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CHAPTER VI

PERCEPTUAL ANALYSIS OF BENEFICIARIES AND IMPACT OF WATERSHED DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMMES

The present study on the Impact of Watershed Development Programmes on Rural Socio-economic conditions of Farmers in Andhra Pradesh is an empirical study that has been observed on the basis of field study. Watershed Development Programme is an all India programme to improve water conservation and provide adequate water for drinking and irrigation purpose. Hence the present study aims at finding implementation of Watershed Development Programme, intricacies in the installation of the programme and importantly its impact on socio-economic conditions of the state.

To substantiate the above goals the researcher has selected major zones of Andhra Pradesh and two districts each from the selected zones. The selected districts in Rayalaseema are Anantapur and Y.S.R. Kadapa, from Coastal Andhra Prakasam and Srikakulam, Mahabubnagar and Khammam from Telangana. From these six districts four Mandals of watershed implementation programme or randomly selected from each watershed twenty five samples were collected, making a total of 600 samples. To make this inquest into realization the researcher used an effective questionnaire enquiring with certain questions to gather information from beneficiaries/farmers pertaining to socio-economic conditions and probing implementation of Watershed Development Programme.
To acquire adequate inputs regarding Impact of Watershed Development Programmes researcher assessed opinions of respondents with suitable questions on the tune of satisfaction of respondents towards the impact of WDPs. Most of the questions were asked on a five scale sample with variables of strongly agree, agree, disagree, strongly disagree and not applicable. These variables would give proper assessment of the respondents over the impact of WDPs. The questions are continued from here.

6.1. Implementation of WDP’s and People’s Participation:

Watershed development programme implementation involves people’s participation. This section of the question is very critical in the stages of WDP; it requires cooperation and support of the locals and their valuable assessment of the WDP. This is analyzed on five scale basis, the respondents are asked whether they have strongly agreed, agreed, disagreed, strongly disagreed and response if the question is not applicable. In this assessment there are four variables to be observed from respondents.

6.1.1. Selecting the Region: The process of selecting the region for implementation, mostly respondents have agreed and strongly agreed, as 21.2 per cent, 75.6 per cent, respectively and a mere 3.2 per cent disagreed.
6.1.2. **Beneficiary Group:** Most of the respondents have the similar opinion regarding this, as 25.8 per cent strongly agreed, 70.6 per cent agreed, with 2.6 per cent disagreed and 1 per cent marked not applicable.
6.1.3. Members of Core Group: this process can also felt on the positive side, 25.6 per cent, call it strongly agreed and 70.8 per cent, had agreed and a small section of them had a negative or disagreement of 3.6 per cent.

**Fig: 6.3: Selecting the Core Group at the Implementation Stage of WDPs**
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Source: Evidence from the field work

6.1.4. Activities under Implementation: Activities under implementation has got outstanding response. As only 2.4 per cent expressed disagreed, compared to 29.6 per cent strongly agreed and 69 per cent agreed. Interestingly there is no hatred or indifference as strongly disagreed and not applicable is not found.
6.2. People’s participation at implementation stage:

Implementation of watershed development programmes and people’s participation in the scheme is important. Any programme that is initiated for the improvement of people’s life has to be thoroughly observed. This was analyzed with five scale method taking the agreement or disagreement of the respondents. There are 8 questions asked regarding the implementation of WDPs.

6.2.1. Resources: Providing resource material locally available was more are less on higher side of the acceptance with 16.6 per cent strongly agreed and 68 per cent agreed however there is a reasonable negation with 5.6 per cent disagreement and 9.4 per cent opted for not applicable.
6.2.2. Manual Labor: Contributing the manual labour in the activities of the programme, for this question there was a line’s shares of positive response with 29.6 per cent strongly agree and 65.6 per cent agreed. However there is a mere 2.2 per cent disagreement and 2.6 per cent not applicable.
6.2.3. **Financial Support**: Contributing financial support to the programme, for this question over whelming positive response were drawn as 25.6 per cent strongly agreed, and a whopping 71 per cent agreed, here is also a slender response of 3 per cent disagreement and 0.4 per cent strongly disagreement.

