Integrated Watershed Management Programme

Preliminary Project Report (PPR)

ERNAKULAM

Department of Land Resources,
Ministry of Rural Development,
Government of India

Preliminary Project Report

I. Institutional Structures.

   A. State Level Nodal Agencies

   B. District Level Watershed Units

II. Selection of Watershed Projects

III. Profile of the each selected watershed project

IV. Agro-climatic condition of project area.

V. Demography & land distribution

VI. Livelihoods

VII. Expected project out comes

VIII. Mandatory certificates

IX. Status of on-going projects

X. Abstract of projects proposed for sanction

I. Institutional Structures

I. A. State Level Nodal Agencies (SLNAs):

Table-PPR 1: Details of SLNA

1	2	3	4	5	6
S. No.	State	Type of SLNA[#]	Date of Notification	Date of MoU with DoLR	Total no. of members of SLNA
	Kerala	Mission	14 June 2010		Twenty five

[#]Whether it is a Department/ Mission/ Society/ Authority/ Others (pl. specify)

Table-PPR 1: Details of SLNA (Contd..)

7		8					
Chairperson		CEO					
Name	Designation[#]	Name	Designation	Date of Appointment	Nature of appointment [$]	Tenure (No. of years)	Contact Ph. No./ Fax/ E-mail
Subrata Biswas IAS	Agriculture Production Commissioner	K.V. Mohankumar IAS	Commissioner for Rural Development	14 June 2010			
Dr. Rajan Khobragade IAS	Secretary, LSGD						

[#] APC/ ACS/ Dev. Commissioner/ Others (pl. specify) [$] Deputation/ Contract

Table-PPR 2: Details of functionaries in the SLNAs*

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		9	
Sl. No	Total no of Persons working in the SLNA of IWMP	Name & Designation	Qualification	Experience	Work Allocation	Monthly remuneration	Total budget of SLNA		Funding Expected from DoLR (Rs)	
							R	NR	R	NR
1	8	K.Shoukathali, Administrative Officer	MBA	25 Years	Administration & Co-ordination	Rs.65000/-	885000	3000000	885000	3000000
2		M.Jayasree, Technical Expert (Agri)	MSc Agriculture	25 Years	DPR,Agri & Soil, GIS	Rs.65000/-	875000		875000	
3		P.Balachandran Nair,Technical Expert (livelihhod)	MA	12 Years	Livelihood activities & Capacity Building	Rs.47000/-	636000		636000	
4		Kabeer.H, Finance Officer	Mcom	25 Years	Finance & Accounting	Rs.40000/-	540000		540000	
5		Dinil.R, Accounts Asst	MA	15 Years	Funds, Accounting, Establishment	Rs.30000/-	405000		405000	
6		Sindhu.D.S, Accounts Asst	BSc	15 Years	Scheme, IWDP,Audit	Rs.28000/-	379000		379000	
7		Karthiyani Devi.A.J, Programmer	Btech Computer Science	05 Yeas	Programming, MIS	Rs.25000/-	300000		300000	
8		Jisha.C.C, Data Entry Operator	Bcom with PGDCA	05 Years	Data Entry	Rs.10000/-	120000		120000	
							4140000	**3000000**	**4140000**	**3000000**

PPR 3 Details of State Level Data Cell (SLDC) functionaries

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		9	
No	Total no. of persons working in the SLDC for IWMP	Names & Designation	Qualification	Experience	Work allocation	Monthly remuneration (Rs.)	Total budget of SLDC (Rs.)		Funding expected from DoLR (Rs.)	
							R	NR	R	NR
1	Nine	Technical expert, (Agriculture/ Agriculture Engineering)	PG/Ph.D in the related Field	10 years		50000				
2		Technical expert, (IT/Livelihood,micro enterprises /livelihood)	B Tech. Computer Science / MCA	10 years		50000				
3		Administrative Officer	PG in Administration / Management	10 years		40000				
4		Finance cum Accounts Officer	PG in FM / Accounts / CA	10 years		35000				
5		Accounts assistants - 2 numbers	Graduation in Accounts / Commerce / Economics	5 years		25000				
6		GIS expert	B Tech / M Sc / M Tech in related field	5 years		40000				
7		Data entry operator	Graduate+Certi ficate in DTP	5 years		15000				
8		Programmer	Diploma/Certifi cate in related fields	5 years		25000				

