

A Study to Understand the Efficacy of the  
'Ganga Kalyana Yojana' in Heggadavenkote and  
Nanjangud Taluks

2010 Status Report

Submitted to:

**The Managing Director  
Devaraj Urs Backward Classes Development Corporation  
Bangalore**

Undertaken By:



**Vivekananda Institute for Leadership Development**

**(Unit of Swami Vivekananda Youth Movement)**

**Combining Commitment with Competence**



**Evaluation Team**

Principle Advisor:

R. Balasubramaniam, Swami Vivekananda Youth Movement

Principle Author and Main Investigator:

H. Lafontaine, University of Windsor

Lead Analyst:

Narasimhaiah K., Grassroots Research and Advocacy Movement

Contributing Authors:

S. Kashyap, Grassroots Research and Advocacy Movement

Drishya M., Swami Vivekananda Youth Movement

Advisory Team:

Basavaraju R., Grassroots Research and Advocacy Movement

Shanthi G., Grassroots Research and Advocacy Movement

Rekha D., Grassroots Research and Advocacy Movement

Jyothi M. A., Grassroots Research and Advocacy Movement

T. Bolisetti, University of Windsor

## **Acknowledgements**

We would like to thank the Devaraj Urs Backward Classes Development Corporation for their continuous involvement and support throughout the Ganga Kalyana Yojana evaluation study. We would like to especially appreciate Managing Director, DBCDC and his colleagues for their contribution to the study tool, interview process, and evaluation approach.

We would like to thank Swami Vivekananda Youth Movement for providing the necessary resources and information throughout the study period.

We would like to thank the University of Windsor for the technical advice, and continuous support throughout the Ganga Kalyana Yojana study.

A special thanks to the Ganga Kalyana Yojana beneficiaries for their participation and contribution to the Ganga Kalyana Yojana evaluation study.

## Table of Contents

Executive Summary .....	9
1 Introduction .....	11
1.1 Background .....	11
1.1.1 Criteria for Selection Under the GKY Scheme .....	12
1.1.2 Financial Structure .....	15
1.2 Study Area .....	16
1.2.1 General Statistics .....	16
1.2.2 Agro-ecological Statistics .....	18
1.3 Scope of the Study .....	19
2 Evaluation Methodology .....	20
2.1 Evaluation Strategy .....	20
2.1.1 Taluk Selection .....	20
2.1.2 Sampling Plan .....	21
2.1.3 Scheme Stages .....	22
2.1.4 Evaluation Tool Selection .....	22
2.1.5 Idea Mapping and Evaluation Tool Development .....	23
2.2 Ethical Considerations .....	25
2.3 Surveyor Training .....	25
2.4 Pilot Test .....	25
2.5 Field Interviewing .....	26
2.6 Data Entry .....	26
2.7 Data Verification .....	26
2.8 Data Analysis Methodology .....	26

3	Analysis/Results .....	30
3.1	GKY Scheme Overview .....	30
3.2	Socio-economic Status .....	35
3.2.1	GKY Beneficiary Overview .....	35
3.2.2	Household Statistics .....	37
3.2.3	Net Income Statistics .....	40
3.2.4	Agricultural Status.....	44
3.3	Process Analysis .....	48
3.3.1	Pre-Implementation Analysis .....	48
3.3.2	Implementation Analysis.....	52
3.3.3	Post Implementation Analysis .....	53
4	Conclusions and Observations .....	60
4.1.1	Pre-Implementation.....	60
4.1.2	Implementation .....	60
4.1.3	Post-Implementation .....	62
4.1.4	Other observations.....	64
5	Recommendations.....	64
5.1	Recommendations with Short-term Objectives .....	65
5.1.1	Reservation for women and physically challenged applicants.....	65
5.1.2	Public display of selected beneficiaries .....	65
5.1.3	An information kit of scheme related training and resources.....	65
5.1.4	Orientation program for selected GKY Scheme beneficiaries .....	66
5.1.5	Early borewell check.....	66
5.2	Recommendations with Long-term Objectives.....	67
5.2.1	Strengthening the human resources in DBCDC.....	67

5.2.2	Transparency in the beneficiary selection process.....	67
5.2.3	Engagement with other related departments including other GKY implementing agencies.....	68
5.2.4	Development of more comprehensive indicators of success for regular monitoring.....	68
5.2.5	Coordination with local contractors for implementation .....	70
5.2.6	Prevention of borewell failures.....	70
5.2.7	Flexibility in allotment of GKY targets for taluks and districts .....	70
6	References .....	72
7	APPENDIX A: Interview Tool (Kannada).....	73

### List of Tables

Table 1: Ganga Kalyana Yojana Scheme Criteria and Benefits .....	13
Table 2: Approved agencies for Ganga Kalyan Yojana Scheme 2000 - 2009 .....	15
Table 3: Taluk Wise Population Distribution in Mysore District.....	17
Table 4: Groundwater Development in Mysore District.....	18
Table 5: Pre-Interview and Post Interview Sampling Plan .....	22
Table 6: HD Kote Year-wise Borewell Functionality .....	32
Table 7: Nanjangud Year-wise Borewell Functionality .....	32
Table 8: HD Kote Average Life of Failed Borewells .....	34
Table 9: Nanjangud Average Life of Failed Borewells .....	34
Table 10: Child Access to Education 2010 Snapshot .....	39
Table 11: Cost of Education 2010 Snapshot.....	39
Table 12: Taluk-wise Average Income With and Without Other Family Occupations .....	44
Table 13: Taluk-wise Average Income for Individual and Group Schemes.....	44
Table 14: Intensity of Cultivation Snapshot for 2010 .....	45
Table 15: Crop Diversity Snapshot for 2010.....	46
Table 16: Taluk-wise Market Access for Beneficiaries 2010.....	47
Table 17: Number of Beneficiaries Sanctioned in Each Year .....	49
Table 18: Time Taken for Application Process .....	51
Table 19: Respondent’s expression of inquiries during post implementation.....	55
Table 20: GKY Borewell Maintenance and Repairs .....	56

