Headquarters
Irrigation Management Division/Headquarters

7. In what ways is the current system not responding to the above groups?
8. What have been the deficiencies in the Monitoring, Evaluation and Feedback system in terms of:
 - a. data analysis
 - b. reporting
 - c. dissemination
 - d. In what ways will these deficiencies be addressed in the future?
9. In what ways is headquarter, district and scheme level staffing for the Monitoring, Evaluation and Feedback component:

adequate?

inadequate?

RESEARCH

1. In what ways has the research component been satisfactory?

unsatisfactory?
2. What lessons have been learned through the research component and how have these learnings been applied to other components of the ISMP?
3. How can the research component be made more relevant to the ISMP?
4. How should ISMP identify relevant topics for applied research?
5. What role should ME&F play in identifying research topics?
6. How can dissemination of research results be improved?
7. What process should be instituted to assess the appropriateness of research results
8. What process should be instituted to assure that appropriate lessons learned will be applied?
9. One of the 2 purposes of the ISMP is to test different combinations of management and structural improvements carried out in selected irrigation systems. What can be done now in the research component to address this project purpose.

PROJECT MANAGEMENT

1. What recommendations should be made by ISMP to the Ministry of Lands and Mahaweli Development about the permanent status of Institutional Organizers?
2. How can ID/IMD internal reporting be streamlined?

How can two way information flow and feedback be assured?

3. How can the Irrigation Engineers' management and supervision of Technical Assistants be strengthened?
4. How can more direct field support and supervision be provided for Project Managers?
5. What should be the roles and responsibilities of Technical Assistants in supporting Farmer Organizations?
6. In the two years left in the project, how feasible is it to complete project requirements?
 - Polonnaruwa
 - Gal Oya
7. The 1990 workplan has a budget of 77.5 million rupees. The projected budgets for 1991/92 period are 207.7 million rupees.
 - a. Can these resources be effectively and appropriately utilized in this short time frame?
 - b. What impact will D & F channel construction have on project management and effective utilization of resources?
8. How is crop diversification justified as a project priority?
 - a. What are the benefits of ISMP farmer training in crop diversification?
 - b. In what ways do these benefits justify the use of limited project staff and SAI consultants over the next two years, given the other priorities of the project (ie ESI construction, O&M plan development, ME&F, and strengthening of farmer organizations)
9. How can ISMP coordination with other institutions and departments be improved at the national level? district level?

Appendix C

AGREEMENTS/NEXT STEPS

POLICY

- * ISMP will convene a meeting with the Secretary, Mr. Wijetunge, MLIMD, to discuss the importance and ramifications of funding for sustained maintenance and the next steps needed.

(Next Step: ISMP Project Director will set meeting date)

- * Mahaweli Agriculture and Rural Development project -MARD-officials will be invited to ISMP monthly meetings and consultative meetings.

(Next Step: Piyadasa will take lead responsibility for this. Action by May 1)

- * ISMP will develop a Farmer Exchange Program with MARD

(Next Step: The 7 Program Managers will take the lead in planning. Plan will be presented at May ISMP monthly meeting.)

Person responsible: Abeygunawardena

- * ISMP will invite MARD to appropriate ISMP workshops. Discussions will take place with MARD Institutional Development Officer re: Farmer Organizations and further ISMP - MARD Collaboration.

(Next Step: Sena Ganawatte will take lead responsibility, and present a report at the May ISMP monthly meeting)

FARMER ORGANIZATIONS

- * A Think Tank will be formed to identify recommendations and next steps on Farmer Organizations. The recommendations will be presented to the Steering Committee on Irrigation.

(Next Step: Sena Ganawatte and Doug Merrey will co-chair and develop a mandate for the Think Tank by June 1, 1990)

- * ISMP will further study the federation issue and issue of self-reliance of Fos. ISMP will also define "self-management" as it applies to Fos.

(Next Step: Mr. Kuruppu will take lead responsibility. Completion date: June 1, 1990)

(Next Step: Recommendations communicated to Steering Committee on Irrigation by Kuruppu at June Meeting)

- * ISMP will undertake education and training programs to help Fos understand their new powers and responsibilities following legalization and to develop skills to interpret and execute legal powers.

(Next Step: SAI\ADB\IMD\ID to develop methodology. Ananda Gunasekera will take lead in organizing. Methodology to be developed by January 1, 1991)

- * Until GSL Policy on Farmer Organizations is further clarified, Project Managers carry on with current ISMP Policy.

(Next Step: Ananda Gunasekera will seek further clarification on policy (and Farmer Organization coordination) from Inter-Ministerial Committee. He will provide update to ISMP by July 1, 1990)

- * Code of Ethics for farmers will be developed by farmers.

(Next Step: Pms will communicate this to DCOs at April Project Management meeting. Pms will brief ISMP Project Committee on farmers' reactions to this decision at May meeting)

- * Project Managers in ISMP will identify the Farmer Organizations to pilot the concept of shadow water courts and present to June ISMP Monthly Meeting.

- * To decrease the dependency of Farmer Organizations on Project Managers, Pms will always go through the FO structure in solving problems.

(Next Step: Pms will inform DCOs of this policy at the next Project Committee Meetings)

OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE

- * ISMP will make recommendations to the Director of IMD, Mr. Ariyaratne, on how FO involvement in D and F canals should be handled.

(Next Steps: Mr. Senthinathan will take lead in forming committee. USAID and IIMI representatives will participate. First meeting on April 4, 1990. Recommendations will be presented to IMD Director by June 30, 1990)

- * In fostering a sense of total responsibility of Farmer Organizations for the Operations & Maintenance of D- and F-canals, training in O&M, Financial Management, Institutional Development and Contract Management will be enhanced and intensified.

(Next Steps: Pms and Irrigation Engineers will make recommendations on what and how by June ISMP monthly meeting. Mr. Piyadasa will coordinate and organize)

- * Irrigation Department Technical Assistants and Work Supervisors will be trained in management and development of D channels.

(Next Steps: Lynton Wijesuriya will organize with Galagmuwa Irrigation Training Institute by June 1, 1990 and report on status at June Monthly Meeting.)

- * Irrigation Engineers, with the Deputy Director Irrigation, will select Tas for a Training of Trainers program (Tas will form a training pool)

(Next Steps: Ies will make nominations for Tas to participate in training program to Lynton Wijesuriya by May 15, 1990)

- * Tas and Wss will receive additional training in participatory management.

(Next Step: Ies will nominate trainees by May 15, 1990)

- * To develop greater trust with Farmer Organizations, Tas and Wss will be encouraged to attend FO meetings on a regular basis (and to have other frequent and direct associations with farmer groups).