PPR 4 Details of Functionaries in District level Watershed Cell

1	2	3	4	5	6
No	Name of the District	Name of the executing Agency	Status of Chairman	Date of signing of MoU with SLNA	Total no. of persons working for Watershed programme
1	Thiruvananthapuram				
2	Kollam				
3	Pathanamthitta				
4	Alapuzha				
5	Kottayam				
6	Idukki				
7	Ernakulam	Respective District	President, Respective		Three each in all districts, 52 persons in
8	Thrissur	Panchayats	District Panchayat		the State
9	Palakkad				
10	Malappuram				
11	Kozhikkode				
12	Wayaand				
13	Kannur				
14	Kasaragpd				

PPR 4 Details of Functionaries in District level Watershed Cell (contd...)

	7	8	9	10	11	12		13	
No	Names & Designation	Qualification	Experience	Work allocation	Monthly remuneration (Rs.)	Total budget of Watershed Cell (Rs.)		Funding expected from DoLR (Rs.)	
						R	NR	R	NR
1	Technical expert	Graduation in the related field	5 years		25000				
2	Accountant	Graduation in the related field	3 years		10000				
3	Data entry operator	Diploma / certificate in the related field	3 years		7500				
					595000				

II. SELECTION OF WATERSHED PROJECTS

Table-PPR 5: Status of District-wise area covered under the watershed programme* (MIS Table-M(SP)2)

1	2	3		4						5	
S. No.	Names of District	Total micro-watersheds in the District		Micro-watersheds covered so far						Net watersheds to be covered	
				Dept. of Land Resources		Other Ministries/ Depts.		Total watersheds covered			
				Pre-IWMP projects (DPAP +DDP +IWDP)		Any other watershed project					
		No.	Area (ha.)	No.	Area (ha.)	No.	Area (ha.)	No.	Area (ha.)	No.	Area (ha.)
1	**Ernakulam**	**258**	**305830**	**0**	**0**	**64**	**95906**	**64**	**95906**	**94**	**83628**
	State	4529	3874535	29	19345	955	1018761	983	1038991	2067	1459817

Table-PPR 6: Prioritized list of projects proposed for sanction during the financial year 2013-14*

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8													
Sl. No.	District	Name of the project	No. of micro watersheds proposed to be covered	Proposed project area (ha)	Type of project (Hilly/ Desert/ Others)	Proposed cost (Rs. in lakh)	Weightage under the criteria#													
							1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	Total
1	**Ernakulam**	**Ernakulam -IWMP-IV-2013-14**	**7**	**4428**	**Hilly**	**664.20**	**7.5**	**3**	**0**	**10**	**2**	**0**	**15**	**5**	**10**	**10**	**10**	**0**	**15**	**87.5**

** From column no. 2, total no. of districts, from column no. 3, total no. of projects selected for sanction, from column no. 4, total no. of micro-watersheds to be covered, from column no. 5, total project area proposed, from column no. 7, total cost proposed, may be indicated for the entire State at the end of the table.*

