

NATURAL RESOURCES SYSTEMS PROGRAMME
FINAL TECHNICAL REPORT¹

DFID Project Number

R 8103

Project Title

Consensus for a holistic approach to improve rural-livelihoods in riverine-islands of Bangladesh (CHAR)

Project Leader

Dr Stuart A. Coupe

Organisation

ITDG Intermediate Technology Development Group

NRSP Production System

Land/Water Interface

Date

November 2005

¹ This document is an output from a project funded by the UK Department for International Development (DFID) for the benefit of developing countries. The views expressed are not necessarily those of DFID.

CONTENTS

	No. of Pages
Front End Report	26
Annex A – Project Overview & Findings <i>Barnaby Peacocke</i>	27
Annex B	
Annex B-I Project-related change – consequences for char-modified PAPD <i>Authors: Roger Lewins, Stuart Coupe, Mohammad Ali, Faruk-ul-Islam and Kamal Hossain</i>	51
<i>Appendix 1 - Report on Institutional Monitoring - Stakeholders matrix</i>	19
<i>Appendix 2 - Update on Monitoring</i>	13
<i>Appendix 3 - Compilation of Community Monitoring information; captured by community facilitators</i>	22
<i>Appendix 4 - PTD Case Studies: Maize, pit-production and Boron fertilizer</i>	15
<i>Appendix 5 - Case Studies – Micro-PAPD with the Community House and Canal Fishery in Nadagari</i>	10
<i>Appendix 6 - Case Study – Progress on Macro PAPD on Jalmahal / Waterbody in Char Nandina</i>	18
<i>Appendix 7 - Case Study – Towards Consensus Building in Charlands for Poverty Alleviation</i> A Report on an Experimental PAPD workshop in Char Nandina	7
<i>Appendix 8 - Experimental People's Action Plan in Char Nadagari, Jamalpur</i>	4
<i>Appendix 9 - Problem census, cause/effect analysis and STEPS analysis during early PAPD</i>	43
<i>Appendix 10 - Consultation Meetings at Sharishabari and Madarganj Upazilas</i>	21
Annex B-ii Technical solutions to NRM constraints in the charlands context – a report on project experiences <i>Authors: Faruk-Ul-Islam, Mohammad Ali, Kamal Hossain, Shadullah Hil Mamun and Anton Immink</i>	33
Annex B-iii The PAPD monitoring strategy <i>Authors: Roger Lewins, Faruk-Ul-Islam and Kamal Hossain</i>	16
<i>Appendix 1 - Development of a Process Monitoring Format for LWI-R8103</i>	4
<i>Appendix 2 - Developing the new Diary and Meeting reports</i>	12
<i>Appendix 3 - Update on Monitoring, NRSP CHAR Project</i>	9
Annex B-iv Social Capital in Nadagari and Nandina Charland Villages <i>Author: Francis Murray</i>	1-37

Project Completion Sheet

Acronyms and Local Terms

ADC	Additional District Commissioner
<i>beel</i>	A shallow lake-like waterbody that may be seasonal or permanent.
BRAC	Bangladesh Rural Advancement Committee (large NGO)
CARE	Co-operative for American Relief Everywhere (large NGO)
CBOs	Community Based Organisation
<i>char</i>	<i>Riverine sand islands</i>
<i>charlands</i>	<i>Char areas, especially of North East Bangladesh</i>
<i>choura</i>	<i>Spontaneous civil uprising</i>
CLASP	Charlands Livelihoods Project of DFID
CMS	Community Monitoring System (participatory monitoring within this project)
CPR	Common Property Resources
DFID	Department for International Development (UK development agency)
E C	European Commission
GO	Government Organisation
<i>gusthi</i>	A clan group
<i>jalmohal</i>	A discrete waterbody, registered by MoL for the purposes of leasing and rent generation
<i>jotedars</i>	Richer peasants
<i>kabiraj</i>	Traditional healer
<i>khas</i>	Government owned land
<i>masjid</i>	Mosque committee
NGO	Non Governmental Organisation
NRM	Natural Resource Management
PAPD	Participatory Action Planning for Development (a consensus-building methodology)
PME	Participatory monitoring and evaluation
PTD	Participatory Technology Development (a key approach of ITDG)
RCE	The ITDG Rural Community Extensionist – trained to deliver specific types of or services on behalf of wider community
RMO	Resource Management Organisation (a generic term for local institutions managing NRs)
<i>salish</i>	A locally-legitimate, informal judicial system for the resolution of minor disputes
<i>samaj</i>	An informal but pervasive local institution – a type of “brotherhood” that exerts power and influence by emphasising social and religious duty
STEPS	Social Technical Economic Political Sustainability – planning exercise
UACC	Upazila Agricultural Coordination Committee
UNO	The Upazilla Nirbahi Officer, selected from the Union Parishad Chairmen and.
UP	The Union Parishad, the lowest tier of government, consisting of twelve elected members
Upazila	The lowest <i>bureaucratic</i> tier of government – previously termed Thana
WBMC	Waterbody Management Committee (group elected to manage jalmohal stocking in this project)

1 Executive Summary

A previous NRSP project, R7562 (*Consensus building in CPRs*), designed and tested a consensus building method (Participatory Action Plan Development - PAPD) for use in the integrated improvement of floodplain management. This project tested this method in a new floodplain location (i.e. riverine sand islands or *Chars*). Through sustained engagement with local authorities and poor people, the project has produced a model for PAPD in which the consensus building instrument can bring poor people into local decision-making processes over the allocation and management of the natural resources on which they depend. The project has also researched the pathways for embedding the model in the system of local governance in Bangladesh

ITDG-Bangladesh worked with char communities in the northern Bangladesh charlands of the Jamuna River. They focused initially on short-term issues and needs identified by the poor which centred on a range of production technologies developed in partnership with char communities. ITDG saw PAPD as a complement to this primary focus and so it was piloted in two char villages to see what adaptations, if any, were needed for its use in the charlands. Would it, for example, enabled char communities to debate longer term and seemingly intractable issues in order to identify actions for resource management that could help to improve their livelihoods in more enduring ways?

The R7562 PAPD is designed to resolve specific constraints over a limited time period, whereas in char villages it was evident that the timetable needed relaxing. The communities went through the various PAPD stages at their own pace. Sustained support over at least two seasons on micro-level livelihood improvement is considered necessary to draw in the landless farming and fishing groups into a village-wide planning process. Treating poor women as a separate interest group also proved effective in enabling women leaders to emerge and articulate their issues in community meetings. An added problem to resolving conflicts among char dwellers is that most natural resources are 'private' rather than common property. The influential classes exercise power through informal channels to capture resources, making asset accumulation by the poor almost impossible. This is a particular problem on isolated chars where land grabbing is a common practice.

The experience strengthened the view that NGOs can facilitate the emergence of community-based organisations that can interact directly with local and meso-level government institutions and private service providers. It can lead to more concrete expressions of demand from char villages and provide a channel for charland development and the allocation of resources. NGOs and local institutions also need to find ways of internalising the PAPD process to overcome the need for continued outside facilitation.

The challenges for PAPD in the charlands are threefold. The first is to bring the hidden informal power holders into the local consensus building process. The second is to influence the local network of organisations that support char dwellers with short-term seasonal aid to become involved in planning activities for the medium and long term. Finally, the major bilateral donors who are supporting char interventions need to use their linkages with national government to facilitate this emergence of local economic development rather than continue supporting a traditional top-down approach. ITDG believes there can be positive outcomes on all these challenges. Already, their research level experience of PAPD will be scaled-up in donor-supported development projects for other char communities. So, the research testing of PAPD is moving to wider application with the accompanying potential for wider pro-poor outcomes.

