Chapter 4

COMMUNITY MANAGEMENT - THE NEW APPROACH TO DEVELOPMENT

The past several decades of planned development and top-down conservation practices have made one fact amply clear that the capacity of states to coerce their citizens into unpopular development and conservation practices is limited. A historic analysis of development management vividly tells us that the key stakeholder has always been the government. But it was Gandhiji who placed the community itself at the centre of development initiatives. He believed in the inherent capacity of individuals to effect desirable changes in his environment.

The advent of the new economic order, manifested in the form of globalization, liberalization and privatization has brought in a new governance paradigm prescriptively being referred to as good governance. The new system of governance is making the state to lose its preeminence as an agent for development. This new paradigm of governance has got special significance in the state of Kerala which has demonstrated a high degree of social and political development. The institution of state has been, traditionally, held in high esteem by the people of Kerala. This, in turn, had the effect of keeping private initiative and volunteerism at a reasonable distance from the public realm. The people, by and large,
looked towards the intervention of the government for the betterment of their living conditions and infrastructural development. But with the advent of the new economic order, it is being increasingly realized that the state cannot withstand the global current towards economic integration. As a result, the government has started receding to the back ground from many of its traditional areas of operation and the non-governmental organizations, community based groups and multinational development agencies have stepped in to fill that void. The thrust of the new approach appears to be one of maximizing the growth potential by unleashing outward looking and market driven forces by making necessary adjustments in the structure of the economy and the manner of exercise of control over power and resources (Government of India 2002).

Though the essence of the new paradigm could be seen in the efforts made in the west to dismantle the welfare state in the 1980’s, the clear conceptualization and articulation of the paradigm emerged only at the end of 1990’s. The emergence this new paradigm of governance has serious implications for both developed and developing nations (Chandhoke 2003:2957). In the developed countries of the west, the role of welfare state has been declining under the influence of the neo – liberal Reagan - Thatcher ideology, which advocates a drastic cut in the public in the public spending on welfare activities. In the developing countries, the state is being forced to give more scope for the actors in development with the
introduction of globalization and structural adjustment programmes. As a result, there is a growing pluralisation of state with multiple actors or agencies spread over from local to global level trying to both supplement and supplant the conventional state in its basic role of development.

It was the World Bank which first linked governance issues to development (World Bank 1994). To World Bank, governance is the ‘manner in which power is exercised in the management of a country’s economic and social resources for development. Good governance, according to World Bank, is characterized by ‘predictable, open and enlightened policy making; a bureaucracy imbued with a professional ethos; an executive arm of government accountable for its actions and a strong civil society participating in public affairs, and all behaving under the rule of law’. The four major areas of concern identified by the World Bank to be achieved in good governance are: (i) improving the public sector management; (ii) ensuring accountability of public and private sectors, (iii) creating appropriate legal framework for development, and (iv) promoting transparency and information (World Bank 1994). All these four dimensions are to work in a mutually reinforcing way leading to establishment of good governance.

The concept of good or effective governance as advocated by World Bank is broadened and adapted to suit the development demands of
developing countries with a view to address the vexed problem of poverty. This has been done by integrating political dimensions into the World Bank’s concept of good governance. This assumes that good governance goes along with participatory development and democracy. Democratic system which encourages inclusive and participatory institutions and promotes transparent and accountable societies is a major requirement for good governance (Shylendra2004). It is in this framework, Government of India has outlined its approach to governance for the implementation of the Tenth Five Year Plan (2002 – 07) in the country.

In contextualizing governance, the Government of India goes further and has identified specific operational strategies that are to be implemented for realizing good governance for development. These strategies include: improved people’s participation by way of effective decentralization through local self governments and involving civil society and voluntary organizations to accelerate socio – economic development; ensuring right to information for transparency; reforming civil service to improve accountability and efficiency; administrative procedural reforms for a hassle free public - government interface; improving the co – ordination between different public agencies and departments involved in development for a better synergy and efficiency; empowering the marginal and the excluded to equip them to act as pressure group to resist bad
governance and exploitation by vested interests (Government of India 2002).

Harmonizing the relation between multiple actors is the major essence of the new governance paradigm. Different actors and elements of governance are to adapt to the scenario of plurality in order to evolve a system with harmonious interactions. Development is thus perceived to be delivered by multiple agencies including the state. This realization has been necessitated as the state alone cannot respond to the diverse needs of development. The different actors who come into picture for development include state agencies like local, state and national governments, and multi-lateral agencies; market agencies like local traders, national and multi-national companies; and civil society institutions like community based organizations (CBOs) and national and international NGOs (Table 1). Thus, governance as a paradigm includes real multiplicity or plurality of institutions which are supposed to be acting in unison to influence development at and from different levels. All these actors are to coordinate and network with each other more through horizontal linkages which are both non-hierarchical and non-bureaucratic (Chandhoke 2003:2957).
Table 8: Actors in development under governance paradigm

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reach/Jurisdiction</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Market</th>
<th>Civil Society</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Global</td>
<td>Multilateral Agencies (UN, WB, WTO, etc)</td>
<td>Multi – National Companies (MNCs)</td>
<td>International NGOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National</td>
<td>National/ Regional Governments</td>
<td>Domestic Companies/ MNC Branches</td>
<td>National/ Regional NGOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Local self government</td>
<td>Local traders/ Businessmen</td>
<td>Local NGOs/ CBOs/ Citizens</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


This new paradigm of governance has got special significance in the state of Kerala which has demonstrated a high degree of social and political development. The delivery of welfare measures was considered to be the exclusive domain of the state. But with the advent of the new economic order, the state cannot withstand the global current towards economic integration. As a result, the government has started receding to the background from many of its traditional areas of operation and the NGOs, CBOs and multinational development agencies have stepped in to fill that vacuum.