Criteria and weightage for selection of watershed

Sl. No.	Criteria	Maximum score	Ranges & scores			
i	Poverty index (% of poor to population)	10	Above 80 % (10)	80 to 50 % (7.5)	50 to 20 % (5)	Below 20 % (2.5)
ii	% of SC/ ST population	10	More than 40 % (10)	20 to 40 % (5)	Less than 20 % (3)	
iii	Actual wages	5	Actual wages are significantly lower than minimum wages (5)	Actual wages are equal to or higher than minimum wages (0)		
iv	% of small and marginal farmers	10	More than 80 % (10)	50 to 80 % (5)	Less than 50 % (3)	
v	Ground water status	5	Over exploited (5)	Critical (3)	Sub critical (2)	Safe (0)
vi	Moisture index/ DPAP/ DDP Block	15	-66.7 & below (15) DDP Block	-33.3 to -66.6 (10) DPAP Block	0 to -33.2 (0) Non DPAP/ DDP Block	
vii	Area under rain-fed agriculture	15	More than 90 % (15)	80 to 90 % (10)	70 to 80% (5)	Above 70 % (Reject)
viii	Drinking water	10	No source (10)	Problematic village (7.5)	Partially covered (5)	Fully covered (0)
ix	Degraded land	15	High – above 20 % (15)	Medium – 10 to 20 % (10)	Low- less than 10 % of TGA (5)	
x	Productivity potential of the land	15	Lands with low production & where productivity can be significantly enhanced with reasonable efforts (15)	Lands with moderate production & where productivity can be enhanced with reasonable efforts (10)	Lands with high production & where productivity can be marginally enhanced with reasonable efforts (5)	
xi	Contiguity to another watershed that has already been developed/ treated	10	Contiguous to previously treated watershed & contiguity within the microwatersheds in the project (10)	Contiguity within the microwatersheds in the project but non contiguous to previously treated watershed (5)	Neither contiguous to previously treated watershed nor contiguity within the microwatersheds in the project (0)	
xii	Cluster approach in the plains (more than one contiguous micro-watersheds in the project)	15	Above 6 micro-watersheds in cluster (15)	4 to 6 microwatersheds in cluster (10)	2 to 4 microwatersheds in cluster (5)	
	Cluster approach in the hills (more than one contiguous micro-watersheds in the project)		Above 5 micro-watersheds in cluster (15)	3 to 5 microwatersheds in cluster (10)	2 to 3 microwatersheds in cluster (5)	

III) PROJECT WISE PROFILE OF THE SELECTED WATERSHED PROJECT

Table –PPR 7: Project at a Glance

1	Name of the State	Kerala		
2	Name & type# (Hilly/ Desert/ Others) of the project	IWMP 4	0	Hilly
3	Name of the District	Ernakulam		
4	Names of the Blocks	Pampakkuda		
5	Names of Grama Panchayats	Elanji		
		Thirumaradi		
		Piravam		
		Pampakuda		
6	Names & Census Code of Villages covered	Thirumarady	00087100	
		Ramamangalam	00086700	
		Onakkur	00087000	
		Elanji	00087400	
		Piravam	00086900	
7	Names & Codes of the micro-watersheds	Onakkoor	13M59j	
		Piravam	13M60a	
		Mulakkulam- Vadakkekkara	13M60b	
		Elanji	13M60c	
		Perumbadavam	13M60e	
		Mulakkulam	13M60f	
		Valiya Thodu	13M64c	
8	Four major reasons for selection of watershed	Water scarcity and insufficient irrigation system		
		Low productivity of land		

		High cost of proeduction
		Poor adaptation to climate change
9	Area of the Project (ha.)	4555.90
10	Area proposed to be treated (ha.)	4428.00
11	Project Cost (Rs. in Lakhs)	664.20
12	Name and Address of proposed PIA	**Pampakkuda Block Panchayat**
13	Any other (please specify)	

Table-PPR 8: Details of previously identified DPAP/ DDP areas proposed under IWMP (ha) during the financial year*

(There are no DPAP/DDP blocks identified in Kerala)

Table-PPR 9: Land Use pattern of the project*

(Area in ha)

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
S. No.	Code of watersheds	Names of villages	Geographical Area of the Watersheds	Forest Area	Land under agricultural use	Rainfed area	Perm-anent pastures	Wasteland	
								Cultivable	Non-cultivable
1	13M59j	Thirumarady Ramamangalam Onakkur Elanji Piravam	1066.60	0	985.59	985.59	0	0	0
2	13M60a	Onakkur Piravam	1490.31	0	1078.08	1078.08	0	0	0
3	13M60b	Elanji Piravam	884.22	0	855.48	855.48	0	20.31	2.97
4	13M60c	Elanji	404.00	0	403.99	403.99	0	0	0
5	13M60e	Neezhoor Mulakkulam Elanji	364.67	0	356.82	356.82	0	0	0
6	13M60f	Neezhoor Mulakkulam Elanji Piravam	187.79	0	155.26	155.26	0	0	0
7	13M64c	Monippally Elanji Neezhoor	158.31	0	150.11	150.11	0	0	0

Source of data: Land Use Board

* From column no. 2, total no. of microwatersheds, from column no. 3, total no. of villages, from column no. 4 to 9, totals, may be indicated for the project at the end of the table.