2 Background

Project R7562 was developed and applied within the specific scenarios created by a large fisheries project (DFID-CBFM2). In order to widen the relevance and appeal of the PAPD methodology in the Bangladesh development context, it was decided to test it in the very different context of charlands, which are characterised by a vacuum of formal institutions. The adaptation was envisaged to have potential wider application to remote zones with weak institutional presence in other countries and regions

In 2001, two villages were selected for testing of PAPD. Various criteria were involved in their selection. Jamalpur, the selected district, was within the five districts selected by DFID and was considered strategic in terms of potential influence on its bilateral charlands programme, the £50m DFID Charlands Livelihood Programme, which was under development at the time. Then two villages were selected at different ends of the spectrum in terms of settlement maturity, in order to be able to compare the impact of PAPD in two different sub-contexts within the charlands. The initial hypothesis of the project research team was that the younger and more isolated char context would be more propitious for rapid progress in reaching consensus for action planning. Firstly, the community would be more homogeneous in terms of dependence on crop based agriculture, therefore reducing the likelihood of clashes between livelihood groups over natural resources at different points during the seasonal cycle. Secondly, the inherent hardships and pioneering spirit of new settlement might endure to produce more intense solidarities and interdependencies. It was felt that mature settlement was more socially complex and riven by decades of conflict over access to and management of the water bodies, which are left behind by dead river channels, making progress on consensus building much more painstaking.

3 Project Purposes

Methods for implementation of management opportunities relevant to the poor, including community participation in integrated sustainable management of terrestrial and aquatic floodplain resources, especially sandbar areas, developed and promoted by building sustainable livelihoods for the poor into consensus building approaches

4 Outputs

Main Research Findings of the Project by Output.

1. PAPD Adaptation

- ⇒ Livelihoods constraints in the chars largely relate to political and institutional isolation.
- ⇒ Service providers can ameliorate problems associated with environmental setting and factors related to production.
- ⇒ The purpose of PAPD in the charland context should be to form links with external institutions in order to release future support and collaboration.

2. Technology Options

- ⇒ Catalytic opportunities around agricultural technologies are relevant for releasing energies among the poor for participatory planning

⇒ To bring about the essential “livelihood boost” which releases the energies of marginalised communities for planning, a dedicated public resource for NGO capacity building and programme outreach is required

4. Social Capital

⇒ Local informal institutions (the *gusthi*, the *samaj* etc.) strongly influence levels of participation, consensus and PAPD success in char villages.

⇒ PAPD methodology less suitable for very new/young char settlements where insufficient trust exists between *gusthi* groups to sustain a village level plan.

5. Policy and Uptake

⇒ Local authorities were found to be passive in the planning phase of PAPD

⇒ Prior knowledge or reconnaissance and institutional mapping is required to uncover receptive individuals at critical points in the institutional system.

⇒ Once the time and costs of local planning had been invested by communities and by ITDG as the facilitator, local officials from Union Parishad and Upazila authorities stepped in to assist implementation using their formal and informal political ties and influence.

Detailed Appraisal of Project Outcomes

Output 1 Proposed Methodology for PAPD implementation in charlands

Stage 1 Familiarity phase (experimental PAPD), issue identification

⇒ The initial stage of the PAPD approach was to introduce concepts of community-planning and consensus and to learn of key livelihoods constraints in mixed group meetings.

⇒ The process extended over a period of about 9 days.

⇒ During this phase, the original PAPD can be re-evaluated. In the char context, for instance, *gusthi* (kinship) groupings appeared as significant as livelihoods or resource-user groups normally established with the facilitator.

Stage 2 Information gathering and sharing, group formation, 1st plenary

⇒ An information gathering process is established around a specific, unifying and cross-cutting prospective intervention.

⇒ Researching and reporting responsibilities are delegated to community-identified representatives.

⇒ A facilitator creates links with the relevant secondary stakeholders, local government institutions such as the Land Office, Union and Upazilla level agriculture and fisheries agencies.

⇒ The community develop several (in the project’s case, seven) distinct groups in order to represent multiple interests and delegate responsibilities.

⇒ The groups’ stance to the intervention is discussed and potential problems/solutions identified before a plenary is held where the concerns and suggestions are presented and negotiated in public.

Stage 3 Committee formation, 2nd plenary, implementation

- ⇒ The committee formation process is a gradual one and occurs in parallel with the development activities in addition to the PAPD negotiations..
- ⇒ Roles and responsibilities are confirmed and agreed in a public plenary.
- ⇒ Key to this stage is the “service negotiation” between the community and the secondary stakeholders invited to attend the meeting(s)..
- ⇒ The intention is to reach agreement on the timing and logistics of implementation.
- ⇒ The PAPD intervention is then modified and managed by interaction between the management committee and participants.

Key PAPD modifications and their relevance

Some of the most interesting and potentially useful aspects of the team’s use of PAPD relate to overall flexibility. The char-modified PAPD adopted to plan jalmohal management at Nandina recognised that local stakeholders have their own ways of negotiating new opportunities and their impacts in an off-stage setting – contrasting somewhat with the intensive workshop form of PAPD within the project-setting of the Community-Based Fisheries Management Project, for instance. In summary, the project findings/experience can develop the PAPD process in 4 particular areas;

1. *Timing*

- ⇒ Initial development activities and small-scale consensus building were intended to “*test the water*” and to slowly develop a local habit of interacting with service providers and political representatives. People became used to debating options and representing their own interests in a public setting.
- ⇒ From start to implementation, this macro-PAPD took about 18 months to achieve. The long timeframe was partly a function of the research team, themselves, learning and building up their own confidence, before tackling a major issue with powerful, external, interest groups.
- ⇒ Project experience suggests that momentum and confidence takes time to build in these isolated settings. Recently, the role of the *gusthi* groups in controlling or blocking change has been challenge by the cross-cutting CBO and popular support for challengers to membership of the committee.

2. *The role of formal institutions (service providers and political representatives)*

- ⇒ PAPD in the project context draws in secondary stakeholders during the public plenary sessions in order to provide gravitas to the occasion and place some pressure on local political stakeholders for continued support.
- ⇒ In this project, however, the ITDG team and community felt the need to consolidate the planning process further *before* presenting detailed plans to these stakeholders. The team expressed their concern that these public meetings were used by political stakeholders to garner public support through hollow pronouncements unrelated to community plans and the project.
- ⇒ The role of the Union Parishad changed during the lifespan of the project. Pre-planning the UP was relatively passive and any public pronouncements were routine and support-seeking. However, once the planning stage proper had started and the scope and potential of the process became more obvious the Union role became more supportive and facilitatory. During the

information-gathering phase of the *jalmohal* macro-PAPD, for instance, the Union Parishad actively created a bridge between ITDG and the community to the line department agencies, the Land Office, UNO and the District administration.

- ⇒ Finally, once the information-gathering and planning was complete, the Union-level administration became less significant. Links had been formed with the relevant service providers (DoF and DAE personnel at Upazilla level, for instance) and the Union Parishad stood to one side. The Union Parishad role had been strongest in the mid-planning period where the potential beneficiaries and necessary agencies were being identified.
- ⇒ In terms of technical service provision, the project forged relationships with under-utilised staff at Upazila level. Community plans created a demand for livestock vaccination, soil testing, crop demonstrations etc. where previously there had been none. Local residents then formed their own personal (and business or client) relations with these staff, suggesting an element of mutual gain and sustainability.

