

THE PAK-GERMAN SELF-HELP PROJECT

The Pak-German Self-Help Project was started in 1983, following an agreement between the Federal Republic of Germany and the Islamic Republic of Pakistan in August 1982. This Project is today a leader in the field of rural development in Baluchistan. The Project is striving to induce changes and bring improvement in the socioeconomic conditions of people in the project area. The total project allocation (up to 1990) is around Rs 93 million, of which DM 7.67 million (Rs 61.65 million) is development assistance from the Federal Republic of Germany. The local component of Rs 31.25 million comes from annual development plans. The total expenditure incurred by the Project, by the end of March 1989, was a little over Rs 44 million and the balance with the Project is Rs 48.85 million.

The basic objective of the Project is improvement in the socioeconomic conditions of the rural poor by inculcating the spirit of self-help and by supporting self-help groups at the village level. Within a conceptual framework of self-help, the Project experimented with different approaches in implementation. It has periodically reviewed its policy and this has led to changes in its approach and methodology of implementation.

The Orientation Phase

In 1982, a grant of DM six million from the Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation of the Federal Republic of Germany was provided to finance small-scale development schemes for self-help groups in the rural areas of Baluchistan. It supported schemes requiring financial support in the range of DM 2,500 and DM 50,000. Schemes designed to meet the basic needs of food, potable water, clothing, housing, health, and education were accorded high priority. The self-help groups were required to contribute at least 20 per cent of the cost themselves and financial assistance was channelled through the Local Government Department (LGD). The LGD was entrusted with the responsibility of assisting self-help groups by providing them with the relevant information and helping them to apply for assistance. The German Agency for Technical Cooperation (GTZ) was made responsible for authorising the implementation of schemes and disbursement of financial assistance.

The initial procedure was complicated and had many procedural bottlenecks. It was decided that the LGD would invite applications from the self-help groups, scrutinise these applications, and forward them with comments to the Economic Affairs Division, of the Ministry of Finance and Economic Affairs of the Government of Pakistan, for onward transmission to the Embassy of the Federal Republic of Germany in Islamabad. The Embassy would examine these applications to check if the required information had been provided and forward them to the Federal Ministry of Economic Cooperation. Finally, the GTZ would decide which schemes to implement and disburse financial assistance accordingly (GTZ n.d.). Not only was the procedure very lengthy, it was also impractical.

An advertisement was given that invited applications from self-help groups with a view to financing small scale development schemes in rural Baluchistan on the basis of 20 per cent of the investment being met from the group's own resources. The priority areas listed in the advertisement were bio-gas plants, agricultural equipment and machinery, erosion control,

establishment of schools, and building teachers' residences. Several thousand applications were received and scrutinising them became an arduous task.

The self-help groups, designated as recipients of the aid, had never existed as institutions. However, it was not difficult for influential people to form such groups in order to obtain assistance for their schemes. Unfortunately, influential rural people are not interested in school buildings and teachers' residences. As a result of the dilemma caused by this overwhelming response, the Federal Ministry of Economic Cooperation in Bonn sent a GTZ team, in 1983, to investigate and propose alternative methods of establishing the Project.

The GTZ team, which included the former Project Coordinator, conducted a feasibility study for a full-fledged rural development project in Baluchistan. The team held consultations with representatives of various government agencies and travelled extensively to different parts of the province. After long deliberations on the difficulties involved, it was decided to introduce the rural development programme initially into a limited number of areas. The GTZ team proposed cooperation with the LGD which had field staff, logistics, and knowledge of local conditions. Six union councils viz., Jalal Khan and Mashkaf in Kachhi District, Sharigh in Sibi District, Nisai in Qilla Saifullah District, and Nichara and Dasht in Kalat District, were selected for this purpose.

A union council is the smallest administrative unit in rural areas. It covers an area with a population ranging from 10 to 15 thousand. The local government system allows one councillor each for a population of 1,000 on the basis of universal adult suffrage. Many villages are grouped together to form a union council, and they may also be combined to form an election ward for one councillor. The union council also has representatives of special interest groups, such as peasants, workers, and women, who are indirectly elected by the councillors. The average number of councillors in a union council is 15.