IV. AGRO-CLIMATIC CONDITION

Details about soil types, land uses etc. are given as additional tables

Table – PPR 10: Details of Agro-climatic condition*

1	2	3	5	7	8
Sl. No.	Name of the Watershed	Name of the Agro-ecological zone covers project area	Names of the villages	Topography#	Average rainfall in mm
1	13M59j	Central Midlands	Thirumarady	Valleys less extensive, Hills with moderate gradient, slpes having mild gradient	3578 mm
			Ramamangalam		
			Onakkur		
			Elanji		
			Piravam		
2	13M60a	Central Midlands	Onakkur	Valleys less extensive, Hills with moderate gradient, slpes having mild gradient	
			Piravam		
3	13M60b	Central Midlands	Elanji	Valleys less extensive, Hills with moderate gradient, slpes having mild gradient	
			Piravam		
4	13M60c	Central Midlands	Elanji	Valleys less extensive, Hills with moderate gradient, slpes having mild gradient	
5	13M60e	Central Midlands	Neezhoor	Valleys less extensive, Hills with moderate gradient, slpes having mild gradient	
			Mulakkulam		
			Elanji		
6	13M60f	Central Midlands	Neezhoor	Valleys less extensive, Hills with moderate gradient, slpes having mild gradient	
			Mulakkulam		
			Elanji		
			Piravam		
7	13M64c	Central Midlands	Monippally	Valleys less extensive, Hills with moderate gradient, slpes having mild gradient	
			Elanji		
			Neezhoor		

* From column no. 5, total no. of villages, from column no. 6, total area, from column no. 9, total no. of crops and total cropped area, may be indicated for the project at the end of the table.

Flat, undulating, moderate slope, Steep slope

Table – PPR 10 a: Details of soil types and major crops

1	2	6				9				
Sl. No.	Code of the watershed	Major soil types				Major crops				
		K07	K08	K11	Total	Coconut	Paddy	Mixed	Rubber	Total
1	13M59j	0	310.16	756.44	1066.60	0	206.73	269.18	505.95	981.86
2	13M60a	100.42	452.78	815.39	1368.6	122.35	7.81	343.62	595.17	1068.95
3	13M60b	0	341.37	542.70	884.07	0	140.07	518.14	192.77	850.98
4	13M60c	0	216.37	187.63	404.00	0	7.60	222.8	83.93	314.33
5	13M60e	0	264.14	100.53	364.67	0	0	275.32	81.52	356.84
6	13M60f	0	115.37	53.48	168.85	0	0	35.42	93.48	128.9
7	13M64c	0	0	158.31	158.31	0	0	147.37	2.74	150.11

Source of data: Land Use Board

*From column no. 5, total no. of villages, from column no. 6, total area, from column no. 9, total no. of crops and total cropped area, may be indicated for the project at the end of the table.

Table-PPR 11: Details of flood and drought in the project area*

1	2	3	4		5
Sl. No.	Particulars	Villages	Periodicity		Not affected
			Annual	Any other (please specify)	
1	Flood	No. of villages	-	1	
		Name(s) of villages	-	Piravam	
2	Drought	No. of villages	-	5	
		Name(s) of villages	-	Thirumarady, Ramamangalam, Onakkur, Elanji, Piravam	

* From column nos. 4 & 5, total no. of villages, category wise, for the project may be given at the end of the table.

Table-PPR 12 : Details of soil erosion in the project area

1	2	3	4	5
Cause	Type of erosion	Area affected (ha)	Run off (mm/ year)	Average soil loss (Tonnes/ ha/ year)
Water erosion				
a	Severe	0		
b	Moderste	2714.9		
c	Slight	1700.19		
Sub-Total		4415.10		
Wind erosion			NA	
Total		4415.10		

V. DEMOGRAPHY AND LAND DISTRIBUTION

Growth in population during the last three census' , per capita availability of land, sex ratio, population age group in the project area, literacy level, migration, workforce available in different sectors of the economy, demography of SC, ST, BPL and landless families in the project area in the last ten years, etc. Key features of population in Table