**Fig: 6.7: Financial Support for WDPs at the Implementation Stage**
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Source: Evidence from the field work

6.2.4. **Indigenous Knowledge**: Providing indigenous knowledge to the programme, this question has the biggest difference between positive and negative responses. Out of the total respondents a paltry 0.8 per cent disagreed, against 35 per cent strongly agreed and 64.2 per cent agreed.
6.2.5. **Activities:** Initiating activities for the programme’s success regarding the success of WDPs initialization all most 99 per cent positive response was gathered. As 36.8 per cent strongly agreed, 62.4 per cent agreed, and 0.8 per cent disagreed indicates more people whole heartedly accepted and approved the success of WDPs.

**Fig: 6.9: Initiating Activities for WDPs at the Implementation Stage**
6.2.6. **Evaluation:** Giving evaluations during meetings rewardingly conduction of evaluation meeting the total respondents were happy, as 28.6 per cent strongly agreed, and 67.4 per cent agreed against 3.2 per cent disagree, and 0.8 per cent indifference. It indicates that mostly the evaluation meeting provided ample instances of proper awareness pertaining to WDPs.

**Fig: 6.10: Evaluation of WDPs at the Implementation Stage**
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Source: Evidence from the field work

6.2.7. **Suggestions:** Giving suggestions to improve the programme. This question was also ended up with the response of high positive attitude as 31 per cent strongly agreed and 67.2 per cent agreed, however 1.8 per cent disagreement shows that there is a section of people grunting and grumbling regarding the suggestions for the improvement of the programme.
6.2.8. **Disseminating Knowledge:** The disseminating knowledge to people in the community, through awareness programmes, campaigns and conservation response: with 35 per cent strong agreement, 63.2 per cent agreement and 1.8 per cent disagreement, out of conviction is a general positive response towards WDPs. This question has driven a maximum positive response. At implementation stage people’s participation was on a satisfactory note and a partial disagreement. Therefore it can be understood that the implementation stage of WDPs was received positively and reacted by people well for the development of the region.

**Fig: 6.11: Suggestions for Improvement of WDPs**

Source: Evidence from the field work
6.3 List of Activities under WDP’s:

Harvesting the rain and runoff water is the prime objective of the watershed development programme. To do this, many structures of various types like check dams, contour bunds, Stone bunds, farm ponds, growing greenery Dry land Agriculture, forestry, horticulture and pastures, etc., needs to play a crucial role in generating impacts in a post project scenario. It helps us assessing the nature of project implementation. Further, unless the qualities of the structures are constructed across the gullies of various orders. Quality and current status of water harvesting structures good, the desired results cannot be produced. Also these structures are expected to withstand the rough conditions. Thus the quality is essential to maintain status quo. Maintenance of water harvesting structures is significant to enhance storage capacity and also in certain cases the infiltration capacity. The structures also require periodical maintenance like plastering,
pointing, and repairing to prevent cracks and leakages. Maintenance of storage capacity and infiltration capacity is essential in order to avoid water flow as a runoff.

6.4. Statements with Respect to WDP’s.

This particular question is divided into 3 sub sections with regional variation of the 3 major geographical zones. The same 5 scale method is used to analyze this question as well.

6.4.1. Knowledge Level: The WDPs has greatly enriched the knowledge of the people e.g.: out of the total respondents of Andhra Pradesh 37.2 per cent of them agreed, and 58.2 per cent agreed for the question of people’s knowledge enrichment regarding the WDPs. Nevertheless there is a 4.6 per cent of the respondents disagreed to the point.

Respondents of Rayalaseema region was on the almost positive sign regarding the WDPs with 68 per cent strongly agreement and 32 per cent agreement for the first time in this variable there is no negative response.