3. The role of *informal* institutions (including elite and social factions)

- ⇒ It is widely acknowledged that elites and pre-existing power differentials can modify or destroy intended management structures and activities but there is also a growing recognition that it can be counterproductive to attempt to circumvent them completely -true consensus entails identifying win-win options than can benefit the interests of all. However, the balance between facilitating an evolving local process and of over involvement (or interference) that may be unrealistic outside the project context is a delicate one. The ITDG team, themselves, have identified the key role they played in re-framing committee representation towards the poor and deflecting pro-landowner interests, for instance. Without careful scrutiny and concerted effort by the team the process would have been co-opted by elite but these raises questions over institutionalising PAPD in other contexts and with other facilitators.
- ⇒ However, the differences between the processes and outcomes at the two villages suggest greater prior knowledge of the areas was required before PAPD was introduced. While some of this relates to geographic characters (distance from markets, flood risk etc.), the strongest influencers appear social and institutional. In turn, whether formal or informal, these can be ubiquitous or site-specific. Some form of social and institutional mapping should highlight those site-specific characters that provide opportunities or obstacles to consensual planning. Many of these would relate to the informal institutional setting of the site in question – personal allegiances within Union-level government relating to *gusthi* or party politics, the interests of the Union Chairman, the function of the mosque committee (is it already associated with flood mitigation or land rights issues?), the level of respect for *salish* and their local role, the identity and interests of other elite etc.

4. The meaning of “success”

- ⇒ The role and function of PAPD depends on setting and objective. In strongly-facilitated projects with distinct NRM objectives, consensual community-level planning can be a useful mechanism to raise the level of awareness and support for more equitable or sustainable management and practice. In the case of the chars, social development and empowerment may be a more pressing requirement.
- ⇒ A particularly pressing issue in the chars relates to security of access rights and tenure. Currently, allocation of private and khas land is controlled by a complex institutional melange representing

the personal interests of privileged and political stakeholders and maintained by opaque process and deliberate obfuscation.

- ⇒ However, in the case of the canal and community house micro-PAPDs and the macro-PAPD on the *jalmohal*, the project has demonstrated that this institutional landscape can be navigated by local and poor stakeholders with the facilitation of an agency such as ITDG. The land and the *jalmohal* required for these community initiatives was secured through a lengthy process of interaction and repeat visits to the Land Office and District level bureaucrats. The message here is that property rights can be negotiated for and by the poor and that the poor can be introduced to the formal and informal institutional workings of secondary stakeholders.
- ⇒ At the village level, PAPD has attempted to build cooperation between existing social factions. The *gusthi* (kinship groups) at Nadagari represent an informal but resilient institution in its own right. Initially, differences between these groups represented a serious constraint to decision-making and agreement but towards the end of the project there were some signs that younger and more pro-active individuals were challenging these local barriers. This relates directly to the greater (social capital and institutional) goals of PAPD in development.
- ⇒ The issue here is how sustainable these impacts on social and institutional constraints actually are. This project has invested considerable effort forging links and relationships between poor charland residents and the political stakeholders and service providers that are meant to represent them. However, although ITDG acted as a catalyst, injecting a base level of energy and incentive into the system, local people were active in shaping the direction and form of dialogue that resulted from village to District level. Project diaries have captured the fact that many community delegations to secondary stakeholders evolved independently of ITDG coordination.

Output Two: Six technical solutions adapted and promoted.

- ⇒ As well as contributing to the confidence of poor farmers and women to engage in village level planning as described above, these technical solutions stand alone as a pioneering contribution to agricultural development science in charlands. R8103 has involved comprehensive testing of new crops and techniques. Special attention was given to developing market linkages and private sector service provision..
- ⇒ Although PTD was applied as a vehicle to introduce concepts of wider, local planning within PAPD, the training manuals developed by ITDG will introduce the technical lessons learned in the charlands context. Activities investigated the potential of agricultural development - alternative cropping to target new markets and provide winter income, market analysis to explore prospects for diversification and the feasibility, soil improvement and livestock support to women.
- ⇒ In this regard, the technical activities were relatively successful from a technical perspective (new crops such as maize and mustard were productive and popular, for instance) but, more importantly, the PTD developed social and institutional links that proved useful in the latter PAPD stages of the project. This occurred in two ways. Firstly, PTD participants (women and the poor) interacted with project staff and secondary stakeholders and technical service providers such as Block Supervisors and Livestock Department staff on a regular basis. This created the confidence required to represent the needs of the poor in community meetings later on and introduced the poor to the potential support of government and research service providers. Secondly, because the membership of these groups overlapped, these individuals were already represented in established groups by the time of village-level planning (the maize group was particularly unified and vocal, in this respect).

Output Three: Participatory M and E established and practiced.

- ⇒ The monitoring strategy has evolved over the course of the project. Originally, the emphasis was on detecting tangible changes in participation, livelihoods and production. The key tools here were the diary and meeting report formats but the process of developing these with the team was informative for all project staff and consultants. This activity reinforced the need of the team to critically assess the meaning of what was seen and heard in terms of wider, long-term project objectives (testing the significance of PAPD to the charlands context and investigating prospects for lasting change).
- ⇒ The narratives developed by the team were intended not just to provide material for final reporting but to realign project and community strategy in real time. Although the broad areas to consider were pre-determined in diary design (*decision-making, linkage, dispute resolution* etc.) the content of diaries and the interpretation of their meaning was directed by staff. In some respects, this approach mirrors the flexible approach to reporting as developed within the most significant change (MSC) approach (see Annex B-iii).
- ⇒ Because PAPD relates to social capital and, particularly in isolated contexts like chars, to formal and informal institutional change, reporting had to highlight the ways people and vested interests were working with or reacting to PAPD concepts and plans. The overall approach to institutional change reflected the findings and recommendations of Project R8195 which suggests focussing on the processes that operate at interface between the project, communities and external stakeholders
- ⇒ With respect community-driven monitoring, the community monitoring system (CMS) that evolved was a very informal, routine, process of reporting to both the community and to ITDG (see Annex B-i: Section 1.5). The process depended on a community-elected representative communicating local issues of project performance and outcomes to project staff. Information gathering by these Community Monitors (CMs) operated informally at tea shops, group meetings and during “off-stage” discussions but it was also an opportunity for the community to discuss progress or problems in isolation from ITDG. This latter aspect was one of the main participatory characters of the approach. The other was the manner in which monitoring was decided. The communities rejected conventional forms of indicator and instead agreed to consider up to 10 positive or negative changes on a monthly basis.
- ⇒ The CMS feedback seemed to reveal something about changing priorities and concerns as community-planning progressed at the two villages. The main theme represented by the CMS feedback is the switch from technical and physical observations and concerns to social and institutional ones. To some extent this might be expected because the project design had intended to make this progression and to follow the regular ITDG pathway from simple, practical solutions to more complex market and institutional issues.
- ⇒ However, PAPD was intended to make people more aware of the services available to them and the potential of collective planning in this respect. The type of community feedback did, in fact, change with time to incorporate social issues relating to acceptability of plans, linkage with outside institutions, public support or conversely to local disputes. At both villages, the total frequency of technical versus social observations made by the community and the CM changed over time so that social and institutional issues outgrew concerns over technical constraints or approval of new benefits from alternative cropping etc.

Output Four: Increased human and social capacity to increase representation.