### List of Figures

Figure 1. Ganga Kalyan Yojana Beneficiary Selection Process.....	14
Figure 2. Ganga Kalyan Distribution of Funds.....	15
Figure 3: Mysore District Map .....	17
Figure 4: State of Ground Water Utilization, CGWB - January 2009.....	19
Figure 5: Study Organizational Chart.....	20
Figure 6: Cause and Effect Idea Mapping for GKY Irrigation Scheme .....	24
Figure 7: HD Kote Borewell Status 2010 Snapshot .....	33
Figure 8: Nanjangud Borewell Status 2010 Snapshot .....	33
Figure 9: Taluk-wise Gender Distribution 2010 Snapshot.....	35
Figure 10: HD Kote Caste Distribution 2010 Snapshot.....	36
Figure 11: Nanjangud Caste Distribution 2010 Snapshot .....	36
Figure 12: Taluk-wise Age Distribution 2010 Snapshot .....	37
Figure 13: Taluk-wise Level of Education Distribution 2010 Snapshot .....	37
Figure 14: Taluk-wise Household Dependency on GKY Cultivable Land .....	38
Figure 15: Taluk-wise Household Occupations 2010 Snapshot.....	39
Figure 16: HD Kote Income Status 2009 and 2010.....	41
Figure 17: Nanjangud Income Status 2009 and 2010 .....	41
Figure 18: HD Kote 2009 Income Brackets Year-wise.....	42
Figure 19: Nanjangud 2009 Income Brackets Year-wise .....	42
Figure 20: HD Kote 2010 Income Brackets Year-wise.....	43
Figure 21: Nanjangud 2010 Income Brackets Year-wise .....	43
Figure 22: Respondents’ expression of pre-implementation Stakeholder Communication.....	49
Figure 23: GKY Advertising Avenues Reaching Beneficiaries.....	50
Figure 24. Stakeholder Communication during implementation.....	53
Figure 25: Respondents’ expression of post implementation Stakeholder Communication.....	54
Figure 26: Perception of Crop Yield Improvements 2010 Snapshot.....	57
Figure 27: Taluk-wise Seasonal Borewell Usage .....	58



## Executive Summary

The Ganga Kalyana Yojana evaluation study was conducted from March 2010 – August 2011 with three main objectives: to understand the efficacy of the scheme for its design, implementation and achievement of desired outcomes; to understand differences in the socio-economic status of the beneficiaries; and to understand and suggest scope for improvements.

The evaluation methodology was developed to create a unique beneficiary interview tool that addressed the study objectives and evaluated all three stages of the GKY scheme: pre-implementation, implementation, and post implementation. In total, 145 beneficiaries were interviewed from HD Kote and Nanjangud taluks. Further, various stakeholders at the taluk level, from the DBCDC, and selected approved drilling and supply agencies were consulted.

The GKY analysis was divided into three main sections: GKY Scheme overview, socio-economic status, and process analysis. As of 2010, 38 borewells in HD Kote and 42 borewells in Nanjangud were functioning where as 7 borewells in HD Kote and 11 borewells in Nanjangud had failed. Additionally, 24 % of beneficiaries in HD Kote and 14 % in Nanjangud did not have electrical service to their borewells. Beneficiaries were divided into individual and group schemes. In group schemes the majority of beneficiaries were from the IIIA and IIIB categories of backward classes while individual schemes were predominately from I and IIA categories. Only 12% of the selected beneficiaries were women and only 1 physically challenged beneficiary was identified amongst respondents. Overall, 80 % of households in each Taluk were dependent on agriculture as the main source of income and approximately 13 % of households rely on 1 other family occupation. As of 2010, 55 % of beneficiaries with functioning borewells in HD Kote and 60 % in Nanjangud reported net incomes of greater than Rs 20,000 for both 2009 and 2010. Only 2.3 % of respondents in

HD Kote and 4.3 % of respondents in Nanjangud acquired a net income of Rs 50,000 or greater for 2009 and 2010.

When examining agricultural status, approximately 83 % of beneficiaries in HD Kote "strongly agree" or "agree" that their crop yields have been improved while there were 91 % of beneficiaries in Nanjangud. On average, 65 % of the farmers grew annual cash crops of either sugarcane or banana. Of the 91 valid respondents, 23 farmers (25%) practiced mono-crop cultivation while 44 farmers (48%) had a crop diversity value of more than 0.50.

In the post implementation phase, maintenance costs of the borewell were identified as a main roadblock to beneficiaries availing financial benefit from the scheme. Motor repairs were determined to cost approximately Rs 4,000 per year. Further, the quality of materials and improper installation using PVC or GI piping had caused 2 borewell breakdowns or further financial burdens of up to Rs 40,000 for some beneficiaries. Further, the use of additional technology such as water recharging techniques, piping, drip irrigation, or sprinkler irrigation were low. Information was available with related departments like Agriculture, Watershed, and Horticulture; however there was no formal collaboration or relationship established within the scheme to introduce beneficiaries to such additional information. Finally, there was little follow-up and support provided to beneficiaries once the borewell was received.

The recommendations for the study were divided into short-term and long-term activities. Short-term goals included reservation for women and physically challenged GKY applicants, training resources and orientation for selected beneficiaries, and a scope for a borewell visit 3-6 months post implementation. Long-term goals addressed the internal capacity of the DBCDC to follow-up with the GKY scheme, discussed options for collaboration amongst all GKY implementing corporations as well as other line departments.