When it comes to costal Andhra region, the particular response is identical but a shifting the strength of the agreement. 29 per cent strongly agreed, and 66 per cent agreed, against 5 per cent discontentment reveals that the positivity of WDPs in costal Andhra is just accepted as any others scheme.

Response of Telangana region regarding WDPs is a carbon copy of the response of costal Andhra region. 31 per cent strongly agreed, and 63.5 per cent agreed, and 5.5 per cent disagreed shows that WDPs is considered as average water conservation method.
6.4.2. **Attitude Level:** The people have become more interested and concerned about watershed development programme. This has been the major issue of concern for the researcher to probe the real intention of the respondents. Usually the large section of the respondents has a great concern for the development of watershed development programme. In Andhra Pradesh a Total of 41.2 per cent of the respondents strongly agreed, and 51.4 per cent agreed, with 4.4 per cent disagreed, and 3 per cent not applicable indicates that the respondents are eager to participate in the watershed development programme.

Rayalaseema; has the maximum positive response as 83 per cent strongly agreed, and 17 per cent agreed. Whereas Coastal Andhra inputs show a little variation towards drifting interests, as 32.5 per cent strongly agreed and 57 per cent agreed, to 6 per cent
disagree and 4.5 per cent not applicable shows a bit of negative response. These numbers for Telangana also indicate almost the same response as Coastal Andhra with 32.5 per cent strongly agreement, and 57 per cent agreed, 6 per cent disagreed and 4.5 per cent not applicable.

**Fig: 6.14: Attitude level for Improvement of WDPs**
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Source: Evidence from the field work

6.4.3. **Practice Level:** The WDPs has changed the Trend of water-use pattern of the people and persuaded them more conservation. One of the salient feature of WDPs is water conservation, therefore most of the people opted the possible positive attitude towards this question. In Andhra Pradesh 43.4 per cent, strongly agreed and 55 per cent, agreed for the point of water conservation aims of WDPs. However there is a minute percent of 0.8 per cent disagreed, and another 0.8 per cent opted for not applicable.
When it comes to the regional variation, Rayalaseema and Coastal Andhra show total acceptance. With 85 per cent, strongly agreed and 15 per cent agreed, Rayalaseema indicates that the WDPs are the strongest need of the region for water resources.

Numbers for Coastal Andhra 34 per cent strongly agreed and 66 per cent agreed indicates the same. However Telangana has a difference in the approach, as 32 per cent, strongly agreed and 64 per cent agreed, with 2 per cent disagreed and 2 per cent not applicable.

**Fig: 6.15: Conservative Practice level at WDPs**

Source: Evidence from the field work
6.5. Results of WDPs.

6.5 1. Availability of water increased: In this regard a high positive response came from the respondents. In the state water availability has improved after the installation of watershed development programme, out of the total respondents in the state 43.4 per cent strongly agreed, and 55.8 per cent agreed, for the availability of water resource increased after WDPs. However, 0.8 per cent disagreements indicate a negligible portion of respondent’s opted unavailability of water.

To take the regional variation regarding the point of availability of water respondents in Rayalaseema region opted for a high positive response with 60 per cent strong agreement and 40 per cent agreement. When it comes to Coastal Andhra 38 per cent strongly agreed and 60 per cent agreed along sided 2 per cent disagreement indicates, a high positive response with relative negation. Telangana region is again on the maximum positive response with 40.5 per cent strong agreement, and 59.5 per cent agreement. All these indexes show that water availability with WDPs increased and were made available for all the users of the scheme.
6.5.2. Changes in Crop Pattern: One of the elementary changes after the installation of WDPs is the change of crop patterns. Most of the areas considered for the scheme are more or less water drought or low rainfall areas, which are usually, had problematic crop patterning or dependent on the conventional source of water resources for crops. WDPs provided such areas with a proven healthy water resource propelling a significant crop patterning change or diversion. Throughout the state of Andhra Pradesh the total respondents gave a optimized opinion regarding the question of crop pattern 32 per cent gave a strong agreement and 65.8 per cent agreed, 1.4 per cent disagreed and 0.8 per cent opted for not applicable.
To observe the regional variation Rayalaseema indicates 34 per cent strongly agreed, 64 per cent agreed, and 2 per cent disagree, gives high positive nature. When it comes to Coastal Andhra 35 per cent strongly agreed, 62.5 per cent agreed and 2.5 per cent disagreed gives a drop in the level of agreement. The corresponding numbers for Telangana region are 28 per cent strongly agreed, 70 per cent agreed and strangely 2 per cent not applicable indicates a great note of agreement with unknown ambiguity of opinion. Regardless of the negative opinions these indexes indicated crop pattern has really changed ever since the implementation of WDPs.