- ⇒ Clearly in terms of the project goals, and running counter to the original expectations of the project team, the PAPD outcomes were much more successful in Nandina, where there appears to be a strong possibility of achieving beneficial and sustainable change. Results were much less favourable in Nadagari, where, although an almost identical process was followed, there was some evidence of latent conflicts actually being inflamed. A comparison of the pre-intervention situations in both villages can therefore yield useful lessons as to the broader applicability of the PAPD method.
- ⇒ Nandina, a longer settled and relatively affluent village clearly, clearly had much greater pre-existing social cohesion than Nadagari. The ability to conduct a macro PAPD exercise around the *jalmohal* fishery was also instrumental in achieving broader acceptance and unity; there was no comparable 'large-scale' win-win opportunity in Nadagari. Nandina, which had two ex-UP members, also benefited from good linkages and political influence with external institutions which may also have strengthened their negotiating position, particularly with respect to the *jalmohal* fishery. In Nadagari lack of secure title to recently settled land was one of the principle causes of division. This was compounded by social heterogeneity and poorly defined project boundaries. Some fundamental institutional capacity building mistakes also fuelled a sense of grievance; especially relating to transparency and accountability in financial matters.
- ⇒ Nandina's cohesion was also reflected in their successful co-operation with earlier development projects. Under a recent UNICEF water sanitation program implemented by a local NGO, RDSM, the community constructed a deep arsenic-free community ground well with financial contributions from each household. Development initiatives in Nadagari appeared to be characterised by individual micro-credit and loans schemes which may have promoted a dependency culture.
- ⇒ In both villages there was an initial desire to incorporate functions of more traditional indigenous institutions such as *salish* into the CBO process. How compatible such functions might be given the more democratic nature of the CBO requires further investigation. Certainly, many of those on *Masjid* committees, Gram Sarkars etc. are also represented on the CBO and in Nandina at least appear to be benefit from the alternative prospectives provided by both systems. Furthermore, whether incorporated or not, villagers appear to be using these highly effective and sustainable traditional institutions as yardstick against which to measure the success of the CBO.
- ⇒ Although hope was expressed that a 'youth rebellion' in Nadagari might revitalise the CBO, there was clear evidence of linkages between this movement and agendas of broader interest groups involved in existing divisions. Never the less representation of younger people appeared poor in both villages; most of those attending the focus group meetings, including a large number of CBO executives, were in their late thirties or older. In Nandina, there was also some evidence of improved woman's representation although their role in collective decision-making is still extremely marginal.
- ⇒ Overall the results suggests that there will be a much greater challenge in implementing the PAPD process in more marginal Charland areas where internal struggles over land access are critical. Other parallel conflict resolution approaches are also required in such instances. Finally, in regard to dissemination of the method, ITDG provided strong advocacy up to MP level in order to secure

rights to the *jalmohal*. Serious consideration must be given to the extent to which this could be repeated on larger scale by smaller and less experienced / influential NGOs?

Ouput Five: Policy stakeholders using consensus-building methodologies in charland development

The project has concluded that within the formal structures of government there is no immediate champion or catalyst agent at village level for transfer or embedding of new planning and consensus building tools developed in the project. The recommendations of the project revolve around bringing PAPD into the activities of local and district level NGOs working in char districts. These findings are discussed in more detail in Annex B-v.

The potential role of administrative structures

- ⇒ The UP a provided support in data gathering and for agricultural development, generally. In this last respect the Upazila officials have also proved supportive. The UNO personally met with Nadagari residents during the flood of 2004, for instance, and has witnessed the level of community planning, first-hand.
- ⇒ Project-related structures and mediators (the CBOs and RCEs) have proved catalytic in changing roles and creating links with other secondary stakeholders, especially within PTD. With respect to PAPD, secondary stakeholders were crucial at all stage of pre-planning, planning and implementation and the Union and Upazila Level Land Offices and Additional District Commissioner (ADC) at District level were generally supportive and enabling in this respect. The Upazila Agricultural Coordination Committee (UACC) also appears to be a very important interface between the various line departments and service providers and a potential audience for PAPD plans.
- ⇒ The project team did find it possible to interact with and influence secondary stakeholders at these higher administrative levels and the opaque land and water rights issues necessitated this before meaningful interventions could proceed.
- ⇒ Crucially, as the research team note, although the support of secondary stakeholders cannot be solely attributed to the community themselves (the process was heavily facilitated by ITDG), what is important is that the community *do* recognise the potential of these stakeholders and *are* aware of the difference in relationships and their function before and after the PAPD process.
- ⇒ Although there are undoubtedly political and administrative nodes that can permit or obstruct local-level planning such as PAPD, some of the opportunities and constraints encountered may have been a manifestation of the personal stance of individuals. In turn, this may relate to complex personal stakes relating to social and political capital and influence or it may simply relate to enthusiasm for community-based rural development, distrust of NGOs, indifference etc.

The potential role of NGOs - influencing policy and practice by example

- ⇒ There currently appears limited scope for affecting change in char livelihoods at policy level only. One of the most intractable char-specific constraints, for instance, is the proper allocation and administration of private and khas land. In principle, this is covered by suitable legal and institutional frameworks but it is the failure of these structures to deliver that has turned attention to the wider issue of governance, more generally (see Annex 5 for a discussion of the key charlands-related policy).

- ⇒ To deliver new participatory forms of local planning in the charlands will require drawing on a range of suitable stakeholders as contributors and users. Project experience suggests that Union to District GOs, service providers and NGOs will all have a role to play.
- ⇒ ITDG, in this project and elsewhere, is attempting to invigorate practice at all levels by providing evidence of participatory planning and progress. Unfortunately, the expertise and experience of most NGO field staff does not currently extend to understanding the significance of informal institutions and power relations and of ways to recognise problems or opportunities as they arise. In addition, the NGO presence in char regions has been limited to the delivery of pre-packaged activities such as credit provision that require little flexibility, planning or interaction with other institutions.
- ⇒ In summary, there appears potential for up-scaling (in this case, increasing coverage and political influence) by linking PAPD to broader programmes with long-term support.

5 Research Activities

ITDG established a field office in Jamalpur district. Between four and six full time staff were employed by the project between August 2002 and March 2005. Their research outputs consisted of fortnightly reports, technical reports and reports and analysis of major events during the lifetime of the project. These outputs were then refined into project reports by the ITDG staff in Dhaka. These project reports are all available as Appendices to Annex B i and Annex B iii..

The research process centred on the adaptation of the PAPD methodology to form part of the implementation activities of a non-governmental organisation. It was necessary to design a theoretical modification of the PAPD. Then this modified PAPD design was tested in the field sites. The results of this testing have then produced further observations and refinements, before arriving at the presentation of a definitive set of recommendations for deployment of PAPD in charlands.

The project was designed to include three phases: inception, adaptation and dissemination. In practice the adaptation and dissemination phases merged the extensive involvement of secondary stakeholders in the adaptation phase permitted dissemination of ideas. Also the adaptation phase continued throughout the period from March 2003 to October 2004, and conclusions concerning the pro-poor outcomes of implementation of the Waterbody Action Plan in Nandina village continue up to the present.

As reported in Annex A (p 10) various difficulties were encountered in recruiting field level research staff, it was necessary to build the research capacity of staff throughout the lifetime of the project. Various disagreements and misunderstandings over the adaptation of PAPD were experience between the field, Dhaka and UK and this delayed the production of various outputs. Nevertheless, a review of activity milestones reveals that almost all have been satisfactorily completed. Two field staff employed by ITDG on the R8103 contract, Mamun and Kamal, have been retained as full time PAPD trainers at ITDG Bangladesh and were able to write the Charlands Development Manual (bangla)

Review of Activity Milestones (Comments in Brackets)

Inception workshop held (09/02)

Internal dissemination of CBM and capacity raising to field staff and local partners by 06/02 (process continued through to 11/03)

Draft stakeholder matrices developed by 06/02, finalised by 09/03 (documentation finalised in 04/04)

Primary stakeholder meetings begin 04/02 (they began in 10/04)

Technical issues report by 06/02 (completed on schedule by Faruk ul Islam)

Technical need assessment report finalised by 09/03 (no report was produced, this activity was conducted through a series of briefings by Mohammad Ali of the Jamalpur field team)

Local partners finalised 04/02 (An additional local partner RDSM joined the project in 04/03)