The union council is responsible for planning, supervision, and execution of development activities carried out in its constituent villages. Most union councils have their own financial resources, however small, realised from taxes levied on transportation of goods and from the registration of births and marriages. Union councils also receive a regular government grant of approximately Rs 50,000 per annum and some of their projects are financed by the Government through the District Council. The union councils work under the administration of the LGD which is the executing agency for different development schemes.

Since the Project wanted to establish self-help groups, to decide upon local needs and submit applications for common benefit schemes, it provided LGD field staff with transport and other facilities. Hence, the Development Officer (DO) of the LGD was entrusted with the responsibility of organising self-help groups and of assisting them to apply for development schemes. The LGD, which has been the main agency for rural development programmes in the country, based on its past experience, appointed project committees instead of self-help groups. These project committees consisted of influential people from the villages, who claimed to be representatives of the people and were able to demonstrate their support, and the DO submitted applications for schemes put forward by them.

The Project, on the other hand, only had a limited number of staff, although their visits to the villages provided a forum for discussion of village problems with the project committees. At these meetings, project staff were unable to ascertain whether the schemes were wanted by the majority of villagers and whether benefits would go to a substantial section of the community or not. Nevertheless, these schemes were approved by the Project Coordinator and materials, equipment, and finances were disbursed to the DO who was responsible for their implementation.

It should be noted, however, that the villagers were not organised properly and the schemes were not properly scrutinised to ascertain their feasibility, need, demand, and benefit to the community.

In the absence of these formalities, decisions about schemes were taken quickly by the Project Coordinator. In 1984 and 1985, 293 schemes were sanctioned and some of them ran into trouble because of lack of proper supervision; about 50 schemes remained incomplete until the end of 1986. These schemes included supply of drinking water, development and improvement of irrigation facilities, construction of village protection dams, land levelling, and construction of schools and teachers' residences (See Table 3). Total expenditure on these schemes, over a two year period, was Rs 24 million. During the two year Orientation Phase, the Project brought about some improvements in the socioeconomic conditions in the project area, although it had failed to organise villagers into broad-based community organisations.

In the autumn of 1985, an evaluation team from the head office of GTZ visited the Project. After examining the project strategy and implementation procedure, the evaluation team was very critical. It identified several areas where progress had not been made and suggested methods

Table 3: Schemes Under Different Project Phases

Type of Scheme	Orientation Phase	First and Second Phase	Total	Per Cent
Drinking Water Supply	229	64	293	60
Irrigation	13	0	1	3
Communication	7	22	29	6
Flood Relief/Protection	31	25	56	11
Health and Sanitation	2	2	4	1
Erosion Control	-	4	4	1
Education/School Buildings	27	24	51	10
Women's Programmes	27	-	27	6
Miscellaneous	4	4	8	2
Total	340	145	485	100

of improvement. The evaluation report mentioned some of the conventional shortcomings of rural development programmes in the Project. Some of these, and their remedies, are given below:

1. The Project had failed to organise broad-based self-help groups and had relied on village councils or project committees which were no more than associations of 'local influentials'. It was suggested that formal, broad-based Village Organisations should be formed and enabled to establish self-help or common savings' funds.
2. The staff was too small to supervise the large number of schemes sanctioned.
3. The procedures for scheme approval and fund disbursement were unsatisfactory.
4. The Project lacked an institutional structure which would sustain it after the termination of German economic assistance.

The evaluation team recommended that a self-help unit be created within the LGD, in order to integrate project activities into the LGD so that they could be eventually handed over to the local authorities.

The First Implementation Phase

The evaluation report was submitted in late 1985, and, following this, the GTZ organised a Project Planning Workshop in Quetta to prepare a coherent strategy and a well defined work plan for implementation of the Project. A team of rural development specialists, from the Federal Republic of Germany, was invited to attend the workshop, as well as representatives of different government agencies and the project staff. In this workshop, a Project Planning Matrix was prepared using the ZOPP (*Ziel Orientierte Project Planung* or Goal/Target Oriented Project Planning) methodology. They recognised that the Orientation Phase served the purpose of familiarisation with the political environment, socioeconomic conditions, administrative structure, and constraints; as well as acquisition of first hand knowledge of the basic needs of the rural poor. Thus, the Orientation Phase was to provide a firm foundation for the development of the First Implementation Phase which took place between 1986 and 1988.