(Next Step: Ies will communicate this expectation to the Tas and Wss at their April staff meetings)

- * The Irrigation Department will assure that DCOs receive their final and retention payments within 4 weeks of construction completion.
- * ID will provide construction materials to DCOs, if available, within 3 days of request.

(Next Step: Ies will communicate this expectation at their April staff meetings).
- * DCOs will receive first priority for all construction materials.

FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT

- * How ISMP defines Financial Management will be further studied and clarified.

(Next Step: Mr. Senthinathan, Dan Jenkins, Mr. Periyasamy, and Mr. G.T. Jayawardena will take responsibility. Action by July 1. Dan will organize)
- * ISMP will review FM approach to O&M fees.

(Next Step: Periyasamy will form a committee with Dan Jenkins, U.G. Abeygunawardena, and D. Wijenayake to do review. Recommendations due by July 1, 1990 and submitted at July ISMP Meeting. FM committee will also address auditing issue: internal FO audit and GSL audit)
- * All ISMP personnel will receive awareness training about FM systems and approaches.

(Next Steps: Periyasamy will make recommendations on this training at the May monthly meeting)

- * ISMP will investigate alternatives to institutionalizing FM; additional permanent staff is not an option.

(Next Steps: Issue to be dealt with by committee to define FM (see first point under Financial Management section). Peri will take lead if a study is required.)

- * Pms will request all DCOs to submit monthly annual financial statements (until legalization) to help determine their financial management system needs and DCO skill needs after legalization.

(Next Steps: Pms will provide status report on this issue by June ISMP meeting)

- * ISMP will study fund raising possibilities for DCOs to generate funds.

(Next Steps: Sena Ganawatte will work with Pms and report recommendations at June ISMP monthly meeting)

MONITORING/EVALUATION/FEEDBACK

- * ISMP will clarify the monitoring requirements of ISMP as an on-going activity which provides management information.

(Next Steps: Periyasamy will take responsibility for organizing this by the end of May, 1990 and it will be presented at the June monthly meeting)

- * ME&F Questionnaires will be completed and translated into Sinhala and Tamil.

(Next Steps: Peri will take lead. Completion by March 30)

- * Farmer Record Book will be completed by March 30

(Next Step: Peri will take lead. Distribute to farmers by April 15.)

- * ISMP will train Ios and ME&F assistants in new ME&F system by April 30 in Polonnaruwa and Kurunegala, and by May 15 in Ampara.

(Next Steps: Peri and Ananda Gunasekera will meet Monday, March 26, 1990 to agree on an action plan, including schedule and location of training)

- * ISMP will refine the ME&F report format by May 31. The data analysis computer model will be refined by the end of Yala season.

(Next Steps: Peri will take lead)

- * ME&F seasonal reports will be prepared for scheme and range levels by Yala Season, 1990.

(Next Steps: Peri will take lead)

RESEARCH

- * Under ISMP, when research is released, ID & IMD will respond in writing about usefulness and actions to be taken.

(Next Steps: Mr. Ariyaratne, Director of IMD, will take lead)

- * Research results will be translated into Sinhala and Tamil. A Sri Lankan institute will be identified to provide newsletters in both languages for national distribution.

(Next Steps: Research Advisory Committee will make recommendations on these agreements by July 1, 1990)

- * After research results have been accepted, IMD implementation mechanisms will be developed by ISMP.

(Next Steps: G.T. Jayawardena, ISMP Director, will take lead)

- * Pms will be allowed to submit research proposals for funding to the Research Advisory Committee.

- * ISMP will conduct a workshop at field level to identify research ideas. These ideas will be combined with ideas of Joint Standing Committee ID/IMD to identify research priorities.

(Next Steps: DDI will take lead in organizing this workshop by August 1, 1990)

PROJECT MANAGEMENT

- * ID\IMD\SAI\USAID will study the project extension of ISMP, including length of extension, budget and technical assistance required.

(Next Step: G.T. Jayawardena will take the lead. Meeting by May 15 to initiate action)
- * Permanent Status will NOT be requested for IO's

(Next Step: PM will recommend outstanding Ios for related job opportunities)
- * ISMP will re-assess the management support requirements of Pms after the Provincial Council Administration is in place and operating.

(Next Step: Review at January, 1991 ISMP Monthly Meeting)
- * Under ISMP, new responsibilities will be assigned to Tas, including participation in Farmer Organization Activities and Training of Fos in O&M

(Next Step: Ies will communicate new responsibilities to Tas at April staff meeting.

Next Step: Lynton Wijesuriya will re-draft TA job descriptions by June 1, 1990.
- * Crop diversification as an ISMP component will continue to be seen as a project priority.

ISMP Workshop Agreements Monitoring Team

The ISMP Workshop Agreements Monitoring Team who will follow-up on these agreements over the next year are:

Mr. M.F.M. Falleel, USAID Engineer
Mr. W. Ellawela, IMD Deputy Director of ME&F

Appendix D

ISMP MAJOR SUCCESS in 1989

Participants were asked to identify major project successes for the previous year of the project.

- Handing over of D-Canals to DCOs

Minneriya	28
Kaudulla	13
Gal Oya LB	26
PSS	20
Giritale	5
Ridi-Bendi-Ela	9

- Institutional Training on site of Tas in water flow measurement

- 1st annual workplan workshop

- Several DCOs have started self-employment programs on the Gal Oya LB, & Polonnaruwa project area.

- Introduction of new crops in a big way in Polonnaruwa to replace paddy

- 3 research activities completed and 4th one to be completed for the next quarter

- 200 acres of mortgaged land released to farmers by DCOs

- ISMP trained 24 Ios from outside the project

- Commencement of work in Gal Oya RB

- The initiative by the farmer organization to organize women's group at the scheme level in Polonnaruwa & Gal Oya LB

- DCOs starting a development fund for using their development activities

- Workshop to refine ME&F

- Improved cooperation of ID & IMD and the AD at scheme level interfaces of the farmers

- Registration of 32 farmer groups with IMD

- Construction work was on schedule and of high quality in spite of the problems

- **Three or four DCOs amalgamated into area councils**
- **Cultivation calendars being adhered to**
- **Progress in crop diversification at Ridi-Bendi-Ela and Gal Oya RB**
- **Training and development of 60 IOs**
- **Shramadana activities undertaken by DCOs**
- **Training in management for 180 DCOs leaders**

Appendix E

PARTICIPANT EXPECTATIONS

During the opening session on March 21, participants were asked to identify their expectations for the workshops.