Inception report including scoping studies of Jamalpur sandbar livelihoods, the CBM model and the stakeholder matrix published 07/02 (inception report concentrated on local governance, completed 03/03)

Research plan disseminated to related NGOs/experts/projects by 09/03 (Charlands Network regularly briefed on research findings from 02/04 onwards)

First revised draft sandbar PAPD model disseminated to reviewers by 10/03 (revised model not compiled until after waterbody PAPD process completed, in 10/04 and not submitted for review)

Technology testing begins 08/02 (Process commenced in 02/03)

Post-production processing and marketing options published by 12/03 (reports completed by 06/04)

Comparative technologies study report published 11/04 (crop specific reports completed by 12/04)

Rapid Market Appraisal reports published 1/04 (not completed until 12/04)

Participatory monitoring review report published 12/03 (report prepared for FTR)

Community monitoring modules disseminated 12/03 (learning from community monitoring deemed not sufficient to proceed)

Community and CBM monitoring approach implemented beginning 06/03 (commenced in 11/03)

Community natural resource management action plans from final round PAPD finalised and commercial buyers interest documented by 10/03 (commercial linkages identified for specific crops by 06/04, commercialisation of fish production at Nandina waterbody according to community plan from 07/04)

Community management action plans implemented by 06/03 (community hall plans implemented by 10/03, village wide plans implemented at Nandina from 06/04)

Policy issues report disseminated, uptake by donors & NGOs, evidence to secure government policy change, 11/03 (national level policy influencing of Department for Agricultural Extension and Charlands network through various Powerpoint presentations commencing 02/04)

Revised communication strategy document by 10/03 (Communications strategy submitted 03/04)

First draft decision support tools disseminated to reviewers 10/03 (Draft charlands manual testing from 09/04)

Revised policy decision support tools disseminated by 02/04 (Charland manual final draft ready by 01/05)

Mainstreaming consensus-building for sandbar CPR management 06/04 (Not possible because DFID Charland programme not implemented at field level in lifetime of the project)

Final workshop 02/05

Video and technical bulletins published and disseminated 08/04 (Ready by 03/05)

Dissemination of participatory review report and monitoring modules by 06/04 (not produced)

MOUs finalised with government and NGO partners 05/04 (MoUs developed from 10/04 onwards)

Training modules produced by 06/04 (ready for pilot testing by 09/04)

Final Technical Report 03/05 (first submission 05/05, revised 11/05)

6 Environmental Assessment

6.1 What significant environmental impacts resulted from the research activities (both positive and negative)?

Local improvements to the management of water bodies and canals have secured better aquatic diversity and agro-ecosystem functions of integrated fish/crop production.

Changing agricultural practices in chars have been ecologically sustainable, e.g. chilli/mainze intercropping, use of micro-nutrient fertilisers. Grafting of flood resistant root stocks *c.f.* fruit trees have a stabilising effect on flood effected embankments.

6.2 What will be the potentially significant environmental impacts (both positive and negative) of widespread dissemination and application of research findings?

Widespread adoption of Action Planning for waterbodies and changing cropping/livestock patterns for improved productivity will occur through effective training of NGOs intervening in charland areas .

6.3 Has there been evidence during the project's life of what is described in Section 6.2 and how were these impacts detected and monitored?

The process of application of improved planning and agricultural techniques has started through the training of approx. 20 NGOs with the draft char manual.

6.4 What follow up action, if any, is recommended?

7 Contribution of Outputs

7.1 NRSP Purpose and Production System (PS) Output(s)

NRSP Purpose: *'To deliver new knowledge that enables poor people who are largely dependent on the NR base to improve their livelihoods'*

:

Knowledge of planning based upon consensus embedded in two research village sites and spreading to six adjacent villages, which have replicated the process of negotiation for a community hall. (improved representation of the poorest in village affairs)

Improvement of livelihoods in one village (Nandina) mainly through improved income from community water body stocking scheme which was the product of a five month PAPD process (Feb-June 2004)

Wide range of service providers activated in the meso-level government service providers in Jamalpur district, model being replicated in Gaibanda and Faridpur Districts, Bangladesh.

Non participating institutions taking up lessons from the project at national level in Bangladesh include the Departments of Agricultural Extension and Department of Disaster Planning and

Management. PAPD disseminated internationally in ITDG/Practical Action's "Reducing Vulnerability Programme" with potential uptake in Nepal, Zambia and Mozambique.

Land Water Interface

Improved resource-use strategies in coastal zone production systems developed and promoted in floodplain production systems.

PAPD methodology has been effectively adapted and applied to pro-poor seasonal waterbody management in the chars of Jamalpur by March 2005 with potential for replication in hundreds of char villages where waterbodies are underutilised due to conflicts over management, through district level networks of government, ngo and private service providers.

7.2 Impact of outputs

R8103 Outputs

NGOs, Development agencies and government line departments taking steps to establish pilot floodplain management projects by using at least 2 decision support tools promoting participatory consensus building approaches

In the life cycle of the project the "Charlands Development Manual" was recently published in September 2005 and is being vigorously promoted for use by technical line ministries and NGOs. DFID was the principle target amongst development agencies, has not mainstreamed the PAPD in its approach to charland implementation.

Poor community members organising themselves to participate in implementing natural resource and common property resource management arrangements.

Poor people implementing a series of micro level production plans and one village level plan

Community based participatory monitoring tools evaluated and presented to Bangladesh stakeholders by community representatives.

Community monitoring tools not developed to the anticipated level. Community monitors in Nandina village active in promoting the PAPD approach and taking a lead in receiving exchange visits from other communities to explain the PAPD negotiation process and the process of formation of a community based organisation to carry out the plan.

An at least one project site, changes for specific groups of the poor identified in resource access, institutional representation, production and economic returns.

Transformation of external technical and political linkages witnessed in both project sites. Also evidence of greater private sector linkages with major uptake of winter vegetables and maize crops.

7.3 Uptake Promotion

- ⇒ ITDG has a full draft in Bengali language of a “Charlands Technical and Planning Manual”, based upon the documents to be found in Annex Bi and Annex Bii of this FTR. Pilot testing of this manual commenced in September. So far the staff of approximately twenty district-level NGOs in Jamalpur have been trained.
- ⇒ ITDG Bangladesh and its staff have benefited from its experiences during this research project. The team has been exposed to the complexities of inclusive planning and now has the skill and knowledge to recognise, document and guide these institutional processes in other contexts. The team have already drafted training manuals for partner NGOs and will draw on their experience in ongoing and future projects.
- ⇒ Partly as a result of the innovative programme approaches stimulated by the NRSP R8103 project, ITDG Bangladesh has secured two significant development projects with funding up to 2008-9. The training will continue for the ITDG local partner NGOs in Gaibanda, Jamalpur and Faridpur districts
- ⇒ ITDG has been interacting with some of these NGOs to build their capacity through the Charland NGO Network and the Department of Agricultural Extension Liaison Committee. An early output of this project was to develop a PAPD training manual for NGOs currently associated with ITDG in the charlands region and in several large programmes that have recently come on stream (these include the EC-funded Food Security – Bangladesh project at Jamalpur and Faridpur and the Disappearing Lands project supported by the UK Lottery Community Fund).
- ⇒ It has been shared with the FAO Bangladesh office, provided the basis for a series of lecture by Faruk Ul-Islam at Bangladesh Agricultural University and the Rural Development Academy, Bogra.
- ⇒ Presentations have been given to the National Charlands Network, introducing the option of consensus building for waterbody management in Chars.
- ⇒ ITDG Bangladesh has registered as a potential partner of the DFID Charlands Livelihoods Programme and has submitted various capability statements based upon the manual.
- ⇒ The FTR Annex A will provide the basis for a published working paper, entitled “Consensus building and planning with the Vulnerable, Experiences from Bangladesh” This paper will make the PAPD charland experience relevant to an international audience of development practitioners.