One of the reasons for the increased role of these multiple players in development process, in fact, is the decentralization drive that was unleashed in the country for the last one decade. The historic 73rd Constitutional Amendment Act 1992 which came into being on April 20,
1993, was intended to improve participation of people in the process of development and to transform Panchayat raj institutions into institutions of self government for rural areas.

Water Sector has undergone basic changes in recent years due to perceived scarcity. While focus in the past was mainly on investment in physical structures, recent developments are associated to a great extent with improved management, conservation and institutional changes.

Optimal sustainable development, maintenance of quality and efficient use of country’s water resources to match the growing demands on the precious natural resource with active involvement of all stakeholders in order to achieve accelerated, equitable economic development of the country is the vision for integrated water resources development and management.

Now we have to look into the effective water resources management practices. Management or conservation of natural resources means rational utilization of environment to provide the highest sustainable quality of living for mankind. Management of resources is essential for the survival of man. Management of resources like water must have a bearing on future. It must be future oriented ensuring intergenerational justice by rationally limiting the uses of this resources at an optimum level.
Certain management practices have been developed and adopted from the earliest times of human civilization. Religious sanctions prevented the destruction of forests, groves, sacred rocks and mountains. Early civilizations developed good techniques of terracing to prevent soil erosion on hill sides and for making more effective use of water for irrigation. As civilization progressed human experience led to increasingly sound land and water practices. The agricultural landscapes in India reflect great skill in conservation of water and soil resources.

Long before the terms ‘ecology’ and ‘sustainability’ came to be accepted as scientific concepts, a profound knowledge base for the same had been laid in Indian classical literature thousands of years ago. The present day debate on ‘limits to growth’ is centered around the adverse impact of the over exploitation of resources in our ecology.

The unprecedented economic boom witnessed in the wake of industrial revolution in Europe has been realized at the cost of large scale depletion of natural resources. Similarly colonization and subsequent imperialism resulted in the massive environmental plunder impoverishing the colonized. Both reduced the prospects for sustainable development in the long run. The present day materialistic culture igniting the desire of the consumers dramatically also results in resources depletion. The relentless bid to enhance the GDP ignoring the Sustainable Development Index (SDI)
invariably leads to a steady erosion of our resource base often compromising non-renewable resources or those which would take millions of years to regenerate. This clearly points to the stark need for striking a balance between growth and preservation of our resources.

Water is a scarce, finite precious natural resource to be planned, developed and conserved and managed as much as on an integrated and environmentally sound basis. It is one of the most crucial elements in development planning. The principle of water justice must be implemented by equitable distribution and access. The Eco-system approach must be adopted. It is a strategy for integrated management of land, water and living resources that claims to promote conservation in an equitable way.

Robert Chambers, Robert Rhodes and companions of the Chaing Mai University in their rural development studies bring forth the stark reality that indigenous technical knowledge (ITK) and community capacity are major elements to be reckoned with in development interventions. Paulo Friere in his well known conscientization model stressed the necessity of local leadership and peoples’ participation in sustainable development.

The ‘dependency syndrome’ generated by the government and some NGOs via subsidies and loans has been the root cause of setting the development priorities wrong in the last four decades of planned
development. People’s knowledge and indigenous skills must be made a basis of the new paradigm shift. The paradigms for rural development pursued and practised in developing countries have transformed greatly since 1950. Failure to achieve intended results caused shift towards a more user centered approach to development and ‘People first’ development models based on popular participation gained popularity in 1980 and 90 (Burkley1993; Chambers1997; Cernea1991).

Failed development efforts are a too common story. Apparently sound programs designed to improve people’s well being have often suffered from the disjuncture between outsider’s visions and local realities. Many projects built on strong higher level partnerships among national and international actors have nonetheless provided examples of “how to alienate, rather than include, local people in the development process” (Locker2000:308). The grassroots development approaches of the 1970’s emphasized that local people could solve their own problems, given the appropriate resources (IAF 1977). Over the years, developmental initiatives beginning from charity to welfare models, could not fair.

A close analysis locates the missing component is nothing but the people’s participation. Whatever be the model, the government or the donors played the key role and the real beneficiaries played no or less role in planning, formulating, implementing and even in monitoring. This top-
down approach was supply driven and lacked transparency, social accountability and people remained passive recipients at the receiving end. Corruption and mismanagement were common and no initiatives fulfilled its purpose. The poor conservation outcomes that followed decades of intrusive resource management strategies and planned development have forced policy makers and scholars to reconsider the role of community in resource use and conservation. Community was considered a hindrance to progressive social change. But current writings champion the role of community in bringing about decentralization, meaningful participation and conservation.

The people around the world, especially the poor and the disadvantaged no longer believe that the responsibility of governing macro societies (nation) as well as micro societies (organizations) is the exclusive responsibility of governments. The language of development is fast changing to mean co-governance, coalition governments, partnership ventures and networking among development staff, elected men, development organizations, community based organizations (CBOs) and individuals. The bottom line of all prosperity and peace in future should be a development process and outcome that is essentially facilitated by development partnerships and networks which nurture as well as further the goals of human development with focus on “Putting the people and their institutions first” (Durgaprasad et al 2001:721).
We now need a new paradigm of envisioning social change and development built around overcoming information asymmetrics, development disparities and deprivations. Knowledge and action networks and partnerships can become a means (Gupta 2000:115).