In the first implementation phase, the Project's goal, "*improvement in the socioeconomic conditions of the rural poor*" was rephrased as "*improvement in the socioeconomic conditions of the rural poor through better utilisation of local resources*". The Project pursued specific goals for which objectively verifiable indicators were worked out. In view of the evaluation report and workshop recommendations, the following changes were introduced at the beginning of the First Implementation Phase:

1. The concept of the VO was introduced to impart the self-help philosophy through popular participation and institution building.
2. The project management base was broadened through the participation of the LGD.
3. Previously, the Project Coordinator alone was responsible for decision making and fund disbursement. In this phase, the LGD became an equal partner in management, implementation, and financing of the Project.
4. A Self-Help Unit was created in the Project.

The Project is now under the overall supervision of the Chief Secretary, Additional Chief Secretary (Planning and Development), and the Secretary of LGD, Government of Baluchistan, to whom the project management is responsible. The project management, in the initial stages of the First Implementation Phase, consisted of the Project Coordinator and the Director of the LGD, Government of Baluchistan.

The Director of the LGD, because of his other engagements and the physical separation of his office from the Project Office, could not fulfill all his responsibilities. In view of these difficulties, the Director deputed one of his Assistant Directors to be a Liaison Officer in the Project Office. The Director of LGD who made these arrangements was transferred in 1987. The new incumbent delegated his powers to the Liaison Officer and redesignated him Project Manager. Theoretically, the Director of the LGD and the Project Coordinator constitute the management of the Project. The redesignation of the Liaison Officer as the Project Manager, with enhanced jurisdiction, has made the project management lopsided. The Project Manager, who officiates on behalf of the Director of the LGD has become the *de facto* counterpart of the Project Coordinator.

Formation of Village Organisation

The concept of the Village Organisation (VO), developed at Comilla and Daudzai, and at present implemented with considerable success by the Aga Khan Rural Support Programme in the Northern Areas of Pakistan, is a major breakthrough in rural development strategy. The Project decided to apply this concept of the VO in Baluchistan. The Training Section of the Project, and the development officers (DO) of the LGD, were deputed to disseminate the concept of the VO in the project area. Villagers were trained in organisational matters and encouraged to organise broad-based VOs in their respective villages.

In the autumn of 1986, the Project organised a grand convention of VO leaders, prospective VO leaders, and other villagers to explain the concept of the VO in the strategy of self-help for rural development. In most villages, VOs were formed in August-September of 1986. An ideal VO is required to meet the following conditions:

- o participation of a sizeable majority of the villagers,
- o elected leadership,
- o establishment of a joint savings' fund,
- o regular contributions to the savings' fund (monthly amount to be determined by the VO),
- o regular monthly meetings to discuss problems, identify felt needs, and fix priorities,
- o development of plans for solving their problems,
- o submission of the proceedings of meetings to the Project,
- o forwarding of schemes to the Project for approval,
- o implementation of schemes, and
- o nomination of local inhabitants for training in different fields to facilitate village self-reliance.

Some constraints were observed in the formation of VOs. This is because some villages are dominated by powerful landlords who often assume leadership of the VOs. Dependence on these landlords prevents villagers from challenging their leadership. In some communities there are sharp class differences and these villages do not succeed in eliciting popular participation in the VO, and the absence of consensus restricts the ability of the VO to get schemes sanctioned by the Project. Communities composed of small landowners, who are relatively prosperous due to perennial irrigation and cash crop cultivation, have not responded to the Project's organisational approach or to the development initiative. These communities are marred by factionalism and have made their VOs arenas for internecine political struggles. Conflict, rather than consensus, is the predominant social process in such communities. On the other hand, communities with a vast majority of tenant-cum-small landholders are more responsive, enterprising, and eager to extend cooperation. In such communities the organisational potential is utilised, and, consequently, they benefit from the project. They have not only achieved consensus in decision-making but fully participate in scheme implementation. In many villages it is difficult to find literate persons and the VOs depend on the LGD field staff to record the minutes of their meetings and report to the Project. This presents problems because the implementing agency -- the LGD field staff -- has its own style of work and priorities that are distinct from those of the Project and the VO, and it has not successfully internalised the self-help philosophy.