8 Publications and other communication materials

8.1 Books and book chapters

8.2 Journal Articles

8.2.1 Peer reviewed and published

8.2.2 Pending publication (in press)

8.2.3 Drafted

Coupe,S, Lewins R and Peacocke, B., 2006, Consensus Building and Planning with the Vulnerable, Lessons from Bangladesh , Rugby, UK: ITDG, 80pp

Coupe S. and Lewins R, 2005, *Local Planning and Institutional Reform in Bangladesh*, Rugby, UK: ITDG, 20pp

Coupe, S. and Lewins, R, 2005 *Formal and Informal Leadership in Char villages*, Rugby, UK: ITDG, 20pp

8.3 Institutional Report Series

DFID NRSP, 2005 , *Uplifting Poor 'Island' Communities: NRSP 2003-04 Research Highlights*.

8.4 Symposium, conference and workshop papers and posters

8.5 Newsletter articles

Author or Authors, Initial. Year. Title. Publisher. XXpp. (Page numbers)

8.6 Academic theses

Author or Authors, Initial. Year. Title. Publisher. XXpp. (Page numbers)

8.7 Extension leaflets, brochures, policy briefs and posters

8.8 Manuals and guidelines

ITDG-Bangladesb, *Charland Technical and Planning Manual*, (Bangla Language) 2005

8.9 Media presentations (videos, web sites, TV, radio, interviews etc)

ITDG Bangladesh “Promises to keep, Dreams to Fulfil, Miles to Go: Grassroots Planning in Bangladesh”, video, 22 minutes

8.10 Reports and data records

8.10.1 Project technical reports including project internal workshop papers and proceedings

8.10.2 Literature reviews

8.10.3 Scoping studies

8.10.4 Datasets

8.10.5 Project web site, and/or other project related web addresses

9 References cited in the report, sections 1-7

9 Project logframe

SECTION B. INSERT THE PROJECT LOGICAL FRAMEWORK HERE

R8103 Activities updated following MTR, September 2003

Narrative summary	Objectively verifiable indicators	Means of verification	Important assumptions
Goal			
NRSP-LW Output 2: Improved resource-use strategies in floodplain production systems developed and promoted	<p>By 2002, new approaches to integrated natural resource management which explicitly benefit the poor validated in two targeted areas</p> <p>By 2004, these new approaches incorporated into strategies for the management of floodplain resources, including common pool resources in one targeted country</p>	<p>Reviews by Programme Manager</p> <p>Reports of research team and collaborating/target institutions</p> <p>Appropriate dissemination products</p> <p>Local national and international statistical data</p> <p>Data collected and collated by programme manager</p>	<p>Target beneficiaries adopt and use strategies</p> <p>Enabling environment exists</p> <p>Budgets and programmes of target institutions are sufficient and well managed</p>

Purpose			
Methods for implementation of management opportunities relevant to the poor, including community participation in integrated sustainable management of terrestrial and aquatic floodplain resources, especially sandbar areas, developed and promoted by building sustainable livelihoods for the poor into consensus building approaches	<p>NGOs, development agencies and government line departments taking steps to establish pilot floodplain management projects by using at least 2 decision support tools promoting participatory consensus building approaches by 03/05</p> <p>Poor community members organising themselves to participate in implementing natural resource and common property resource management arrangements by 07/03</p> <p><u>Community based participatory monitoring tools evaluated and presented to Bangladesh stakeholders by</u></p>	<p>Project phase and final reports</p> <p>Methodological and research documentation</p> <p>Decision support package published</p> <p>Government, donor and NGO policy documents</p> <p>Donor programme evaluation reports (in particular DfID CLASP)</p> <p>Implementing agency planning documents, and</p>	<p><i>Government and NGOs disseminating policies</i></p> <p><i>National policies implemented at meso and local levels</i></p> <p>Policy agreements between landowners and government secure access rights for tenant communities</p> <p>Immediate livelihood</p>

	<p><u>community representatives by 01/04</u></p> <p>In at least one project site, changes for specific groups of the poor identified in resource access, institutional representation, production and economic returns by 02/05</p>	<p>monitoring and evaluation reports</p> <p>Community based participatory monitoring and evaluation reports</p> <p>Local NGO and ITDG field monitoring and evaluation reports</p>	<p>constraints of poor households do not prevent participation</p>
--	--	---	--

Outputs			
<p>1. Participatory Consensus Building Methodologies (CBM) developed by project R7562 understood, adapted and promoted by poor women and men and their institutions in two sandbar sites of Jamalpur district</p>	<p>1.1. Stakeholders from community to national levels summarised in stakeholder matrix by 06/02</p> <p>1.2. Stakeholder interests, influences and institutional constraints mapped by 06/02 and reviewed by 02/03</p> <p>1.3. Gender analysis of decision making priorities in planning meetings and workshops – all project phases</p> <p>1.4. Participation of at least 2 specific groups of the poor in implementing CBM strategies for Natural Resource Management (NRM) and Common Property Resource (CPR) management by 12/02</p> <p>1.5. Adaptations to R7562 CBM models including justification agreed by secondary stakeholders by 12/03</p> <p>1.6. Evidence of implementation of revised CBM models by secondary stakeholders by 12/04</p>	<p>Stakeholder matrix produced and reviewed</p> <p>Inception report</p> <p>Phase 1 (inception) and phase 2 planning workshop reports</p> <p>CBM action plan</p> <p>CBM institutional planning documents</p> <p>CBM institutional progress reviews</p> <p>Participatory NRM – CPR management monitoring and evaluation framework</p> <p>Monitoring and evaluation reports from Jamalpur</p>	<p>Stable law and order in sandbars</p> <p>Limited out-migration of poor from sandbars</p> <p>Government, private sector and NGOs interested in operationalising in sandbar areas</p> <p>Donor financial allocations to sandbar development programmes</p> <p>Suitable training and dissemination institutions available</p> <p>Support from local Members of Parliament</p>
<p>2. Up to 6 (six) technical solutions to constraints in integrated NRM and CPR management identified by local consensus building in sandbar areas prioritised, tested, adapted and promoted by community members</p>	<p>2.1. Community prioritisation of constraints and solutions by 11/02</p> <p>2.2. Participatory technology development processes established through farmer-fisher group leaders (including use of existing technical recommendations under NRSP LWI projects R7868, R6383 and R6756) by 03/03</p> <p>2.3. At least 3 rapid market appraisal reports investigating local and national market opportunities by 12/03</p> <p>2.4. Changing practices in integrated resource management; food production; value adding processes and product marketing beginning by 12/03</p> <p>2.5. Uptake of technical solutions by wider primary stakeholders by 02/04</p>	<p>Inception report</p> <p>CBM institutional planning documents</p> <p>Participatory monitoring reports</p> <p>Monitoring and evaluation reports from Jamalpur Mid term review report</p> <p>Field sample control case study</p> <p>Production sampling records</p> <p>Farmer-fishers visit reports</p> <p>Season end reports</p> <p>Published technical briefs</p> <p>Rapid market</p>	<p>Landowners and their representatives do not oppose sandbar development</p> <p>Positive policy stakeholder attitudes</p> <p><i>Interest of NGOs secured through donor allocations tied to sandbar CBMs</i></p>