Community participation and resource pooling leading to collective decision and action emerged as the panacea to overcome the limitations of earlier models. This will help to address local realities, felt needs and effect cost-effectiveness promoting social accounting and transparency. Attempts in involving beneficiaries and user groups (UGs) here and there exemplified that it is not in planning but through mobilization, organizing, implementing and even monitoring, they have their say and role. Evolution of people’s organizations and local leadership together with community coherence and we-feeling ensured the sustenance of majority projects.

Community participation has been seen in two ways, as an ideology of development (as an end) and as a tool for planning and management (as a means to some other end).

4.1 Community Participation – Rationale

The community development approach offers an alternative by generating community based, community wide problem solving competency. Community based competency implies that changes should be in response to locally felt needs, instead of being determined by external
agencies. The rationale for this approach is that the community is encouraged to participate fully in the change strategy. The community learns the skill of problem assessment. It encourages the people to reach upon solutions for the same.

Community participation helps to increase the acceptability and utilization of services by the community members and also enables professionals to be more productive since community response helps them touch the right problems in the community. It helps in tapping the locally available resources. It provides additional resources to a field continually facing resource scarcity, for the community is an untapped, resource base, which when used, engenders a commitment to the cause itself. Finally, community participation as a step helps people gain control over their own lives because power gravitates to those who solve problems. Participation is thus valued because it redistributes power more democratically.

As an instrument of empowerment, CP should lead to an equitable sharing of power. CP builds beneficiary capacity so that the beneficiary may share in the management tasks of the project thus contributing to the sustainability of the project. CP may enhance effectiveness and efficiency of the project (Bhatt and Ganapathy 1996).
4.2 History of Community Management in India.

In India the need for wider involvement and participation of the community for effective management has been long recognized. But the development projects that have been initiated by communities themselves first have been few and far between. Though small and dispersed in nature, such projects as in Wayanad, Pondicherry, Ralegoan, Sukhomajri, Araville, Mysore, Warana, Delhi, Ahemdb bead and elsewhere have made significant contributions to the development of partnership scenario in the country.

The Community Agro Biodiversity Centre (CABC) – a pioneering project- of M.S. Swaminathan Research Foundation (MSSRF) and first of its kind in the country in Tamil Nadu envisaging a partnership mode of development involving the local tribal communities, farmer’s unions, S.H.Gs., Government of Kerala (GOK), World food programme and the peoples’ science movements. The warana experiment in Kolhpur district of Maharastra ‘wired village project’ initiated by the Prime Ministers Office jointly carried out by National Information Centre,(NIC) Government of Maharashtra(GOM), Warana Vibhag Shikshan Mandal was a success(Vijayaditya2000:132). Encouraging user’s involvement is new part of official policy. The necessary enabling legislation has also been enacted in several states. Efforts to actually organize farmer’s groups and make them participate in management are seriously taken up.
Earlier development process in India has been unilateral, generally decided by policy makers and authorities who believed in a trickle down approach. The initial years of planning processes were based on this trickle-down theory in the belief that fruits of development and growth will spread out equally among all regions and all sections of society. But this did not happen as a large segment of our population especially those in weaker sections and women have been left outside the greenery of the growth process. The result has been reflected in massive failures at most of the attempts at development. The manifest failure of State and market mechanisms to promote sustainable and equitable natural resource management in the developing world has stimulated a search for community based and user centered alternatives.

Advocates of Community Based Natural Resource Management (CBNRM) offer the best prospect for meeting conservation objectives while improving the position of the impoverished rural communities who have been denied the fundamental right to substantive participation in decisions that impact on their well-being and livelihoods. Argument in favor of CBNRM combine environmental sustainability, social justice and development efficiency with assertions about practicability and “good sense” (Lynch and Talbot 1995:6).
Experience gained over the years in water supply and sanitation projects shows that best results are obtained only when communities participate in the planning and running of projects and when other sectors contribute simultaneously to the development effort. In the light of this knowledge, multi-sectoral development and community participation strategies were adopted for the projects undertaken during the international drinking water supply and sanitation decade.

The emphasis on community participation in new projects implies that communities will be involved early in project planning and will be encouraged to play an active and decisive role in them. Once a project is launched, the community will be responsible for running and maintaining facilities built as part of the project (P.Oakley et.al1991:6). Community participation is an active process by which beneficiaries or client groups influence the direction and execution of a development project with a view to enhancing their well-being in terms of income, personal growth, self-reliance or other values they cherish (Trevor Parfitt 2004:537). Community based management (CBM) is receiving attention as a potential mechanism for increasing the efficacy, legitimacy and sustainability of natural resources management (Basnet1992:390). Western and Wright (1994) CBM depends on the sustained involvement of the local people who find themselves charged with management of natural resources for the good of their local community.
Government’s approach to development changed only after the 73rd amendment. This has compelled to examine the ways in which development and under-development issues have been understood and addressed. A co-ordinated effort of various sectors of societies by working more closely with each others is expected to yield greater benefits.