Fig: 6.17: Change of Crop Pattern WDPs area
6.5.3. The Yield from Agriculture has Increased: To complement with the above question about the change of crop pattern the researcher went for the inquest on the increase of agricultural yield the total respondents in the state gave a good account of positivity with 37.2 per cent strongly agreed, 60 per cent agreed, 1.2 per cent disagreed and 1.6 per cent not applicable.

To observe the regional variation Rayalaseema region went with a 38 per cent strongly agreed, 57 per cent agreed, and 5 per cent not applicable gives an indication of good agriculture with watershed program. Coastal Andhra indexes show 38 per cent strongly agreed, 59 per cent agreed, 1.5 per cent disagreed, and 1.5 per cent not applicable indicates a better yield with WDPs with a marginal negative response. Telangana region gives a better response with 36 per cent strongly agreed; 62.5 per cent agreed, against 1.5 per cent disagreed.

**Fig: 6.18: Increased of Agriculture Yield under WDPs areas**
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*Source: Evidence from the field work*
6.5.4. Increase of fuel and fodder; This particular question is an indirect responsive agent of the watershed development. Providing water availability for the increase of yield in agriculture and making drinking water facility are the first and foremost goals of watershed development. However water brings life to the area in which its presence is felt. Therefore growth of forest and bushes can be seen in the watershed areas. Thus it made easy access to fuel and fodder possible.

Pertaining to this question total respondents in the state gave a relative positive opinion 32.6 per cent strongly agreed, 59 per cent agreed, 3.6 per cent disagreed and 4.8 per cent not applicable draws a considerable negativity in the availability of fuel and fodder. The same is drawn from the regional variants Rayalaseema respondents opted 32 per cent strongly agreed, 59 per cent agreed, 9 per cent not applicable indicates an in different approach alongside the high positive attitude. Indexes of Coastal Andhra show 28 per cent strongly agree, 58.5 per cent agreed, 6.5 per cent disagreed, and 7 per cent not applicable shows a chunk of negative attitude though maximum is on the positive side. These numbers for Telangana Region are 37.5 per cent strongly agreed, 60 per cent agreed, and 2.5 per cent disagreed indicates implementation of WDPs improved availability of fuel and fodder.
6.5.5. Decrease in Collection of Fuel and Fodder: This question is an explanation of the previous question, regarding the availability of fuel and fodder. Usually in the rural areas collection of fuel wood and fodder is tradition of keeping up process though availability of scientific methods of cooking, rural folk opts for the conventional fuel wood. Rural areas hugely depend upon many domesticated animals for various purposes. Therefore fodder is a question in the drought prone areas. Hence instillation of watershed gave the local people to collect requirements of fuel and fodder within their localities.

In response to the question total respondents in the state gave a relative positive note with 27.8 per cent strongly agreed, 64.6 per cent agreed, 3.4 per cent disagreed, and 4.2 per cent not applicable. When it is compared to the regional variation Rayalaseema indicates 29 per cent strongly agreed, 61 per cent agreed, 5 per cent disagreed, and 5 per
cent not applicable. Identical figures are shown in Coastal Andhra as 24.5 per cent strongly agreed, 64 per cent agreed, 5 per cent disagreed, and 6.5 per cent not applicable. However indexes of Telangana region show a higher positive opinion with 30.5 Per cent strongly agreed, 67 per cent agreed, 1 per cent disagreed and 1.5 per cent not applicable. In this particular Telangana region, gives less negative impression towards the collection of fuel and fodder.