Rural development projects in different countries have been criticised for their inability "*to mobilise the savings potential of peasantry*" (Griffin and Khan 1982,242). It should be noted that one of the important aspects of the rural development strategy followed by the Project is the development of the savings' potential of villagers. The VO is required to establish and maintain a joint savings' fund with regular contributions from all members. The monthly contribution is determined by the VO members and their savings are deposited in the bank by the DO. In the First Implementation Phase, the Project sanctioned a large number of schemes for physical infrastructure to help the VOs in capital formation. Labour for these schemes was provided by VO members and they were paid daily wages, according to the prevailing market rate in different areas, and were required to deposit 25 per cent of the wages so earned in the VO savings' account. These schemes not only provided the means for capital formation at the village level, but they also inculcated the habit of saving among the villagers.

Implementation of Schemes

The Project adopted a logical and efficient strategy for the approval of development schemes. Theoretically, the scheme is planned by the VO and submitted to the union council DO who forwards it to the Project Office. In practice, the VO reports to the DO who prepares the application for the scheme on the prescribed proforma. The field staff of the LGD check the scheme's feasibility and prepare estimates for its implementation. The application, duly signed by all VO members and accompanied by a report on the regularity of savings and meetings of the VO, is then sent to the Project Office. In the Project Office, the application is examined to check that the information is complete and in order. The Monitoring and Evaluation Unit reports on the operational status of the VO and its activities. Then, the application is sent to the Technical Section to check the scheme's feasibility. After this scrutiny, the application is submitted to the Project Manager of the LGD and the Project Coordinator for approval.

The Project considers all schemes submitted by the VOs and approves them if they are found appropriate for meeting basic needs or laying the foundation for improved socioeconomic conditions in the village as a whole. The Project is demand-oriented, has no fixed yearly budget for the implementation of development schemes, and it considers and implements all schemes designed to meet the felt needs of villagers (see Table 3 above). The DO is informed of approval and the first advance for implementing the scheme is disbursed by the Project. The Project requires that local materials be used where available, as well as local labour. In all schemes, use of draught animals is preferred over mechanical means.

The Project intervenes through the VO and provides services in developing physical infrastructure, agriculture, livestock, health, education, improvements in sanitation, women's programmes (particularly income generating activities), rural finance, and introduction of appropriate technology. Programme components have only been provided in an integrated manner in some villages, however, and this is mainly due to political problems and sociocultural constraints. The agriculture and livestock section has organised a few activities only for union councils in Kachhi and Quetta district due to the shortage of personnel (see Table 3) and the Women's Section concentrates its efforts in five union councils only. Kenwari, Baghao, and Panjpai union councils have not received the same attention and assistance as other union councils in the project area. Theoretically, however, the programme components are coherent and will be extremely beneficial if implemented in an integrated manner throughout the project area.

Under the First Implementation Phase, the Project was extended to nine union councils with a total number of 450 villages. However, these union councils were not contiguous and were spread throughout four different districts. By the end of 1988, 181 VOs had been organised in 179 villages. The total number of VO members was 4,380 and their total savings amounted to Rs 1.65 million; the maximum individual saving being Rs 78,000. A total of 127 schemes, with an estimated expenditure of Rs 18.2 million, were approved by the Project, of which 38 were completed and 89 were in different stages of implementation.

The Second Implementation Phase

The experience gathered and problems encountered, during the two years of the First Implementation Phase, necessitated a review of the procedures and policies, in order to provide a firm foundation for the continuity of the Project. Based on the evaluations and expertise of an external consultant, major policy and administration changes were introduced from the latter half of 1988, and these may be regarded as the Second Implementation Phase of the Project.