	02/04 2.6 At least 250 individuals report by 12/04, livelihood betterment that they associate with the change in NRM and/or CPR management strategies	appraisal reports Comparative study report reviewing technology uptake against NRSP project reports R7868, R6383 and R6756
3. Participatory monitoring and evaluation mechanisms established and practised by community institutions, including an end of project assessment of efficacy	<u>3.1. Community indicators and monitoring tools² identified, prioritised and applied by 06/03</u> <u>3.2. In at least 1 target site, M&E records of community initiatives, new technological options, decision making, and planning and implementing CBM approaches enable detection of stakeholder activities by 12/03</u> <u>3.3. In at least 1 target site, by 09/04, participatory review of the efficiency and effectiveness of monitoring and evaluation tools determines that stakeholders see some value in sustaining their use</u>	Training Needs Assessment (TNA) report Training report including recorded evaluations of trainees' reactions M&E Protocol Visual/Pictorial format outline - community resource, access and institutional maps; venn diagrams; flow diagrams and network diagrams Staff support follow-up Record Sheets Monthly Progress Reports Success & failure case studies Participatory review report
4. Increased human and social capacity of poor to increase their representation within and gain benefits from greater influence over development planning and decision making for sandbar areas	4.1. Stakeholder analyses of NRM and CPR interests and influences developed by 06/02 and reviewed by 02/03 4.2. In each target site, local human and social-organisational strengths and weaknesses including individual training, management and leadership capacity determined by 03/03 4.3. In at least 1 target site, specific groups of the poor advise the project team of the acceptability of the management action plans by 09/03 4.4. Implementation by poor of natural resource management	Stakeholder matrix Inception report, phase 1 (inception) and phase 2 planing workshop reports Training Needs Assessment (TNA) reports and training progress reports CBM community institution action plans Participatory NRM – CPR management monitoring and evaluation framework

²For example

- Maps: to show the location and types of changes in the area being monitored.
- Venn diagrams: to show changes in relationships between groups, institutions, and individuals.
- Flow diagrams: to show direct and indirect impacts of changes, and to relate them to causes.
- **Network diagrams: to show changes in the type and degree of contact between people and services.**
- Diaries: to describe changes in the lives of individuals or groups.
- Photographs: to depict changes through a sequence of images.
- Matrix scoring: to assess people's preferences for a set of options or outcomes and how they change
- Network diagrams: to show changes in the type and degree of contact between people and services.

	action plans by 02/04	framework CBM community institution progress reviews and monitoring reports (supported by local partner NGO)	
5. Policy stakeholders use CBM decision support tools to inform and influence development planning priorities for floodplain, especially sandbar areas (Relevant stakeholders include government, DfID CLASP, other multilateral and bilateral donors, NGOs and the private sector)	5.1. Participation in planning workshops and meetings of senior policy makers and their advisors by 12/03 5.2. At least 2 decision support tools disseminated by 04/04 5.3. At least #5 local NGOs, #2 national level development projects, #2 research institutions, #2 universities and #3 government ministries participating in the wider uptake of the research product by 09/04 5.4. Evidence of technical support to sandbar communities by NGO, private and/or government sectors by 09/04 5.5. Policy dissemination package formulated in collaboration with government line departments by end project (03/05)	Pre and post project evaluations Project inception, interim and final reports Decision support publications and training Inception and phase 2 planning workshop reports Government, NGO, and donor policy and planning documents Formal documents outlining collaborations – partnerships	

Activities		
<u>Phase 1 (inception)</u>		
<u>(Feb 2002 – June 2002)</u>		
<i>Designated to output 1</i>	<i>Summary Budget:</i>	<i>Participation of target groups in Jamalpur not restricted by natural disaster or conflict problems</i>
1.1. Review secondary information on floodplain and sandbar livelihoods by 04/02,	<i>UK staff: £43,881</i>	<i>No mass out-migration from sandbars</i>
1.2. Collate existing evidence on consensus building methods for NRM, in particular those generated by R7562 by 04/02	<i>Bangladesh staff: £63,402</i>	<i>Participation of government representatives not disrupted by national or meso political processes</i>
1.3. Meet R7562 UK and Bangladesh partners for briefs on implementing CBM, trouble shooting, and establish training plan by 04/03	<i>Overheads: £16,093</i>	<i>Participation of local and sub-national government agents, and both primary and secondary stakeholders not disrupted by assertion of landowner agents</i>
1.4. Conduct inception phase planning workshop by 04/02 for all project partners to	<i>Capital equipment: £7,400</i>	<i>Stable law and order in sandbars</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review R7562 with its partners • Review technical background to NRM • Review current institutional frameworks and constraints • Review methodological issues and approaches • Clarify project aims, approach and timeframe • Allocate tasks • Identify capacity gaps among partners 	<i>Overseas travel: £19,340</i>	
1.5. Finalise the field version of the CBM for testing and training of field staff by 05/02	<i>Miscellaneous: £34,650</i>	
1.6. Disseminate CBM to field staff and begin training and implementation by 06/02	Total: £184,766	
1.7. Develop draft field, meso and national stakeholder matrices including interests and influences by 06/02	<i>2001/2: £19,729</i>	
	<i>2001/2: £42,223</i>	
	<i>2003/4: £59,629</i>	
	<i>2004/5: £63,185</i>	
	Milestones:	
	Inception workshop held 03/02	
	Internal dissemination of CBM and capacity raising to field staff and local partners	

<p>matrices including interests and influences by 06/02, finalise national stakeholder matrix by 09/03</p> <p>1.8. Assess gender and wealth differences in resources access, management and development priorities by 06/02</p> <p>1.9. Cross-reference primary and secondary information on livelihoods, institutions and technical constraints for inception phase report by 06/02</p> <p><i>Designated to output 2</i></p> <p>2.1. Review secondary information on floodplain resource management and production systems by 04/02</p> <p>2.2. Conduct participatory field assessments of production priorities and constraints/technical need assessment , poverty and gender dimension of technical interventions by 05/02</p> <p>2.3. Collate technical information on integrated resource management, crop and livestock production, agriculture, forestry, fisheries, common property resource access and use, sandbar stabilisation, value adding agri-food processing, marketing small business development and disaster preparedness planning by 05/02</p> <p>2.4. Assess primary information/ market integration and market opportunity perceptions of primary stakeholders by 05/02</p> <p><i>Designated to output 3</i></p> <p>3.1. Context assessments of poverty disaggregation within sandbar areas as part of participatory appraisals of target communities by 06/02</p> <p>See also activities 1.7-1.9.</p> <p><i>Designated to output 4</i></p> <p>4.1. Identify and select local stakeholder partners (at least 2 local NGOs, 4 line department, 2 administrative, and 7 private service providers) by 03/02</p> <p>4.2. Initiate field level stakeholder workshops and meetings by 04/02</p> <p>4.3. Conduct gender disaggregated primary stakeholder assessments of local institutional capacities and representation in natural resource access and use, conflict resolution and disaster preparedness planning by 05/02</p> <p>4.4. Assess horizontal and vertical institutional linkages operating to support CBM, conflict resolution and technical and development support between grassroots organisations, line departments, NGOs, landowners and private sector service providers by 05/02</p> <p><i>Designated to output 5</i></p> <p>5.1. Identify and select local and national stakeholder partners (at least 2 local NGOs, 4 line department, 2 administrative, and 7 private service providers) by 03/02</p> <p>5.2. Assess horizontal and vertical institutional linkages operating to support CBM, conflict resolution and technical and development support between grassroots organisations, line departments, NGOs, landowners and private sector service providers by 05/02</p> <p>5.3. Disseminate CBM institutional and technical information to DfID CLASP highlighting gaps and development constraints by 06/02</p>	<p>by 06/02</p> <p>Draft stakeholder matrices developed by 06/02, finalised by 09/03</p> <p>Primary stakeholder meetings begin 04/02</p> <p>Technical issues report by 06/02 Technical need assessment report finalised by 09/03</p> <p>Local partners finalised 04/02</p> <p>Inception report including scoping studies of Jamalpur sandbar livelihoods, the CBM model and the stakeholder matrix published 07/02</p>	<p>order in sandbars</p> <p>Government, private sector and NGOs interested in operationalising in sandbar areas</p> <p>Suitable training and dissemination institutions available</p> <p>Positive policy stakeholder attitudes</p> <p>Support from local Members of Parliament</p>
---	--	--