Over the past thirty years, participation has become one of the shibboleth of contemporary development theory and practice, often directly linked to claims of empowerment and transformation. Initially a marginal concern within development, most development agencies now agree that some form of participation by the beneficiaries is necessary for development to be relevant and meaningful. What is believed today is that people who happened to be poor and uneducated can, with some outside encouragement, assistance and support, take control of their lives thus institutionalize viable patterns of co-operation.

In simple terms, community participation refers to the involvement of the people in a community in development projects. Since social, economic, educational and other conditions differ from community to another, the form and degree of people’s involvement in development activities also vary. Since community participation implies action by people to solve their own problems, it can be understood in terms of
activities performed by the communities in development projects. Broadly these include.

- assessment of the problems
- definition of the problems
- setting of priorities
- making decisions.
- Planning of action programs to solve the problems
- Sharing responsibility in project implementation.
- Evaluating and modifying the project.

One of the far reaching implications of the community participation approach is that it allows and encourages people to select development they accord to various development issues (Anne Whyte 1986). Experiences show that community participation is essential to make any program sustainable. Willingness of the local community members to participate in management of local and regional resources is a fundamental component of any CBM effort. Development practitioners believe in the ‘latent capacities of the community which will be unleashed in the interests of development’ (Cleaver 2001:46).

Following much disillusionment with previous top down approaches, most development agencies, including governments from
developed countries and international organizations are rushing to adopt the so called participatory, or community driven approach to development. Participation implies not only that the rural poor will share in the benefits of development and that they will contribute labour and funds but also they will take responsibilities for planning, managing and evaluating their activities undertaken and having ownership of these and their products (Uphoff et.al 1999: 9).

Historically governments have assumed responsibility for resource control and management, frequently preventing access by the rural population to much needed resources under the guise of controlling their use for the purpose of national development (Gadgill and Guha1995:81). In the name of sustainable development and sustainable rural livelihoods, governments are today increasingly attempting to make these resources more available to the poor. We have to expand the role played by actors outside the government sector in the making and execution of development interventions. The participation of the populace those for whom development efforts are intended in the identification and shaping of development policies has become a major issue in almost all development circles (Riley 2002:55). Government led development efforts are often comparatively ineffective. Making the change from a service provider to that of an effective enabler of social and political change is the need of the hour. John Clerk (1995:593) refers to the shift in the types of activities
conducted by NGOs as they progress through this evolution as a progression from a “supply side” approach to local development to a “demand side” orientation. As a result of critique from a number of venues which stresses that development should be more participatory, inclusive and diverse, the search for an alternative to what had become a consistently ineffective national development bureaucracy, with its massive, centralized, top down planning process grew (Riley 2002:109). Such relationships allow both government agencies and NGOs to work together as partners, or stakeholders - parties who have an interest in the outcome of a particular problem (Riley 2002:110). The new development approach envisages the concepts that both the state and public have central roles to play in economic development. Just as the nature of state activities depend a great deal on public development and pressures, the action of the public-both-collaborative and adversarial – are all the more effective when the state plays its part in helping to empower the citizens by guaranteeing basic democratic freedoms (Dreze and Sen 1995).

Instead of top-down approach, development initiative is to become community based enterprises. Community sharing is an essential component of natural resource management. Community management brings about decentralization of political process and de-schooling prevailing politics and brings about cultural autonomy and resource conservation (Chambers and McBeth 1992:20). The paradigm shift has
enabled to narrow the divide between the state and community, and marks a beginning for the state towards a learning organization that is adaptive to the changing social and environmental condition. At the end of 20th century the increasing role and relevance of social and institutional structures in connection with the whole field of contemporary environmental management is gaining prominence.

Thus the role of the government has to shift from, ‘service provider’ to that of a ‘facilitator’ for providing financial and policy support to the communities and their institutions for fulfilling the desired levels of services on a sustainable and equitable basis (Duggal 2005:410). It is today perceived that the goal of social development can not be achieved unless the beneficiaries participate in the entire process of preparation, implementation and follow up of the development plans and programs (Chambers 1994:15).

4.3 Developmental Dimensions of Community Management

The need of the hour is to prepare and make local rural inhabitants capable of handling the environmental problems as well as problem of over – utilization of natural resources. The application of participation is rooted in the logic that people should have an opportunity for controlling their own fate, as much as possible. Participation has now become virtually synonymous with development projects. Participatory approaches are being tied in almost all sectors.
A consensus seems to be emerging in both academic and policy making circles about the desirability of participatory models of local resource management. According to a survey carried out by FAO, more than 50 countries have adopted participatory forest protection programs (Agarwal and Gibson 2001:1). A rhetoric of participation permeates a majority of the thinking related to local resource management. It has become commonplace in development thinking to start by noting how influential this approach has become. Henkel and Stirrat (2001) refer to it as the ‘new orthodoxy’, noting that by the early 1990 every major bilateral development agency emphasized participatory policies. Thousands of development initiatives involve some form of participation, but often there are no clear answers on who is participative, and whether participation as a process in itself, or as a vehicle for better delivery of services.

Participation is considered a voluntary contribution by the people in one or another public program supposed to contribute to national development. The concept of participatory development hinges upon a power shift. Outside professionals no longer attempt to control the development process solely on their own terms. Rather ‘local’ insider knowledge and viewpoints are sought, “free from the normative biases of non locals” (Mohan and Stoke 2000: 252). ‘Local ownership and the acknowledgment of the analytical capabilities of the people’ (Chambers 1994) are among the key tenants of participatory approaches. Participatory
development responds to the longstanding bias placing beneficiaries or “insider” at the receiving end of development designed by more powerful “outside” developers (Mohan and Stocke: 2000:253).