6.5.6. Increase in the Area under Grass: Grazing fields are the basic needs of the rural folk. Therefore addressing the needs of grass cultivation for cattle is also a salient feature of watershed development programmes. For this particular question respondents opted for high positive approach throughout the state. 39.4 per cent strongly agreed, 56.8 per cent agreed, 3.4 per cent disagreed and 0.4 per cent not applicable.

In Rayalaseema region, it gives a superlative positivity with 45 per cent of strongly agreed and 55 per cent agreed. This is a clear indication of increase in the grasslands after the WDPs. To observe Coastal Andhra corresponding numbers such as 39.5 per cent strongly agreed, 59 per cent agreed and 1.5 per cent disagreed indicates, a high level of positive approach with very less opinion of disagreement. However Telangana region pulls up the negative impact high with 7 per cent disagreement and 1 per cent not applicable, against 36.5 per cent strongly agreed and 55.5 per cent agreed.
**6.5.7. Increase in the Main and Variety Crops:** Perhaps this is the only equation to which respondent of all the regions gave 100 per cent acceptance. Since the watershed development programmes main aim is to provide improved irrigation facilities, therefore the implementation of WDPs increased the growth of variety of crops supplementing irrigation sources to the conventional sources. 46.8 per cent of respondents at the state level strongly agreed, and the rest of 53.2 per cent respondents are agreed. Even the regional variants also indicated 100 per cent positive results as Rayalaseema presented the maximum satisfaction with 73 per cent strongly agree and 27 per cent agreed. The corresponding numbers for Telangana reads as 39 per cent strongly agreed, and 61 per cent agreed.

Source: Evidence from the field work
6.5.8. Better Facility for Domestication of Animals: This question is a complete indicator for five scale method using all its variants. This has been an extension for the previous questions of grazing fields and fodder. As it is mentioned earlier that domestication of animals is a reciprocal human activity in the rural areas on the issue of interdependency of cattle over humans and humans over cattle.

Indicators of the state show 26.6 per cent strongly agreed, 59.6 per cent agreed, 7 per cent disagreed, 1 per cent strongly disagreed and 5.8 per cent not applicable. Therefore making a relative dip of 13 per cent of negative impact, causing a bit disturbance in the composition of acceptance of Watershed programmes. To observe regional variation respondents from Rayalaseema went with 21 per cent strongly agreed, 45 per cent agreed, 12 per cent disagreed, and 22 per cent not applicable. This has been a contrastingly indifference from this zone regarding the facilitation of domestication of
animals. However the similar numbers for Coastal Andhra reveals a far more scarce statistics as 22.5 per cent strongly agreed, 65 per cent agreed, 7.5 per cent disagreed, 2.5 per cent each strongly disagreed and not applicable.

The same is the case with Telangana region with a relative drop in the negative column as 33.5 per cent strongly agreed, 61.5 per cent agreed, 4 per cent disagreed, and 1 per cent not applicable.

**Fig: 6.22: Facility for rearing Domestication Animals**
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Source: Evidence from the field work

**6.5.9. The Soil Conservation Practices have improved:** This question also drew the maximum acceptance of the respondents as conservation of soil and reforestation is the key objectives of the watershed development programmes. At the state level indexes show 38.4 per cent strongly agreed, and 61.6 per cent agreed. Such is the case with the regional variation. Rayalaseema opted for highest strongly recommended option with a
45 per cent strongly agreed, and 55 per cent aggregate. Similarly Coastal Andhra counted for 39 per cent strongly agreed, and 61 per cent agreed. Telangana also yields 34.5 per cent strongly agreed to 65.5 per cent agreed.