Sl. No	Watershed name	Area (in Ha)	Total families	Population			BPL Families	Land holding/ Family (in Ha)
				Total	SC	ST		
1	13M59j	1066.6	1539	6631	592	12	1026	0.69
2	13M60a	1490.31	3044	13201	1023	7	2029	0.49
3	13M60b	884.22	1416	6274	389	1	944	0.62
4	13M60c	404.00	479	2175	99	0	320	0.84
5	13M60e	364.67	462	2095	96	0	308	0.79
6	13M60f	187.79	279	1240	73	0	186	0.65
7	13M64c	158.31	196	891	41	0	131	0.81
Total		**4555.90**	**7415**	**32508**	**2313**	**21**	**4943**	

Growth in population during the last three census

No	Watershed name	1981	1991	2001
1	13M59j	5301	6060	6631
2	13M60a	10553	12065	13201
3	13M60b	5016	5734	6274
4	13M60c	1739	1988	2175
5	13M60e	1675	1915	2095
6	13M60f	991	1133	1240
7	13M64c	712	814	891
	Total	25988	29709	32508

VI. LIVELIHOODS

The existing scenario and the opportunities are described in the tables. One more word about capacity building activities. There is tremendous scope of these activities can be organized in the field level in a participatory manner. Of extreme importance is adaption to climate change. How an effective strategy can be developed is the very question of survival. Then comes the hands on exposure to modern agriculture practices, technologies and machines. Trainings should be imparted in such a manner that new social institutions can be created at grass root level to sustain these initiatives.

Table-PPR 13 Summary of livelihoods

No	Name of Watersheds	Existing livelihood activities	Possible livelihood interventions under the project	Current status of migration (no. of people)	Main reasons for migration
1	13M59j	Employment in construction sector, wage labour in semi skilled and unskilled activities, trading etc. are the major livelihood of the poor people now. Middle and upper class are employed in service sector, government and large private enterprises. Agriculture is not the soul income anymore. Agricultural labour is part of the employment of the poor. For the poor families another major chunk is the income from MNREGS. Lower income people also attempt animal husbandry with mixed results. More often the cash income from such activities is not sufficient due to a number of factors	Animal husbandry with strong forward and backward linkage and supporting infrastructure and initiatives at the homestead is the main possibility. high yield cows which can be milked in tandem, scientifically constructed cowshed and biogas tank, grass cultivation, training to the concerned, ensuring the availability of milking machines, soft finance, hand holding for the first few years, providing functional insurance etc, are essential for the success of the programme. Food processing at household level using locally available banana, jack fruit, mango etc. is another possibility. Rearing of backyard chicken, quail, rabbit etc. can b explored.	66	Lack of job opportunities in agriculture sector due to low productivity and poor income from land. This is inducing the farmer to fallow the land and search for better alternatives. As more and more people move to urban areas seeking employment, whatever rural economic activities remain gets weakened and faces a gradual demise. Only the people with ensured income or people who are unable to move remain in the villages
2	13M60a			132	
3	13M60b			63	
4	13M60c			22	
5	13M60e			21	
6	13M60f			12	
7	13M64c			9	

VII. EXPECTED PROJECT OUTCOMES

VII. (i). Expected employment related outcomes:

Table-PPR 14: Employment generation

No	Watershed name	Wage employment										Self employment					
		No. of mandays in '00 s					No. of beneficiaries					No. of beneficiaries					
		SC	ST	Others	Women	Total	SC	ST	Others	Women	Total	SC	ST	Others	Women	Total	
1	13M59j	59	1	93	96	250	59	1	93	96	250	36	1	23	77	137	387
2	13M60a	102	1	160	167	430	102	1	160	167	430	61	0	40	134	236	666
3	13M60b	39	0	60	64	163	39	0	60	64	163	23	0	15	51	90	253
4	13M60c	10	0	15	17	42	10	0	15	17	42	6	0	4	13	23	65
5	13M60e	10	0	15	16	40	10	0	15	16	40	6	0	4	13	22	62
6	13M60f	7	0	11	12	31	7	0	11	12	31	4	0	3	10	17	48
7	13M64c	4	0	6	7	17	4	0	6	7	17	2	0	2	5	9	26
Total		**231**	**2**	**361**	**379**	**974**	**231**	**2**	**361**	**379**	**974**	**139**	**1**	**90**	**303**	**534**	**1508**

* From column no. 2, total no. of villages, from column no. 3 & 4, category-wise totals may be given at the end of the table for the project.