“Strengthening democracies” and promoting “good governance” are key to the increased participation of marginalized social groups – enabling them to be involved in influencing the direction of policy and social change, putting locals in the driving seat of development. For the grassroot activists participation may equate to a “radical agenda of empowerment” of the former “object” of development (Mohan1998:164). Participation responds to the demand, to include and involve people who are politically and socially excluded, as well as to achieve greater efficiency in resource allocation and service provisions(Tice Hurst 1998: 358) Participation as a concept people are not merely acted upon, but they are actors; nor should they be reliant upon the “unpredictable whims of out of town administrators” (Gray : 1994:4).

We have lagged much further behind in understanding the power relations that affect participation in practice. In the complex social landscapes of local communities themselves, and in their links to outside agencies, consultants, organizations, governments and markets, lie the relationships which welcome or discourage participation. Power differentials and socio economic disparities are significant regarding
participation. These relationships influence the resources that people can access (what Sen 1981 has called ‘entitlements’) as well as the resources which remain out of reach.

The advocates of participatory models basically belong to two categories: one who views participation as a means to achieve institutional efficiency; and the other, which sees participation as furthering the goals of empowerment, equity and democratic governance. A very useful distinction has been made by the proponents of the social capability approach regarding the concept of participation - the idea that efficiency based participation is different from agency – based participation. The first idea understands participation as an instrumental means to the ends that vary from institutional efficiency to state- defined public interests. The latter concerns itself with the role of human agency in policy and political changes (Puri 2004:2511).

4.4 Historical Antecedents

Both these ideas have varied and impressive theoretical antecedents. In the ‘Politics’, Aristotle had defined a citizen as someone who is entitled to participate in an office involving deliberation or decision for the ultimate aim of making the city self sufficient. He saw participation as a tool to reach the ‘telos’ of the city. In contemporary political science, authorities like Sidney Verba, Schlozman, Brady and Nie talk of potential participation as a mechanism through which needs and preferences of
citizens are communicated to political decision makers and by which pressure is brought to bear on them to respond.

The idea of active citizenry embodied in the ideas of Rousseau reflects the concept of participation as an end in itself. For contemporary communitarian thinkers like Benjamin Barber, participation is an essential part of this vision of community’s ethical life. In the Indian political context, Gandhi’s concept of Grama Swaraj (Village republics) and M.N. Roy’s idea of people’s committees propound a system of participatory democracy as an alternative to parliamentary democracy.

Even though these concepts of participation have illustrious lineages, the current discussion on these ideas is situated in a very specific and unique contextual space, a space which is distinguished from the other historical contexts by characteristic features – the near ubiquitous presence of a liberal bureaucratic welfare state with its decisions affecting and determining almost all spheres of public as well as private life; ever increasing globalization in economics and knowledge among other areas and demands for a political voice by groups that were hitherto marginalized and excluded sections of society. Because of this unique situation, these ideas of participation are basically addressing these audiences. The state, which provides as well as ensures presence of institutions that facilitate participation, a global audience consisting of international organizations
like World Bank, NGO’s and global knowledge generators like research institutes and universities; and the people that they seek to include in the participatory regimes (Puri2004:2511).

4.5 Community management and Social Capital Generation

One of the recent and perhaps the most famous works that could be placed in the category of participation for efficiency approach is Robert Putnam’s seminal book, ‘Making Democracy Work’, which attempts to answer the question of what conditions are conducive for creating strong, responsive and effective representative institutions. Putnam’s work on the Italian regional experiments with decentralization led him to the conclusion that there are basically two pre-requisites for effective ‘good government’ - one, active participation of the civic community in public affairs, and two, a civic culture in which the participants are bound together by horizontal relations of reciprocity and co-operation, not vertical relations of authority and dependency, and whose norms and values instill in the members habits of co-operation, solidarity and public spiritedness. The latter constitutes what is termed as ‘social capital’ which in Putnam’s words includes ‘features of social organization, such as trust, norms, and net-works that can improve the efficiency of society by facilitating co-ordinated action (Putnam 1993:35).

The idea of ‘Social Capital’ and civic participation providing the raw material for successful policy making was soon picked up by
development managers. As a result of the influence of Putnam’s book, by the 1980’s many people started questioning the idea of top down, state managed development programs and began talking of ‘peoples movements’ and participation in programs. Another result has been that policy makers have over the past decade started increasingly relying on the concept of social capital to fashion development interventions that mobilize pre-existing local social networks for varied policy goals (Rankin 2002:1).

A range of new research shows that communities endowed with a rich capacity to form social networks and adhere to social norms are in a stronger position to resolve disputes, share useful information, implement successful development projects and alleviate poverty. Investments in social capital improve local development and environmental outcomes. Social capital facilitates productive activity. Communities within which there is extensive trustworthiness are able to accomplish much more than a community without trust.

There is another approach on participation which has two broad theoretical foundations. The first is current democratic theory, which articulates a preference for a deepening of the democratization process through the inclusion and recognition of hitherto marginalized groups of society. Secondly, this approach borrows heavily from Amartya Sen’s
work on ‘entitlements and capabilities’. The basic objective of development is expansion of these capabilities for this ‘intrinsic value’. Development policies should not view people as the ‘means of production’ but as an ‘end’ in themselves (Dreze and Sen1995:83-185). For achieving this broad goal, ‘this people centered’ approach puts human agency and its contribution to ‘changing policy, social commitment, and norms that require collective action’ at the centre–stage (Fukuda – Parr 2003:301).