- Workshop should highlight the weak areas of ISMP and come out with some solutions.
- See the progress we have made so far/find out the shortfalls and the constraints, and actions needed to remedy these constraints.
- Clarification of the project as a "learning project". How will lessons be recorded and disseminated more broadly and adopted in other places.
- Identify further opportunities and strengths of ISMP.
- More emphasis for crop diversity, increasing crop intensity training and adaptive research at district or scheme level
- Clarification of legal status of farmer organizations. Will there be action soon?
- Sharing experiences from different projects under ISMP
- Review this year's program - 1990
- Find a satisfactory solution for F-Channel earth work
- Discuss the influence of devolution of power on the extension program
- Review management expectations from 1989 workshop - are any adjustments needed?
- Evaluate present status of rehabilitation efforts; What are shortfalls? Is there a need for an extension of project in order to complete rehabilitation?
- What are lessons learned from ISMP which can be replicated in other systems in Sri Lanka?
- What are the contributions of ISMP in establishing new irrigation management systems?
- How to improve training facilities at project level
- To examine the expanding role of DCOs from water management to other activities

Appendix F

POLICY

1.a What has been the effect of ISMP on national irrigation policy to date?

* The point was made in this presentation that many of the following aspects began under other other projects (i.e. INMAS, MARD, etc.) and that ISMP has built on these areas.

Effects of ISMP on Sri Lanka Irrigation Policy include:

- Participatory management
- Physical construction
- Operation and Maintenance
- Agricultural extension
- Exemption of O&M fees
- Three tier structure of farmer organization

1.b What is the anticipated impact of ISMP in national irrigation policies by the end of the projects?

- Legal recognition of farmer organization
- Guarantee of funds by Treasury for sustainable maintenance
- Self-management of distributory systems by farmers
- Each system to be a separate unit
- Need for a new law on irrigation management

2. In what specific ways has ISMP helped increase farmer participation in decision making?

- Training and awareness program
- Deciding on construction priorities
- Cultivation calendar and water scheduling
- Crop diversification

3. Impact of ISMP on Institutional Development

a. In what specific ways has ISMP improved the working relationships between ID and IMD?

Working relationships have been improved more effectively under ISMP in the following ways:

ID and IMD are participating in:

- Joint training and workshops at scheme level
- Steering committees
- Central coordinating committees
- Project and sub-project management committees
- Annual implementation workshop

b. In what specific ways has ISMP improved the working relationships between ID/IMD on one hand and other government agencies (eg. Ministry of Agriculture and Cooperatives, Ministry of Finance)?

- Same as in (a) plus involvement of ID & IMD in District Agricultural Committee Meetings

c. In what specific ways has ISMP improved the working relationships between government and farmers?

- Promotion and development of farmer organizations
- District Agricultural Committee management
- Catalyst program through Institutional Organizers
- Involving farmers in construction operation and maintenance programs
- Farmer-training programs

d. What can be done to facilitate greater cross-learning between the ISM project and MARD project.

- Invite MARD officials to monthly review meetings and consultative meetings

Next Steps: Who: TA Team - Sena
When: Next Meeting - First of May

- Farmer exchange programs with MARD

Next Step: Who: 4 Project Managers will take lead in planning
When: Present plan at May monthly ISMP management meeting

- Joint Workshops -ISMP will invite MARD to any ISMP workshop

- Exchange of research and other literature lists

(Exchange of monthly MARD and ISMP reports is already taking place and IIMI publications are shared now)

Next Step: Who: Sena will meet with MARD training officer about farmer organizations

When: Report at May monthly ISMP management meeting

4. In what specific ways is ISMP providing opportunities for increased dialogue and interactions between farmer organizations representing different ethnic groups?

- Provides a common platform for dialogue
- Common programs and cultivation calendar
- Deliberations at project management committees
- Solidarity of common interest

5. In what ways is ISMP serving as a laboratory, identifying lessons that can be applied beyond the project to strengthen such things as farmer organizations, financial management, etc.?

- Self-reliant farmer organizations
- Release of mortgage lands through the intervention of DCOs as guarantors
- Provision of training programs for IOs from outside of ISMP
- Promotion of cultural and social activities
- Promotion of income generating activities
- Organizing Shramadana for maintaining local infrastructure
- Registration of Farmer Organizations with the ID & IMD
- ISMP can serve as a model for all-purpose farmer organizations.

Overall Policy Recommendation

- * The 1992 ISMP budget should include a line item for sustained maintenance (ISMP Project Director should develop budget).
- * IMD Director should draft a letter to Treasury to explain concept of sustained maintenance

Appendix G

FARMER EXPECTATIONS

1. What progress has been made in Farmer Organization development since the last workshop?

- I. DCO - 122 formed
FCGS - 1569 formed
- II. More contract works awarded to DCOs.
- III. Constitution and by-laws for DCOs strengthened
- IV. Financial management training. Proper financial procedures instituted in DCOs.
- V. Registration of DCOs with IMD commenced
- VI. Progress made in giving legal status
- VII. Recruitment, training and deployment of IOs
- VIII. 132 D-Canals handed over to DCOs
- IX. Fund raising campaigns by DCOs to set up development funds
- X. Involvement of farmer organizations in crop diversification
- XI. Recognition of DCOs by government departments and other agencies
- XII. Undertaking special activities by DCOs such as
 - mortgage release
 - self-employment
 - women's farmer organizations etc.

2. What has been learned about Farmer Organizations and how have these lessons been applied to the project?

What concepts have been learned	Learned about farmer organization innovations
- Bottom up approach	ISMP started midway - shadow farmer organizations formed
- Hydrological basis for farmer organization formation	- accepted
- Catalyst concept (graduate cadres)	- Catalyst concept accepted. G.C.E. A. level from locality
- Team concept	- accepted
- Federation of farmer organizations at different levels	- Formation of area councils
- Learning process approach	- Learning process Approach
- Development of self-reliance	- Promoted economic and social self-reliance
- Consensus in selection of farmer representatives and DCO officers	- Secret ballot selections introduced and adopted
- Comprehensive Training Program	- Farmers, farmer-representatives, field level officers etc.
	- Greater involvement in operation of O&M
	- Appointment of water managers. Irrigation for operation and maintenance.
	- Management training for DCO office-bearers

- Expanded membership of DCOs to include all farmers. Farmer representatives serving in 'exco' in DCO (broader-base of farmer representation - all farmers are included in DCOs)

3. How will legalization affect Farmer Organizations?

a. What support will farmer organizations likely need after legalization?

- Facilitate obtaining loans from banks
- Imposing sanctions
- Punishments to deterrent members
- Raising and disbursement of funds.

b. How can these needs be further clarified?