One of the unsettled questions is the interaction between LGD and the GTZ. No set pattern has emerged and different options are being considered. In the First Implementation Phase, project activities increased in different directions, and this required decentralisation of the Project Office which was the basis for a new administrative structure.

New Management Structure¹

The Project has established five different sections and two units. They are the Training Section, Social Development Section, Women's Section, Agriculture and Livestock Section, Technical Section, Administrative Unit, and Monitoring and Evaluation Unit. This structure was developed according to the Project Planning Matrix and takes into account the division of labour. The record of the past several months indicates that project implementation is increasingly efficient. Each of these specialised sections is responsible for specific programme components and their activities are coordinated by the respective section heads. All section heads meet regularly every week to review the previous week's progress and to plan for the following week. These meetings serve to coordinate the different programmes, because the minutes are circulated to all project sections.

-
1. The management structure here represents the situation in April 1989 and does not reflect the recent changes whereby the LGD project staff are under the Director of LGD, who has been designated as the Project Director (PD). This also implies changes in the status and title of the Project Manager (PM) as given in this description.

The project staff is bifurcated into two categories: one employed by GTZ and the other employed by the LGD of the Government of Baluchistan. All sections and units employ staff from both the GTZ and the LGD apart from the Training, Agriculture and Livestock, and Social Development Sections. The GTZ staff consists of expatriate senior professionals and their local employees who make up the junior level staff for the most part (one Pakistani is a senior professional). The LGD staff have a Manager who is a district level official of the Provincial Government. All appointments to the LGD Self-help Unit are junior in terms of responsibility and emoluments. In terms of salaries and perquisites, the GTZ professionals and one Pakistani are at the apex, the second layer is filled by local employees of GTZ, and the third tier is occupied by Self-help Unit employees of the LGD. The total strength of GTZ and LGD staff in the Project is given in Table 4.

The GTZ junior staff members draw larger salaries than the LGD employees, and there are a number of differences in terms of employment, tenure, salary, and perquisites which do not make for easy coordination. On the other hand, GTZ employees lack security of tenure, while the latter are permanent employees of the Government of Baluchistan. In July 1988, GTZ introduced a new and uniform rate of daily allowances for field visits for all employees of the Project and this has helped equalise the situation to some extent.

Table 4: Project Staffing

Sections	No. of Staff		
	GTZ	LGD	TOTAL
Management	1	1	2
Monitoring & Evaluation	1	3	4
Administration	20	16	36
Training	2	0	2
Engineering	5	3	8
Agriculture & Livestock	3	0	3
Women's Section	6	3	9
Social Development	4	0	4
Total	42	26	68

Assistant Directors and gave him the designation of Project Manager (PM), who is the counterpart of the Deputy Project Coordinator.

However, the PC and PM are not congruent positions in any respect. The two are neither theoretically counterparts nor do the two appointments correspond. There are substantial differences in terms of salary, perquisites, authority, and the sphere of influence between the PC and the PM. The PC is responsible to GTZ headquarters in the Federal Republic of Germany, while the PM is responsible to the Director of the LGD, Government of Baluchistan. The PC deals with, and exercises influence over, the seniormost officials of the Province: the Chief Secretary, the Additional Chief Secretary (P & D), and the Secretary, LGD, while the PM is a subordinate of the Director of the LGD who is a subordinate of the Secretary of the LGD. The position of the PM in the Self-help Unit is not a permanent appointment and any district level official of the LGD can be assigned to the post (the present PM is the third incumbent since July 1986). Past attempts on the part of the PMs to obtain some control over decision making and over financial resources have tended to cause problems within the Project between the GTZ staff and the LGD field staff.

There is a discrepancy in working hours between LGD and GTZ employees in the same office. LGD employees work six days a week, from 8 am to 2 pm, while GTZ employees work five days a week, from 8 am to 3 pm². LGD project staff are under the PM and the Director of LGD, not under the jurisdiction of the PC and this restricts the PC's authority to supervise their work. This obviously creates divisions between the LGD and the GTZ staff even though loyalty to the organisation is invoked when the situation so demands³.

Programme Emphases

Training: In the Second Implementation Phase (since mid 1988), the Project has laid emphasis on training villagers in different fields rather than on establishing a physical infrastructure. The villagers are nominated for training in different trades and skills, by their VOs. The largest training programme is in health education; it is run by the Women's Section, and provides training for Community Health Workers (CHW) and *dais*. Next are the training programmes run by the Agriculture and Livestock Section. These schemes not only enhance individual skills but are a good measure of the response to non-financial incentives. Participation in these schemes also indicates the degree of cooperation with the Project, over the long term, as well as the extent to which the self-help philosophy has been internalised (See Table 5).

Women's Programme: The women's programme operates in four out of nine union councils in the project area. It has not been extended to the other five because of political problems and sociocultural constraints on the participation of women. The Women's Section concentrates its programmes in health education on the training of *dais* (traditional birth attendants), information about nutrition and hygiene, and training community health workers in knowledge about waste disposal and matters related to general cleanliness and sanitation. Another important activity is in income generating schemes for women whereby village women are encouraged to raise poultry (for which the Project assists them in acquiring better breeds and in providing vaccines for chickens). The development of a traditional skill (embroidery) has become a means

2. These hours have changed, as of 1990, to 9 a.m to 2 p.m, for LGD employees, and 8 a.m. to 4 p.m., for GTZ employees.
3. Since 1990 there have been some organisational changes instituted to bring about a closer working relationship between the GTZ and the LGD.

Table 5: Training Schemes^a

Nature of Training	Number	Per Cent
Workshops & Conventions	47	23.5
Organisational Matters	83	41.5
Agriculture	8	4.0
Livestock	15	7.5
Technical Training	25	12.5
Health Training	21	10.5
Total	199	100.0^b

Note:

- a. These schemes were implemented between January 1984 and December 1988.
- b. Total may not add up exactly to 100 because of rounding errors.

Source : Monthly Monitoring Report, December 1988.

of realising a regular source of income by marketing the products. The improvement of resource use, environment, and health is facilitated by the construction of fuel-saving cooking stoves which are both fuel efficient and less polluting.

Loan Scheme: The Project also started an internal lending scheme -- lending to the VO members according to their own savings -- as a test case in two villages. This programme has been a tremendous success and the recovery rate was 100 per cent within the scheduled deadline. In 1989, the Project agreed to finance loans equal to 200 per cent of the VO savings in these two villages. For this, criteria have been developed for grading the VOs whereby the number of plus points on a given scale determines eligibility for loans.

The VOs benefiting from "internal lending" have had a unique opportunity for experience in financial management. These VOs were able to recover 100 per cent loans with interest from their members, and the loans helped villagers to purchase seeds for the 1988 sorghum crop. Although the loans have not as yet succeeded in freeing villagers from resorting to money-lenders, who charge an exorbitant rate of interest, it has nevertheless reduced dependence on the traditional financial market to a large extent. Lending will increase by 100 per cent during 1989, and it is expected that, if the present recovery rate continues throughout 1990, the necessity of

traditional financial market to a large extent. Lending will increase by 100 per cent during 1989, and it is expected that, if the present recovery rate continues throughout 1990, the necessity of resorting to money-lenders will disappear completely. A recovery rate of 100 per cent, in early 1989, is clearly an indicator of the ability of the sponsored institutional structure to manage its financial affairs. The current state of savings is in Table 6 and 7. Project-sponsored institution-building on the other hand met with different attitudes and expectations in different areas, resulting in a variable degree of success. The factors contributing to this will be discussed in detail in the conclusions.

Monitoring: The DO is responsible for preparing the monthly progress reports for each VO in the union council, and these should include information on the regularity of savings, meetings, and a brief summary of the scheme or assistance demanded. The progress report is sent to the Monitoring and Evaluation Unit which is responsible for the maintenance of records for each individual village in the union council. Information and feedback linkages between the LGD field staff and the Project are maintained by monthly review meetings at the office in Quetta. The first session of the review meeting is attended by the DO and the Self-help Unit of the LGD and the second session is attended by the DOs and the GTZ section heads at the Project Office.

Table 6: Village Organisations (VOs) and Savings

Union Council	No. of Villages	No. of VOs	No. of Members	Total Savings (Rupees)
Sharigh	20	11	240	52,853
Jalal Khan	76	24	835	4,54,922
Mashkaf	37	13	321	1,59,743
Nachara	35	40	956	4,49,987
Dasht	97	21	358	1,49,456
Nisai	44	17	437	1,82,805
Kinwari	53	18	597	2,53,017
Baghao	111	28	369	85,922
Panjpai	16	9	328	76,387
Total	489	181	4483	1,865,092

Source: Monthly Project Report, March 1989.

Table 7: Savings of Village Organisations^a

Savings in Rupees	No. of VOs	Per Cent of VOs Represented
Less than 10,000	123	68
10,000 - 20,000	28	15
20,000 - 30,000	20	11
30,000 - 40,000	7	4
40,000 - 50,000	0	0
50,000 - 60,000	2	1
60,000 - 70,000	0	0
70,000 - 80,000	1	1
Total	181	100

Note:

- a. These savings correspond to the records as of the end of March 1989.

Source : Monthly Project Report, March 1989.

The Project has also established inter-disciplinary teams (ID teams) to monitor the functioning of the VOs, the implementation of schemes in the villages, and, more importantly, to monitor and support the institution building efforts of the Project. Each ID team has members from different sections of the Project, section heads are team advisors, and the DO of the concerned union council is the ex-officio team leader. Each section head is the advisor to one ID team and in this capacity is responsible for one or more specific union councils. The teams visit villages, collect information about the VOs, examine the schemes under completion, and submit reports. Problems arose because some of the early reports did not always agree with reports submitted by the DOs and the former Project Manager and some of the DOs. However, in the course of a few months, the ID teams justified their existence and the efficiency of programme implementation improved. The ID teams also motivated the languid and stagnant VOs by reiterating the project's objectives, approach, and rules of cooperation and this strengthened the community organisations.

Like other aspects of the Project, the monitoring system has undergone changes after periodic reviews and has consequently become an exemplary system for other projects as well. Until the First Implementation Phase, the monitoring system was based on implementation of development schemes. All the earlier monitoring system produced was information concerning the implementation status of different schemes. From the commencement of the Second Implementation Phase, the Project has developed an efficient monitoring system by using the

various components of the ZOPP Project Planning Matrix. The Monitoring and Evaluation unit prepares regular Mid-Monthly Monitoring Reports (MMR) and Monthly Monitoring Reports. Since March 1989, the Monthly Monitoring Report has been rearranged and renamed the Monthly Project Report (MPR). The new MPR is integrated with the Project Planning Matrix (PPM). Information is organised on the basis of eight components spelled out in the PPM with two appendices; one a short summary of the project area and the other a short summary of development work in nine union councils in the project area. Targets based on the objectively verifiable indicators for each result are the main feature of the report. The MPR notes the achievements as well as the shortcomings for each specific project. It is sent to all the DOs in the project area, section heads, and management of the Project before the monthly review meeting, and the monthly review meeting analyses and appraises the achievements; as well as discussing the shortcomings and solutions to them.

The MMR prepared by the M & E unit is based on information at the union council level which is provided by the DOs on the Village Report Forms, as well as on the field visit reports submitted by the project staff. The MMR is sent to all section heads, who are also ID team advisors responsible for specific union councils, and to the management. The MMR is discussed by the project management and section heads during a monthly meeting held to review project implementation. The ID team advisors review shortcomings for the specific month and plan activities to increase efficiency. Thus, the monitoring system is an integral part of the PPM.

Problems in Implementation

The Project has encountered different types of difficulties in implementing schemes. In the initial phase, it was found that "*Many applications (for assistance) turned out to be fake*" (Jerve 1985:99), and these applications were submitted through the LGD. To solve this problem, the Project increased the field and supervisory staff in the Orientation Phase. Because of the experimental nature of the programme at that time, the overhead costs were about one third of the implementation cost. The overhead costs for the First Implementation Phase and the Second Implementation Phase are not available.

During the First Implementation Phase, there were a number of financial irregularities. In some cases, implementation cost was substantially more than the approved expenditure, and, in other cases, the materials used were not according to the prescribed and approved specifications. In addition, the Project also received complaints concerning non-payment to the contractors. Most of the DOs are interested only in infrastructural schemes such as the construction of dams, bridges, culverts, rural roads, school buildings, irrigation works, and water supply schemes.

These schemes are implemented by the LGD field staff who, in some instances, benefit personally; thus increasing the costs considerably and delaying implementation. For example, one lined water tank in Nichara Union Council, at an estimated cost of Rs 250,000, was started in early 1988 but the DO kept demanding more funds and, after an expenditure of Rs 560,000, it is still incomplete. This is not the only scheme to suffer from such problems.

Communication Problems

The Project faces different types of communication problems at different levels. The senior professionals are Germans, proficient in English but unable to communicate in Urdu which is the *lingua franca* and the so-called official language of the Government (actually all communications at senior level are in English). The project staff can speak English but their ability to write in English is limited. Some problems are not properly communicated to the

management because of this handicap. The Project does not require its section staff to prepare monthly performance reports either and, even field visit reports are produced on a one page proforma which requires only a few sentences. In view of the LGD-GTZ relationship in the Project office and project area, the GTZ employees should report their field experiences in detail, analyse the current situation, and make suggestions and recommendations on the basis of their own experiences. This can be fulfilled only if the staff are allowed to write in Urdu. A summary of their reports can be translated into English for the management.

Baluchistan is a multilingual province where several languages and many dialects are spoken and the project area is scattered all over Baluchistan. The languages and dialects spoken in the project area include *Baluchi*, *Brohi*, *Pushto*, *Sindhi*, *Saraiki*, *Khetrani*, and *Lassi* but it is very difficult for the Project to find polyglot field staff. This is a problem for other development agencies as well. While most men can speak more than one language, most women in the villages speak only their native tongue. The desirability of communicating with different linguistic groups in their own languages should be taken into consideration when making staff appointments.

At the village level, the DO and the project field staff are two important communication channels. We have noted that some of the project staff have internalised the traditional values of the colonial bureaucracy. On field visits they often meet the DO first and request him or his subordinate to accompany them to the village. Likewise, in the village they search for VO leaders rather than other villagers, and this is contrary to the spirit of the principle that the villagers "*are very happy if somebody comes and asks them what their problem is and tries to help them*" (Khan 1976,213). Institution building at the village level will succeed if the Project staff can encourage self-confidence among villagers who are trying to emerge from a limited environment of authoritarianism and economic dependence. A dynamic attitude is necessary for this, and bureaucratic attitudes and social distance between the project staff and the villagers need to be removed.

Village problems are discussed in VO meetings, but the minutes of these meeting are sometimes recorded by the LGD field staff because most VOs have no literate members. LGD field staff do not attend VO meetings but record whatever is reported to them by the VO leaders, and this means that many problems discussed in the meetings are not recorded. Sometimes the minutes are reduced to mere repetition over several months. The LGD field staff are more interested in schemes related to agriculture, livestock, and health care. In some cases, villagers claim to have discussed the latter type of schemes in their meetings but this was not communicated to the Project by its own field staff or by the DO (see village studies of Khumbri and Gola Basti).

Sociocultural values of gift exchange, which were once restricted to the kin group, are now extended to the wider secondary group. In some cases this has caused problems for the recipients and the donors. Sycophancy, with a view to obtaining official patronage, is not uncommon and is practised in more than one form as a result of the extension of such sociocultural values. Some of the DOs and VO leaders make elaborate arrangements for project staff during their field visits and, no doubt, expect favours in return. Attempts should be made to limit these practices since, in one significant instance, they led to the approval of schemes that are a wastage of resources by any standards (see village profile of Killi Musa Khan Jumma Khan).