Policies encouraging participatory development have been around for a long time – the example of community – based development programmes in Latin America in the 1950s is often quoted. However, it was only from 1950’s onwards that such programs were pushed by the governments and NGOs (Guijt and Shah-1998:1-23).

There is a vast array of instances available to form the basis for these conclusions privileging the idea of participatory local resource management. Many development interventions by the state in the 20th century in local resource management point out that they did not take into account the ground level realities, did not pay adequate attention to participation by the communities affected by these interventions, and with new legislations managed to exclude underprivileged sections of the community even from the previously available customary rights of resource use and access. For instance, one of the main causes of the
decrease in food production in Africa was seen to be the fact that research and implementation of projects for food grain production had ignored the female farming practices (Guijt and Shah-1998:1-23).

Land tenure reforms in Kenya, initiated by the colonial government and continued by the post colonial government excluded women from land resources that they were entitled to customarily (Recheleau et.al 1996:3-23).

Similarly in India, scholars like Ramachandra Guha have blamed the colonial state for initiating policies that sought to exploit timber for imperial needs by enclosing forests and excluding peasantry from using forests as a resource base (Guha1984:15). In the same vein, the schemes that were undertaken to mitigate the fuel-wood crisis in the 1970’s and 80’s were seen to be an overall failure because they were top-down and non-participatory. Such analyses pointed to the need for the involvement of communities that had been traditionally associated with resource management, for the success of the new state initiated local resource management projects. In India, community participation, therefore, came to be seen as the answer to the need for providing the effectiveness of various development projects (Elson 1995:112).

The broad arguments that are given for community involvement are: one, that sharing of responsibilities of management with the primary user groups would ensure sustainability of the resource by encouraging ‘prudent
practices’. Two, it was felt that in a context where the government owned the resources but did not have the managerial capacity nor the commitment to manage these resources, community involvement would result in regulated use and conservation of resources (Kameswari 2002:430 Locke 1999:265). Contemporary interest in the ideas of democratic governance and human development is also reflected in the issue of local resource management. Involvement, inclusion and participation of the local community in this resource management are steps toward their empowerment and equity.

In the words of Guijt and Shah (1998) “the broad aim of participatory development is to increase involvement of socially and economically marginalized people in decision – making over their own lives”. To Peters and Beck (1994) participation is the ability of people to share, influence or control, design, decision making and authority in development projects and programs that affect their lives and resources.

A popular and proper vehicle for people’s participation and for delivering services in natural resource management is ‘user groups’. Thus water user associations (WUA) forest user groups, and watershed committees, among others have been formed all over Asia, either as a complement to or as a substitute for centralized government led management, democratic in management style with the potential to meet
the equity and efficiency objectives of development. The creation of local institutional capacity to manage natural and other resources through collective action, not dependent entirely on the structures and authority of the state, offers an important alternative to the bureaucratic approach.

Therefore, there is need for people’s participation for sustainable development of rural India. Bottom-up approach is needed so as to involve local people in planning, managing and decision making process. The bureaucracy should only play the role of a facilitator. The maximum involvement of people, PRIs, NGOs, SHGs and other peer social groups may be encouraged by the central and the state governments. Awareness education and motivation of the local inhabitants is the right way for the management of natural resources (Sharma 2005:4-13).

Appropriate legislation to institutionalize user participation, knowledge transference and skill formation is important. Sharing of costs by users of the resource in terms of money or labour is conducive to sustained participation. The idea behind this being that it would encourage a sense of partnership and dignity as also of responsibility. A democratic frame work forbidding regimentation and closed systems is equally important. Community has to be mobilized and sensitized to save the country from a water scarce region to a water resourceful state. Community participation should be considered mandatory in any development project.
Water rights must be vested in communities instead of some abstract notion of ‘state’.

Democratic decentralization is a key aspect of the participatory government agenda and is associated with the institutionalization of participation. The devolution of power to local authorities is also alleged to create incentives for increased civil society activity. The experience that has been acquired for several decades, regarding water management emphasizes the need for an institutional association of the ‘civil society’ inside mechanisms of decentralized water resource management in order to allow an optimum and adapted meeting of growing and diversified needs.

Administrators and public bodies in charge of water management must increasingly decentralize their actions, while relying on partnerships that enable a real participation of local authorities and users. The notion of water users being the prime movers in water management rather than passive recipients of a greater ‘water good’ is becoming widely accepted. Hence it is empowered deliberative democracy (Hickey and Mohan 2004:118).

Participation is also associated with political liberties and civic consciousness shaping the local institutions for the beneficiaries’ goals is the element of self expression amounting to participation. Hence participation is generated through a dialogue among the stake holders. And
these stake holders become the major agents of social change and can play an important role in the management of natural resources at the local level or lowest appropriate level.

4.6 Critical collaboration and co-management

Development has come a long way from top down approach to a bottom up approach. The perspective has been changed and results are reflected in terms of outcomes which might not have undergone metamorphosis, but certainly not worthy. Development of people demands a rich mix of societal justice, institutional governance, technology and partnership. It calls for the combined efforts of different agencies, essentially state, NGOs, community and local institutions. Implicit in the concept of development is the need for co-operation than competition between the different stake holders. The adoption of structural adjustment policies, globalized de-regulation and privatization have reduced the scope of government intervention where the state gradually is retreating from several traditional areas. Simultaneously other actors emerge to fill the gap and to complement. For instance, NGOs, Community Based Organizations (CBOs) grassroots organizations, and the private sector. The civil society is now active. The interplay of these multiple actors demanded public private partnership and mutual collaboration. This synergistic collaboration is always deep rooted in the dynamics of community participation.
The co-management concept looks on the state, once recognized as the only vehicle for development, to recognize and share experience with multiple set of non-state institutions engaging in partnership. Jalanidhi, the community managed water resourced management programme envisages all the unique features of a critical collaborative initiative.