Not discussed

c. What role should ISMP play in providing this support?

-ISMP should undertake education and training programs to help farmer organizations understand their new powers and responsibilities after legalization and develop skills to interpret and execute legal powers.

Recommendation:

SAI/ADB/IMD/ID will develop methodology. Ananda to take lead

d. How can Government policy on farmer organizations be further clarified?

- Participatory management should be clearly defined
- Can there be another organization for the same purpose in the same locality?
- Policy on scope and functions assigned to FOs
- Should there be a new FO law rather than amendments to existing ordinances?
- Should FOs get ownership of system ultimately?

Recommendation

* PMs should carry-on with Farmer Organizations as current ISMP Policy

* Ananda will seek further clarification through the Inter-Ministerial Committee and will seek clarification on how coordination should take place between different kinds of FOs organized by various GSL ministries.

4. What mechanisms should be created to resolve water conflicts?

a. How can ISMP assist in the development of these mechanisms?

- ISMP should develop a mechanism to set up water-courts, in either as a new law or amended law.

- Shadow water-courts set up by FOs, using social sanctions rather than legal sanctions, should be started on an experimental basis in ISMP area

b. What next steps are needed to provide this assistance?

- Develop a Code of Ethics for farmers to resolve conflicts.

Recommendation

* Possible research study The Research Advisory Committee should take up this issue.

* IMPSA should also make recommendations on this issue.

* Farmers should develop "code of ethics".

* Social sanctions/shadow water courts.

* PMs to identify FOs to pilot the concepts of shadow water courts. PMs report how at the April ISMP Monthly Meeting.

5. Should farm organizations be federated?

No

a. If yes, what specific steps should be taken to federate organizations at the scheme level?

-The spontaneous decision to form project farmer organizations should be guided and directed.

b. Which of these steps can ISMP facilitate and how?

- The DCOs should be strong and consolidated before Federation is undertaken.

-A project farmer organization should be strong enough to resist political pressure.

- All management decisions should be taken jointly by the farmers and officials.

Recommendation

* ISMP will not facilitate the Federation of FOs at this time. ISMP will work to strengthen FOs, and let them decide on Federation.

6. What should ISMP do to help develop self reliance of farmer organizations?

*Three (3) conditions to be followed

- FO should be strong and viable to take over management of the D-canal

- DCO and officials should have 100% rapport

- D-canal should be in satisfactory condition to deliver the water.

a. What are the implications when DCO's are not ready to take over the canals?

-O&M fees have to be paid

b. What can ISMP do to decrease the dependency of farmer organizations on project managers?

-Greater links and closer relationship with ID and other agencies

-To decrease dependency of FOs on PMs

-Project Managers to understand their roles and functions vis a vis farmer organizations

-PMs always to go through farmer organization structure in solving problems

c. When farmer organizations are legalized, what should the relationship be between Technical Assistants and farmer organizations?

-The TA should give his fullest cooperation to the FO (one TA to oversee one SPCA)

d. What should be the role of the Institutional Organizers?

-ICs should be phased out when FO self confidence and self reliance is developed and FOs are strong and viable.

e. In your opinion, which conditions should be met before D & F channels are handed over to assure sustainability?

Why?

- develop consultative process between Irrigation Department and DCO

- continued guidance and support to be given by ID after handing over

- the D-channel should be operational

Recommendation

* Further study by ISMP is needed on the Federation issue and the issue of self-reliance. ISMP to communicate to Steering Committee on Irrigation. Also issue of "self-management" - How should this be defined? (Lead responsibility: Kuruppu)

Overall Recommendation

* A think tank is to be formed to identify recommendations and next steps on Farmer Organizations. Their suggestions and recommendations should be presented to Steering Committee on Irrigation. The think tank should consider questions of how farmers can resolve water conflicts, what role if any ISMP should take in federation of farmer organizations and how ISMP can help farmer organizations develop self reliance, plus other issues about farmer organizations that should be dealt with by ISMP (see response to 3 above). (Sena Ganawatte and Doug Merry will co-chair and develop mandate)

Appendix H

OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE

1. What has been learned to date about O&M and Essential Structural Improvement/Pragmatic Rehabilitation in this project and how has this been applied to the implementation of ISMP?

-ESI and PR were not clearly defined at the time of project commencement.

DEFINITION - ESI\PR

-ESI and PR is to improve an existing irrigation system to a proper functional level using cost effective and economical methods. Only difference between ESI and PR is level of financial input, i.e. new water measurement structures in Gal Oya (PR) vs modification to existing structures for water measurement in Polonnaruwa schemes (ESI).

Points Learned During Implementation:

a. Need to up-date issue trees for increased extent of irrigable area (unauthorized areas)

How Applied - Presently in the process of up-dating issue trees.

b. In improving operations, need to consider the system as a whole, taking into consideration infrastructural facilities, such as field operation units, rain gauges, communications, etc.

How Applied - Presently in the process of implementation under improved Systems Operations Plan.

c. Need to utilize existing structures for water measurement with minor modifications.

How Applied - Presently being implemented on the 4 Polonnaruwa Schemes under ESI

d. Dry rubble packing has been effective in bank erosion protection and training and is very cost effective. However, retaining walls are found necessary on curves and/or where adjacent to service roads and close to the banks.

How Applied - Has been implemented during 1987, 1988 and 1989 ESI Polonnaruwa Range and 1989 PR Amparai Range.

e. Uncontrolled Weir Regulators have been found to be cost effective in controlling upstream water surface vs gated

regulators which cost 2.5 to 3 times more with more maintenance. Also modified vertical drop structures have been found to be cost effective.

How Applied - Six ungated weir regulators have been constructed during 1988-89 and are successfully working. Numerous vertical drops have been constructed in Pol. Range under ESI.

f. Field tested design parameters, i.e., crops, rotational water distribution, present irrigated area canal regime etc. to be taken into consideration in design and operation of the system.

How Applied - In process of being applied during LOP under computer model for improved systems operations.

g. Existing tertiary systems need not be modified to meet OFC water requirements. What is needed for OFC is to adjust operations and to improve on-farm water management. Do not need major modifications.

How Applied - Larger size FTO pipes have not been included in ESI/PR for OFC.

2. The GSL is implementing a phased turn-over of the D&F canals to farmer organizations, which means that eventually there will be no further GSL funds for operations and maintenance of the D&F canals.

a. What can ISMP do to foster a sense of total responsibility within the Farmer Organizations for O&M of the D&F canals?

-Enhance and intensify efforts already being implemented for on-going activities, such as, Training in O and M, FM, Institutional Development and Contract Management.