**Fig: 6.23: Soil Conservation Practices Under WDPs**
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**Source: Evidence from the field work**

6.5.10. The Fertility of the Soil has improved: This is complementary question to the above question drawing same result as above. If the soil erosion is controlled automatically fertility of the soil also improves. Indications of the state showed 41.8 per cent strongly agreed, to that of 58.2 per cent. The regional variation also indicates the same. Rayalaseema 49 per cent strongly agreed and 51 per cent agreed gives a strong indication whereas Coastal Andhra slides on the scale of strong agreement with 41 per cent to 59 per cent agreed. Telangana region slides a little further with 39.5 strongly agreed to 60.5 per cent agreed.
6.5.11. The Aforestation measures have increased: This question though an effect of the above questions it requires an additional adjustment. The inputs at the state level causers a concern as 6.6 per cent disagreement and 7.4 per cent not applicable compared to the positive side of 26 per cent strongly agree and 60 per cent agree. Variables at the zonal level indicate Rayalaseema with 34 per cent strongly agreed, 52 per cent agreed, 8 per cent disagreed, and 6 per cent not applicable presents the high point of disagreement compared to other zones. Coastal Andhra with 21.5 per cent strongly agreed, 61.5 per cent agreed, 6.5 per cent disagreed and 10.5 per cent not applicable. Numbers for Telangana show 26.5 per cent strongly agreed, 62.5 per cent agreed, 6 per cent disagreed not applicable. Both these regions presented further dip in the field of not applicability concerning a worry factor at the regional level regarding the methods and means of aorestation.
6.6. Role of Government in the WDPs

This particular issue is very important to be dealt when it comes to the matters of government intervention in the public welfare schemes and programs. In countries like India which are established with socialistic goals government is the key player in the social welfare activities and any activity that aims at the holistic development. Water Shed Program is also part of the government programs to improve various issues that are depending on the supply of water and its conservation such as drinking water facility, irrigation facility, aorestation, improvement of alternative employment or improving living standards by providing employment or benefit schemes that are other than agriculture. This question was asked on three scale method with variables of very active, active, less active.
In the state of Andhra Pradesh total number of respondents gave a positive response for the question of role of government in WDPs as 39.2 per cent very active, 54.8 per cent active, and 6 per cent less active. The same was drawn with a complete positive response from Rayalaseema region with 55 per cent very active and 45 per cent active. These numbers in coastal Andhra are 38 per cent very active, 57 per cent active and 5 per cent less active. Corresponding numbers for Telangana region decline little further with 10 per cent response of less active, 32.5 per cent very active, and 57.5 per cent active. Therefore it can be said that Rayalaseema region which was recognized under the desert area development felt government intervention is very much a need in the implementation of Water Shed Development Programs (WDPs).

**Fig: 6.26: Role of Government in the WDPs**
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6.7. Role of NGOs in the WDPs

Role of NGOs in development program is also essential in the developmental activities. These NGOs act as inevitable bridge between the people and the government. They play a vital role in providing much needed awareness on the schemes and their drawbacks. They help people in realization and utilization of resources and optimizing the control of bureaucracy and political intervention over people in the implementation of any development activity.

This question also sought the three scale method for which the respondents in Andhra Pradesh opted for majority of positive approach. 39.4 per cent of major respondents opted for very active, 38.6 per cent active, and 2 per cent less active. Rayalaseema once again gave the regular response of 100 per cent positive response with 54 per cent very active and 46 per cent active. Coastal Andhra also gives the same as 39 per cent very active and 61 per cent active. However respondents from Telangana region responded with slightly negative numbers as 32.5 per cent very active, 62.5 per cent active and 5 per cent less active. Therefore these numbers reveal that the role of NGOs is active such as the role of government in the implementation and the functioning of WDPs.
6.8. Role of SHGs in the WDPs