Conscientisation Model

Sustainability of various development models so far followed was affected mainly due to the lack of informed involvement of the beneficiaries. It is where the community awakening and organizing model of Paulo Friere fits in. Conscientised community involvement enhances sustainability component of any development intervention. Community participation which is informed and deliberate qualifies development management as the social, financial technological and environmental impacts are debated at large.

Local Leadership

Failure in promoting local leadership was the major drawback of government controlled development initiatives. In top down approach outsiders and bureaucrats played the significant role and once they withdrew, the efforts and initiatives gradually perish. Local leadership evolved and sustained through community participation in management always acted as a vehicle for continuation of development management within the community at grass root level. Non dependence to outside
agencies and external leaders empowered the community to become self-reliant in development efforts.

**Social accounting and Transparency**

Community consciousness and involvement provided room for social accounting. Monitoring and evaluation efforts through collective involvement ensured transparency. Optimum utilization of resources takes place minimizing wastage and misuse. Thus community participation and management provides for cost-effectiveness and mutual trust leading to social capital generation.

**Need Driven**

The top down approach fostered by government and outside agencies was always supply driven. Equitable distribution of resources and services as per need and demand were less common in such initiatives. On the other hand, the component community participation made it possible to recognize the felt needs of the beneficiaries before hand. The ‘demand driven’ approach to development planning currently promised and practiced by development agencies assume that it is possible to obtain accurate information about community preferences for project outputs.

The last two decades have seen a resurgence of interest in community driven and need driven development with community groups in
charge and the focus shifting to local initiative, self help, local organizational capacity and demand orientation.

The success rate for any model formulated as per the real needs of the community is high. The recognition of the felt needs of the community involved, in a way accelerated increased participation

**Sustainability**

Social feasibility manifested through their expression of real needs and the programmes implemented based on it helped the sustainability of the developmental initiatives in the community. Increased involvement of the community and their learning helped the promotion of local leadership development. Effected local leadership utilizing transferred technology and available resources address further needs of the community. This empowerment along with other generated social capital will always sustain development efforts.

4.7 **User participation-levels**

The first view considers people’s participation in a functional perspective. It is viewed as an instrument or strategy to achieve the goals of social development as designed by the policy makers. As an intervention methodology, people’s participation is sought to improve the performance of development as designed by the policy makers.
Gandhiji, Tagore, and Freire etc. the proponents of this view perceive participation in a broader framework of people centered vision of development. They argue that mere passive participation of masses in the programme in whose formulation they have no say, would not lead to real development. In their opinion, people’s participation has to emerge and be promoted from grass root level through community mobilization and various kinds of people’s movements. In fact, the South Asian Commission on Poverty Alleviation, 1992, in its report “meeting the challenge” has clearly summarized this viewpoint. To quote the commission, “participation here is seen not in narrow terms pointing towards formal activities effected through representatives, instead it is defined as a socially vibrant grass root process where by people identify with the process as their own with occasional help from facilitators. The process is inherently educative, leading progressively to a higher level of consciousness which evolves through newer experience of facing reality. They are then able to participate as active subjects in the development process rather than passive objects.

There are generally two views of participation namely, functional, encouraging involvement of the people and potential focusing in the inherent capacity of masses to initiate and direct. There are different kinds of participation.
1) Passive participation:

People participate for being told what is going to happen or has already happened. It does not pay heed to people’s response.

2) Participation in information giving:

People participate by answering questions posted by outside experts or officials, and they do not have the opportunity to influence the proceedings

3) Participation by consultation:

People participate by being consulted and external agents are under no obligation to take people’s views on board

4) Participation for material incentives:

People participate by providing resources, such as labour in return for material incentives. Here they have to stay in prolonged activities when the incentives end.

5) Functional participation:

People participate by forming groups to meet pre-determined objectives related to the projects. These institutions tend to be dependent on external initiators as facilitators, but may become self reliant.

6) Institutional participation:

People participate through already established formal institutions like panchayats, cooperatives, and peoples organizations etc.
Participation is a many splendored word which means different things to different people and contexts. In the context of community driven development, participation refers to community group’s authority and control over decisions and resource allocation including material resources. Information dissemination and consultation are essential pre-conditions of effective participation.

Getting people’s participation in any development programme is not an easy task. Participation in the real sense indicates that people should be voluntarily involved based on mutual respect which should make themselves break their socio-economic barriers and unite them as a single group for achievement of the set goals. Thus people’s participation in a broader sense means their total involvement with development agencies in deciding the programme and activities, fixing up priorities, taking initiative and carrying out the programme by contribution of their ideas, interest, material, money, and labour (Kumar 1977:117).

Enhanced social capital generation is recognized as a corollary or by product of community participation model. People collectively labouring for a common goal has to set aside many differences and merge together to forge ahead. Putnam observes this by-product as key factor for community management approach. People, so far narrow minded and divided due to
socio-political polarizations are coordinated to unite to work on their felt needs.