Activities continued		
<p><u>Phase –2 (adaptive research)</u></p> <p><u>(July 2002 – February 2004):</u></p> <p><i>Designated to output 1</i></p> <p>1.10. Disseminate research plan by 08/02</p> <p>1.11. Hold Phase 2 planning workshop by 09/02. Please see ITDG MTR response document for discussion of this.</p> <p>1.12. Implement experimental CBM models for aquatic and terrestrial sandbar resources in two sites, wherever possible building on established institutions by 10/02, facilitate micro-PAPD on technical, disaster and market issues, documented by 11/03</p> <p>1.13 Two further macro-PAPD processes in two sites by 03/04</p> <p>1.14 Summarise and review adaptations of R7562 CBM models by 01/04</p> <p>1.15 Phase 2 review workshop held by 02/04</p> <p><i>Designated to output 2</i></p> <p>2.5. Develop crop, livestock and fisheries, and pre- and post-harvest technical interventions with farmer and fisher leaders and technological support agencies by 03/03</p> <p>2.6. Monitor uptake and use of technologies, and participation in CBM institutions according to livelihoods strategies of gender and wealth groups by 06/03</p> <p>2.7. Conduct up to 3 rapid market appraisals of local and national product opportunities for sandbar small businesses in product marketing by 12/03</p> <p><i>Designated to output 3</i></p> <p>3.2. Develop participatory development indicators for monitoring NRM and CPR management and impacts by 06/03 and finalise by 11/03</p> <p>3.3. Develop participatory indicators for monitoring changing institutional capacity, representation and linkages to service providers and agencies by 09/03</p> <p><i>Designated to output 4</i></p> <p>4.5. Develop community level natural resource management action plans from experimental PAPD sessions by 01/03 including support (through local partners) to community implementation by 04/03</p> <p>4.6. Develop NRM and CPR institutional transformation plans including training, representation and resource arrangements <u>by 09/03</u></p> <p><i>Designated to output 5</i></p> <p>5.4. Formulate revised matrix of primary and secondary stakeholder interests, <u>policy</u> linkages, participation and influence, including a review of institutional policies, policy recommendations, internal and external policy dissemination processes, implementing resources, capacities and inter-agency linkages of government, administrative, NGO, and donor priorities by 09/03</p>	<p>Milestones:</p> <p>Research plan disseminated to related NGOs/experts/projects . By 09/03</p> <p>Phase 2 planning report by 11/03</p> <p>First revised draft sandbar PAPD model disseminated to reviewers by 10 /03</p> <p>Phase 2 report published 02/04</p> <p>Technology testing begins 08/02</p> <p>Post-production processing and marketing options published by 12/03</p> <p>Comparative technologies study report published 11/04</p> <p>Rapid Market Appraisal reports published 01/04</p> <p>Participatory monitoring review report published 12/03</p> <p>Community monitoring modules disseminated 12/03</p> <p>Community and CBM monitoring approach implemented beginning 06/03</p> <p>Community natural resource management action plans from final round PAPD finalised and commercial buyers interest documented by 10/03</p> <p>Community management action plans implemented by 06/03</p> <p>Policy issues report disseminated(uptake by donors & NGOs, evidence to secure government policy change) 11/03</p> <p>Revised communication strategy document by 10/03</p> <p>First draft decision support tools disseminated to reviewers 10/03</p>	

<p>Specific policy review on Khash land, jalmahal, credit, legal aspects of people's organisation, gram sharker/village government body and agriservices to chars by 07/03</p> <p>5.5. Identify and review primary policy constraints such as lease rules, regulations, legal frameworks and the role of local administration and line ministries 09/03</p> <p>5.6. Develop a decision-support tool bringing together livelihoods approaches, field assessment methodologies, CBM models, institutional capacity building and policy appraisal elements to help policy makers focus on key constraints in management of natural capital in sandbar areas by 02/04</p>	<p>Revised policy decision support tools disseminated by 02/04</p>	
<p><u>Phase –3 (dissemination)</u></p> <p><u>March 2004 – April 2005)</u></p> <p><i>Designated to output 1</i></p> <p>1.15. Hold national workshop to review phase –2, bring on-board senior government officials, identify training agencies and disseminate recommendations by 04/04</p> <p>1.16. Hold final workshop and project completion report linking to hand-over of different project outputs to the responsibility of government line departments by 03/05</p> <p><i>Designated to output 2</i></p> <p>2.8. Technical briefs for Char resource management finalised and distributed by 04/04</p> <p>2.9. Dissemination of technical approaches to local NGO, line department and private sector service providers by 05/04</p> <p>2.10. Demand driven approach to technical transformation established through improving market linkages among farmer-fisher leaders by 05/04</p> <p>2.11. Char community farmer-farmer and fisher-fisher demonstration and extension approach developed and documented by 06/04</p> <p>2.12. Pilot farmer-fisher field schools established through farmer-fisher organisations and group leaders and supported by local NGO, line department and/or private sector service providers by 06/04</p> <p>2.13. Final technical report including recommendations on technical support services by 03/05</p> <p>See also relevant Phase 3 activities under outputs 1, 4 and 5</p> <p><i>Designated to output 3</i></p> <p>3.4. Comprehensive review of participatory monitoring and evaluation (PME) systems by 05/04</p> <p>3.5. Production of PME training modules by 06/04</p> <p>3.6. Training of a minimum 3 local NGOs and 2 line departments operational in sandbar areas in participatory monitoring approach including technical and capacity support, representation in development planning, and leadership and management capacity by 09/04</p> <p>See also relevant Phase 3 activities under outputs 1, 3 and 5</p>	<p>Milestones:</p> <p>Phase 3 planning workshop 03/04</p> <p>Mainstreaming consensus-building for sandbar CPR management 06/04 01/05</p> <p>Final workshop 02/05</p> <p>Video and technical bulletins published and disseminated 08/04</p> <p>Final Technical Report 03/05</p> <p>Dissemination of participatory review report and monitoring modules by 06/04</p>	

<p><i>Designated to output 4</i></p> <p>4.7. Support to wider scaling-up of institutional capacity raising by local NGO and line department partners by 06/04 including technical and institutional backstopping to local NGO and line departments and how they support community implementation of natural resource management action plans</p> <p>See also activities under outputs 1 and 5</p> <p><i>Designated to output 5</i></p> <p>5.7. Discuss and finalise MOUs with local and international partners (2-3 government line departments, 3-5 local NGOs, and 2 international partners for formal dissemination of findings)</p> <p>5.8. Prepare training and other communication modules in participation with DfID CLASP including</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • # One training module in NRM institutional development;/ adapted PAPD/CB for char areas • #2 modules in applying livelihoods analyses and methodological tools in informing CBM policy (monitoring and policy influence module) • #01 modules on technical aspects of integrated natural resource management and food production in char areas; • #2 modules in agri-food processing and small enterprise development <p>Each module to be supported by communication materials and technical briefs in Bangla & English</p> <p>5.9. Mainstream CBM model approaches, NRM and CPR management action planning and technological findings through training courses with #5 training courses held for target government and NGO staff and their beneficiaries</p>	<p>MOUs finalised with government and NGO partners 05/04</p> <p>Training modules produced by 06/04</p>	
	Pre-conditions	<p>Political stability</p> <p>Government interest</p> <p>No catastrophic floods</p> <p>Logistic access to Jamalpur sandbars maintained</p>

11 Key Words

Community, Planning, Consensus Building.