Self help groups also play crucial roles in rural areas. After the 10th five year plan self help groups were established all over Andhra Pradesh to appropriate savings that to be invested for their own purpose. The main aim of these groups is to make people’s partnership in funding activity and other socio-economic partnerships though this was thought to be a forum of rural women folk, it has a great impact on the family structures as these are run by the villagers themselves they also play a role in any sort of development program in the villages. The respondents throughout Andhra Pradesh gave a relative positive response as 30.8 per cent gave a response of SHGs very active in WDPs, 50 per cent active and 19.2 per cent less active. These indicators in the regions are as follows: - Rayalaseema 52 per cent very active, 34 per cent active and 14 per cent less
active. Coastal Andhra response is 22 per cent very active, 50 per cent active and 28 per cent less active. These numbers for Telangana are similar to that of Coastal Andhra 29 per cent very active, 58 per cent active and 13 per cent less active. These numbers show that self-help groups are relatively ineffective when it is compared to the role of government and NGOs in the implementation and functioning of WDPs.

**Fig: 6.28: Role of SHGs in the WDPs**
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Source: Evidence from the field work

### 6.9. Benefits of WDP’s:

Advantages/Future of Watershed Development program is a revolutionary program aimed at fulfilling the water needs in the water scarce areas. In areas where there is inadequate water supply watershed management offers an ideal solution. It helps in
utilizing the primary source of water and prevents the runoff from going into sewer or storm drains, thereby reducing the load on treatment plants. If we take steps to encourage each drop of rainfall to penetrate in the ground at the point where it strikes earth, it will result in addition of one drop to our useful water supply and subtraction of one drop from a potential flood.

Irrigation facilities have increased drastically in Watershed Development village earlier farmers depended either on natural resources of rivers and canals are rainfall at present irrigation is improved with water conservation and preservation under the Watershed Development Programmes.

With conserved water by using purification methods safe and clean drinking water facilities is created throughout watershed development villages. Due to the improve irrigation facilities barren lands or inundated and brought under cultivation, Growing greenery – trees, crops and grasses. aorestation, development of horticulture etc… were the benefits of the Watershed Development Programmes.

Water is the source of epidemic and endemic diseases. With the conservation of water clean and sufficient drinking was provided of which many water born diseases are eradicated to restore rural health.

6.10. Negative impacts of WDP’s;

- Constructions of watersheds structurally are very week. They often break and water locking is maintained.
In some of the check dams silt is deposited on the bed and water flow is not properly checked is regularly. Regular clearing the debris provide proper supply of water.

In terms of complex constructions, there is a requirement for high costs, trained professionals.

Maintenance costs may add to the monetary burden.

If not maintained properly then it can cause various problems in terms of algal or bacterial growth.

Tanks if not constructed properly might result in leakages and metal tanks may also lead to problems such as corrosion harming the water quality.

All these factors might prove harmful and result in various kinds of health issues.

The system is very much rainfall dependent and hence if there are problems with the rainfall in the area, it may not be very effective.

It was found that there was good quality water harvesting structure in some watershed areas, but in some other watershed areas, it requires further attention.

Maintenance of WDPs during post implementation phase is poor in many states.

Micro watersheds in DDP areas perform better in this regard.

Watershed Development Programmes and its implementation is received with very much positive attitude by farmers from all over districts. The selected areas provided maximum satisfactory results thus it can be concluded 90 per cent of WDPs
implementation is carried out successful. The remaining 10 percent is either disagrees or not applicable shows hatred or lack of interest due to lack of awareness respectively. At very few instances respondents express strong disagreement out of total questions posed strongly disagreed percentage is not more than 0.2 per cent which indicates overwhelming acceptance of WDPs from farmers all over the watershed villages.

Researcher found some negative impacts of WDPs based upon the opinions of the respondents which are purely technical and structural. To solve these problems strong political will, good support from the villagers, beaurocratic assistance and the most, proper governance is required. Next chapter discuss various Findings of research and necessary suggestions based upon the study.