Table-PPR 15: Details of migration from Project area

No	Names of the watersheds	No. of persons migrating	No. of days per year of migration	Major reasons for migrating	Expected reduction in no. of persons migrating
1	13M59j	66	6299	Lack of opportunities in the agriculture and allied sectors. Low productivity and poor income from land. Rural economic activities getting weakened. Weak infrastructure and support services to agriculture. Better livelihoods. Changing life syles	50
2	13M60a	132	12541		99
3	13M60b	63	5961		47
4	13M60c	22	2067		16
5	13M60e	21	1991		16
6	13M60f	12	1178		9
7	13M64c	9	846		7

* From column no. 2, total no. of villages; from column no. 3, total no. of persons migrating; from column no. 4, average no. of days for annual migration; from column no. 6, total expected reduction on no. of persons migrating, for the project may be given at the end of the Table.

VII. (ii). Water related outcomes:

Table-PPR 16: Details of average ground water table depth in the project areas (in meters)

1	2	3	4	5	6
No	Names of the watersheds	Sources	Pre-Project level	Expected post-project level	Remarks
1	13M59j	Open wells	3 - 5	2 - 4	This increase will substantially improve the drinking water availability, reduce the drudgery for fetching water . But substantial steps to improve water and irrigation efficiency through the application of modern and traditional technologies is essential. There must be simultaneous initiatives to reduce the contamination of surface water and ground water.
		Bore wells	30	28	
		Others - Ponds	3	2	
2	13M60a	Open wells	2	1	
		Bore wells	30	28	
		Others - Ponds	2	1	
3	13M60b	Open wells	5 -6	4 - 3	
		Bore wells	35	32	
		Others - Ponds	4	3	
4	13M60c	Open wells	4	3	
		Bore wells	35	32	
		Others - Ponds	3	2	
5	13M60e	Open wells	4	3	
		Bore wells	35	32	
		Others - Ponds	3	2	
6	13M60f	Open wells	4	3	
		Bore wells	35	32	
		Others - Ponds	3	2	
7	13M64c	Open wells	4	3	
		Bore wells	35	32	
		Others - Ponds	3	2	

Source of data: Central Ground Water Board

Table-PPR 17: Status of Drinking water*

1	2	3		4		5
S. No.	Codes of the watersheds	Availability of drinking water (no. of months in a year)		Quality of drinking water		Comments
		Pre-project	Expected Post-project	Pre-project	Expected Post-project	
1	13M59j	10	11	Turbulence, hardness, high iron are the major issues observed.	Reduced concentration of total dissolved salts, less incidence of turbulence, better bacteriological quality etc. are the major expected post project benefits	The issues listed are culled from varies studies conducted in the area by other agencies. There is also a variation in quality issues during different seasons
2	13M60a	10	11			
3	13M60b	10	11			
4	13M60c	10	11			
5	13M60e	10	11			
6	13M60f	10	11			
7	13M64c	10	11			

***** from column no. 2, total no. of villages implementing the programme, from column no. 3, average no. of months may be given at the end of the table for the entire project.

VII. (iii). Crop related outcomes:

Table-PPR 18- Major crops grown and their productivity in the project area

1	2	3		4	
S. No.	**Name of the Crop**	**Current status**		**Expected post project status**	
		Area (ha)	Productivity (kg/ ha)	Area (ha)	Productivity (kg/ ha)
1	Paddy	362.2	1977	400	2000
2	Coconut	122.35	5152 nos/ha	150	5500 nos/ ha
3	Rubber	1555.6	1553	1600	1650

***** From column no. 2, total no. of crops; from columns no. 3 & 4, total cropped area, average productivity, for the project may be given at the end of the Table.

VIII. MANDATORY CERTIFICATION

"It is certified that the State Government of Kerala will abide by the following mandatory conditions laid down by DoLR"