Managing water resources in an integrated and participatory manner requires the involvement of all those who have a stake in water allocation and its use, to manage water, land and related resources so that economic and social welfare is maximized without compromising the sustainability of vital environmental systems. Less state interventions mean freeing up the civil society to participate openly. Many regions, countries and local communities have come to realize that water issues should allow partnerships of all interested and affected parties in order to make water management viable.

The goal attainment and realization result in the re-generation of mutual trust, spirit de-corpse, team work and other bonding agents. A gradual capacity building takes place to stand against and overcome narrow and fissiparous forces. This rejuvenated social software empowers the community to pursue similar or challenging tasks.

The pattern of demand for water in Kerala is undergoing gradual but continuous change towards increasing pressure for drinking and other household and commercial needs relative to the demand for irrigation which is also declining towards less water demanding perennial crops in lieu of seasonal food crops. As water could not be manufactured,
conservation and management of water is the only way out for the growing demands (Tenth plan Mid Term review, planning commission, 2005). Water resources development is to be seen not merely as a single sector – end objective, but as a prime mover in developing larger systems with multiple linkages. A trained, motivated manpower being the back bone of any development activity, in the water resource sector also, there is need for human resource development.

The present scenario and future challenges point to the need of a long term water vision and wisdom. Water wisdom should lead to sustainable development, maintenance of quality and efficient use of water resources to match the growing demand with active involvement of all actors in order to achieve accelerated equitable development. Long term perspective planning of water resources is needed to attain the goal of prosperity and to meet the various competing demands on sustainable basis.

National Water Policy (2002) calls for development and management of water resources in a holistic and integrated manner encompassing various sectoral needs through community based approach. Water has to be made everybody’s business therefore individuals, institutions and government have a role to play. Who decides how water is utilized is the most important concern of the day. Many water experts say
that the world faces a governance crisis rather than a water crisis. Community management is successful and sustainable alternative to state and private management of resources. The vision of community as the centre piece of conservation and resources management is attractive.

Community participation in the management of natural resource is now considered a natural corollary of the neo – liberal economic policies. Community participation means that the intended beneficiaries accept the project as their own effort, and thus participate in it at various stages (Deb2004:61). This approach is based on the premise that the community has a say in the project conception; it is demand driven and need based, and the community possess substantial knowledge required for the design and operation of the project. This helps to reduce monitoring, supervision, and maintenance costs of the project. Thus as opposed to supply driven schemes, direct interest of the users is a major strength of any community driven schemes. Consumer participation in local water supply and sanitation projects has also been seen to improve efficiency and increase ownership. User participation also makes services and service providers more responsive and accountable to beneficiaries and aligns the provision of services with users’ needs and ability to pay, thereby cost recovery and sustainability. Thus a demand driven approach provide users with the services they want and are willing to pay for.
Community participation can be initiated by individuals themselves or facilitated by Grama Panchayats. Self initiated community participation schemes are need based, usually entirely community driven, sometimes entirely self funded, and are not part of any existing institutional framework. Most water supply related initiatives taken up through community participation are limited to rural areas where single water supply schemes are possible. In this approach, the existing institutional structure (Grama Panchayat) may play a supportive role from outside as is the case with Olavanna Community Initiative in Kerala.

### 4.8 Olavanna Community Initiative

In the 1980’s, Kozhikode district in Kerala suffered acute water scarcity. The service of the Kerala Water Authority proved to be very unreliable. Small groups of villagers of the Olavanna Grama Panchayat organized themselves into groups for providing drinking water supplied since 1987. The following are the highlight of the model (Deb 2004: 63).

- The villagers have formed a registered co-operative society, collected money, and set up small piped water supply schemes to meet their needs. Today, there are over 25 such private co-operative societies operating in the Grama Panchayat.

- Self regulation is the essential issue in this scheme. Except during the summer months, water is available 24 hours a day. In the
summer, water supply is reduced to 10 hours a day, by mutual agreement among the beneficiaries.

- The user community met the full capital and operation and maintenance costs of their drinking water schemes. There is, thus, a user willingness to pay. Community groups have paid 100% capital costs involved as well as 100% operation and maintenance costs.

- Such private schemes are most cost effective since in most government run schemes, a large part of the cost is towards paying staff salaries.

- There is user satisfaction because of efficient user management.

- The villagers have done without external technical assistance, using local expertise quite efficiently.

- The schemes have been supported by the Grama Panchayat and the panchayat has played the role of a facilitator, not a provider.

- Water is now perceived as an economic good by the community.

Jalanidhi is the community management of water resources programme. It is aided by the World Bank. Kerala Rural Water Supply and Sanitation Agency (KRWSA) is the nodal agency in the state. It was started in 1999 and implemented in four districts viz. Palakkad, Trissur, Malappuram, and Kozhikkode. Erimayoor is the first panchayat
where *Jalanidhi* scheme is implemented on a large scale. Now, 80% households are covered under the scheme.

The major feature of this project is its demand driven approach instead of the existing supply-driven projects. The implementation, operation and maintenance of these schemes are done by the beneficiary groups formed for this purpose. This ensures user participation to the maximum extent at the various levels. There is an NGO called Supporting Organization (SO) to facilitate user participation. The grama panchayat plays an active role in the scheme by facilitating, funding and monitoring. The scheme ensures local leadership development with special thrust to women empowerment. The civic engagement dimension of the project promotes social capital generation.