When: Now IE/PM at DCO level

By Whom: ID/IMD

-Centrally designed training module is already prepared. PM & IE to review module, modify if necessary - PMs have capacity to train with IE.

-Need to get more TAs involved.

ID (IE, DD, TA,) to be directly involved in training to help farmers take more responsibility.

-Provide farmers with:

-information sketch plan of area water distribution schedule/issue.

-list of canals and structures to be maintained

-inventory of padlocks

(this information should be included in training)

-ID technical staff should be trained on management and development of D channel.

-While TAs are being trained as trainers by GITI, PM & IE should provide training to DCO's. TAs should be observers in these programs.

-IEs should select TAs for training of trainers in coordination with DDI

b. How should farmer organizations be involved in design and construction of the D&F canals?

- Consultation with farmer organization during investigation and design phase

- Involvement of farmer organization in construction

When: Now

By Whom: IMD

- Farmer organization involvement in D & F canals

Committee to make recommendations on how this should be handled.

When: June 30, 1990

By Whom: Mr. Senthinathan

USAID representatives and others

IIMI will also participate

What: Report to IMD Director

3. What does 'sustained renewal' mean?

-Maintaining the system to a level which will eliminate the need for major rehabilitation in the foreseeable future.

Recommendations:

- Implementation of ESI/PR

- Sufficient funds required for main systems

When: After completion of project

By Whom: GSL

- Adequate maintenance of tertiary system by farmer organizations

When: After taking over of canals

By Whom: FOs

a. What progress has been made to achieve sustained renewal?

- Through ESI/PR under ISMP the tertiary system has been brought to a level that can be maintained and sustained by the FO. The up-keep of the tertiary system is undertaken by the FOs more efficiently in the canals that have been handed over to them.

- Preventative maintenance plans are being developed for the systems.

When: During LOP

By Whom: ID

b. What specific tools (ie computer models, maintenance plan) will be provided by ISMP to achieve sustained renewal?

- Maintenance plans (part of maintenance manual)

When: During LOP

By Whom: ID

- Resource mobilization through farmer organization

When: after take-over of canals

By Whom: DCOs

c. How will these tools be integrated into the existing O&M routine to achieve sustained renewal?

- The preventative maintenance plan for the tertiary system will be implemented in consultation with and by the FOs.

When: after take-over

By Whom: ID/FO

- The main system preventative maintenance plan will be executed by ID with consultation of FOs, provided sufficient maintenance funds are made available by GSL.

When: after LOP

By Whom: ID

4. How can relationships between Technical Assistants and Farmer Organizations be strengthened?

- a. in contract management
- b. in training
- c. in water allocation decisions (adequacy, equity, scheduling/timeliness)

- Provide additional training for TAs & WSs in participatory management

When: now
By Whom: IMD/ID

- Intensify association of TAs with FO by providing increased mobility and contact through incentives.

When: now
By Whom: IMD/ID

- Train selected TAs as trainers. (D & F)

When: now
By Whom: ID

d. Assistance/Farmer Organization relationship?

e. How can trust be developed between Farmer Organizations and Supervisors?

- Encourage TAs, WSs to attend FO meetings
- Explain estimating and fund allocation procedures to farmers.

When: now
By Whom: ID/IMD

- Promote frequent and direct associations between FOs and TA/WSs

When: now
By Whom: ID/IMD

5. What other major O&M issues are facing ISMP?

- GSL funds for O&M of main system.
- Voluntary earthwork in field canals to be executed by farmers.

6. Why has progress been slow on F-channel rehabilitation and what can be done to assure the completion of this work?

Reasons:

- Situation in the country during 1989
- FOs were in the process of being developed.
- Lack of initial capital funds by DCO
- Insufficient construction time compared to what was planned.

RECOMMENDATIONS

- Ensure extended construction period by adhering to the cultivation calendar and cultivation of short term varieties\OFC

When: now
By Whom: IMD/ID

- DCO be allowed to undertake work outside their area with the consent of the DCO of the area concerned.

- Where the DCO is unable to cope-up with the work, contracts to be awarded to private contractors with the consent of the DCO.

- Ensure timely payment and provision of materials to DCO

When: now
By Whom: ID

Appendix I

FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT

1. How is ISMP defining Financial Management?

- Enhancing the competence of personnel (ID, IMD, District staff and also representatives of DCOs) in accounting which would lead to development of a sound Financial Management System.
- DCOs to adopt approved record keeping methods.
- This definition will be further studied by ISMP DCO/ Financial Management Committee. (Dan, Doug, Senthinathan)

2. What has been learned about financial management, what are the implications and how have these specific lessons been applied to the implementation of ISMP to date?

- FOs & officials show keen interest in improving Financial Management; DCOs are capable of maintaining records and books
- Financial Management is being done in limited areas; limited period for use and O&M fee collection policy.
- Ability to follow procedures
- Officers' supervision

3. How can ISMP accelerate the full scale implementation of the Financial Management system?

- DCO formation
- Training of DCOs
- Handing over of DCOs
- Appoint permanent FM/MEF assistant and provide training
- Make available computerized record keeping formats, test and transmit for practice

Recommendations

- Financial Management at DCO level should go beyond O&M fees
 - Option to collect O&M fees should rest with the DCOs
 - Completely review entire question of FM vis-a-vis O&M fees
Committee: Peri, Sena, Dan, Abbe, Wije
- Also address if and how internal auditing should take place and should government audit farmer organizations' Financial Management records.

4. What specific steps need to occur to make financial management operational?

- Timely information on allocation, work program
- Agency personnel be prompt in developing methods
- All personnel to be aware about how Financial Management works, through training

5. How will the financial management system be institutionalized (i.e. sustained beyond ISMP) in terms of staffing, training, reporting, etc., at the:

a. Irrigation Department

b. Irrigation Management Division and

c. Distributory Canal Farmer Organization levels?

- Other alternatives other than permanent staff need to be investigated because no new staff can be sustained

6. After legalization, what changes should be made within the Financial Management System (bank account, record keeping requirements, other?)

- Government auditing
- Immediate recommendation now and legalization request
- PM to request DCO to submit monthly financial statements
- Institute yearly audit after legalization

7. What other major financial management issues are facing ISMP?

- Non-collection of O&M fees
- Funds for personnel training
- How DCOs can generate funds (i.e. fund raising should be studied)

Appendix J

MONITORING, EVALUATION, AND FEEDBACK

1. How should the project define Monitoring?

-Find out the status of activities under the different components of ISMP at a given time.

2. How should the project define Evaluation?

-Analyze the information and compare with set targets and goals.

3. How should the project define Feedback?

-Passing up and down the results of monitoring and evaluation to beneficiaries and to all levels of management to improve performances.

4. What have been the past problems with the ME&F?

Past problems:

- (i) Inability of getting required information in some areas due to lack of water measuring devices, e.g. water delivery conveyance losses.
- (ii) Collection of too much data and too many indicators, e.g. over 500 indicators
- (iii) Problem in getting reliable information
- (iv) Utilization of trained KVSN enumerators
- (v) Analysis of data, using computer program could not be done as program was not developed fully.
- (vi) Inadequacy of staff
 - Monitoring officers
 - MEF assistants

5. What has been done to address these problems? What problems still remain to be solved?

- (i) DCO clusters are to be formed.
(4 or 5 DCOs for a cluster)
- (ii) Workshop was held in February 1990.
 - Refinement and modification of ME&F format
 - Reduced in length by approximately 60%
 - Number of indicators reduced from 530 to 200
- (iii) For reliable information:
 - a. Sample size will be reduced to 5%
 - b. Maintain a farmers record book
- (iv) Train the IOs in data collection to assist DCO members
- (v) New MEF computer program is to be developed.
- (vi) Appointments of ME&F assistants at scheme level

Problems that still remain to be solved:

- A. Development of new computer program
- B. Completion of MEF staffing
 - Permanent MEF assistants
 - Monitoring officers
 - DD (MEF)\IMD

Recommendation

- * Certain information needed for Project Manager activities
 - Performance Monitoring.... PMS should monitor staff performance, i.e. how are IOs doing, their impact, etc.
- * Clarify monitoring requirements of ISMP as an on-going activity for management information and for seasonal monitoring of ISMP impact.

6. How is this system going to benefit:

Project Managers
Irrigation Engineers
Farmer organizations
Technical Assistance Team
Research Advisory Committee
Irrigation Department/Headquarters
Irrigation Management Division/Headquarters

Anticipated Benefits

- PM -PM can compare DCO's performances with one another in respect of each indicator, as well as schemes.
- IE -Irrigation related problems
eg: water use efficiency for each DCO.

- Adequate and equitable distribution of water delivery.
- FO - With respect to FOs performances
- TAT - TAT will be guided in future planning - they can identify areas where assistance is needed.
- RAC - Identifying various areas of research
- ID\HQ - To monitor the implementation program and review the progress of planned work.
- IMD\HQ - - do -

7. In what ways is the current system not responding to the above groups?

- Although reports were prepared for two seasons, they were not complete due to the above reasons.
- No proper feedback has been given to management or to the FOs: therefore group is unable to comment

8. What have been the deficiencies in the Monitoring, Evaluation and Feedback system in terms of:

a. Data Analysis:

- Computer program was incomplete.
- Proper data analysis cannot be done.
- Computer program is not user-friendly, so analysis could not be done fully.

b. Reporting:

- As there was no proper analysis, proper reporting was not possible.

c. Dissemination:

- Was not possible because of above problem.

d. In what ways will these deficiencies be addressed in the future?

- Workshop was held - February 1990
 - Indicators were reduced by 60%
 - Questionnaires revised from 33 pages to 15 pages
- Enumeration will be made easy
- Farmer record books will be maintained by farmers
- A user-friendly data analysis program will be developed to produce complete reports at two levels:
 - i. Scheme level
 - ii. Range level

9. In what ways is headquarter, district and scheme level staffing for the Monitoring, Evaluation and Feedback component:

adequate?
inadequate?

Inadequate at scheme level:

- Permanent MEF assistants with adequate transport facilities are needed.
- Training is needed for these officers in data collection methods and use of computer for data analysis.

District Level: DDI

HQ: Monitoring Officer
DD\ME & F

Next Steps:

1. Completion of refined questionnaires and translation
in to Sinhala and Tamil
When: Before end of March, 1990
By Whom: SAI\IMD
2. Completion of Farm Record Book
When: Before end of March, 1990
By Whom: Mr. P. Periyasamy (SAI)
- Distribution to Farmers
When: 01-15 April 1990
3. Training of IO & MEF assistants
When: Before end of April, 1990 (Polonnaruwa and
Kurunegala)
Before 15th May 1990 in Ampara
By Whom: IMD\SAI
4. Refinement to data analysis computer model
By Whom: Mr. Periyasamy (SAI)
5. Refine MEF Report format
When: By end of May 1990
By Whom: Mr. Periyasamy\SAI
6. MEF Seasonal Reports (scheme and range level)
When: By Yala Season, 1990
By Whom: Mr. Periyasamy

Appendix K

RESEARCH

1. In what ways has the research component been satisfactory/unsatisfactory?

- Research component is satisfactory to the extent that

a) targets have been kept - by mid year on a line scale in spite of initial setbacks

b) four areas covered are a wide spectrum

flow measurements
O&M costs
institutional building
role of NGOs

similarly, areas identified cover a wide spectrum

low cost rehabilitation techniques
MANIS program
crop diversification
farm turnout size

c) participation by agency personnel

- Research component is unsatisfactory due to late start of activities.

Suggestion

Research Advisory Committee should address this issue on an as-needed basis

2. What lessons have been learned through the research component and how have these learnings been applied to other components of ISMP?

- There is a wide array of subjects needing research in Irrigation Management, eg.:

institution building
O&M costs
farmer organizational development
training needs assessments

- Applications to other components - premature to make observations

3. How can the research component be made more relevant to ISMP?

- Research findings need integration into the other components as well as constant feedback

Suggestion

Establish a close relationship between research group, IIMI, and the rest of the project. The Research Advisory Committee should be expanded to include representatives from the field, including Project Managers and Irrigation Engineers.

4. How should ISMP identify relevant topics for applied research?

Suggestion

Hold a workshop at field level to identify research ideas, combine with Joint Standing committee ID/IMD to identify research priorities.

5. What role should ME&F play in identifying research topics?

-vertical and horizontal flow of information. ME&F should play a direct role in identification of specific research needs of the project.

6. How can dissemination of research results be improved?

7. What process should be instituted to assess the appropriateness of research results?

Suggestions

Under ISMP, when research is released, ID and IMD should respond in writing about acceptability or non-acceptability of research.

Pms should be able to submit research proposals for funding.

8. What process should be instituted to assure that appropriate lessons learned will be applied?

- Research activities need institutionalization and translation into action programs through management process. This should be done as soon as possible by the respective implementing agencies.

Suggestion

Research results should be translated into Sinhala and Tamil. Sri Lankan institutes need to be identified to provide newsletters in both languages for national distribution. This issue should be taken up by RAC.

Management of respective agencies should develop implementation mechanisms after research has been accepted - work with research groups.

- 9. One of the two purposes of the ISMP is to test different combinations of management and structural improvements carried out in selected irrigation systems. What can be done now in the research component to address this project purpose?**

- Within the identified research subjects, comparative studies should be done in each of the different types of management and physical improvement systems in the three different areas -Gal Oya, Polonnaruwa and RBE.

Appendix L

PROJECT MANAGEMENT

1. What recommendations should be made by ISMP to the Ministry of Lands, Irrigation and Mahaweli Development about the permanent status of Institutional Organizers?

- Permanent status should not be recommended because it creates another bureaucracy, "dependency syndrome".

Recommendation:

- phasing out and deploying IOs in other project areas
- outstanding IOs should be considered for related opportunities.

Who: DD/IMD

P.M.s to recommend who should be considered for related opportunities

2. How can ID/IMD internal reporting be streamlined? How can two way information flow and feedback be assured?

- Internal communication at following levels is OK
 - Between DCOs and TA\WS
 - Between Area Council and TA
 - Between Project and IEs

Needs improvements at district level

Recommend: GA be appointed as Additional Director/ IMD

Who: DD/IMD/MLIMD - Public Administration

When: immediately

Recommendation:

Rather than appoint the GA as Additional Director/IMD, the PMs should be able to get support from District Agriculture Committee.

In the meantime, there is a new structure being put in place at the provincial level -Provincial Council Administration.

Suggestion is to continue as is until effects of provincial council administration are known.

3. How can the Irrigation Engineers' management and supervision of Technical Assistants be strengthened?

Recommend: Suggest general discussion

4. How can more direct field support and supervision be provided for Project Managers?

Refer to question no. 2, same recommendations

5. What should be the roles and responsibilities of Technical Assistants in supporting Farmer Organizations?

Present Roles and Responsibilities

- Prepare and operate water issue schedules
- Issue instructions regarding operations in handed-over canals.
- Prepare maintenance programs and estimates according to FO priorities
- Maintenance and construction supervision
- Routine supervision of canals and structures
- Speedy action for irrigation-related discrepancies with FOs

New Responsibilities:

- Participate in FO activities
- Train FOs in O&M

WHO: ID & IMD

WHEN: Early

6. In the two years left in the project, how feasible is it to complete project requirements in Polonnaruwa and Gal Oya?

- Not feasible

Recommendation

- Two year project extension

Justification

- Gal Oya started 2 years late and resources for both areas are limiting

Who : MLILD and USAID. G.T. Jayawardena will take the lead

What: ID/IMD/Sheladia/USAID will study the extension of ISMP, including the length of the extension, budget required and technical assistance needed.

7. The 1990 work plan has a budget of 77.5 million rupees. The projected budget for 1991/92 period are 207.7 million rupees.

a. Can these resources be effectively and appropriately utilized in this short time frame?

'No' - refer 6

b. What impact will D&F channel construction have on project management and effective utilization of resources?

- Proper water management not possible
- Participatory management will not take place

8. How is crop diversification justified as a project priority?

- To increase agricultural production and productivity
- To increase farm incomes and living standards
- To generate employment opportunities
- To increase cropping intensity
- To increase returns per unit of water used
- Improve cash flow
- Avert risks

a. What are the benefits of ISMP farmer training in crop diversification?

- Training will achieve the following goals - (see answer above)

b. In what ways do these benefits justify the use of limited project staff and SAI consultants over the next two years, given the other priorities of the project (ie. ESI construction, O&M plan development, ME&F, and strengthening of farmer organizations)

- Cost in terms of personnel and funds negligible <1% of total ISMP budget
But the cost:benefit is **dramatic**.

9. How can ISMP coordination with other institutions and departments be improved at the national level? district level?

- Present level of coordination is adequate (District Agricultural Committee coordination should be strengthened)

Recommendation

IMD should go to higher levels in the Ministry to seek reconsideration of the Water Panel Management Committee decision to reopen the canals.

Who: Director, IMD

Appendix M

MANAGEMENT EXPECTATIONS

Agreements

- * An annual report will be submitted to A.I.D. on all commodity procurement to date (on time), including the location of specific items (i.e. 5 Jeeps at _____, etc.). This will replace the requirement for a purchase-by-purchase report. The format for this report will be studied.
- * ISMP Project Director will submit to A.I.D. an Annual Training Plan for 1990.
- * Recipients of overseas training will submit a written report to A.I.D. highlighting what was learned of relevance to ISMP, and how it will be applied.
- * By the first of June of each work year, (this year September for Ampara), Irrigation Department DDIs will submit to A.I.D. cost estimates and designs with accurate figures/data for the entire year. (As many as possible, so that the PIL can be drafted)
- * Sheladia will submit a justification and request to USAID Project Officer and ISMP Project Director six weeks in advance for approval of home office visits to Sri Lanka.
- * IMD will be represented ISMP on the Water Management Panel. A.I.D. will be invited as observers.
- * ISMP Project Director will provide 7 days advance notice of meetings.
- * IMD will inform Sheladia of new ideas/approaches being tried with Farmer Organizations in other areas. (Ananda will take lead responsibilities).
- * DDI will establish regular procedure for sharing technical information on an on-going basis:
 - Quarterly Progress Information to Sheladia by 17th of first month of next quarter
 - DDIs will notify Sheladia Team when projects reach 50% completion (so Sheladia can make monitoring visits).
 - Sheladia will recommend reimbursement once 50% completion met.

- ID, Sheladia, ISMP Project Director and A.I.D. will meet on March 29 at GT's Office: Lynton, Doug, GT, Warren.

Agenda will include discussion of time frame for reimbursement, and PIL.

- * Sheladia will solicit specific feedback from A.I.D. and ISMP P.D., and requests unsolicited feedback from them (this especially would be helpful) about helpfulness and usefulness of reports submitted by the project.
- * Sheladia requests written reports from Agriculture, SLIDA, ARTI - on project-related research studies
Sheladia will make formal written request for information sharing from above groups. (SLIDA and DOA representatives at the workshop will also communicate this request to their agencies)
- * Monthly physical and financial reports will be submitted to ISMP Project Director by DDI's (And made available to Sheladia)
- * DDI/IE/Pms will provide more information on construction at ISMP Monthly Committee
- * Sheladia will inform ISMP Project Director when a member of the Technical Assistance team is to be away from office for more than 2 days.
- * IIMI will inform USAID by 30 March if there is a problem with the research budget requested in the cooperative agreement. Also IIMI, ISMP/PD, and USAID will hold more candid discussions about issues surrounding the research component.
- * Farmer Organization Think Tank (Doug and Sena) will discuss how IIMI and Sheladia should communicate more about learning from the project.
- * ISMP Project Director will inform IIMI of up-coming ISMP meetings.
- * Research activities will be discussed at ISMP monthly meetings. Research Advisory Committee meetings will be determined at ISMP Monthly Meetings. (Next meeting to discuss project as a learning laboratory - Doug will set up agenda to discuss research fellowships, and reappraisal of Phase II research.)
- * Steering Committee on Irrigation Management will clarify how "concurrent decisions" will be made in ISMP between ID and IMD. (April 26 meeting).

Appendix N

EVALUATION RESULTS

Summary of Workshop Evaluations

Following are the results of the written evaluations of the workshop.

A. Workshop Goals

The goals of the workshop are listed below. The number following each statement indicates how well participants felt each goal was achieved during the workshop. The scale is from 1 (low, goal not achieved) to 5 (high, goal achieved very well).

1. To exchange information on current project status
(4.0)
2. To improve the ability of all groups to work together as a team.
(4.1)
3. To review progress made since the 1989 ISM project review workshop.
(3.9)
4. To identify ISMP challenges and opportunities for the remainder of the project and to address immediate critical issues.
(3.9)
5. To develop agreements and next steps.
(4.3)

B. Opinions and Feedback

1. What do you think has been the primary benefit of this workshop.

- Foreword planning for future implementation and better understanding by all parties.
- Clarification of expectations.
- Meeting all field staff and other officers.
- Better understanding of the project.

- Exchange of information on project status.
- Improve the work on ISMP future programs.
- To develop agreements.
- Team spirit.
- Identified the roles of each institutions specifically.
- to make policy discussions.
- Information exchange, agreements on some next steps.
- A clear picture of ISMP past, present and immediate future.
- To make adjustments in course of action to achieve goals on various project components.
- To get an idea of the progress in order to determine the future decisions.
- To discuss and arrive at final decisions clearly.
- Awareness of project activities as being done.
- To identify the constraints in the present work plan and to take corrective measures.
- To arrive at a decision on agreements of last workshop.
- All institutions coming together to identify and take steps to correct errors.
- Team action.
- Came to agreement with all implementing ISMP.
- Got the opportunity to move with various organizations and people performing ISMP activities and exchange ideas frankly.
- Exchange ideas with participants and have better idea about the project.
- To understand the enormous problems that are yet to be tackled in the project.
- Getting together several disciplines, grades and cadres.
- Identification of problem areas and finding ways of problem resolution.
- To find out the present status of the ISMP and to plan for the future.

- Able to find out present status of the ISMP.
- Identification of the major issue areas and the development of steps to be taken.
- Arriving at consensus on certain aspects which were pending and also future plans.
- Exchange of experience by different groups of implementors.
- To identify the constraints of project implementation.
- Review resolves.
- Goal 4.
- Sharing of ideas, clearing doubts, arriving group consensus.

2. What workshop activity could have been done better ?

- All went on well.
- Goal one.
- Dealing with issues - not enough time.
- Solutions to overcome the constraints.
- Group presentations.
- Questionnaire for the small groups could have been done better.
- Small groups (2).
- Small group activities.
- Maximum possible communication from all participants.
- This workshop did well.
- To review what has been agreed during the last workshop that they will do and what has been achieved.
- Allow participants to prepare for the workshop by giving more time before workshop started and more time for discussions and interactions.
- O & M (2).
- If group discussions were in Sinhala (2).

- Within the limited time best has been done.
- All have been done equally better.
- Sharing responsibilities.
- Not clear.
- All done satisfactorily.
- None.
- All.
- Needed more time or focus on given issues. Many discussions were rushed and may not be optional.
- None.
- Farmer organizations.
- Everyone has done well.
- More time to consider FOs and O & M.
- All were Okay.

3. Do you believe there are unresolved issues that should be dealt with in follow up activities ? What are they, and what should be done about them ?

- No response (18).
- No, I think the agreed action covers everything of importance that can be resolved.
- N/A.
- Field problems in Farmer Organization.
- Yes I think there is a contradiction between the project objectives of institution building and project implementation, which focuses on construction targets. Project should adopt innovations suggested from floor but not included in project agreements.
- Teamwork at project level is not fully happening. PM, IE and TA meetings are formalities. Therefore future workshops should address this point very strong.
- Major decisions on project extension is critical for onward timely project planning.

- Yes. O & M activities.
- Yes, Administration in district level.
- No (6).
- Yes. Performance of staff evaluation, ME&F and FM Program.
- Yes training materials, research studies, O & M activities.
- Yes, MEF Program.
- Policy and assumptions, more flow of information.
- Earth work in field canals to be executed free by farmers
- Motivation of farmers.
- 1. Whether the contract work to be given to outsiders or the work to be carried out by farmers.
- 2. Will the farmers carry out earth work free of cost.
- 3. A clear policy is to be arrived at.
- There are. Other key problems faced by farmers have not been touched at least. Cultivating loans, agricultural instructions, stray cattle, problem between VV and FOs, leasing of farm lots, poor canal clearance by farmers.
- Resolving of the problems will depend on the actual performance.

4. What comments do you have about the workshop arrangements and accommodations ?

- Good (12).
- Excellent (4).
- Good (they could have given a copy of the project paper).
- Satisfactory for most part - need good mike at each table.
- Very good (5).
- Very good - Hotel food ?
- O.K.
- Fine (2).
- Generally good ! (or "excellent").

- Audio (Microphones) arrangement hopeless.
- Very fine.
- Well done.
- Adequate.
- Fine, no serious problems, but sessions were too long to be effective.
- Satisfactory.
- Workshop arrangements were very satisfactory, Accommodation was OK, some payment should have been paid to participants.
- Arrangements were good, time is just enough.
- PA system could have been better arranged.
- Satisfactory. Organizers would have asked for the kind of food they like to have at the commencement.

5. What final comments do you have for the workshop facilitators on their performance ?

- thanks.
- All real pro's in identifying the issues, planning and facilitating the sessions.
- Good (6).
- Job well done (2).
- Very good (5).
- Facilitators did an excellent job. Congratulations.
- Excellent (8).
- Not to be biased.
- Very professional and effective.
- A good job of work
- Worked very hard and did a good job given the constraints.
- Did very well.
- It was conducted satisfactorily.

- Satisfactory.(2)
- Many thanks for an excellent job.
- Their performances are excellent.
- Very good - able to distill essence of many diverse comments and translate into action.
- Everything OK.
- They have done an excellent job.
- Congratulations on a good job done.
- I sincerely admire the endeavor made by the facilitators.
- Continue on same lines.