1	The area of the proposed projects are not covered under assured irrigation
2	The area of the proposed project is not covered or overlapping with any other watershed projects sanctioned by the central govt./ state govt./ autonomous bodies & others
3	The State must sign all the mandatory MoUs before implementing the project
4	The timeframes and milestones of the projects will be followed
5	The Budget requested for must follow the criteria laid down in the Common Guidelines, 2008
6	The State must release matching State Share within 15 days from release of each installment of central funds
7	Purchase of vehicles and other equipments are not permitted and nor is construction of buildings allowed. Only purchase of computers and related software is permitted
8	Savings, if any, in each component of the project cost can be utilized only for activities in the Watershed works
9	The DWDU will have one Member exclusively responsible for monitoring
10	All works will be evaluated after each phase of completion. Fund release will depend on favourable reports received from evaluators
11	Evaluators must include only institutions and agencies and not individuals
12	The State and DRDA cell will furnish monitoring reports and periodical reports as desired by DoLR
13	Composition of the WDT must be clearly spelt out and the team Members must be fully in place at the time of signing of the MoU of contract between the PIA and DRDA Cell
14	That DRDA shall release the funds to the PIAs and the watershed committees within 15 days of receipt of the funds
15	The Watershed Committee must be a registered society under the Societies Registration Act, 1860
16	At least one of the WDT Members must be a woman
17	The Gram Sabhas of the proposed project areas have passed resolutions for people's contribution towards WDF
18	Resource-use agreements on the principles of equity and sustainability must be worked out among the User Groups prior to the concerned work being undertaken
19	The DPR must give detailed justification for the proposed project duration
20	No works on private lands will be repaired/ maintained from the WDF
21	The PIA will start project work within three months of the receipt of first installment by DWDU/agency or else it can come under the purview of foreclosure
22	The State will not undertake unnecessary foreclosure of the projects. In the event of foreclosure, the State will refund the amount and furnish all necessary documents as desired by DoLR. The State shall also take administrative and legal action against any defalcation, misappropriation, mis-utilization, deliberate negligence and laxity which has caused foreclosure of the project.

Date:

Signature of officer authorized by State Govt.*
NAME OF OFFICER (IN CAPITAL LETTERS)
DESIGNATION

*Letter of Authority from Secretary of the concerned Department, authorizing the concerned officer to sign the above undertaking, should be enclosed with PPR.

IX. STATUS OF ON-GOING PROJECTS (DPAP/ DDP/ IWDP)

Table- PPR 19: Details of pending UCs: Statewise*

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		9		10	11	
Sl. No.	District	Project	Instal-ment no.	Financial year of release of fund	Amount released (Rs. in lakh)	Amount utilized (Rs.in lakhs)	Submission of UC		Date of submission of UC		Reasons for not submitting / delayed submission of UC	Pending UCs	
							Due date	Amount (Rs. in lakhs)	Date	Amount (Rs. in lakhs)		Period	Amount (Rs. in lakhs)
1	Ernakulam												

*From column No. 2, total no. of Districts, from column No. 3, total no. of projects, from column no. 6, total amount released, from column No. 7, total amount utilized, from column No. 8, total amount due, from column no. 9, total amount for which UCs submitted, from column No. 11, total amount of the pending UCs, may be mentioned at the end of the table for the entire State.

Table- PPR 20: Details of Unspent balance as on 31.07.2013: Districtwise*

1	2	3	4	5		6
S. No.	District	Name of the Project	Total cost (Rs. in lakh)	Total funds released (Rs. in lakh)		Unspent balance (Rs. in lakhs)
				DoLR	State	
1	Ernakulam					

*From column No. 2, total no. of Districts, from column No. 3, total no. of projects, from column no.4 to 6, totals, may be mentioned at the end of the table for the entire State

X. ABSTRACT OF PROJECTS PROPOSED FOR SANCTION DURING FINANCIAL YEAR 2013-14

		Hilly/Desert	Others
1	Number of districts to be covered under the present proposal		
2	No. of Watersheds projects proposed to be taken up under IWMP	1	
3	Total area to be covered under proposed projects (000' ha)		
	(a) Hilly & Desert areas[#]	4428.00	
	(b) Others		
	(c) Total	4428.00	
4	Total cost of the proposed Watershed projects (Rs. in lakhs)		
	(a) Hilly & Desert areas[#]	664.20	
	(b) Others		
	(c) Total	664.20	
5	First installment required from central funds for the proposed watershed projects	132.84	

[#] *For details refer Appendix-I*

Date of meeting of PPR sanctioning Committee	:
Decision taken by the Committee	:
Date of receipt of Annual Action Plan	:
Brief details of Annual Action Plan	:
Final approval of projects/area/costs/project period	:
Amount released as first installment and date of release	:
File No.	: