113478/2020/789

Impact Assessment Study of Training of PRIs covering 18 sample States of India

FINAL REPORT

Panchayati Raj

Ministry of Panchayati Raj, Government of India,
New Delhi

Submitted by:
CENTRE FOR DEVELOPMENT COMMUNICATION & STUDIES, JAIPUR (CDECS)
133, Devi Nagar, Nannu Marg, New Sanganer Road, SODALA, Jaipur –302019
Ph -0141-2294988/ 2295533, Mobile: 09414077287/ 09950124028
Email-cdecsjpr@gmail.com; cdecsjpr@yahoo.in; Website: www.cdecs.org
(November, 2020)

113478/2020/789

Impact Assessment Study of Training of PRIs covering 18 sample States of India

FINAL REPORT

Panchayati Raj

Ministry of Panchayati Raj (MOPR), Government of India,
Sardar Patel Bhawan, New Delhi

Submitted by:
CENTRE FOR DEVELOPMENT COMMUNICATION & STUDIES, JAIPUR (CDECS)
133, Devi Nagar, Nannu Marg, New Sanganer Road, SODALA, Jaipur –302019
Ph -0141-2294988/ 2295533, Mobile: 09414077287/ 09950124028
Email-cdecsjpr@gmail.com; cdecsjpr@yahoo.in; Website: www.cdecs.org
(November, 2020)

113478/2020/789

Some Reality …….

“If I Have the Belief that I can do it, I shall surely acquire the capacity to do it, even if I may not have in the beginning”.

…….Mahatma Gandhi

"People want guidance, not rhetoric; they need to know what the plan of action is and how it will be implemented. They want to be given responsibility to help solve the problem and the authority to act on it."

……Howard Schultz, Starbucks

“We learn to do something by doing it. There is no other way.”

……..John Holt

Our Task now is not to fix the blame for the past, but to fix the course for future.

……..The Real Purpose

Foreword

In India, Panchayati Raj Institutions (PRIs) are rural local governments entrusted with the responsibilities to prepare plan and implement schemes for economic development and social justice in rural areas. Under various Centrally Sponsored Schemes (CSS) important role has been assigned to PRIs. In addition, PRIs are also involved in implementation and monitoring of several State Schemes. For achievement of Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) in rural India, PRIs will have to play the key role. Importance of PRIs is also in ensuring people's participation and enforcing downward accountability in the rural development initiatives. It would not be wrong to say that if India has to achieve good governance, PRIs have to function effectively as envisaged by the Indian Constitution.

The Constitution of India through the 73rd and 74th Constitutional Amendments in 1992, envisaged a strong local governance system in rural and urban areas respectively. Panchayati Raj system established with 73rd Amendment aimed at ensuring inclusive economic development and social justice through active participation of local citizens in Rural India. To ensure inclusive participatory functioning of Panchayati Raj Institutions (PRIs) and holistic development of rural areas with participation of all, provisions of mandatory reservations have been made for members from amongst Scheduled Castes, Scheduled Tribes, Other Backward Classes wherever applicable, and women.

Capacity Building of Panchayati Raj Institutions (PRIs) is critical to the success of programmes and policies meant for upliftment of the rural masses. The irony is that this is largely a neglected area. While various Ministries have ample resources for capacity building and training (CB&T), utilization has been low and slow due to the deficiency of strong commitment and a clear plan of action. Institutions engaged in the work have also often not delivered as they ought to have. Of course, they are constrained by lack of autonomy, drive and other factors.

Training programmes for the elected representatives (ERs) and functionaries associated with the PRIs are normally undertaken by the State Institutes of Rural Development (SIRDs) and the networks of Extension Training Centres (ETCs) in various States. In some States, Panchayati Raj Training Institutes (PRTIs) and Panchayat Training Centres (PTCs) are also involved in providing training. However, doubts are being expressed about the quality of the training being imparted and the impact of the same on the functional abilities and aptitude of the trainees. The need for evaluation of the existing programmes related to capacity building, therefore, cannot be undermined.

The Rashtriya Gram Swaraj Abhiyan (RGSA) is being implemented since 2016 by the Ministry of Panchayati Raj (MoPR) with the objective of supporting States & UTs in enhancing the capabilities of Elected Representatives through the capacity building and training (CB&T) of ERs and functionaries of PRIs. While the coverage of the training programmes needs to be further expanded, the qualitative aspects need even deeper introspection. Towards this process, Impact Assessment of Training of PRIs was commissioned by Ministry of Panchayati Raj, Government of India which covered largely the impact assessment of the CB&T. Altogether, six zones were covered by covering three States in each of the six zones. Thus, in total, 18 States were covered viz. Assam, Sikkim, Arunachal Pradesh, West Bengal, Jharkhand, Oddisha, Andhra Pradesh, Kerala, Karnataka, Madhya Pradesh, Uttar Pradesh, Haryana, Rajasthan, Himachal Pradesh, Uttarakhand, Gujarat, Goa and Maharashtra.

The key findings and recommendations of the impact assessment of training of PRIs are:

- Outreach of Capacity Building & Training (CB&T) needs improvement through proper planning, time bound strategy, collaboration with the professional service providing agencies and harnessing the potential etc.
- Realizing the importance of Good and Quality pool of Master trainers/resource team/ persons should be developed at the States, Districts and Block levels.
- The training Institutes viz. SIRDs, PRTIs, ETCs and PTCs need to be strengthened in terms of better management, technology, infrastructure, Human Resources, time bound responsibilities and tactfulness. Proper coordination and collaboration with State Government should be the vital element in overall planning, execution, controlling and management of CB&T.
- Periodic review and assessment (May be every month) in terms of Planning, coverage, organization of trainings, training team, management of training, research & studies should be organized at State level under the chairmanship of State Panchayat Raj Department.
- Developing belief in CB&T rather than an event to be carried out/ organized.
- Training needs assessment (TNA) of elected representatives (ERs) and functionaries should be carried out at regular intervals, in a particular required time period rather than in a haphazard process, which is unending.
- Handholding support to Zilla Panchayat, Block /Intermediary Panchayat and Village Panchayats should be followed with trainings on regular basis to really take support from the PRIs/ ERs.
- Concurrent monitoring, Research and evaluation studies should be taken up with some third party organizations.
- Exposure visit to Inter and Intrastate should be included as a part of CB&T for PRIs. The training team should also be given exposure so that they may learn from other peers.
- Training Institutes in the States should take some Adarsh Gram Panchayats, Blocks and Zilla Panchayats where the handholding support may be given by them to really demonstrate model to show PRIs effectiveness and efficacy for SDGs, Mission Antyodaya, aspirational and PESA inputs.
- There is need to have strong data base at State and districts level of PRIs with tracking of kind of trainings the particular PRIs had participated.

I hope this assessment report, which is based on empirical study, would help all concerned with the schemes and programmes of Gram Panchayat development in looking at various aspects of the CB&T programme and making appropriate changes, so as to make the programme more effective in attaining its objectives.

Chairman
CDECS

04 November, 2020
Jaipur

Acknowledgement

By providing Constitutional status to the Panchayati Raj Institutions, the 73rd Constitutional Amendment Act ushered in democratic decentralisation and paved the way for about 3 million elected representatives to participate in governance at the grassroots level, of which about half of them are women.

A tremendous opportunity for grassroots democracy, this also brings with it challenges, particularly when capacities are limited or uneven across gender and social groups. Capacity development of Panchayati Raj representatives is imperative for robust, effective and successful democratic decentralization.

Capacity development is the process through which individuals, organizations and societies obtain, strengthen and maintain the capabilities to set and achieve their own development objectives over time. It is the 'how' of making development work better.

Ministry of Panchayati Raj, Government of India focuses exclusively on capacity development of elected representatives in local governance through various ways in which Rashtriya Gram Swaraj Yojana (RGSY) is the major one.

This study aims at examining the impact of capacity building activities undertaken in various states for all three tiers of PRIs with regard to the enhanced capacities of elected representatives and other stakeholders to perform their official roles effectively and efficiently and developing a systematic means of analysing and quantifying changes in capacity building initiatives provided to the elected representatives of PRIs, Panchayat functionaries and others in the context of basic orientation, various thematic areas and Gram Panchayat Development Planning.

This report on '**Impact Assessment Study of Training of PRIs'** is an outcome of the kind cooperation & support of the following officials/ persons to whom we acknowledge our gratefulness.

1. Shri Sunil Kumar sb, Secretary, Ministry of Panchayati Raj, GoI, New Delhi
2. Shri Amarjeet Sinha sb, Former Secretary, Ministry of Panchayati Raj, GoI, New Delhi
3. Shri Rahul Bhatnagar sb, Former Secretary, Ministry of Panchayati Raj, GoI, New Delhi
4. Dr. S.K. Patjoshi, Joint Secretary (AR&RS), Ministry of Panchayati Raj, GoI, New Delhi
5. Shri Alok Prem Nagar, Joint Secretary, Ministry of Panchayati Raj, GoI, New Delhi
6. Shri Khuswant Singh Sethi, Joint Secretary, Ministry of Panchayati Raj, GoI, New Delhi
7. Ms. Sujata Sharma, Economic Advisor, Ministry of Panchayati Raj, GoI, New Delhi
8. Shri S.S. Prasad, Director, Ministry of Panchayati Raj, GoI, New Delhi
9. Shri Kamlesh Kumar Tripathi, Director (IFD), Ministry of Panchayati Raj, GoI, New Delhi
10. Ms. Malti Rawat, Deputy Secretary, Ministry of Panchayati Raj, GoI, New Delhi
11. Shri Basudeo Das, Deputy Director, Ministry of Panchayati Raj, GoI, New Delhi
12. Shri S.K. Upadhaya, Under Secretary (CB), Ministry of Panchayati Raj, GoI, New Delhi
13. Shri Subhash Sagwan, Under Secretary (CB), Ministry of Panchayati Raj, GoI, New Delhi
14. Shri Aditya Vikram Singh, Consultant (AR&RS), Ministry of Panchayati Raj, GoI, New Delhi
15. Shri Kunal, Consultant (CB), Ministry of Panchayati Raj, GoI, New Delhi

We owe our gratitude to Ministry of Panchayati Raj, GoI Officials and functionaries for their support and cooperation.

113478/2020/789

We are thankful to Secretary, Special secretary, Commissioner, Director, Deputy director of sample States namely, Assam, Arunachal Pradesh, Sikkim, Maharashtra, Gujarat, Rajasthan, Haryana, Himachal Pradesh, Madhya Pradesh, Uttar Pradesh, Uttarakhand, Jharkhand, West Bengal, Oddisha, Goa, Karnataka, Kerala and Andhra Pradesh for their deep concern for '**Impact Assessment Study of Training of PRIs'.** They themselves and their team supported the whole Assessment /Evaluation process. We owe our gratitude to State, District, Block & Gram Panchayat teams of sample Districts, Blocks & Gram Panchayats. We have also been benefited with the support of young & dynamic team of Panchayat Raj department, Training Institutions SPRCs, SIRDs, ETCs, PRTI, STARPARD, GIPARD etc. in the sample States, districts, Blocks.

We are also thankful to sample respondents, associated teams and associated beneficiaries who have cooperated in the whole process of '**Impact Assessment Study of Training of PRIs'**.

We appreciate the efforts of the whole team of CDECS for their patience and hard work, which have really helped in bringing out this report. We hope this Impact Assessment report, which is based on empirical study, would help in looking at various aspects of the programme and making appropriate changes, so as to make the programme more effective in attaining its objectives. Also, the findings of this report will be useful to various Stakeholders and people concerned with planning, implementation and management of effective execution of Training & Capacity Building in the Country.

Dr. UPENDRA K. SINGH,
Team Leader,
CENTRE FOR DEVELOPMENT
COMMUNICATION AND STUDIES (CDECS)

04 November,2020

Table of Content

Chapter	Content	Page No
	Foreword	**4-5**
	Acknowledgement	**6-7**
	List of Tables	**10**
	List of Figures	**11**
	Abbreviations	**12**
	Executive Summary	**13-17**
1.	**Background, Approach & Methodology**	**18-37**
1.1	Background	
1.2	Objectives of Training	
1.3	Components of Training	
1.4	Impact Assessment Objectives	
1.5	Approach & Methodology	
1.6	Team Composition	
1.7	Limitation of the Impact Assessment Study	
2.	**Capacity Building & Training - Approach & Processes**	**38-101**
2.1	Outreach of Training Programmes - SC and ST categories, Elected Women Representatives and other marginalized, PESA	
2.2	National Capability Building Framework, 2014 – followed and practiced	
2.3	Training Quality - methods & procedure for need based, thematic and sectors convergent training	
2.4	Need based modes of training –TNA	
2.5	Institutional set ups, roles and performances - Performance of Panchayati Raj Departments of States and other concerned authorities putting in place the Institutional structure and process	
2.5.1	Management & Functions of State Level Training Institutions - Assessment of functions & system of training institutions	
2.6	Quality of Plans for providing training in mandatory, specialized, thematic, devolved sectors related areas	
3.	**Impact of Training of PRIs - Achievements, Outcome, Impact & Gaps**	**102-188**
3.1	Outcome of Training – Knowledge levels and capacities & overall functioning of PRIs	
3.1.1	Impact of Trainings on Elected Representatives – Knowledge levels and capacities & overall management	
A.	Profile of Elected Representatives	
B.	Facilities, Environment and Logistics-–State Rank Analysis	
C.	Advantage of various trainings -–State Rank Analysis	
D.	Impact Assessment of capacity Building & Trainings –State Rank Analysis	
E.	Outcome of Trainings–State Rank Analysis & Spearman Rank Correlation Analysis	
3.1.2	Impact of Trainings on Panchayati Raj Functionaries – Knowledge levels and capacities & overall Functioning	
A.	Profile of Panchayati Raj Functionaries	
B.	Advantage of various trainings- State Rank Analysis	
C.	Impact Assessment of capacity Building & Trainings under RGSA - State Rank Analysis	
D.	Outcome of Trainings under RGSA - State Rank Analysis & Spearman Rank Correlation Analysis	
3.2	Key outcome of Training – Knowledge levels and capacities & overall functioning of PRIs	
3.3	Comparison of Benefits/Outcome-Amongst PRIs- SCs, STs, EWRs & Overall	

	aggregate	
3.4	Constraints & Usefulness – Some Issues	
3.5	Key Findings & Suggestions	
4.	**Conclusions & Recommendations**	**189-209**
4.1	Conclusions	
4.1.1	Outreach of training programmes conducted for all stakeholders of Panchayati Raj System with particular stress on elected representatives amongst SC and ST categories, Elected Women Representatives and from other marginalized sections	
4.1.2	Quality of trainings provided to various stakeholders, methods & procedure adopted for need based, thematic and sectors convergent training	
4.1.3	Impact of the suggestions, recommendations and strategies as contained in National Capability Building Framework, 2014 on various aspects of Capacity Building	
4.1.4	Need based modes of training adopted for respective sectors/ categories of stakeholders and extent of success achieved	
4.1.5	Performance of Panchayati Raj Departments of States and other concerned authorities putting in place the Institutional structure and process sanctioned by Government for CB & T, their maintenance/ upkeep and upgradation for optimum results	
4.1.6	Quality of Plans for providing training in mandatory, specialized, thematic, devolve sectors related areas and establishing appropriate network	
4.1.7	Knowledge levels and capacities of trained elected representatives and other stakeholders to perform their official roles effectively and efficiently	
4.2	Recommendations	
4.2.1	Improve Outreach of training programmes conducted for all stakeholders of Panchayati Raj System with particular stress on elected representatives amongst SC and ST categories, Elected Women Representatives and also those from other marginalized sections	
4.2.2	Ensure Quality training provided to various stakeholders, methods & procedure adopted for need based, thematic and sectors convergent training	
4.2.3	Execute the suggestions, recommendations and strategies as contained in National Capability Building Framework, 2014 on various aspects of Capacity Building	
4.2.4	Strategy to ensure Need based modes of training adopted for respective sectors/ categories of stakeholders	
4.2.5	Improve Performance of Panchayati Raj Departments of States and other concerned authorities putting in place the Institutional structure and process sanctioned by Government for CB & T, their maintenance/ upkeep and upgradation for optimum results	
4.2.6	Ensure Quality of Plans for providing training in mandatory, specialized, thematic, devolve sectors related areas and establishing appropriate network	
4.2.7	Policy Issues	
	Annexure	**210**
A.	Tables - Data of Responses of Elected Representatives (ERs)	**211-308**
B.	Tables - Data of responses of Panchayat Raj Functionaries	**309-401**
C.	Tables - Data of responses of Master Trainers	**402-422**
D.	Glance of Field Level study in sample States	**423-442**
E.	Questionnaires used for Assessment of the Trainers	**443-447**

List of Tables

Table No.	Table title
Table 1.1	Profile of Panchayats in India
Table 1.2	Sample States & Sample districts covering PESA & Aspirational districts
Table 1.3	List of Sample States & Districts covered in the study titled 'Impact Assessment of Training of PRIs'
Table 2.1	Outreach of Training of Elected Representatives in the Sample States
Table 2.2	Training achievement (Outreach) of elected representatives in the Sample States
Table 2.3	Elected Representatives (ERs) Trainings within six months of Election in the States
Table 2.4	States reported usefulness of NCBF, 2014
Table 2.5	Percentage of NCBF, 2014 recommendations followed
Table 2.6	Ranking of States based on following the recommendations of NCBF Framework, 2014
Table 2.7	Training materials for ERs/PRIs in the State
Table 2.8	Selection for training of Trainers/ Resource Persons/Master Trainers
Table 2.9	Strengths & Weaknesses of TOT (State-wise)
Table 2.10	Imparting training by Trainers/ Resource Persons (RPs)/ Master trainers
Table 2.11	Logistics & Honorarium
Table 2.12	Participation & Timelines
Table 2.13	Rating of arrangement & facilities in training programmes
Table 2.14	Mode & hours of trainings
Table 2.15	Training Need Assessment in the States
Table 2.16	Institutional Set-ups for Training in the Sample States
Table 2.17	Rating of Functions & System of Training Institutions
Table 2.18	Assessment of functions & system of Training Institutions in overall trainings
Table 3.1	State-wise Ranking as per Respondents' Rating Status
Table 3.2	Mode & hours of trainings
Table 3.3	State-wise Ranking as per Respondents' Rating Status
Table 3.4	State Ranks: Understanding Developed in Trainings as per Working Requirement
Table 3.5	State Ranks: Usefulness in Working under RGSA
Table 3.6	Table 3.6: State Ranks: Rating of Benefits of Capacity Building & Training
Table 3.7	Spearman Rank Correlation of Trainers' Rating with
Table 3.8	Spearman Rank Correlation of Learning Environment's Rating with
Table 3.9	Spearman Rank Correlation of Reading / Training Materials Rating with
Table 3.10	Spearman Rank Correlation of Session on Best Practices, Case Studies, Experience Sharing Rating with
Table 3.11	Spearman Rank Correlation of Field Visit and Group Discussion Rating with
Table 3.12	Basic Profile of Respondents
Table 3.13	State-wise Ranking as per Respondents' Rating Status
Table 3.14	State Ranks: Understanding Developed in Trainings as per Working Requirement
Table 3.15	State Ranks: Usefulness in Working under RGSA
Table 3.16	State Ranks: Rating of Benefits of Capacity Building & Training
Table 3.17	Spearman Rank Correlation of Trainers' Rating with
Table 3.18	Spearman Rank Correlation of Learning Environment's Rating with
Table 3.19	Spearman Rank Correlation of Reading Materials / Training Materials Rating with
Table 3.20	Spearman Rank Correlation of Session on Best Practices, Case Studies, Experience Sharing Rating with
Table 3.21	Spearman Rank Correlation of Field Visit and Group Discussion Rating with

List of Figures

Figure No.	Figure title
Fig 2.1	Outreach of training of elected representatives (Year-wise)
Figure 2.1	Imparting training by trainers/ Resource persons/ Master trainers
Figure 2.2	Participation of EWRs in Induction training Programme (Year-wise)
Figure 2.3	Participation of SCs in Induction training Programme (Year-wise)
Figure 2.4	Participation of STs in Induction training Programme (Year-wise)
Figure 2.5	Participation of SCs in Refresher/thematic training Programme (Year-wise)
Figure 2.6	Participation of EWRs in Refresher/thematic training Programme (Year-wise)
Figure 2.7	Participation of STs in Refresher/thematic training Programme (Year-wise)
Figure 2.8	Imparting training by trainer/ Resource persons/ Master trainers
Figure 2.9	Logistics & Honorarium
Figure 2.10	Participation & timelines
Figure 2.11	Rating of training as a trainer/ Resource person
Figure 2.12	Rating the arrangement & facilities in training programmes (Elected Representatives)
Figure 2.13	Rating of arrangements & facilities in training programmes (Panchayat functionaries)
Figure 2.14	Assessment of functions & system of Training Institutions
Figure 3.1	Rating of Trainers across States
Figure 3.2	Rating of Learning Environment across States
Figure 3.3	Rating of Training Venue, Seating Facilities & Training across States
Figure 3.4	Rating of Lodging & Boarding Facilities across States
Figure 3.5	Rating of Reading / Training Materials across States
Figure 3.6	Rating of Session on Best Practices, Case Studies, Experience Sharing etc. across States
Figure 3.7	Rating of Field Visit and Group Discussion across States
Figure 3.8	State-wise Rank Analysis
Figure 3.9	Online mode of training
Figure 3.10	Rating of Need-based Training across States
Figure 3.11	Rating of Training Programmes across States
Figure 3.12	Rating of Training Role in Skill Upgradation& Knowledge Enrichment across States
Figure 3.13	Rating of Training Role in Better Performing the Responsibilities across States
Figure 3.14	Rating of Training Role in Developing Attitude on Roles & Responsibilities of GP across States
Figure 3.15	Rating of Training Role in Completely Equipping on Roles & Responsibilities across States
Figure 3.16	State Ranking
Figure 3.17	State Ranking
Figure 3.18	State Ranking
Figure 3.19	Undertaking e-governance in the Gram Panchayats
Figure 3.20	Training of Elected Representatives
Figure 3.21	State Ranking
Figure 3.22	Advantages of various training under RGSA
Figure 3.23	Rating of Need-based Training across States
Figure 3.24	Rating of Training Programmes across States
Figure 3.25	Rating of Training Role in Skill Upgradation& Knowledge Enrichment across States
Figure 3.26	Rating of Training Role in Better Performing the Responsibilities across States
Figure 3.27	Rating of Training Role in Developing Attitude on Roles & Responsibilities of GP across States
Figure 3.28	Rating of Training Role in Completely Equipping on Roles & Responsibilities across States
Figure 3.29	Ranking across States
Figure 3.30	Ranking across States
Figure 3.31	Ranking across States
Figure 3.32	Panchayat Functionaries training
Figure 3.33	Ranking across States
Figure 3.34	Benefits of CB &T- Comparison of EWR, SC, ST & Overall PRIs

Abbreviations

BDO	Block Development Officer
BP	Block Panchayat
BRAIPARD	Bhim Rao Ambedkar Institute of Panchayati Raj & Rural Development
CB&T	Capacity Building and Training
CDECS	Centre For Development Communication & Studies
CEO	Chief Executive Officer
CSO	Civil Society Organisation
DP	District Panchayat
DPRC	District Panchayat Resource Centre
ER	Elected Representatives
ETCs	Extension Training Centres
EWR	Elected Women Representatives
GoI	Government of India
GP	Gram Panchayat
ICT	Information Communication Technology
IEC	Information, Education and Communication
IGPRS	Indira Gandhi Panchayati Raj and Gramin Vikas Sansthan
IT	Information Technology
JP	Janpad Panchayat
KILA	Kerala Institute of Local Administration
MGNREGA	Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Act
MGSIRD	Mahatma Gandhi State Institute of Rural Development
MIS	Management Information System
MOPR	Ministry of Panchayati Raj
MPDO	Mandal Parishad Development Officer
MPTC	Mandal Parishad Territorial Constituency
MTs	Master Trainers
NCBF	National Capability Building Framework
NGO	Non-Government Organisation
NIC	National Informatics' Centre
NIRD	National Institute of Rural Development
PDO	Panchayat Development Officer
PESA	Panchayat Extension to Scheduled Area
PLA	Participatory Learning and Action
PMGSY	Pradhan Mantri Gram Sadak Yojana
PMU	Project Management Unit
PRI	Panchayati Raj Institutions
PRTI	Panchayati Raj Training Institute
RGSA	Rashtriya Gram Swaraj abhiyan
SATCOM	Satellite Communication
SDM	Sub-Divisional Magistrate
SDO	Sub-Divisional Officer
SIRD	State Institute of Rural Development
SPRC	State Panchayat Resource Centre
STARPARD	Society for Training Research on Panchayat & Rural Development
TOT	Training of Trainers
WB	West Bengal
YASHADA	Yashwantrao Chavan Academy Of Development Administration
ZP	Zilla Panchayat

Executive Summary

I. About the Impact Assessment Study

The Ministry of Panchayati Raj (MOPR), Government of India commissioned the study titled 'Impact Assessment of Training of PRIs' aimed at examining the impact of capacity building activities undertaken in various states for all three tiers of PRIs with regard to the enhanced capacities of elected representatives and other stakeholders to perform their official roles effectively and efficiently and developing a systematic means of analysing and quantifying changes in capacity building initiatives provided to the elected representatives of PRIs, Panchayat functionaries and others in the context of basic orientation, various thematic areas and Gram Panchayat Development Planning. The assessment study was conducted in 18 sample States covering 3 States from each of six zones of India. For this study, six different tools were used to collect information, including primary and secondary data, and analyze it objectively.

II. Introduction

The 73rd and 74th constitutional Amendments are historic in several ways and hailed as great democratic reforms the country has witnessed after Independence. This is particularly so because it has envisaged a strong system of local governance with more power to resolve development criticalities such as perpetual existence of social and economic exclusion of a large majority of the rural population. In other words, a strong development governance at the local level was felt needed to extricate these social and economically ostracized people from becoming constant victim of impoverishment and social injustice. Several development schemes both at the central and state levels are conceived and under implementation for the redressal of what one may call 'development crisis' of rural India which is far away from meeting Sustainable Development Goals.

It is this crisis that requires adequate skill, proven management and efficient implementation of the development schemes for its mitigation and set in sustainable process of change especially for the economically and socially disadvantaged. Besides, equally or more important is to create conditions to conceive new ideas of development strategy that may have potential to germinate at the local level to seek for local development to address the development crisis as mentioned earlier. Systematic exposure of the functionaries and the elected representatives of the PRI at all levels through training towards different development experiments may bring pragmatism in their approach and likely to stimulate them to think new. Hence, in true sense of the term, capacity building at the local level is not confined only to develop management skill of the functionaries and elected representatives. It goes beyond it and encourages all stakeholders to create development ripples at the local level by means of bringing vibrancy in the development governance.

Against this backdrop and to meet the objective of capacity-building at the local level several methods are followed in an attempt to seek appropriate pedagogy, develop appropriate and adequate training infrastructure, mobilize financial resources and give special attention to the management of the training programmes being conducted at all levels of the three-tier PRI system. The question is, however, how has been the impact of such an endeavor in practice across the states?

III. Major Findings of the study

The present assessment study which is conducted based on well-defined parameters, shows that it has certainly made some dent especially in terms of heightening the sensitivities of the development functionaries. In other words, picture is not as dismal as one may think about. However, there is enormous variation of the effects of capacity development programme in that some states have gone much ahead in appropriating desirable results while others are found to be lagging far behind. Therefore, at the present stage of capacity development programme that the states have embarked upon a couple of years ago, state specific intervention is needed. However, at a general level, refashioning of the training programme appears to have immense importance for optimizing the outcome.

Outreach

Take for example, outreach of the induction training and refresher/thematic trainings for the elected representatives – SCs, STs and elected Women representatives. The study shows that only three states including Andhra Pradesh, Assam and Sikkim have been able to achieve more than 90 per cent of the desirable outcome while most of the state's hovers within the range of 50 to 90 percent. In respect of outreach program of the women, SC and ST representatives again only a few states including Andhra Pradesh, Sikkim, Kerala, Rajasthan and Karnataka achieved 100 per cent coverage, while rest of the states are lagging far behind. And on refresher/thematic training for the same group of representatives states including Andhra Pradesh, Kerala, Rajasthan could achieve 100 per cent success while Assam and west Bengal could succeed in covering 90 per cent of them for the same programme.

Further, the study shows that in all the sample 18 States, trainings for elected Representatives of Zilla Panchayats and Intermediary /Block Panchayats were organized within the period of six months of election result. However, looking to the organization of trainings of ERs at Gram Panchayat level namely, Sarpanch/ Gram Pradhan and ward members there were 08 States which had organized trainings for elected representatives within six months of election. These states include Andhra Pradesh, Assam, Goa, Karnataka, Kerala, Oddisha, Rajasthan, and West Bengal. The remaining 10 States namely, Gujarat, Maharashtra, Uttar Pradesh, Uttarakhand, Madhya Pradesh, Jharkhand, Sikkim, Arunachal Pradesh, Himachal Pradesh and Haryana, were unable to organize training within six months of election of Gram Panchayats despite sincere efforts were made. In addition to it, what is a matter of great concern is that the key recommendation of NCBF, 2014 were not followed. The reason can be many namely, large size of ERs and larger States, fund releases, & lack of proper support to Training Institutions from State.

The findings on CB&T in last 5 years i.e. from 2014-15 to 2018-19 appear more encouraging in that States conducted Induction and Refresher / thematic trainings as per the target. In so far as achievement is concerned in terms of organising various training programmes the study reveals 12 states completed more than 90 percent of their targeted training programmes in last any of the 5 years. These states include Andhra Pradesh, Goa, Sikkim, Karnataka, Uttar Pradesh, Maharashtra, Jharkhand, Oddisha, West Bengal, Rajasthan, Madhya Pradesh and Haryana.

Outreaching the concerned for capacity development through training is basic and can hardly be traded off. The lack of its fulfillment is likely to dilute the positive outcome of training in any other respect that local governance counts. However, poor outreach of the programme in several states does not augur well with the efforts being made at both the state and national level. The single most important problem responsible for such limited outcome is found to be the pedagogy which is poorly designed. However, other supply sides of the capacity development programme including training venue or infrastructure, learning environment and ability of the trainers are in

place and able to create positive externalities in many states. But then if the pedagogy is poor, nothing much headway can be made.

Pedagogy

Pedagogy of the training programmes needs to be developed keeping in mind for whom it is developed and what purpose it is meant to serve. One must bear in mind that majority of the stakeholders are illiterate or semi-literate, first timer /second timer/ multi-timer, but absolutely pro-development with great sense of commitment. Hence, while designing the pedagogy, delivery of lecture in classrooms is of little help. There are several ways through which their sensitivities towards development can be raised in that they become capable to implement the development schemes properly, plan for proper allocation and utilization of financial resources and able to come up with new ideas for strategizing development and optimizing allocation of financial resources with higher degree of efficiency. Actually bottom-up approach that makes the difference in development at the local level begins from here no matter whether the stakeholders are illiterate or semi-literate.

What matters most is heightening of their development sensitivities, perception and art of performing in practice with greater sense of commitment. In view of this, exposure visit to learn from successful development intervention, case study presentation, group interaction, participatory mode of learning and many other means one can explore to see that each one develops sense of involvement with the capacity development programmes. The higher success rate in respect of outreach of a few states shows that they could reorient their training modules accordingly. Central to the modules is the concern for improving the quality of training that maintains proportionality with the area or place, development of which is the primary focus of training and mode of training as Capacity Building & Training (CB &T) has rightly emphasized. This must be complemented by the system of monitoring and supervision as it is in place in a couple of states that have witnessed its importance in terms of increasing attendance, timely coverage and quality enhancement of training. Its absence in several other states has yielded negative outcome.

While appropriate practice-oriented pedagogy is a necessary condition, the sufficient condition for the success of the outreach programme is the availability of dedicated and efficient training personnel (Resource Persons/ Master Trainers). This is what is largely missing in several states. It is worthwhile to create a pool of such resource persons wherever it is needed and seek collaboration with some prominent NGOs and academic institutions for their orientation. It is then possible to bring about a breakthrough in enhancing the quality of training that can enormously contribute to the expansion of capacity of the concerned.

Benefits of Capacity Building &Training

With the given limitation, training programmes being conducted are found to have been useful in expanding the knowledge base which is relevant to effectively function and deliver development inputs to the people. While the state of West Bengal followed by Andhra Pradesh, Maharashtra and Kerala rated the capacity development programme very useful in terms of the above, the rest is found to be much below it and therefore they are yet to see the beneficial impact of training on their effective functioning. The deepening of knowledge based on sharing information on different aspects of change and development and specific needs for training to upgrade skill appear to have played significant role in better functioning especially of the elected representatives and other stakeholders in general. The leading states includes West Bengal, Andhra Pradesh and Kerala while the rest of the stares are yet to reach this level. It is important to underline how the training programmes have instilled a great sense of confidence and responsibility in developing their respective local areas in terms of boosting up of the local economy and achieving social justice.

Comparison of benefits

The question is how has the specific target group including SC, ST and elected women representatives benefited from the trainings as compared to others in PRI? The study shows that SCs (24 percent) and STs (24.1 percent) are more benefitted as compared to EWR (20.1 percent) and others together (22.5 percent). It is important to note that STs are benefitted than SCs, Women and overall respondents in seven States namely, West Bengal, Maharashtra, Uttarakhand, Sikkim, Himachal Pradesh, Madhya Pradesh and Gujarat. Similarly, SCs are benefitted more in comparison to STs, Women and overall respondents in eight States namely, Andhra Pradesh, Assam, Oddisha, Haryana, Karnataka, Kerala, Rajasthan & Jharkhand. The state of Goa has performed poorly in this respect. It is lowest of all PRIs. In any case, it appears that the induction training and refresher/ thematic trainings under RGSA made substantive dent among the SC and ST representatives of PRI. It indicates how capacity development initiatives through training has been empowering them to come forward and undertake the responsibilities to bring about socio-economic transformation at Gram Panchayat level.

IV. Recommendations

How to make more meaningful Capacity Building initiative

As indicated in the beginning, initiatives taken so far for capacity development at PRI are not useless and never have lost its relevance to local area development. However, their impact across the states is varied and seems to failed to ingrain sustainability in the process of change expected to come about. It means that even though some states like Andhra Pradesh, Assam, Sikkim, West Bengal and Kerala have gone much ahead of other states in terms of the parameters chosen to examine the impact that capacity development programme has made, it is difficult to discern whether impact is sustainable. It suggests that capacity development programme exclusively meant for the development functionaries and elected representatives at the PRI level has to be conceived primarily based on its relevance to the local people, area and quality that expands the horizon of practical knowledge, no matter if it is blended with theory. It increases development sensitivities, instill pragmatism in development approach and finally turns each participant a 'development soldier' battling against poverty, illiteracy and social injustice.

Against this backdrop and with a view to make the extant capacity building more relevant to the people concerned it may be worthwhile to concentrate on the following. **First,** the most important area of training that needs thorough overhauling is pedagogy of training, reorientation of the training module and capable trainers. All these are explained earlier. While developing the training module training needs of the area concerned must be kept in mind. **Second,** while quality of the training programmes has to be stepped up, periodic evaluation of the training module is a necessity to make it more appropriate. **Third**, consistent and sincere efforts must be made to have convergence of the members of all departments engaged in executing different sectoral programmes for training under the same umbrella. It will not only facilitate inter communication but also maximize positive externalities that makes it possible to achieve sustainable development goals. **Fourth**, system of periodic evaluation, monitoring and supervision of all training institutions under PRI and all training programmes needs strengthening to see that objectives are met and the initiatives for capacity development are cost-effective. If necessary, training institutions must be strengthened in terms infrastructure, better staffing pattern and promoting constant interaction with the academic institutions. **Fifth,** the System oriented information management system needs to be introduced which would not only track the progress but also flag the progress mismatch. **Sixth,** to allow elected representatives to play their role effectively, it is important that states should make systematic progress in devolving funds, functions and functionaries to the PRIs as intended in the Constitutional Amendments. In addition, the professional

handholding support may be planned should be given all the year round in order to get quality plans, convergence, execution and largely improving the 'Quality of Life' of its citizens. **Seventh**, last but not least, mobilization of required financial resources to make inroad to the capacity development programmes. Inadequate financial resources appear to have been posing formidable difficulties to some states, the study reveals, to meet both ends.

V. Concluding remarks

Interrogating capacity development enterprise

Development of capacity of the development practitioners at grassroot is as important as development is. However, the only question that remains unanswered is why the capacity development enterprise falls short of inertia required to get rid of the bottlenecks that appear to be more structural? It is perhaps not the first time that a study like the present one is indicating how poor quality of training embedded with faulty pedagogy has been subverting the essence of the capacity development programme. Apart from deflecting it from the objective it intends to achieve, it turns the enterprise cost ineffective. It is a paralytic manifestation of poor response of the structure of training with a few exceptions. It needs to be replaced by a new one that suits to the local people, local area and local need to make substantive impact on capacity development. While an enterprise of this kind has a far-reaching implication for improving systemic efficiency at the grassroots & at all levels of PRI, delivery of adequate development inputs to the needy is then expected to make a fundamental difference to the development governance at the local level. But then, this does not happen as one hopes. Why is it no built- in accountability exists to bridge the gap, if any, at all levels? If capacity development as an enterprise is meant for enhancing capacity of the concerned to take the development forward then it has to be people oriented programme in that art of management would lie more with the peoples' conscious feeling and choice related to what is to be done and what is not to be done. There is always a room for developing partnership between functionaries, political leaders and people at the local level. Exploration of such collaborative endeavor may open up possibilities for enhancing capacity of the concerned in order to create opportunity for those who now want to survive with dignity.

Chapter - 1

Background, Approach & Methodology

1.1 Background

In India, Panchayati Raj Institutions (PRIs) are rural local governments entrusted with the responsibilities to prepare plan and implement schemes for economic development and social justice in rural areas. Under various Centrally Sponsored Schemes (CSS) important role has been assigned to PRIs. In addition, PRIs are also involved in implementation and monitoring of several State Schemes. For achievement of Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) in rural India, PRIs will have to play the key role. Importance of PRIs is also in ensuring people's participation and enforcing downward accountability in the rural development initiatives. It would not be wrong to say that if India has to achieve good governance, PRIs have to function effectively as envisaged by the Indian Constitution.

Gram Panchayat Building called Village Administrative Centre in West Sikkim District

The Constitution of India through the 73rd and 74th Constitutional Amendments in 1992, envisaged a strong local governance system in rural and urban areas respectively. Panchayati Raj system established with 73rd Amendment aimed at ensuring inclusive economic development and social justice through active participation of local citizens in Rural India. To ensure inclusive

participatory functioning of Panchayati Raj Institutions (PRIs) and holistic development of rural areas with participation of all, provisions of mandatory reservations have been made for members from Scheduled Castes, Scheduled Tribes, Other Backward Classes wherever applicable, and women.

In order to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the functioning of Panchayat Raj functionaries, Ministry of Panchayat Raj Department, Government of India is supporting various training programmes for capacity building which include participants' knowledge, skill, attitude and performance of the PRI representatives and other stakeholders of Panchayat Raj Department across the country.

Almost a quarter of the century has gone by and the status of Panchayats, devolution of powers to them, their functioning and capacities still vary significantly across the country. In current situation PRIs are facing a number of challenges. Inadequate devolution of funds, functions, functionaries and insufficient capacities are among the most important of these challenges. In fact, an insufficient capacity of PRIs has become an excuse for States to deny devolution of funds, functions and functionaries. It is also the reason for Central government to create parallel structures for implementation of several CSSs rather than assigning PRIs the central role. Hence, for strengthening PRIs and to attain sustainable rural development in India, it is very pertinent to develop capacities of PRIs so as to enable them to function effectively.

Nevertheless, the Panchayats being the nearest and most accessible to the local citizens remain relevant as key local government institutions on the one hand and vehicles for implementing a gamut of Government initiatives for the poor on the other. However, strengthening capacities of elected representatives, functionaries and other stakeholders of the local government institutions to deliver basic services and to undertake administrative and governance functions more effectively and in a sustainable manner remains a key challenge.

It is observed that majority of the elected representatives in PRIs lack adequate education and are often unaware of their responsibilities as elected representatives as well as powers and functions of PRIs and its routine functioning. In addition to that, every five years, a new set of elected representatives (a large number of them as the first timers) take charge for taking forward the mandate for local development. Similarly, functionaries of PRIs require clarity and competence about the mandate of rural local governance and their own roles and responsibilities in this on one hand and about those of elected representatives on the other.

Capacity development is a means to achieve the goal of a decentralised governance system which is vibrant and beneficial for the people. Besides, building capacities of individuals, it is important to strengthen the PR institutions to realise this goal. At the same time, to allow elected representatives to play their role effectively, it is important that states have to make systematic progress in devolving funds, functions and functionaries to the PRIs as intended in the Constitutional Amendments.

Capacity building programs of the states have been designed to make the Elected Representatives and functionaries well conversant with powers and functions of PRIs, the processes to be followed for ensuring democratic decision making, planning and implementation of schemes for local development along with managing public funds with prudence and day to day office management.

Capacity building at the Individual level or human resource development is only one component of a multi-dimensional, integrated approach that comes under the rubric of capacity building. Transferring skills to an individual will only be effective when those skills can be exercised. For this to occur there must be support from Ministry of Panchayat Raj, GOI, State Government & Stakeholders Institutions & Officials to practice these new skills and, they must be integrated into role profiles, operational procedures and policies within an organization, institution and project.

Since its inception in the year 2004, the Ministry of Panchayati Raj (MOPR) has launched various schemes from time to time, for providing resource support to the states for addressing critical gaps that hinder effective functioning of PRIs. All the schemes aimed at strengthening PRIs with a focus on capacity building so that PRIs are strengthened, capacitated and function effectively as institutions of local self-government. The strategy for capacity building of the PRIs is an approach for enhancing the capabilities of the elected representatives and other stakeholders for participatory planning, implementation and monitoring activities etc.

The study titled **'Impact of Training of PRIs'** has been commissioned to Centre for Development Communication & Studies (CDECS) by Ministry of Panchayati Raj, Government of India, New Delhi to provide a systematic means of analysing and quantifying changes in capacity building initiatives adopted by different states for the elected representatives of the PRIs and other stakeholders, which is a major challenge for people involved in capacity building activities.

1.2 Background & Objectives of Trainings under RGSA

The Government on 24/04/2018 on the occasion of National Panchayati Raj Day launched the restructured Centrally Sponsored Scheme (CSS) of Rashtriya Gram Swaraj Abhiyan (RGSA) for implementation from 01.04.2018 to 31.03.2022 with the primary aim of strengthening Panchayati Raj Institutions (PRIs) for achieving Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) with main thrust on convergence with Mission Antyodaya and emphasis on strengthening PRIs in the 117 Aspirational districts. The scheme has been approved with total budget outlay of Rs. 7255.50 crore out of which State share will be Rs. 2755.50 crore and the Central share will be Rs. 4500.00 crore. The scheme consists of Central and State Components. The Central component comprises (i) National level activities viz. National Plan for Technical Assistance (NPTA) including NPMU, collaboration with

academic institutions/ institutions of excellence including NIRD&PR, Hyderabad for various activities of CB&T for PRIs (ii) Mission Mode Project (MMP) on e-Panchayat and (iii) Incentivization of Panchayats. The State component relates to activities to be undertaken by State Governments for CB&T and other activities for strengthening of Panchayats viz. Capacity Building &Training, training infrastructure and HR support for training, Strengthening of Gram Sabhas in PESA areas, Distance Learning Facility via SATCOM, Support for Innovations, Technical support to PRIs, Financial Data and Analysis Cell, Panchayat Buildings, e-enablement of Panchayats, Project based funding for economic development and income enhancement, IEC and PMU. The sharing pattern for the State component is in the ratio of 60:40 except North Eastern and Hilly States where Central and State sharing is in the ratio of 90:10. For all UTs, Central share is 100%.

The scheme has programmatic focus for phased saturation mode on ensuring basic orientation training for the Elected Representatives of Panchayats, within six months of their election and refresher trainings within 2 years. RGSA will have thrust for SHG-PRI convergence to ensure

Interaction with PESA PRIs in Madugula GP, Mandal V. Madgula, Andhra Pradesh

effective community mobilisation and greater public ownership of flagship programs of the Govt. Use of e-governance and technology driven solutions at Panchayat level will be increased to attain administrative efficiency, improved service delivery, and greater accountability.

For enabling the PRIs to implement the RGSA in a meaningful, concerted and result oriented manner, a Framework for Implementation of RGSA has been prepared and shared with the States.

During the year 2018-19, Ministry has approved the Annual Action Plans (AAPs) of 32 States/UTs and Rs 598.21 crore have been released to States and implementing agencies etc. under the scheme.

Further, with a view to expeditiously implement the scheme and for achieving the stipulated objectives in a progressive manner, this Ministry has taken the initiative for approval of the Annual Action Plans for the year 2019-20 of all States / UTs by the Central Empowered Committee of RGSA, well in advance so that the States / UTs have full year for implementation of their approved activities. Towards this end, the 3rd meeting of the CEC of RGSA was held on 22nd and 23rd February, 2019 and the Annual Action Plans for 2019-20 of 33 States / UTs were approved. The minutes of the meeting have been accordingly communicated to the concerned States/UTs and participants.

The objective of the Rashtriya Gram Swaraj Abhiyan (earlier called RGSY, RGPSA) is to assist States for Training and Capacity Building of elected representatives of Panchayati Raj Institutions so that they can effectively perform the functions devolved and the schemes entrusted to them. The need for Training and Capacity Building of elected representatives and officials of Panchayati Raj Institutions at all the three levels of Zilla Parishad, Block Panchayat and Gram Panchayat cannot be underscored. With the implementation of welfare Schemes such as National Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme, SBM, DAY-NRLM etc. which are extended all over the country, the duties and responsibilities of the elected representatives of Panchayats is increasing manifold. In order to understand the complexities of these responsibilities and to fulfil the aspirations of their constituencies, the elected representatives need strong support in the form of Training and Capacity Building.

The core objectives of RGSA is to improve the capabilities, technical competency, administrative skills and overall functioning of Gram Panchayats to meet institutional formalities for effective execution of SDGs, MGNREGA, DAY-NRLM, SBM & Missions Antyodaya etc. The objectives of RGSA fulfil the CB&T are:

1. Develop Governance capabilities of PRIs to deliver on the SDGs.
2. Enhance capabilities of Panchayats for inclusive local Governance with focus on optimum utilization of available resources and convergence with other schemes to address issues of national importance.
3. Enhance capabilities of Panchayats to raise their own sources of revenue.
4. Strengthen Gram sabhas to function effectively as the basic forum of people's participation, transparency and accountability within the Panchayat system.
5. Promote devolution of power and responsibilities to Panchayats according to the spirit of the constitution and PESA Act, 1996.
6. Develop a network of institutions of excellence to support capacity building and handling for PRIs.
7. Strengthen institutions for capacity enhancement of PRIs at various levels and enable them to achieve adequate quality standards in infrastructure, facilities, human resources and outcome-based training.
8. Promote e-governance and other technology driven solutions to enable good governance in Panchayats for administrative efficiency and improved service delivery.
9. Recognize and incentivize PRIs based on performance.

1.3 Components of Training

The Training of PRIs largely includes Induction training, Refresher and thematic trainings. The core purpose is to ensure,

- Basic orientation training for the Elected Representatives (ERs) of Panchayats within 6 months of their election.
- Refresher trainings to be ensured within 2 years
- Capacity Building of ERs with Priority to Aspirational districts and PESA districts.
- Strengthening of the Panchayats.

The training has been organized under RGSA in addition to SBM, Child Rights, DAY-NRLM. The main purpose of the trainings under RGSA is to bridge gaps in capacity building & Trainings (CB&T), use of IT for distance learning and for e-Enablement of Panchayats, Institutional support for institutionalization, support in economic and income enhancement, to provide handholding support to academic institutions/institutions of excellence to GPs for Gram Panchayat development Plan (GPDP) formulation etc.

Under the Capacity Building & Training programmes, the efforts have been made to build capacity of Panchayat Representatives of district, Intermediate/Block and Village Panchayats. As per the report submitted, the details are stated hereunder,

Table 1.1: Profile of Panchayats in India

S.No.	State Name	District Panchayats	Intermediate Panchayats	Village Panchayats
1	ANDAMAN AND NICOBAR ISLANDS	2	7	70
2	ANDHRA PRADESH	13	660	13063
3	ARUNACHAL PRADESH	25	177	1785
4	ASSAM	26	191	2199
5	BIHAR	38	534	8386
6	CHHATTISGARH	27	146	10963
7	DADRA AND NAGAR HAVELI	1	N.A.	20
8	DAMAN AND DIU	2	N.A.	18
9	GOA	2	N.A.	191
10	GUJARAT	33	248	14292
11	HARYANA	21	126	6197
12	HIMACHAL PRADESH	12	78	3226
13	JAMMU AND KASHMIR	20	275	4290
14	JHARKHAND	24	263	4350
15	KARNATAKA	30	176	6021
16	KERALA	14	152	941
17	LADAKH	2	31	192
18	LAKSHADWEEP	1	N.A.	10
19	MADHYA PRADESH	51	313	22812
20	MAHARASHTRA	34	351	27868
21	MANIPUR	6	N.A.	161
22	ODISHA	30	314	6798
23	PUDUCHERRY	N.A.	10	108
24	PUNJAB	22	150	13269
25	RAJASTHAN	33	295	9888
26	SIKKIM	4	N.A.	185

27	TAMIL NADU	31	385	12524
28	TELANGANA	32	540	12769
29	TRIPURA	8	35	591
30	UTTARAKHAND	13	95	7770
31	UTTAR PRADESH	75	822	58757
32	WEST BENGAL	22	342	3340
	Totals	654	6716	253054

Source: URLhttp://lgdirectory.gov.in; Report Generated on12/12/2019 12:06:15 PM Local Government Directory

1.4 Impact Assessment Objectives

The study titled **"Impact Assessment of Training of PRIs"** has been undertaken with the aim to provide a systematic means of analysing and quantifying changes in capacity building initiatives adopted by different states for the elected representatives of the PRIs and other stakeholders, which is a major challenge for people involved in capacity building activities.

Objectives of the Study

The Key objectives of the study titled "Impact Assessment of Training of PRIs" are:

1. Identifying the outreach of training programmes conducted for all stakeholders of Panchayati Raj System with particular stress on elected representatives amongst SC and ST categories, Elected Women Representatives and also those from other marginalized sections.
2. Assessment of quality training provided to such stakeholders, identifying the methods & procedure adopted for need based, thematic and sectors convergent training.
3. Impact of the suggestions, recommendations and strategies as contained in National Capability Building Framework, 2014 on various aspects of Capacity Building.
4. Identification of the need based modes of training adopted for respective sectors/ categories of stakeholders and extent of success achieved.
5. Performance of Panchayati Raj Departments of States and other concerned authorities putting in place the Institutional structure and process sanctioned by Government for CB & T, their maintenance/ upkeep and upgradation for optimum results.
6. Assessing the quality of Plans for providing training in mandatory, specialized, thematic, devolve sectors related areas and establishing appropriate network.
7. Assessing the knowledge levels and capacities of trained elected representatives and other stakeholders to perform their official roles effectively and efficiently.

1.5 Approach & Methodology

It has been said **'well begun is half done'**. This proverb reminding us about the wonderful beginning of the project/ assignment certainly will lead us to achieve better in terms of quality and quantity. But as far as **"Impact Assessment of Training of PRIs",** is concerned, the study aims at examining the impact of capacity building activities undertaken in various states for all three tiers of PRIs with regard to the enhanced capacities of elected representatives and other stakeholders to perform their official roles effectively and efficiently and developing a systematic means of analysing and quantifying changes in capacity building initiatives provided to the elected representatives of PRIs, Panchayat functionaries and others in the context of basic orientation, various thematic areas and Gram Panchayat Development Planning. This study is able to recommend/ suggest the measures to improve the effectiveness and usefulness of training programmes organized for all the three levels of Panchayat stakeholders. The impact study has helped in identifying the outreach of training programmes conducted for all stakeholders of Panchayati Raj System with particular stress on elected representatives amongst SC and ST categories, Elected Women Representatives and also those from other marginalized sections. In addition, the study has assessed the quality of training provided to various stakeholders, identified the methods & procedure adopted for need based, thematic and sectors convergent training. The study also assessed the quality of Plans for providing training in mandatory, specialized, thematic, devolved sectors related areas and establishing appropriate network & assessing the knowledge levels and capacities of trained elected representatives and other stakeholders to perform their official roles effectively and efficiently.

The study has followed the SWOT Analysis in order to assess the Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats in these PRIs trainings and capacity building trainings across the states and the nation. The study has also come out with the measures regarding the Impact of the suggestions, recommendations and strategies as contained in National Capability Building Framework, 2014 on various aspects of Capacity Building. Further, the study has come out with identification of the need-based modes of training adopted for respective sectors/ categories of stakeholders and extent of success achieved. Assessment has also been made of Performance of Panchayati Raj Departments of States and other concerned authorities putting in place the Institutional structure and process sanctioned by Government for CB&T, their maintenance/ upkeep and up-gradation for providing optimum results in terms of building capacity of elected representatives at all the three tier levels in executing their responsibilities in terms of their mandate effectively and efficiently.

The focus of the study has been on:

- Relevance,
- Effectiveness,
- Efficiency,
- Sustainability and,
- Impact

Strengths Weaknesses Opportunities and Threats (SWOT)

STRENGTHS	WEAKNESSES
▪ In terms of teams and management structure ▪ Process ▪ Inputs ▪ Outcomes ▪ Infrastructures and facilities ▪ Personnel/ Training team and network ▪ Structures and its benefits - immediate and long terms ▪ Records and reporting	▪ System and processes ▪ Management ▪ Execution of facilities defined under guidelines ▪ Trainings & Capacity building ▪ Records and transparency ▪ Infrastructures ▪ Staffs
OPPORTUNITIES	**THREATS**
▪ Existing system – how beneficial and what is beneficial ▪ Value addition in terms of effectiveness of efficiency of development programmes ▪ Improvement in skill, knowledge, attitude and performance ▪ Ensuing conducive environment ▪ Consolidate and use the system strengthening measures ▪ Role of PRIs in management & participation ▪ Functional facilities and usefulness for stakeholders and citizens ▪ Dialogue of PRIs and management ▪ Ensuring better execution of development programmes and better participation ▪ Improved & Healthy environment	▪ Areas, process, system and activities need to be strengthened ▪ Factors and processes affecting the project and its quality execution ▪ Quality of execution ▪ Limited accessibility ▪ Execution level and standards, ▪ Understanding of functionaries and functioning ▪ Perception of PRIs ▪ Institutional structure and process sanctioned by Government for CB & T, their maintenance/ upkeep and up-gradation for optimum results.

A. THE METHODOLOGY OF THE STUDY

The study titled **"Impact Assessment of Training of PRIs"** has been conducted as per Terms of Reference of the MoPR. Based on Terms of reference the Organization has developed detailed methodology to undertake the study.

A combination of quantitative and qualitative research techniques (plurality of tools and technique) have been used for the Study on process, systems and functioning of Capacity building and training programmes to draw the holistic picture of the issues, existing situations, practices, beliefs and the problems which are directly and indirectly affecting the efficiency and quality of intervention of Trainings of PRIs at various levels in order to adhere to the norms of Trainings of Panchayats Representatives for all the three tiers.

As said, Methodological devices make a study organized, systematic and scientific-rational. The selection of methods also expresses the research aptitude of the researcher and his/her objectivity towards the whole exercise of study. By using this objectivity, i.e. inter-subjective agreement, social researcher establishes the relationship between (1) ideas and ideas, (2) ideas and

experiences, and (3) experiences and experiences. This 'triple synthesis' is necessary for making this study particular. In the study we have constructed the triple syntheses in case of both the qualitative and the quantitative assessment. Our team has discussed in detail the nature of tools of data collection. The sample States, districts, Blocks & GPs were visited by evaluation members team to assess the status as per the Questionnaires/ study tools finalized by the MoPR followed by observation –physical and records. The secondary data related to process were also collected in well-defined formats of system, processes, management practices &arrangements for PRIs training in the State.

The stakeholders for the study were:

- Elected Representatives of the PRIs
- Panchayat functionaries
- Working group/ Task force/ Panchayat Planning Team members
- NGOs/ CBOs / SHGs representatives
- Officials at Block and District levels
- Regular and empanelled trainers and training agencies/ Institutions

Also, the methodologies which were followed are,

The study covered all the 06 zones (Eastern, Western, Southern, Northern, North Eastern and Central zones) and States as per spread of the programmes involving all the relevant stakeholders and authorities

The study has covered all the states in the Country where there are elected PRIs. As per TOR three states from each of the six regions of India i.e. Northern, Southern, Eastern, Western, Central and North Eastern region were selected for the Study randomly from the sample frame of Sates of the zone.

In the sample frame of 06 zones, the states selected purposely is the category of PRIs trainings

Interaction of Evaluation team with Women PRIs in Assam

undertaken in the particular states only in the sample frame zone.

(a) Selection of Districts from Sample States

In total, 10% districts will be covered from each of the sample States through multi-stages cluster sampling technique so that each category of geographical and demographic coverage can have equal opportunity to be represented in the impact study.

In the sample there were representation of Aspirational districts and PESA districts in order to really assess the kind of efforts and achievements made in the focused districts in order to really strengthen Panchayats with capacitated ERs and Panchayat functionaries and stakeholders who were involved in developing their village development plan/ GPDP. For selecting sample districts, the state has been clustered on the basis of geographical divisions may be hilly, plain and ravines area. Or districts dominated by SC and STs etc. have been clustered and finally sample has been drawn from the sample frame jointly in consultation with the State.

Also, all the district level Panchayats Representatives/ Stakeholders trained under the programme were interviewed/ interacted based on their availability.

(b) Selection of Blocks from Sample Districts

In total, 10% blocks i.e. minimum 02 to 03 Blocks have been selected randomly from the sample district. Also, all the Block level Panchayats Representatives/ Stakeholders trained under the programme were interviewed/ interacted based on their availability.

(c) Selection of Gram Panchayats from Sample Blocks

In total, minimum 10% Gram Panchayats were covered from each of the Blocks through multi-stages cluster sampling technique so that each category of geographical and demographic coverage can have equal opportunity to be represented in the study.

Also, all the Gram Panchayat level Representatives/ Stakeholders/functionaries trained under the programme were interviewed / consulted based on their availability.

(d) Study tools/ questionnaire used to interview the beneficiaries, stake holders and authorities, officials and functionaries

In total 06 different tools were used,

- Questionnaire for assessment training by Elected Representatives of the PRIs –Induction Training (Tool- 1)
- Questionnaire for assessment training by Elected Representatives of the PRIs –Refresher Training (Tool- 1 A)
- Interview Schedule for Trainers –Resource Persons/ Trainers/Master Trainers at State/District and sub-district level (Tool-2)
- Questionnaire for Review of Training Programme & Training Institutions of PRIs based on Secondary data/Reports/ Training Plan/ Calendars of States/ Districts (Tool-3)
- Questionnaires / Guide for conducting Focus Group Discussions with stakeholders related to trainings under Panchayati Raj/ RGSA (Tool-4)
- Questionnaire/Interview Schedule for Panchayat functionaries (Tool- 5)
- Questionnaire/Interview Schedule for Panchayat functionaries (Tool- 5 A)
- State level data format (Tool 6) & District level data format (Tool-6A)

(e) Focus Group discussions (FGD) with the Elected Representatives, Panchayat Functionaries, Working Group/ Committee/NGOs and Trainers

The focus group discussion were organized separately and in mix group based on FGD guide. In total, about 2-3 FGDs were organized in each district with diverse stakeholders.

(f) Investigation of the records, documents and reports

The records, documents and reports of the sample institutions were observed /assessed/ investigated showing the preparedness for executing the trainings and handholding support.

Since the main effort of the study is 'to make data rational', the conversations with the stakeholders, Elected Representatives, Panchayat functionaries, NGOs/CBO/SHG representatives functionaries and officials 'informal' space was also given importance. We have also made efforts to associate with providing status of methods through the elements of flexibility, consistence and coherence so that the study does not lack direction. This was necessary and needed because missing links between causes and effects can be understood only when flexibility, consistence and coherence continue in the methodological efforts.

The quantitative and qualitative tools were used for undertaking the **"Impact Assessment of Training of PRIs"**, in the sample States of the particular zone of the country. The methods, tools and techniques were used in the study are stated hereunder:

Methods	❑ Quantitative: Empirical, Statistical ❑ Qualitative: Documentary, Cases, FGD, PLA/PRA
Techniques for collecting information	▪ Listing of trained personnel/ officials – Elected Representatives of the PRIs, Panchayat functionaries, Working group/ Task force/ Panchayat Planning Team members, NGOs/ CBOs / SHGs representatives, Officials at Block and District levels, Regular and empanelled trainers and training agencies/ SIRD

	▪ Examining records, literature related to CB&T ▪ Observing/inspecting the roles of various stakeholders and institutions/ department playing an instrumental role in ensuring Training quality & effectiveness. ▪ Standards and Quality of used logistics and methodology, training materials ▪ Interaction with the Training Institute stakeholders (SIRD, SPRCs, ETCs, PRTI, STARPARD), district officials & Block officials, ▪ Interaction with Elected Representatives of the PRIs, Panchayat functionaries, Working group/ Task force/ Panchayat Planning Team members, NGOs/ CBOs / SHGs representatives, Officials at Block and District levels, Regular and empanelled trainers and training agencies ▪ Using secondary data & information ▪ Listening to or interrogating informants: ▪ Open interviews, Focus group discussions (FGD). ▪ Visual Aids ▪ Examining records of Block/ Taluka and districts
Tools	• Interview Schedule/ Questionnaire for Trainees – Elected Representatives of the PRIs, • Interview Schedule/ Questionnaire for Panchayat functionaries, Working group/ Task force/ Panchayat Planning Team members, NGOs/ CBOs / SHGs representatives, Officials at Block and District levels, Regular and empanelled trainers and training agencies, • Questionnaire for Master Trainers/ Resource Persons • Questionnaire for SIRD/ Training Institutions) • Focus Group discussion guide
Techniques for analysis	• SPSS/ Excel - Computer based data processing • Statistical methods • Transforming qualitative information into quantitative data • Photo picture analysis

B. Sampling design –Sample & Sample size

Level	Universe	Sample size	Methodology	Sample respondents	Targeted sample	Actual Sample size
Zone	6	6	03 States have been selected randomly from the sample frame of zone across country -Northern, Southern, Eastern, Western, Central and North Eastern region	States	6	6
State	29 States	03 States from each zone	**18 sample States** of the zone through random sampling.	State level officials, SIRD/SPRC/ KRPS/RPs	180	367
Districts	All districts of Sample States	10% districts	10% districts were selected of the sample States of the zone through multi-staged sampling (SC/ST/ Geographical backward/ Located close to town/city)/ Aspirational district /PESA district at least one in State having more than one sample district –**Total 47 districts**	District level officials, DPRCs/ ETCs/Trainers – KRPs/RPs/ District level PRIs	410	728
Blocks	All Blocks of sample districts	10% or minimum 02 to 03 per districts	-	Block level officials, / Trainers – KRPs/RPs/ Block level PRIs @8-12 per Block	1060	1935
Gram Panchayats (GPs)	All GPs of the sample Blocks/district	10% GPs of the District. 50% ERs & Panchayat Functionaries were included in the sample study.	10% GPs of the sample Block/District were selected through multi-staged sampling (SC/ST/ Geographical backward/ Located close to town/city) Universe = @12 ER+ Panchayat rep. x 1715 =20580. 50% elected representatives & GP functionaries trained = 10290	PRIs and GP functionaries trained under RGSA/ other trainings of MoPR	10290	10681

C. Sample States & Sample districts across 06 Zones of the Country

As per the Study terms of reference, three sample States were drawn from each of the six zones of the country namely, Eastern, Western, Southern, Northern, North Eastern and Central zone. In total, 10 percent sample districts were covered. In the sample States there were total 471 districts. In the study total 47 sample districts were covered @ 10% State-wise (Table).

The sample districts were selected through multi-staged cluster sampling taking into consideration the dispersion of SCs, STs and Minority population in the districts of the State. The geographical location i.e. backward districts, location of district from State Headquarter has been considered while drawing sample districts. The Aspirational and PESA districts were given priority in the sampling process.

Out of the total sample, Aspirational districts were 36 percent and PESA districts covered were 19 percent.

Table 1.2: Sample States & Sample districts covering PESA & Aspirational districts

Zones	S.No.	States	Total Districts	Sample Districts @10%	Sample PESA Districts	Sample Aspirational Districts
1. Northern zone	1	Haryana	22	2	0	1
	2	Himachal Pradesh	12	1	0	0
	3	Rajasthan	33	3	1	1
2. Central	4	Madhya Pradesh	52	5	1	1
	5	Uttarakhand	13	1	0	1
	6	Uttar Pradesh	75	9	0	3
3.Eastern	7	Jharkhand	24	2	2	2
	8	Oddisha	30	3	1	1
	9	West Bengal	23	2	0	1
4.Western	10	Goa	2	1	0	0
	11	Gujarat	33	3	1	1
	12	Maharashtra	36	4	2	1
5.Southern	13	Andhra Pradesh	13	1	1	1
	14	Karnataka	30	3	0	1
	15	Kerala	14	1	0	0
6.North-Eastern	16	Assam	33	3	0	1
	17	Arunachal Pradesh	22	2	0	1
	18	Sikkim	4	1	0	0
		Total	**471**	**47**	**9**	**17**

Table 1.3: List of Sample States & Districts covered in the study titled 'Impact Assessment of Training of PRIs'

Sl.No	Name of State	Sl.No	Name of District	PESA Districts	Aspirational Districts
1	Uttar Pradesh	1	Amethi	0	0
		2	Basti	0	0
		3.	Sambhal	0	0
		4.	Sonbhadra	0	1
		5.	Chitrakoot	0	1
		6.	Saharanpur	0	0
		7.	Mathura	0	0
		8	Shravasti	0	1
		9	Lucknow	0	0
2.	Madhya Pradesh	1	Jabalpur	0	0
		2	Mandla	1	0
		3.	Rajgarh	0	1
		4.	Ujjain	0	0
		5.	Indore	0	0
3.	Uttarakhand	1.	Haridwar	0	1
4.	Haryana	1	Nuh	0	1
		2	Karnal	0	0
5.	Maharashtra	1	Amrawati	0	0
		2	Hingoli	0	0
		3	Thane	1	0
		4	Nandurbar	1	1
6.	Jharkhand		Ranchi	1	1
			Gumla	1	1
7.	Gujarat	1	Dahod	1	1
		2	Anand	0	0
		3.	Ahemdabad	0	0
8.	Oddisha	1.	Ganjam	1	0
		2.	Kharda	0	0
		3.	Khandhmal	0	1
9.	Rajasthan	1.	Baran	0	1
		2.	Nagaur	0	0
		3.	Dungarpur	1	0
10	Goa	1.	North Goa	0	0
11.	Kerala	1.	Trichur	0	0
12.	Andhra Pradesh	1.	Vishakapatnam	1	1
13.	Karnataka	1	Bangalore Rural	0	0
		2	Raichur	0	1
		3	Mysore	0	0
14.	Himachal Pradesh	1.	Solan	0	0
15.	Assam	1	Bishwanath	0	0

		2.	Udalgiri	0	1
		3.	Kamroop	0	0
16	Sikkim	1.	South Sikkim	0	0
17.	Arunachal Pradesh	1.	Namsai	0	1
		2.	Papumpare	0	0
18.	West Bengal	1	Birbhum	0	1
		2	Hooghly	0	0
	Total States (18)		**Total Districts (47)**	**Total PESA districts(9)**	**Total PESA districts (17)**

D. Methodology for Developing State-wise Performance Index

While collecting information on various aspects of training and other issues related to PRIs, we have collected the responses at the scale of 5 by which we have coded the PRIs responses as 1 if they responded poor experience and 5 if they rated it as Outstanding good experience. In order to derive an aggregate measure at the state-level, we considered it wise to assign weights to these responses in such a way that the responses indicating poor experience get low weightage and the responses indicating high / better experience get high weightage.

Specifically, to the responses of 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5, we have assigned the weight of -0.50, -0.25, 1, 1.25 and 1.50 respectively. It may be noted that the response of 1 indicates poor rating, for which a weight of -0.50 is allocated. In the movement from poor to satisfactory, a change of 0.25 is desired. But, in the movement from satisfactory to good which entails a big effort, a change of 0.75 is desired. However, in movement from 3 (good) to 4 (very good), an additional weight of 0.25 is proposed. Same is the case with movement from 4 (very good) to 5 (excellent).

These weights are then multiplied with the percentage share of responses in each response category – the aggregation of which was then divided by the sum of assigned weights. In other words, we have estimated the weighted average of the responses for all activities for each state.

As this weighted average of the responses due to its varying upper and lower bounds had implicit comparability issues among states, a better approach has been to derive an index of these weighted averages across eighteen states. To develop this index, we have used the similar approach as used by the UNDP to develop its Human Development Index across nations. Specific formula used for developing the index is as under:

$$State\ Performance\ Index_{ij} = \frac{wR_{ij} - \overline{wR_i}}{\overline{wR_i}}$$

where wR_{ij} indicates 'weighted response of i activity in j state' and

$\overline{wR_i}$ indicates 'average of weighted responses for i activity across states'

E. Phases of Study

The study has been conducted in four phases in order to gather data/ information on various aspects of Study. These phases are stated here under:

Phase 1: Understanding of Programme & its Processes: The first phase comprises collection of information, getting knowledge about norms for capacity building and Trainings on various modules by SIRD and also undertaking Impact study of various capacity building and trainings undertaken by SIRD/State agencies under the PRIs capacity building across States of country covering all the 06 zones. During this phase, conceptual framework of whole efforts to assess the quality of training, preparedness for trainings, engagement of trained resource persons/ master trainers and various other related aspects, objectives and purpose of study were studied.

Activities: Activities such as meeting with officials and stakeholders / experts to understand the roles and responsibilities of various training institutions –SIRDs and others and consulting various reports and modules.

Phase 2: Designing the Study: This phase consisted of specifying objectives of study, possible target group for study and choosing method for data collection as per objective. Primary data were collected through questionnaires and interview schedule from beneficiaries and stakeholders. Primary data in the study have helped us in getting first-hand information about the various aspects of trainings. After developing tools the same have been pre-tested and finalized for approval. On the basis of some comments & suggestions, the same have been finalized and submitted for approval. After getting approval the tools were used for data collection and field level assessment study.

Activities: The team also held discussions with MoPR, SIRDs officials and experts and Training institutions formally to understand the real dynamism and undercurrents. Also, the interactions with State, District and Block level stakeholders and Panchayat helped to understand every element of the capacity building and training programme. The interactions with Resource Persons/MTs/ NGOs/ CBOs, etc. were also made during the process of study.

Also, the tools were designed for the study. In total, 06 tools were developed and were approved by MoPR. After the consensus of MoPR, the tools have been used in the assessment study.

Phase 3: Empirical Phase: This phase consisted of data collection and data processing as per requirements. After pre-testing the tools and including correction in questionnaire/ interview schedule, FGD and Observation schedule as per feedback from pre-testing, the evaluation team has been put to task of data collection. The investigators were given 2 days extensive training on the tools and process of data collection.

Activities: The data collection has been done after conducting training of the evaluation personnel and field investigators.

Phase 4: Interpretative Phase: This phase includes data analysis and report writing. After editing, and tabulation of data, analysis of data was done keeping in view the purpose and objective of the study. Also, the Draft Report has been prepared based on data analysis. The Final report has been prepared after incorporating the comments, observations & suggestions of the Ministry of Panchayati Raj, Government of India.

Activities: The filled tools data were fed into the excel sheets for quantitative analysis after checking of the tools. Then the data were taken to SPSS software for analysis and generating tables. The quantitative analysis of the open ended and qualitative responses was also done through coding method.

1.6 Team Composition & Roles

To assess the scheme, a multidisciplinary team was constituted comprising Team Leader, Team members & Field Investigators. In each sample State, there was a team of three to seven members of field Investigators in addition to Team Members/ Team Leader.

Team Leader & Team Members	Research Associates	Field Investigator
Dr.Upendra Singh	Dileep Sharma	Mangi Lal Chimpa
Prof.(Dr.) Sunil Ray	Ravi Pareek	Rohitash
Dr. Rajeev Gupta	Jagdish Choudhary	Siya Ram Meena
Dr. K.N.Joshi	Ratan Lal Yogi	Vinod Kumar
Dr. Varinder	Pradeep Kumar	Mahaveer
Govind Narayan Sharma	Pawan Gautum	Kailash Saini
Kailash Kumawat	Manoj Kumar	Chote Khan
T.K. Navale	Patnala Saroja	Rohit Gautum
Vinay Kumar	Dr. D.K.Rana	P. Mathew
Shiv Kumar Jungam	Indrajit singh	Gautum Maity
K.Girijashankar	Rajendra Saini	Chotu Ram Choudhary
Saloni Jain		Parmeshwar
K.N. Sharma		Deepak
Dr. Alpana Singh		Nand Kishore
P.R. Sharma		Ganesh Behra
M.L. Sharma		Sumendra Roy
Ashok Sharma		Sumit Toppo
Amitabh Sharma		Ravi Kant
Annu Rathi		Lisee George
Govind Chandra		Sitakant Das
Pankaj Ojha		J R Kumawat
		Raju ram
		Chotu Ram
		Suresh Kumar

The Impact Assessment study of Training of PRIs was conducted with the overall guidance of Dr. Upendra Singh, Dr. Rajeev Gupta, Dr. Sunil Ray & G.N. Sharma. In each Sample State, the Assessment team has spent a minimum of 3-28 days in the field depending upon the sample spread and sample districts to interact with different stakeholders and receive their inputs.

Roles of Team

1. Selection of States from each of the 06 zone.
2. State level meeting with Department of PRD/ SPRCs officials.

3. Selection of Districts -Sampling of Districts along with State officials –Multi-staged sampling.
4. Selection of Blocks - Sampling of Blocks along with district officials –Multi-staged sampling.
5. Selection of GPs - Sampling of GPs along with Block officials –Multi-staged sampling.
6. Undertake the assessment study in contextual situation.

1.7 Limitation of the Impact Assessment Study

The Impact Assessment study overall has adopted a participatory, consultative and empirical approach. Due to various reasons, effective interaction with many officials, especially at the State, District & Block levels did not materialise. Secondly, many ERs, trained by the state failed to recall the inputs provided to them and methodology adopted for imparting training. This was because they normally attend a number of training programmes conducted on different schemes from time to time, so it was not possible on their part to recall specific training conducted under RGSA.

Secondly, there is not much distinction between RGSA, GPDP, SBM, and many other trainings organized for Block levels, GP level functionaries and ERs. Also, ERs were unable to differentiate schemes based on inputs at trainer, trainees and facilitating agency levels. As per the evaluation frame, secondary information was expected to be gathered from state and district levels. But non-availability of segregated data/information at the state and district levels affected the analysis of different components of the CB&T.

Thirdly, States & districts were unable to provide complete lists of Trainees out of the ERs and Panchayat Functionaries who had undergone training under Induction training and Refresher Training and also based on Caste and Gender-wise. The inputs under PESA is not segregated at the district and Block level in the sample States. Therefore, the assessment study has to involve the Panchayat Functionaries/ ERs of the Gram Panchayat as sample respondents for the study.

Fourthly, there were trainers who were selected and under Training of Trainers and some of them rated by NIRD. But in reality, many of them who were not involved in the training also became sample respondents because their names were reported in the list of Master Trainers/ resource persons.

Fifth, in the State where only one sample district is to be taken, there the choice of aspirational district/PESA district was restricted. Also, the study was done during monsoon season. Due to flood and land slide some sample districts, Blocks and Gram Panchayats were changed /altered at the eleventh hour.

Sixth, the response from SIRD/ Training institutions related to providing data related to CB&T, providing opportunity to interact with officials were not proactive. The reasons may be many.

Seventh, the illiterate ERs were unable to recall about the trainings and their purpose. The women ERs were not available in some States because mostly the roles were undertaken by their male counterparts of the family - husbands, sons and in-laws.

Last (Eighth) but not the least, is the sample PRIs respondents in the States where the tenure of elected ERs were completed and elected Panchayat was dissolved namely, Arunachal Pradesh (election due on May,2018) and Andhara Pradesh (election due on –GP- August, 2018 & BP & DP –April, 2019), there the last tenure ERs trained were the sample respondents. They have been contacted, interviewed and interacted.

113478/2020/789

Chapter - 2

Capacity Building & Training - Approach & Processes

In order to assess the Impact of Training of PRIs, it is necessary to assess the Capacity Building & Training. The Training & Capacity development approach and process adopted by different states was reviewed from the perspective of elected representatives (ERs) of Panchayat Raj (PR) Institutions and functionaries i.e. their capacity requirement and the adequacy of the schematic provisions to address the emerging capacity development needs and challenges. Presently, RGSA largely focuses upon the strengthening of PRIs. In the process of Impact assessment of Training of PRIs, the knowledge, skill, system, process and experiences were examined. Secondly, the state system, plan for capacity building, approach, infrastructures, human resource, monitoring & supervision system and processes were reviewed in the light of its relevance to meet the need and demand for capacity building & Trainings at various levels i.e. Zilla Panchayat, Block / Intermediary Panchayat and Gram Panchayat.

The Government of India has envisioned multipronged startegies to address the core issues of rural poverty, poor human development and unempolyment. After 73rd Constituional Amendment, there has been increase in public expenditure through Panchayats which has been more prominent in recent years. The Government of India provided financial assistance to PRIs through Fourteenth Finance Commission (FFC) award, and from centrally sponsored schemes (CSS) such as MGNREGA, PMAY and others. States additionally devolved funds though State Finance Commission (SFC). The FFC award has created an enormous opprotunity for responsive local governance at the cutting edge instituional level of the Gram Panchayats through large financial transfers during 2015 to 2020. The significant rise in available resources with the Panchayats need to be matched with improved service delivery and tangible impact at the local level.

Evaluation team in the Block level Training at Vishakhapatnam District, Andhra Pradesh

The coverage and outreach is the vital parameter as far as Capacity Building & Training of Panchayati Raj Institutions is concerned. The reason being the size of about 28.5 Lac Elected Representatives and that, too, spread into 654 District Panchayats, 6716 Intermediate/ Block Panchayats and 253054 Villages/ Gram Panchayats in India. In the Panchayat there are ranges of stakeholders such as ERs, Panchayat functionaries including Panchayat Development Officers, Secretaries, Accountants, Water Pump operators etc., departmental officials who work with Panchayats, Gram Sabhas or citizens, as well as people who impact Panchayats in various ways such as public representatives, experts, functionaries etc. The challenge is to reach out to these diverse groups, while ensuring high quality, context specific CB &T.

Capacity Building and Devolution Status

Capacity development is a means to achieve the high level goal of primary aim of strengthening Panchayati Raj Institutions (PRIs) for achieving Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) with main thrust on convergence with Mission Antyodaya and emphasis on strengthening PRIs so that they can effectively perform the functions devolved and the schemes entrusted to them. There is the need for Training and Capacity Building of elected representatives and officials of Panchayati Raj Institutions at all the three levels. So, strengthening the PR institution is a direct product of such initiatives where capacitated ERs contribute to make it happen. This necessitates that the overall environment of devolution which can make it happen should be strengthened enough so that there is ground for the ERs to exercise their powers and functions. Unless and until it happens, capacity development initiatives may not achieve their desired result. Incomplete/partial devolution in most of the states hampers administering the acquired capacity by the ERs at the ground level, which by itself becomes a hurdle in realizing the overall goal of capacity development.

Outreach of Capacity Building and Training

In order to reach out to large numbers, the key strategies are: the cascade mode of training, whereby resource persons are trained and they then provide training at multiple locations. Also, use of distance modes of education, especially satellite communicate or SATCOM based training; establishment of training institutes at decentralized i.e. district and block levels; and collaboration with NGOs and academic institutes to provide training as per a common framework. These strategies need to be continued and strengthened across States. An especially important issue for reaching out to large numbers is the need to train newly elected representatives after elections. Some States are able to train all newly elected representatives within six months of elections, but others take longer time. It is important that each State should develop the capacity and strategy to train all ERs after elections within six months. While all States address the training of ERs, efforts to train Panchayat functionaries such as Village Development Officers (VDO), Secretaries, accountants etc. are less uniform. Several institutes have begun to address new stakeholders, such as training of Panchayat Development Officers and watermen in Karnataka and training of Gram Sabhas, public representatives and media persons in Kerala. All States need to increase the range of stakeholders that they address reaching out to all those involved with Panchayats.

Special initiatives for the CB & T of women as well as SC & ST ERs have been envisaged under the component of capacity building to ensure that these ERs feel enabled to perform their role. In the States, SC, ST and women ERs often have limited formal education and experience, and face hostility and discrimination. Dominant members in their family or in society try to use them as

proxy candidates. In this context, it is utmost important for the States to develop a strategy to address the special needs of these ERs. This can include focused TNA exercises, selection of trainers sensitive to their needs, special sensitization of trainers, focused training campaigns, sensitization of all ERs to the needs of various communities etc. In several States, special measures for CB & T of women as well as SC and ST Elected Representatives have been taken. These need to be strengthened across States. For Schedule V areas, where the Panchayat Extension to Scheduled Areas Act (PESA) 1996 applies, special training programmes should be organized to activate the Gram Sabhas, as also to train the PESA mobilizers.

To achieve the required outreach and quality of CB & T, a strong institutional structure is necessary. At present, the availability of resource institutions below the State level varies across States, yet institutions at decentralized levels are necessary for high quality training for large numbers. Efforts have been made in States to establish State Panchayat Resource Centres (SPRCs) at the State level, District Panchayat Resource Centres (DPRCs) and may also to collaborate with the existing training institutions and NGOs as per the need and functions.

Looking to the above context, in last couple of years, Rashtriya Gram Swaraj Abhiyan has been in function, various initiatives have been taken up by the States to increase and improve the outreach across the States in terms of building Capacity and Training of ERs and Panchayat functionaries at various levels – District, Intermediate/ Block and Village Panchayat levels. The outreach of coverage of building Capacity and Training of ERs and Panchayat functionaries at various levels as per the target of States is stated hereunder,

2.1 Outreach of training programmes - SC and ST categories, Elected Women Representatives and other marginalized, PESA

The core issue of outreach or coverage of variety of Elected Representatives and PESA village committee officials and members is crucial as far as capability building & training (CB&T) is concerned. The comprehensive outreach of capability building & training (CB&T) implies provision of appropriate training to Elected Representatives (ERs) and functionaries at all levels of Panchayats or Panchayati Raj Institutions (PRIs), especially ensuring the inclusion of the cutting-edge level ERs and functionaries. Expanding the outreach of training also entails ensuring

coverage of the diverse groups of stakeholders of Panchayats. For CB&T for Panchayats, the challenge is, on the one hand, to cover very large numbers of ERs of the three tiers of Panchayats, as well as the core officials functioning at all these levels, and on the other hand, undertake appropriate capacity building of various stakeholders such as Gram Sabhas, departmental functionaries and other groups as per GPDP etc.

The comprehensive outreach must also focus on reaching out to heterogeneous groups in terms of gender, age-group, socio-economic background, geographical location, educational profile as well as addressing a comprehensive range of subjects, while maintaining the quality of training. In this section, the assessment has been done in terms of measures taken and method in practice in the states for expanding outreach to large numbers and to diverse stakeholders.

The findings of the assessment largely focused in terms of coverage of the CB&T in induction and refresher trainings as per the RGSA norms. The States level secondary data have been analyzed to assess the outreach of capacity building & trainings of elected Representatives. It shows that State claim coverage varies across the years i.e. from 2014-15 to 2018-19 which is indicated in the Table given below.

Table 2.1: Outreach of Training of Elected Representatives in the Sample States

Sl. no.	Name of State	Year (2014-15)			Year (2015-16)			Year (2016-17)			Year (2017-18)			Year (2018-19)		
		Target	**Achievement**	Achievement (%)	**Target**	**Achievement**	Achievement (%)	**Target**	**Achievement**	Achievement (%)	**Target**	**Achievement**	Achievement (%)	**Target**	**Achievement**	Achievement (%)
1	Andhra Pradesh	130210	130210	**100**	130210	130210	**100**	130210	130210	**100**	130210	130210	**100**	130210	130210	**100**
2	Arunachal Pradesh	NR	NR	**NR**	750	489	**65.2**	12552	8364	**66.6**	14821	3087	**20.8**	7860	1070	**13.6**
3	Assam	137585	119328	**86.7**	66405	55093	**83.0**	127270	92518	**72.7**	145006	131486	**90.7**	114051	110216	**97**
4	Goa	1000	1000	**100**	1000	1005	**100.5**	1000	638	**63.8**	1564	1864	**119**	1000	780	**78**
5	Gujarat	NR	NR	**#VALUE!**	NR	NR	**#VALUE!**	90000	4825	**5.4**	85175	48655	**57**	36520	5379	**15**
6	Haryana	NR	NR	**#VALUE!**	NR	NR	**#VALUE!**	61583	48295	**78.4**	9136	175	**1.9**	6515	10431	**160.1**
7	Himachal Pradesh	2946	788	**26.7**	1982	89	**4.5**	2274	635	**27.9**	2451	1402	**57.2**	1602	115	**7.2**
8	Jharkhand	NR	NR	**#VALUE!**	64698	0	**0**	64698	58402	**90.3**	98282	88181	**89.7**	13175	7749	**58.8**
9	Karnataka	95307	56374	**59.1**	98137	98996	**100.9**	104967	107510	**102.4**	104967	51668	**49.2**	104967	8657	**8.2**
10	Kerala	407886	27968	**6.9**	347679	18033	**5.2**	123091	39903	**32.4**	146329	39420	**26.9**	207151	109581	**52.9**
11	Madhya Pradesh	NR	NR	**#VALUE!**	7642	2113	**27.6**	NR	NR	**#VALUE!**	113764	85409	**75.1**	128559	117791	**91.6**
12	Maharashtra	1,05,024	48,818	**46.5**	27826	664	**2.4**	339159	329792	**97.2**	58634	49581	**84.6**	65,990	51437	**77.9**
13	Oddisa	100781	19969	**20**	100781	5936	**5.9**	100803	121135	**120.2**	106466	92154	**86.6**	106466	35075	**32.9**
14	Rajasthan	131063	72987	**55.7**	137996	23653	**17.1**	137996	169271	**122.7**	137996	148158	**107.4**	137996	128863	**93.4**
15	Sikkim	597	597	**100**	207	207	**100**	597	597	**100**	2419	2419	**100**	2316	2316	**100.0**
16	Uttarakhand	60481	410	**0.7**	108015	78899	**73.0**	71718	21174	**29.5**	46263	25489	**55**	60333	44702	**74.1**
17	Uttar Pradesh	NR	NR	**#VALUE!**	710326	710326	**100**	NR	NR	**#VALUE!**	295365	148975	**50.4**	NR	NR	**#VALUE!**
18	West Bengal	NR	NR	**#VALUE!**	NR	NR	**#VALUE!**	1210	1108	**91.6**	9554	7447	**77.9**	53029	44755	**84.4**

Source: Data of the State provided in Tool 6 & necessary enclosures
Abbreviations: NR- Not Reported

A. Training Outreach of Elected Representatives

As far as training outreach is concerned, this assessment study has made use of quantitative method to assess the outreach of CB&T of elected PRIs. The training outreach (achievement) of PRIs after election in the sample States has shown the different trends. It shows fluctuation between less than 10 percent to even 100 percent within six months of the election of PRIs in the States undertaking Induction/ refresher/ thematic trainings as per the norms and target set by the States in their training plan in the beginning of the financial year. The States namely, Sikkim & Andhra Pradesh have reported 100 percent achievement with regard to the training of elected representatives over last five years.

Arunachal Pradesh has reported 65.2 percent training achievement of elected representatives in the year 2015-16 & 66.6 percent in the year 2016-17 However, in the year 2017-18 & 2018-19 the State reported coverage of 20.8 percent & 13.6 percent respectively.

Assam has reported training achievement of elected representatives of 86.7 percent & 83 percent in the year 2014-15 & 2015-16 respectively. However, in the year 2016-17, 2017-18 & 2018-19 the State reported coverage of 72.7 percent, 90.7 percent & 97 percent respectively.

Goa reported 100 percent achievement with regard to the training of elected representatives in the year 2014-15 & 2015-16 with 63.8 percent training coverage in the year 2016-17 and 119 percent in the year 2017-18 & again to 78 percent in the year 2018-19.

Table 2.2: Training achievement (Outreach) of elected representatives in the Sample States

Year-wise	>50%	50-70%	70-90%	More than 90%	Training not reported
2014-15	Himachal Pradesh. Kerala , Oddisha, Maharashtra& Uttarakhand	Rajasthan &Karnataka	Assam	Andhra Pradesh, Goa & Sikkim	Arunachal Pradesh, Gujarat, Haryana, Jharkhand, Madhya Pradesh, Uttar Pradesh & West Bengal
2015-16	Himachal Pradesh, Jharkhand Kerala , Madhya Pradesh, Oddisha, Maharashtra& Rajasthan	Arunachal Pradesh	Assam & Uttarakhand	Andhra Pradesh, Goa, Karnataka, Uttar Pradesh & Sikkim	Gujarat, Haryana, West Bengal &
2016-17	Gujarat, Himachal Pradesh,Kerala & Uttarakhand	Arunachal Pradesh,Goa	Assam, Haryana	Andhra Pradesh, Jharkhand, Sikkim, Maharashtra, Oddisha, Rajasthan, West Bengal & Karnataka	Uttar Pradesh & Madhya Pradesh,
2017-18	Arunachal Pradesh, Haryana, Karnataka, Kerala	Gujarat, Himachal Pradesh, Uttarakhand & Uttar Pradesh	Jharkhand, Madhya Pradesh, Maharashtra, Oddisha &West Bengal	Andhra Pradesh, Sikkim, Goa, Assam & Rajasthan	
2018-19	Arunachal Pradesh, Gujarat, Himachal Pradesh, Karnataka, Oddisha	Jharkhand, Kerala	Goa, Maharashtra, Uttarakhand& West Bengal	Andhra Pradesh, Sikkim, Assam, Haryana, Madhya Pradesh & Rajasthan	Uttar Pradesh

Gujarat reported only 5.4 percent achievement with regard to the training of elected representatives in the year 2016-17 & 57 percent in the year 2017-18 & again 15 percent in the year 2018-19.

Haryana reported training coverage of 78.4 percent in the year 2016-17, 1.9 percent in the year 2017-2018 and 160.1 percent in the year 2018-19 with regard to the training of elected representatives.

Himachal Pradesh reported 26.7 percent achievement with regard to the training of elected representatives in the year 2014-15 & 4.5 percent in the year 2015-16. The State reported training coverage of 27.9 percent & 57.2 percent in the year 2016-17 & 2017-18 respectively. The achievement with regard to the training of elected representatives was reported 7.2 percent in the year 2018-19.

Jharkhand reported 0 percent achievement with regard to the training of elected representatives in the year 2015-16 with coverage of 90.3 percent in the year 2016-17 & remains 89.7 percent in the year 2017-18. In the year 2018-19, training achievement of elected representative was reported 58.8 percent.

Karnataka reported 59.6 percent achievement with regard to the training of elected representatives in the year 2014-15. In the year 2015-16 & 2016-17 the State reported an achievement of 100.9 percent & 102.4 percent respectively. The State has achieved 49.2 percent & 8.2 percent coverage regarding training of elected representatives in the year 2017-18 & 2018-19 respectively.

Kerala has achieved 6.9 percent coverage in the year 2014-15 & 5.2 percent in the year 2015-16 with regard to the training of elected representatives. However, in the year 2016-17 & 2017-18 the State has reported 32.4 percent & 26.9 percent coverage respectively with 52.9 percent achievement in the year 2018-19. The percentage of achievement has been measured against the target of KILA in which all the trainings of urban town / municipal and Panchayat have been included. In the training plan KILA report all the trainings of State as well as of MOPR. However, in terms of completing the PRIs training the State has reported completion of all the Induction trainings including training of elected women, SCs and STs.

Madhya Pradesh reported 27.6 percent, 75.1 percent & 91.6 percent coverage regarding training of elected representatives in the year 2015-16, 2017-18 & 2018-19 respectively. Maharashtra reported an achievement of 46.5 percent & 2.4 percent regarding training of elected representatives in the year 2014-15 & 2015-16 respectively. The State has shown coverage of 97.2 percent, 84.6 percent & 77.9 percent in the year 2016-17, 2017-18 & 2018-19 respectively.

Oddisha reported training coverage of 20 percent & 5.9 percent regarding training of elected representatives in the year 2014-15 & 2015-16 respectively. The State achieved coverage of 120.2 percent, 86.6 percent & 32.9 percent in the year 2016-17, 2017-18 & 2018-19 respectively.

Rajasthan reported training coverage of 55.7 percent & 17.1 percent with regard to training of elected representatives in the year 2014-15 & 2015-16 respectively. However, in the year 2016-17, 2017-18 & 2018-19 the State reported an achievement of 122.7 percent, 107.4 percent & 93.4 percent respectively.

Uttarakhand has shown an achievement of 0.7 percent in the year 2014-15 & 73 percent in the year 2015-16 regarding training of elected representatives. The State reported coverage of 29.5 percent, 55 percent & 74.1 percent in the year 2016-17, 2017-18 & 2018-19 respectively.

Uttar Pradesh has reported 100 percent achievement regarding training of elected representatives in the year 2015-16 & 50.4 percent in the year 2017-18. The State did not report training of elected panchayat representatives in the year 2014-15, 2016-17, 2018 & 2019.

West Bengal reported training coverage of 91.6 percent & 77.9 percent with regard to training of elected representatives in the year 2014-15 & 2015-16 respectively. The State has shown an achievement of 84.4 percent in the year 2018-19.

The training achievement of elected panchayat representatives over last five years in the sample States can be summarized as follows:

- Sikkim & Andhra Pradesh has reported 100 percent achievement with regard to the training of elected representatives over last five years.
- In the year 2014-15, Himachal Pradesh, Kerala, Oddisha, Maharashtra & Uttarakhand States have reported less than 50 percent achievement with regard to training of elected panchayat representatives. Rajasthan & Karnataka have reported an achievement between 50 to 70 percent, Assam reported an achievement between 70 to 90 percent. Andhra Pradesh, Goa & Sikkim reported an achievement of more than 90 percent.
- Himachal Pradesh, Jharkhand, Kerala, Madhya Pradesh, Oddisha, Maharashtra & Rajasthan have reported less than 50 percent achievement with regard to training of elected panchayat representatives. Arunachal Pradesh has shown an achievement between 50 to 70 percent, Assam & Uttarakhand reported an achievement between 70 to 90 percent. Andhra Pradesh, Karnataka, Uttar Pradesh, Goa & Sikkim reported an achievement of more than 90 percent in the year 2015-16.
- In the year 2016-17, Himachal Pradesh, Kerala, Gujarat& Uttarakhand States have reported less than 50 percent achievement with regard to training of elected panchayat representatives. Arunachal Pradesh & Goa have reported an achievement between 50 to 70 percent, Assam & Haryana reported an achievement between 70 to 90 percent. Andhra Pradesh, Jharkhand, Maharashtra, Oddisha, Rajasthan, West Bengal, Karnataka & Sikkim reported an achievement of more than 90 percent.
- Arunachal Pradesh, Haryana, Kerala & Karnataka have shown less than 50 percent achievement with regard to training of elected panchayat representatives. Gujarat, Himachal Pradesh, Uttarakhand & Uttar Pradesh have reported an achievement between 50 to 70 percent, Jharkhand, Madhya Pradesh, Maharashtra, Oddisha & West Bengal reported an achievement between 70 to 90 percent. Andhra Pradesh, Assam, Rajasthan, Goa & Sikkim reported an achievement of more than 90 percent in the year 2017-18.
- In the year 2018-19, Himachal Pradesh, Arunachal Pradesh, Gujarat, Karnataka,& Oddisha States have reported less than 50 percent achievement with regard to training of elected panchayat representatives. Jharkhand & Kerala have reported an achievement between 50 to 70 percent, Goa, Maharashtra, Uttarakhand & West Bengal reported an achievement between 70 to 90 percent. Andhra Pradesh, Assam, Haryana, Madhya Pradesh, Rajasthan & Sikkim reported an achievement of more than 90 percent.

B. Organizing Training for ERs within six months of election

With regard to organization of trainings for Elected Representatives soon after election as per NCBF 2014, it has been reported that in all the sample 18 States, trainings for elected Representatives of Zilla Panchayats and Intermediary /Block Panchayats were organized within the period of six months of election. But looking to the organization of trainings of ERs at Gram Panchayat level namely, Sarpanch/ Gram Pradhan and ward members there were 08 States which had organized trainings for elected representatives within six months of election namely, Andhra Pradesh, Assam, Goa, Karnataka, Kerala, Oddisha, Rajasthan, and West Bengal. But there were 10 States which despite of all efforts were unable to organize training within six months of election of Gram Panchayats ERs. However, these States were able to organize Zilla Panchayat and Intermediary Panchayat/ Block Panchayat ER trainings. The detailed data are presented in the table below.

Table 2.3: Elected Representatives (ERs) Trainings within six months of Election in the State

S.No.	States	Zilla Panchayat	Block Panchayat/ Intermediary Panchayat	Gram Panchayat
1.	Andhra Pradesh	Yes	Yes	Yes
2.	Arunachal Pradesh	Yes	Yes	No
3.	Assam	Yes	Yes	Yes
4.	Goa	Yes	NA	Yes
5.	Gujarat	Yes	Yes	No
6.	Haryana	Yes	Yes	No
7.	Himachal Pradesh	Yes	Yes	No
8.	Jharkhand	Yes	Yes	No
9.	Karnataka	Yes	Yes	Yes
10.	Kerala	Yes	Yes	No
11.	Madhya Pradesh	Yes	Yes	No
12.	Maharashtra	Yes	Yes	No
13.	Oddisha	Yes	Yes	Yes
14.	Rajasthan	Yes	Yes	Yes
15.	Sikkim	Yes	Yes	Yes
16.	Uttar Pradesh	Yes	Yes	No
17.	Uttarakhand	Yes	Yes	No
18.	West Bengal	Yes	Yes	Yes

While holding interaction with the State and district level stakeholders on the issues of coverage, it has been realized that States took the initiatives for training of ERs within the period of six months and the States were successful in organizing the trainings. But it has been reported that there were PRIs/ ERs who were left out/ not participated in the Induction trainings specially the ward members, ZP members and Intermediary Panchayat/Block Panchayat members.

C. Participation of EWRs/ SCs & STs in Induction Training

The achievement of EWRs, SCs & STs in induction training programme after the election result in the State has wide variation from very low to very high amongst sample states. Andhra Pradesh, Rajasthan, Karnataka, Sikkim & Kerala have shown 100 percent achievement of EWRs, SCs & STs in the induction training programme after the election result.

Madhya Pradesh has reported 0.2 percent,0.5 percent (SCs & STs each) achievement with regard to induction training programme of EWRs, SCs & STs respectively after the election result in the year 2015-16. In the year 2016-17, induction training was not reported and further in the year 2017-18 achievement with regard to induction training programme of EWRs, SCs & STs was reported 22.3 percent & 21.7 percent (each) respectively. Further, in the year 2018-19 the same was reported 30.5 percent, 28.8 percent & 29 percent respectively. Thus, induction training of 100 percent EWRs/SCs & STs was not reported by the State within six months of election result.

In Gujarat election of panchayat representatives was held in the year 2015 in the month of February & October. However, induction training of EWRs, SCs & STs were not reported in the year 2015-16. However, in the year 2016-17, achievement with regard to induction training programme of EWRs, SCs & STs was reported 21.6 percent, 14.9 percent & 14 percent respectively. In the year 2017-18, the same was reported 0.5 percent, 0.6 percent & 0.7 percent respectively. Further, in the year 2018-19, achievement with regard to induction training programme of EWRs, SCs & STs was reported 1.5 percent, 6.3 percent & 54 percent respectively Thus, induction training of 100 percent EWRs/SCs & STs was not reported by the State within six months of election result.

The States like Arunachal Pradesh, Goa, Haryana, Himachal Pradesh, Jharkhand, Maharashtra, Uttar Pradesh & Uttarakhand did not provide data of participation of EWRs, SC & STs in the induction training programme after the election result. In West Bengal, the participation of EWRs, SCs & STs in the induction training programme was 83.7, 84.4 & 85.5 percent respectively in the year 2018-19. In the State the election of panchayat representatives was held in July 2018.

In Assam, achievement with regard to induction training programme of EWRs, SCs & STs was reported 19.2 percent for each respectively. In the State the election of panchayat representatives was held in December 2018.

In Oddisha, the election of panchayat representatives was held in February 2017. The State reported achievement with regard to induction training programme of EWRs, SCs & STs of 34.2 percent, 56.4 percent & 37.5 percent respectively in the year 2017-18. In the year 2018-19, achievement with regard to induction training programme of EWRs, SCs & STs was reported 100 percent, 39.9 percent & 26.5 percent respectively. Thus, induction training of 100 percent EWRs, SCs & STs within six months of election was not reported by the State. However, the State has achieved 100 percent achievement with regard to induction training of EWRs in the next year.

The achievement with regard to induction training programme of EWRs, SCs & STs after the election result can be summarized here under:

- Andhra Pradesh, Rajasthan, Karnataka, Sikkim & Kerala have shown 100 percent achievement of EWRs, SCs & STs in the induction training programme after the election result.
- Induction training of 100 percent EWRs/SCs & STs was not reported by Gujarat, Madhya Pradesh & Oddisha State within six month of election result. However, Oddisha has reported 100 percent achievement with regard to induction training of EWRs in the next year.
- The States like Arunachal Pradesh, Goa, Haryana, Himachal Pradesh, Jharkhand, Maharashtra, Uttar Pradesh & Uttarakhand did not provide data of participation of EWRs, SC & STs in the induction training programme after the election result.

D. Refresher/ Thematic training of EWRs, SCs& STs

The achievement percentage with regard to Refresher/ thematic training of EWRs, SCs & STs was provided by only five states viz. Andhra Pradesh, Assam, Kerala, Rajasthan & West Bengal. The States like Andhra Pradesh, Kerala & Rajasthan have reported 100 percent achievement regarding Refresher/ Thematic training of EWRs, SCs& STs, whereas Assam & West Bengal have reported 90 percent coverage of EWRs, SCs& STs.

The remaining 13 states viz. Arunachal Pradesh, Goa, Gujarat, Haryana, Himachal Pradesh, Jharkhand, Madhya Pradesh, Maharashtra, Oddisha, Sikkim, Uttarakhand & Uttar Pradesh did not provide data related to participation of EWRs, SCs& STs in Refresher/ Thematic training.

The Refresher/ thematic training of EWRs, SCs& STs can be summarized as follows:

- Similar to Induction training, the States like Andhra Pradesh, Kerala & Rajasthan have reported 100 percent achievement regarding Refresher/ Thematic training of EWRs, SCs& STs.
- Assam & West Bengal have reported 90 percent coverage of EWRs, SCs& STs regarding Refresher/ Thematic training.

The remaining 13 states viz. Arunachal Pradesh, Goa, Gujarat, Haryana, Himachal Pradesh, Jharkhand, Madhya Pradesh, Maharashtra, Oddisha, Sikkim, Uttarakhand & Uttar Pradesh did not provide data related to participation of EWRs, SCs& STs in Refresher/ Thematic training.

E. Reasons for not achieving the Target of CB&T of PRIs/ERs in the Sample States

The sample States lagging behind in achieving the target of trainings, namely, Induction/Refreshers/Thematic because of following reasons,

1. The preparedness with regards to modes of training in order to address the large numbers required to be trained were not properly taken care in proactive manner.
2. The pedagogy is poorly designed. Hence, unable to set priority in terms of building desired capacity amongst ERs/PRIs.
3. The needs of special groups, namely women, SCs, STs, PESA,First timer ERs/Multi-timer ERs etc., were not given much focus.
4. The training plans were not properly designed and the mode of training was not properly considered while executing CB&T for PRIs/ERs .
5. The cascade mode of training and distance education, along with the use of media were not given much focus in the States. Lack of diverse training methods such as hand-holding through Help Desk/Help Line, peer interaction, quiz contests, experimental learning etc. to meet the diverse needs.
6. The use of Mass-media, i.e., radio, community radio, television, print media folk-media etc. were not much planned and used effectively.
7. The e-Modules and distance learning material were not reported designed and disseminated to supplement direct training except States namely, Assam, West Bengal, Karnataka, Sikkim & Kerala.
8. The States has limited scope for use of various modes of training by which the exposure of the trainee to theoretical and practical understanding has been happen.
9. The limited or non practice of system of review of training need timely and of current ERs by the SIRDs/ETCs/PTCs and other training institutes.
10. The poor Institutional capacities of SIRDs/ETCs/PTCs and raining institutes in terms of Manpower to undertake the trainings of PRIs timely. The field level capacity and management of trainings by the Institutes namely, SIRDs/ETCs/PTCs was very limited.
11. The coordination between States and Training Institutes were not reported convenient in many States. Also, the State Panchayat Raj Department/ related department hardly interfere and monitor the training programmes once it has transferred to training Institutes namely, SIRDs/ETCs/PTCs.
12. The support from contractual personnel working in the States under Panchayat Raj Department need to be given assured support in terms of their continuance, required monetary benefits and required responsibility so that they really feel connected with the overall CB&T.
13. The States lacked system of periodic evaluation of the training module, which is definitely necessity.
14. The System of tracking the progress of training ER-wise in the States and districts were not practiced in terms of monitoring the trainings in many States.
15. There has been lack of timely availability of required financial resources to make inroad to the capacity development programmes. Inadequate financial resources appear to have been posing formidable difficulties to some States.

2.2 National Capability Building Framework, 2014 – followed and practiced

The National Capability Building Framework (NCBF), a guiding document, was prepared in 2014 by the Ministry of Panchayati Raj (MoPR) for appropriate and regular capability or capacity building of Elected Representatives (ERs), officials and other stakeholders of Panchayats. This document focuses on the following thrust areas (1) Expanding the outreach of CB&T, (2) Modes of training (3) Areas of training (4) Quality of training (5) Training of ERs of SC, ST and women and (6) Institutional structure & processes.

The findings of the study mainly focusing on interactions with the states and understanding the level of following the recommendations made on six of the thrust areas in NCBF, 2014 for appropriate and regular capability or capacity building of Elected Representatives (ERs), officials and other stakeholders of Panchayats are given in the table below.

Table 2.4: States reported usefulness of NCBF, 2014

S.No.	States	NCBF 2014 thrust areas					
		Expanding the outreach of CB&T	Modes of training	Areas of training	Quality of training	Training of ERs of SC, ST and women	Institutional structure & processes
1.	Andhra Pradesh	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
2.	Arunachal Pradesh	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
3.	Assam	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
4.	Goa	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
5.	Gujarat	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
6.	Haryana	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
7.	Himachal Pradesh	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
8.	Jharkhand	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
9.	Karnataka	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
10.	Kerala	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
11.	Madhya Pradesh	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
12.	Maharashtra	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
13.	Oddisha	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
14.	Rajasthan	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
15.	Sikkim	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
16.	Uttar Pradesh	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
17.	Uttarakhand	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
18.	West Bengal	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Table 2.5: Percentage of NCBF, 2014 recommendations followed

S.No.	States	NCBF 2014 thrust areas					
		Expanding the outreach of CB&T	Modes of training	Areas of training	Quality of training	Training of ERs of SC, ST and women	Institutional structure & processes
1.	Andhra Pradesh	70% (3.5)	70% (3.5)	70% (3.5)	70% (3.5)	70% (3.5)	60% (3)
2.	Arunachal Pradesh	50% (2.5)	50% (2.5)	50% (2.5)	50% (2.5)	50% (2.5)	50% (2.5)
3.	Assam	90% (4.5)	70% (3.5)	90% (4.5)	80% (4)	80% (4)	80% (4)
4.	Goa	60% (3)	60% (3)	60% (3)	60% (3)	60% (3)	60% (2)
5.	Gujarat	60% (3)	60% (3)	60% (3)	60% (3)	60% (3)	50% (2.5)
6.	Haryana	60% (3)	60% (3)	60% (3)	60% (3)	60% (3)	50% (2.5)
7.	Himachal Pradesh	70% (3.5)	70% (3.5)	70% (3.5)	60% (3)	70% (3.5)	60% (3)
8.	Jharkhand	70% (3.5)	70% (3.5)	70% (3.5)	60% (3)	80% (4)	60% (3)
9.	Karnataka	90% (4.5)	90% (4.5)	90% (4.5)	80% (4)	80% (4)	90% (4.5)
10.	Kerala	90% (4.5)	100% (5)	100% (5)	100% (5)	90% (4.5)	90% (4.5)
11.	Madhya Pradesh	60% (3)	60% (3)	50% (2.5)	60% (3)	60% (3)	70% (3.5)
12.	Maharashtra	80% (4)	80% (4)	80% (4)	80% (4)	80% (4)	80% (4)
13.	Oddisha	80% (4)	80% (4)	80% (4)	80% (4)	80% (4)	80% (4)
14.	Rajasthan	70% (3.5)	70% (3.5)	70% (3.5)	60% (3)	70% (3.5)	60% (3)
15.	Sikkim	70% (3.5)	70% (3.5)	70% (3.5)	70% (3.5)	70% (3.5)	70% (3.5)
16.	Uttar Pradesh	70% (3.5)	70% (3.5)	60% (3)	60% (3)	60% (3)	80% (4)
17.	Uttarakhand	80% (4)	70% (3.5)	70% (3.5)	70% (3.5)	70% (3.5)	70% (3.5)
18.	West Bengal	100% (5)	90% (4.5)	100% (5)	90% (4.5)	90% (4.5)	100% (5)

Ranking of States based on following the recommendations of NCBF Framework, 2014

The ranking of States based on the recommendations of NCBF Framework, 2014 has been calculated as weightage and marking given. It is based on the extent of the recommendations of NCBF Framework, 2014 followed. Based on the interactions, reports and documents shared by the States regarding the practicing / executed the recommendations of NCBF Framework, 2014, it was rated on each of the six thrust areas (1) Expanding the outreach of CB&T (total 10 recommendations), (2) Modes of training (total 08 recommendations) (3) Areas of training (total 05 recommendations) (4) Quality of training (total 06 recommendations) (5) Training of ERs of SC, ST and women (total 11 recommendations) and (6) Institutional structure & processes (total 08 recommendations). The rating has was done on 5-point scales - 0-Poor; 1- Satisfactory; 2-Good; 3-V.Good; 4-Execllent; 5- Outstanding.

The total weightage is of 100 mark for the six thrust areas (1) Expanding the outreach of CB&T, (2) Modes of training (3) Areas of training (4) Quality of training (5) Training of ERs of SC, ST and women and (6) Institutional structure & processes. Out of the 06 thrust areas of the recommendations of NCBF Framework, 2014, the weightage was given rationally. The thrust areas having 10 & above number of recommendations were given weightage 20 and the thrust areas having less than 10 number of recommendations were given weightage 15.

Table 2.6: Ranking of States based on following the recommendations of NCBF Framework, 2014

States	NCBF 2014 thrust areas							
	Expanding the outreach of CB&T	Modes of training	Areas of training	Quality of training	Training of ERs of SC, ST and women	Institutional structure & processes	Total	Ranking
Weightage	**20**	**15**	**15**	**15**	**20**	**15**	100	
West Bengal	20	13.5	15	13.5	18	15	95	I
Kerala	18	15	15	15	18	13.5	94.5	II
Karnataka	18	13.5	13.5	12	16	13.5	86.5	III
Assam	18	10.5	13.5	12	16	12	82	IV
Maharashtra	16	12	12	12	16	12	80	V
Oddissa	16	12	12	12	16	12	80	V
Utrakhand	16	10.5	10.5	10.5	14	10.5	72	VI
Sikkim	14	10.5	10.5	10.5	14	10.5	70	VII
Jharkhand	14	10.5	10.5	9	16	9	69	VIII
Andhra Pradesh	14	10.5	10.5	10.5	14	9	68.5	IX
Himachal Pradesh	14	10.5	10.5	9	14	9	67	X
Rajasthan	14	10.5	10.5	9	14	9	67	X
Uttar Pradesh	14	10.5	9	9	12	12	66.5	XI
Goa	12	9	9	9	12	9	60	XII
Madhya Pradesh	12	9	7.5	9	12	10.5	60	XII
Gujarat	12	9	9	9	12	7.5	58.5	XIII
Haryana	12	9	9	9	12	7.5	58.5	XIII
Arunachal Pradesh	10	7.5	7.5	7.5	10	7.5	50	XIV

Some Findings and problems shared by States in following the NCBF 2014 are:

1. It has been realized that all the sample states are aware of NCBF, 2014 and to a larger extent, they have followed the various recommendations framed into six different parameters namely, *Expanding the outreach of CB&T, Modes of training, Areas of training, Quality of training, Training of ERs of SC, ST and women and Institutional structure & processes*.
2. The magnitude of following the various recommendations varied in States based on the available system and resources. The ranking of States based on the following/practicing the recommendations shows that States followed the recommendations in descending order are – West Bengal (I), Kerala (II), Karnataka (III), Assam (IV), Maharashtra & Oddisha (V), Uttarakhand (VI), Sikkim (VII), Jharkhand (VIII), Andhra Pradesh (IX), Rajasthan & Himachal Pradesh (X), Uttar Pradesh (XI), Goa & Madhya Pradesh (XII), Gujarat & Haryana (XIII) & Arunachal Pradesh (XIV). ,
3. The Nodal Training Institutes namely, SIRD, PRIT etc. reported that Fund from MoPR, GoI and State Government is not released in time, especially since inception of RGSA and mandate of 60:40 ratio of GoI-GoR funding.
4. Even NCBF 2014 now needs to be updated in view of new scheme of RGSA and new initiative of People's Plan Campaign of GoI for GPDP, by MoPR & MoRD, GoI.

2.3 Training Quality - methods & procedure for need based, thematic and sectors convergent training

Quality is an important ingredient as far as Capacity Building & Training is concerned. As said well that the impact of CB&T depends on its quality which is more determined by arrangement of training, lodging and boarding, Master trainers, Training session, participation of trainees, training methodology looking to the trainees and the training materials given to the trainees/participants. Poor quality CB &T can be meaningless and sometimes gives negative support to the programme, while high quality CB & T can be inspiring and invigorating, and builds skills of the trainees to perform their roles in a better way. Therefore, it is important to strive towards high quality CB&T as far as Training of stakeholders of local democracy/village Panchayat / elected Representatives is concerned.

It has been reported in the sample States that various training programmes namely, Induction, Refresher, and Thematic trainings have been organized for Elected representatives of Gram/ Village Panchayat, Intermediate/ Block Panchayat and Zilla Panchayat/ District Panchayat and respective Panchayat Functionaries and officials.

A. Systematic Approach to Training

Across the sample States, it has been reported that the trainings have largely followed the Systematic Approach to Training. The various stages followed were,

(i) Training Needs Assessment (TNA) – The Training Need Assessment is a stage which entails the conduct of an investigative exercise of identifying the training needs being perceived by PRI-elected representatives & officials at the three levels. This is done through facilitating multi-stakeholder workshops at decentralized locations of divisional/district headquarters (Arunachal Pradesh, Jharkhand, Oddisha, West Bengal, Rajasthan etc.) or may be undertaken by some expert agency (Madhya Pradesh). The TNA helps in proper need based design of the training programmes looking to the contextual situation and trainees' needs. The States, where TNA has been reported were Andhra Pradesh, Goa, Gujarat, Haryana and Uttar Pradesh. In these States it has been done in a proper manner having some documentary evidences.

TNA Process in Rajasthan

In order to identify the need for Training, Rajasthan has adopted a consultative process to identify capacity requirements of ERs and officials. SIRD organized a four day workshop at each divisional location [the state has seven divisions] facilitated by Zilla Parishads of the respective divisions. On the first day of the workshop, needs of elected Zilla Panchayat members and related district level officials were identified. On the second day needs of Panchayat Samiti members and functionaries; on third day elected Sarpanchs, ward members and Gram Sevaks and on fourth day Gram Sabha needs were identified respectively. The needs of Gram Sabha were identified by discussions with selected people/opinion leaders from selected GPs of each division. Thus, needs of all target trainee segments were captured. The extent to which the process was participatory and the degree of participation of different stakeholders could not be ascertained but the strategy adopted for assessment was quite decentralized and consultative.

After the completion of TNA workshops at each division level, an experiential learning and sharing workshop was organized at the SIRD level to finalize emerging needs and aspirations of elected PRI representatives in the state. Based on the findings of the need assessment process, necessary changes were made in the training modules. Till now, the state has conducted three TNAs in the years 2000, 2004, 2009, 2011, 2014 (PRIs-Raj.) 2016 - (sp. for UN-Women Project Districts) & 2019.

(ii) Training Material Development (TMD) – Developing training materials for training is an important stage. This helps in proper design of sessions and training inputs based on the requirements of the situation/ category of trainees and training types i.e. Induction, Refresher and Thematic. Based on the TNA, need-based Training Modules & Learning Materials developed were, in a user-friendly, easy to understand language. The Training Modules comprise a compendium of design briefs of Training Plan and session-wise Programme Schedule of different levels of PRI Training Programmes proposed under each PRI Training Campaign.

In all the sample States, the Training Material has been developed for training of elected representatives and Panchayat Functionaries at Zilla level, Intermediary level and Gram Panchayat level. It was reported Very Good and Good in terms of Training materials in all sample States except Gujarat, where its has been reported Satisfactory. In Gujarat only one Training material was shared which was photocopy.

(iii) Training of Trainers (ToT) – In order to prepare cadre of trainers with common methodology and understanding to meet the challenge of training a huge number of Panchayat ERs and functionaries, without dilution of quality, it requires identification and training of quality trainers; training of trainers is the right answer. The more efficient way of outreaching trainings is all stakeholders of Panchayats have the decentralized training mode in which trainings for Panchayats are held at multiple locations, viz.-state, division, district, block, sub-block/cluster of Gram Panchayats etc., thereby ensuring universal and speedy coverage.

An essential pre-condition for holding decentralized trainings at multiple locations is creating a strong cadre of trainers. Trainers can be trained by SPRcs/ETCs/SIRDs/ DPPRs etc. to deliver training at the decentralized locations. This strong cadre of trainers deployed by State and district certainly helps outreach training to all Panchayats in a fast track mode i.e. within 6 months, without transmission loss.

The focus has been made to ensure uniformity of common training design, content, methodology and session plan, curricula and inputs of knowledge, skills and attitudinal re-orientation, as trainings can be delivered in quality manner.

(iv)Training of PRIs (TPRIs) - For delivering high quality, high speed & inclusive training for PRIs, the decentralized training system - Cascade Model-wherein, Training of PRIs is held at multiple locations simultaneously and completed in a campaign mode in many States. The State where training of Elected representatives has been organized within a period of six months of election is West Bengal. Elsewhere, trainings have been organized after a period of 6 months.

(v) Training Impact Assessment (TIA) - After completion of each PRI Training Campaign, with a due gap of about 6 months, training impact assessment is also conducted, either through multi-stakeholder workshops for taking feedback or through field-based sample research study, involving PRI- stakeholders at various levels.

The findings of study report that training Impact Assessment (TIA) is the regular phenomenon in the CB&T in the sample States during the process of execution of trainings under RGSA and also under GPDP. However, the documentary proof related to TIA is not shared by any of the sample States. Therefore, at this juncture it is needed to learn from the earlier system, process and impact of trainings and it needs to be documented to help in policy planning of CB&T in the State and shape up the whole capsule of trainings for ERs to help them in better delivery of their roles and responsibilities and develop better vision for the development of Gram Panchayat in the ambit of Mission Antodaya, GPDP and SDGs.

As per the recommendations of NCBF 2014, in order to ensure Quality of Trainings, TIA has been the integral part of the whole process. But the State should learn from their own strengths & weaknesses of process system so that it should really make difference and ensure proper impact of CB&T.

B. Planning & Organizing Training

Elected Representatives soon after winning the Panchayat election in the State attained institutional status with 73rd Constitutional Amendment. Article 243(G) of the constitution of India mandated Panchayat to plan for economic development and Social Justice. Thus, looking to the roles and responsibilities expected from Elected Representatives as per 73rd Constitutional Amendment to act as Institutions of Local Self Governance in consonance with the spirit of Constitution, also, huge devolution of power and funds has been made in Fourteenth Finance Commission. Hence, the importance of Capacity Building & training (CB&T) as non-negotiable element has been well recognized and given greater space in RGSA. Thus, the essence of planning for organizing Quality training for ERs can be well understood.

Participated in One Day Meeting for GPDP & not the Training – Rajgarh district of Madhya Pradesh

The ERs during assessment reported that they had been called for one day meeting at Janpad office (in Rajgarh District) in which they had been oriented about the roles and responsibilities and GPDP too.

In each of the sample States, the concern for trainings of PRIs is well thought of; as a result a dedicated Institution has been set-up or nominated which is working as nodal agency for the whole Capacity Building & Trainings of ERs. In each of the sample States, different Institutions have been nominated as Nodal Institution for facilitating trainings of ERs/ PRIs namely, State Institute of Rural Development (SIRD), Central Training Institute (CTI), State Panchayat Raj resource Centre (SPRC), Panchayat Raj Department, Panchayat Raj Training Institute (PRTI) & STARPARD etc. In the sample States efforts have been made to follow the recommendations of NCBF 2014 with regard to Planning for trainings of ERs. It has been planned to undertake Induction Training/ Foundation trainings within six months of election and refresher training may be undertaken within 2 years. But it has been experienced in the sample States that in terms of planning for training every State has been striving for the same and also developing convergence with other sectoral department to build the capacity of ERs on various schemes related to socio-economic development, Planning and execution of development programmes, undertaking provisions for Tribal under PESA Act etc.

The State level Nodal Training Institute/ department in almost all the States have prepared training modules and reference materials for use in the Trainings related to Panchayat Raj Act, devolution of departments/ Subjects, Roles and responsibilities of various PRIs may be at State, Intermediary and Gram Panchayats. Also, manual relating the roles and responsibility of various sub-committees were prepared by the States.

Each state has prepared hand book/reference book for the ERs and functionaries. The handbook depicts the 73rd constitutional amendments, role and responsibilities of PRIs, different schemes implemented in the state, etc. However, the reading material has excessively used written text as medium of communication with less use of graphics, visuals and case analysis. Looking into the profile of trainees, especially at the GP level, the relevance of resource material seems very low as the content is more academic in nature. Many respondents were of the opinion that the training sessions were not reflected in the reading materials provided to them. As trainers did not share their presentations/lecture notes, much information went missing and it becomes difficult for the trainees to recall and apply the learning to the work sphere after training.

However, during the process of Impact Assessment studies and while interacting with various ERs who have low educational level it was reported that the Training materials and training sessions had large number of participants, may vary from 40 to 160 in number. Also, the training materials

were reported not given in some States to Gram Panchayat level trainees (Uttar Pradesh, Haryana, Rajasthan, Arunachal Pradesh, Goa & Gujarat).

Table 2.7: Training materials for ERs/PRIs in the State

S.No.	States	Training Materials & Modules			
		Training Materials and Module for Zilla Panchayat	Training Materials and Module for Intermediary Panchayat	Training Materials and Module for Gram Panchayat	Training modules for GPDP/ Peoples' Plan campaign
1.	Andhra Pradesh	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
2.	Arunachal Pradesh	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
3.	Assam	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
4.	Goa	Yes	NA	Yes	Yes
5.	Gujarat	No	No	Yes	Yes
6.	Haryana	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
7.	Himachal Pradesh	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
8.	Jharkhand	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
9.	Karnataka	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
10.	Kerala	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
11.	Madhya Pradesh	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
12.	Maharashtra	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
13.	Oddisha	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
14.	Rajasthan	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
15.	Sikkim	Yes	NA	Yes	Yes
16.	Uttar Pradesh	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
17.	Uttarakhand	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
18.	West Bengal	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

C.Mixed Vs. Single Group Training

In almost all the states, trainings are organized for trainees in exclusive groups by their functional level – separately for ERs and functionaries. Excluding a few cases, trainings are not organized in mixed groups for different thematic areas. The mix training has been reported in a few States namely, Rajasthan, Kerala and Oddisha. Had it been the case, it could have facilitated the sorting out of many issues related to strengthening the service delivery and local governance system. Organizing training in single group is also attributed to non-willingness of the ERs and functionaries to share a common platform of learning with their counterparts functioning at a lower level. The ERs of district level are not willing to be trained with the ERs of Blocks and GPs. A similar situation marks the functionaries of district, block and GP levels. Other reasons for organizing separate trainings were suitability and cost effectiveness. As cost of training for different categories of trainees by their functional level is different, it was thought of organizing separate trainings for each group rather than training them in mixed groups.

D.Training Feedback System and its Utility

Obtaining feedback on training after the completion of training has been a practice in all the states. In Kerala, software called Mentimeter which is paid software was used in getting feedback from the participants in house trainings. In States, like Himachal Pradesh, Uttarakhand, Goa, Andhra Pradesh, West Bengal, Assam, Sikkim, Jharkhand, Uttar Pradesh the feedback and suggestions are obtained from all participants for evaluation of training. These inputs are used for further improvement of the training programmes and its implementation methodology. The training feedback system includes the internal feedback obtained by administering a schedule. This schedule basically covers the basic amenities at the training centre, the training arrangements and the quality of training. The course coordinator report is prepared based on the feedback received from the participants. The feedback obtained is used to modify the ensuing training programmes.

The States, where the feedback received was not reported / compiled were Rajasthan, Gujarat, Haryana, Himachal Pradesh, and Arunachal Pradesh.

Gram Pradhan took the Role of Trainer in Uttrakhand

In the State of Uttrakhand, the Department of Panchayat Raj, GoUK took the responsibility of trainings by arranging its own resources. The State has a team of Master trainers from department, retired officers of Panchayat Raj. In addition, there were trainers from ex-ERs and also present ERs who were undertaking the responsibility of master trainers. It has been realized by the assessment team that their role as Master trainers was effective in preparing the Gram Pradhans to undertake their role effectively. In Haridwar district of the State, the Gram Pradhan took the role effectively and also undertook the project related to Solid waste collection and treatment.

E.Quality of Trainers

The availability of Trainers and their Quality is directly proportional to have quality training to an extent, provided the required support and system are in place. To meet the vast requirements of capacity building and fulfil the mandate to cover all the ERs and their functionaries, each state has developed a cadre of trainers/resource persons / Master trainers who impart training to the different PRI cadres i.e. State, District, Block and Gram Panchayats. The empanelled trainers have undergone ToT at the SIRD/ PRTI/ State Directorate level and they are given modules and manuals for imparting training at different

levels. With the supply of standardised modules and manuals, content of the programme is kept constant in all the districts which help to minimise any biases on the part of the trainer and deviation from the original theme. In all the sample States except Jharkhand, Kerala, Goa, Karnataka, Oddisha, West Bengal and Sikkim mostly the Master trainers were selected from Government department officials. The retired Government officials, Ex-PRIs and NGOs persons were also taken into the team of trainers. In Rajasthan, there were about 2000 master trainers listed for trainings in the State. In Uttarakhand there were pool of 2400, Madhya Pradesh 1800, Uttar Pradesh 2400, Kerala 1150, Karnataka 198,Assam 6500, Sikkim 49, Arunachal Pradesh 75, Andhra Pradesh 2608, Maharashtra 700, and Haryana 106 trainers/ Master trainers used in the CB&T of PRIs.

In almost all the sample States, the training of Trainers was organized to have uniformity in the training. The TOT in the States varies from 2-5 days. In Jharkhand TOT for State level master trainers was organized for 15 days. In the States, the Master trainers were used after grading. The higher rated Master trainers /Resource persons were used for imparting trainings. It has been also reported that in present situation, the Master Trainers were rated by a process by NIRD&PR. The States are using the recommended master trainers in most of the cases.

F.1 Assessment of Master Trainers/Resource Persons

The Sample study also focused on experience and quality of trainers and as such it is stated hereunder,

F.1.1 Experience of Master trainers/ trainers & resource persons

Regarding master trainers/ trainers & resource persons' years of experience, it has been reported that majority (60%) of Master Trainers have experience, may be up to 5 years and below. Based on years of experience, 18.8 percent sample respondents had experience up to one year followed by 41.4 percent sample respondents had experience of one to five years, 20.7 percent sample respondents had experience of five to ten years, & 14.1 percent sample respondents had experience of ten to twenty years & 5 percent sample respondents had experience of above twenty years.

F1.2 Association with level of training

As far as sample respondents' association with level of training is concerned, 23.1 percent sample respondents are associated with state level training followed by 31 percent sample respondents associated with district level training & 45.9 percent sample respondents associated with Block level training.

F1.3 Selection of Trainers/ Resource Persons/Master Trainers

As far as selection of trainers/ resource Persons/master Trainers for the various training programmes may be at State, district and Block level trainings is concerned, 48.5 percent sample respondents reported that they had applied & were interviewed followed by 41.9 percent sample respondents reported that they were nominated & selected by position, whereas the remaining 9.5 percent sample respondents opted for others.

With regard to Training of trainers (TOT) 90.7 percent sample respondents reported that they had undergone training of trainers on various subjects related to Panchayat Raj, SDGs, Mission Antyodaya, MGNREGA & RGSA related subjects on which they have been associated, whereas 9.3 percent sample respondents reported that they had not undergone training under Panchayat Raj/ RGSA subject on which they have been associated. Regarding duration of TOT, out of 90.7 percent sample respondents who reported that they had undergone training under Panchayat Raj/ RGSA, 15.8 percent sample respondents reported that duration was of one day followed by 31.6 percent sample respondents opted for 2 to 3 days, 44.4 percent sample respondents opted for 4 to 5 days & 8.2 percent sample respondents reported for more than 5 days of TOT.

Table 2.8: Selection for training of Trainers/ Resource Persons/Master Trainers

S.No.	Particulars	Responses	Nos.& %
1.	Selected for RPs/ MTs	Applied & interviewed	183(48.5)
		Nominated	158(41.9)
		Others	36(9.5)
		Total	377(100)
2.	Undergone training of trainers (TOT) under Panchayati Raj/ RGSA	Yes	342(90.7)
		No	35(9.3)
		Total	377(100)
3.	Duration of training (days)	1 day	54(15.8)
		2-3 days	108(31.6)
		4-5 days	152(44.4)
		More than 5 days	28(8.2)
		Total	342(100)
4.	Rating of TOT by trainers/RPs	Satisfactory	37(9.8)
		Good	43(11.4)
		Very good	93(24.7)
		Excellent	92(24.4)
		Outstanding	112(29.7)
		Total	377(100)

Note: Figures within brackets are the percentages

The quality of training depends upon the preparedness in the training of trainers in terms of better organizing the training with active participation of Trainees. Regarding rating of overall training of TOT by sample respondents, 9.8 percent sample respondents rated TOT as satisfactory followed by 11.4 percent sample respondents rated good, 24.7 percent sample respondents rated very good, 24.4 percent sample respondents rated excellent & 29.7 percent sample respondents rated TOT as outstanding. Thus, 90.2 percent sample respondents rated TOT from good, very good, excellent to outstanding.

Table 2.9: Strengths & Weaknesses of TOT (State-wise)

State	Strengths	Weaknesses
Andhra Pradesh	• Icebreaking interactive & participatory	• Short term training • More items were covered in less time
Arunachal Pradesh	• Thorough description of subjects • Handholding sessions, practical & interactive sessions	• Low attendance of participants • Poor internet connectivity
Assam	• Content & methodology of training • Thematic discussion, experienced resource persons, study material provided • Interactive & practical sessions	• Time management • Trainings were of shorter duration
Goa	• Presentation of issues with facts & data & trainers were good during TOT • Sharing of experience during training	• Field trips/visits were not arranged during training

Gujarat	• Contents, Delivery, Pedagogy, Participative	• Time constraint, little hectic due to over occupied with subjects
Haryana	• Projector etc. were used during TOT. • Gained knowledge & information during training • Resource persons were knowledgeable & experienced	• Low attendance of participants during TOT
Himachal Pradesh	• Capacity building • Gain of knowledge & skills	• Technical issues which are not resolved on time
Jharkhand	• Time bound &content based specific • Different tools viz. film, group activity, game & participatory method • Content relevant • Training skill improved • Knowledge gained on various issues/ subjects	• Feedback & assessment should be done after each TOT. • TNA should be planned before each training • Sometimes MTs were not properly trained • Use of lecture method, long sessions & lack of exposure visit • Thematic & core issues not clear
Karnataka	• Video conferencing during TOT	• Exposure visit not organized
Kerala	• Participatory • Activity oriented • Trainee centered • Software based feedback system in the training (using Mentimeter)	• Training of short duration • Target groups are huge to cover
Madhya Pradesh	• Capacity building • Gain of knowledge & skills	• Information to trainees regarding training programmes should be given in advance. Mostly information regarding training programmes were given at the last moment
Maharashtra	• Training arrangement was good viz. boarding & lodging • Knowledge & information gained during training on various issues • Distribution of reading material • Imparting training with pictorial & presentation	• Learning area was less/ minimum, routine training • Attendance was less during training
Oddisha	• Gained knowledge on different themes • Learnt skills to impart training • Helped in building confidence • Capacity building & development of creativity • Improved leadership quality	• Time constraint
Rajasthan	• Capacity building • Gain of knowledge & skills	• Lacking in proper selection of MTs having command on topics/ issues & having capacity to take the whole sessions of training
Sikkim	• Planned sessions, Participants were	• Duration of training is very long.

	active • Helped to develop skills & enhancement of capacity building • Learned various schemes • Resource persons were well qualified & experienced • Training arrangement & facilities were excellent	It should be reduced to 4 to 5 hrs/ day with break • Field visit should be planned to understand the issues practically • Number of participants during training was more
Uttarakhand	• Capacity building • Gain of knowledge & skills	• Field visit should be planned to understand practically
Uttar Pradesh	Master trainers were good, well qualified & facilities during TOT were satisfactory.	• Some of DRG members were not present during training • Completion of module anyhow due to time constraint
West Bengal	• Study materials were good • Experience shared with representatives/ trainers of the whole State • RPs from different department imparted training • Good communication skill/ Interactive sessions • In-depth knowledge on specific issues • Refreshing the training skills • Peer learning • Various training methods / tools used during training	• Subject specific training of trainers may be organized at regular intervals.

F1.4 Imparting training by Trainers/ Resource Persons (RPs)/ Master trainers

Regarding number of trainers/ resource Persons (RPs)/ master trainers associated with training of PRIs and Elected Representatives, 22.3 percent sample respondents reported that they were associated with only one training followed by 13.8 percent sample respondents opted for two trainings, 30 percent sample respondents opted for 3-5 trainings, 14.3 percent sample respondents opted for 6-10 training & 19.6 percent sample respondents opted for more than 10 trainings.

As far as number of days before trainers/ resource Persons (RPs)/ master trainers were informed about the training is concerned, 12.2 percent sample respondents reported that they were informed about the training on the very day followed by 28.1 percent sample respondents reported that they were informed 1-2 days before training, 53.3 percent sample respondents reported that they were

informed about a week before training & 6.4 percent sample respondents opted for others viz. more than a week before training.

Regarding information about association with training, 49.1 percent sample respondents reported that they were informed in writing followed by 45.9 percent sample respondents reported that they were informed on telephone, whereas the remaining 5 percent sample respondents opted for others.

As far as pre planning of training is concerned viz. interaction about the sessions & mode of training etc, 93.1 percent sample respondents reported that they had interaction about the sessions & mode of training, whereas 6.9 percent sample respondents did not report for the same. Further, 97.3 percent sample respondents reported that they had been provided training schedule & module by training institution (SIRD/ district/ block) in time, whereas 2.7 percent sample respondents did not report for the same.

Regarding review done by training institution (SIRD/ district/block) of the trainings organized, 61.5 percent sample respondents reported that by organizing meetings with RPs/ MTs/ trainers review was done, whereas 38.5 percent sample respondents reported that through discussions with trainers during training review was done by training institution.

As far as pre-meeting & post meeting of training is concerned, 76.7 percent sample respondents reported that pre-meeting & post meeting was organized for training, whereas the remaining 23.3 percent sample respondents did not report for the same. Further, 93.6 percent sample respondents reported that they collected feedback from trainees regarding their performance, whereas 6.4 percent sample respondents reported that they did not collect feedback from trainees regarding their performance.

Table 2.10: Imparting training by Trainers/ Resource Persons (RPs)/ Master trainers

S.No.	Particulars	Responses	Nos.& %
1.	Number of trainings associated with Panchayat Raj	One	84(22.3)
		Two	52(13.8)
		3-5	113(30)
		6-10	54(14.3)
		More than 10	74(19.6)
		Total	377(100)
2.	Informed about training	Very day of training	46(12.2)
		1-2 days before training	106(28.1)
		A week before training	201(53.3)
		Other	24(6.4)
		Total	377(100)
3.	Mode of information	In writing	185(49.1)
		Telephone	173(45.9)
		Any other	19(5)
		Total	377(100)
3.	Pre planning of training	Yes	351(93.1)
		No	26(6.9)
		Total	377(100)
4.	Provided training schedule & module by training institution (SIRD/ district/ block) in time	Yes	367(97.3)
		No	10(2.7)
		Total	377(100)
5.	Review of training organized by training institution	Organizing meeting with RPs/ MTs/ trainers	232(61.5)

		Discussions with trainers during training	145(38.5)
		Total	377(100)
6.	Pre & post meeting organized for training	Yes	289(76.7)
		No	88(23.3)
		Total	377(100)
7.	Collected feedback from trainees on performances	Yes	353(93.6)
		No	24(6.4)
		Total	377(100)

F1.5 Logistics & Honorarium

The logistics in training is well supportive in organizing better trainings and also provide an opportunity for the participants and trainers to participate actively in the sessions and whole training programme. The data pertaining to logistics & honorarium have been summarized in table & figure. Regarding the satisfaction shown by trainers on training venue/ training hall in term of creating learning environment for training, 98.7 sample respondents reported their satisfaction, whereas, 1.3 percent sample respondents opined that they were not satisfied with training venue/ training hall in terms of creating learning environment for training. Further, as far as rating of training venue/ hall is concerned, 9.7 percent sample respondents rated the same as satisfactory followed by 3.2 percent sample respondents rated good, 12.9 percent sample respondents rated very good, 16.1 percent sample respondents rated excellent & 58.1 percent sample respondents rated outstanding.

Regarding satisfaction with the arrangement of training materials as required for training, 98.9 percent sample respondents reported for the same, whereas the remaining 1.1 percent sample respondents opined that they were not satisfied with the arrangement of training materials as required for training. Further, 93.1 percent sample respondents reported that they were satisfied with the availability of training aids viz. LCD, boards etc, whereas the remaining 6.9 percent sample respondents did not report for the same. The sample respondents reported that training aids viz. LCD, boards etc were not available during block level training. Disbursement of honorarium to trainers/ resource persons was as per norms in time, 79.6 percent sample respondents reported that they got honorarium in time, whereas, the remaining 20.4 percent sample respondents reported that honorarium was not given as per norms in time.

Non payment of Honorarium in time

The KRPs/MTs/RPs in the sample States namely, Arunachal Pradesh (85.7%), Assam (19%), Gujarat (81.8%), Jharkhand (21,4%), Karnataka (33.3%), Madhya Pradesh (53.8%), Maharashtra (1.2%), Sikkim (12.5%), Uttar Pradesh (16.5%), Uttrakhand (66.7%) and West Bengal (22.6%) reported non payment of honorarium for the trainings they have been engaged in time.

Table 2.11: Logistics & Honorarium

S.No.	Particulars	Responses	Nos.& %
1	Satisfied with the training venue / training hall	Yes	372(98.7)
		No	7(1.3)
		Total	377(100)
2.	Satisfied with the arrangement of training materials	Yes	373(98.9)
		No	4(1.1)
		Total	377(100)
3.	Satisfied with the availability of training aids	Yes	351(93.1)
		No	26(6.9)
		Total	377(100)
4.	Honorarium given as per norms in time	Yes	300(79.6)
		No	77(20.4)
		Total	377(100)

F1.6 Participation & Timelines in Trainings

The data related to participation & timelines of sample respondents are presented in table & figure. On the response to whether the training started on time & as per schedule, 98.9 percent sample respondents opted for the same, whereas, the remaining 1.1 percent sample respondents opined that training was not started on time & as per schedule. Like-wise, 99.2 percent sample respondents reported that training sessions were conducted as per planning, whereas 0.8 percent sample respondents did not opt for the same. The sample respondents who reported that training sessions were conducted as per planning opined that the block level training mostly started late & concluded earlier. Further, 98.9 percent sample respondents reported that training norms & plan were followed, whereas the remaining 1.1 percent sample respondents opined that training norms & plan were not followed. Similarly, 98.9 percent sample respondents reported that trainees were found interested & comfortable during trainings, whereas 1.1 percent sample respondents did not report for the same. Regarding sample respondents' opinion whether training modules & programmes covered the impact of suggestions, recommendations & strategies covered in NCBF, 2014 on various aspects of capacity building,

93.4 percent sample respondents reported the same, whereas, the remaining 6.6 percent sample respondents opined that training modules & programmes did not cover the suggestions, recommendations & strategies covered in NCBF, 2014 on various aspects of capacity building. The sample respondents opined that projector & other teaching aids were not used during trainings. Only lecture sessions were organized during training.

On response to rating of training by sample respondents (trainers/ RPs) on 10 point scale, almost 2/3rd (66%) reported more than satisfactory i.e. Good, very good, excellent and Outstanding. About 1/3rd reported satisfactory and below rating. The issue needs to be taken care by the States in terms of organizing quality training.

Table 2.12: Participation & Timelines

S.No.	Particulars	Responses	Nos.& %
1.	Training as per schedule	Yes	373(98.9)
		No	4(1.1)
		Total	377(100)
2.	Training sessions took place as per planning	Yes	374(99.2)
		No	3(0.8)
		Total	377(100)
3.	Training norms & plan followed	Yes	373(98.9)
		No	4(1.1)
		Total	377(100)
4.	Training modules & programmes as per NCBF 2014	Yes	352(93.4)
		No	25(6.6)
		Total	377(100)
5.	Trainees found interested & comfortable during trainings	Yes	373(98.9)
		No	4(1.1)
		Total	377(100)

F1.7 View of PRIs about Trainers' Quality

Rating of arrangements & facilities in training programmes

Rating of Trainers

Availability of trainers, their qualification, experience, way of imparting training & taking sessions of training decide effectiveness of training. Hence, sample respondents were asked to rate trainers in the training programmes they participated. 2.2 percent sample respondents rated trainers' arrangement in the training programme poor followed by 28.4 percent sample respondents rated satisfactory, 42.5 percent sample respondents rated good & 17.7 percent sample respondents rated very good & 9.1 percent sample respondents rated excellent. Hence, 69.3 percent sample respondents rated arrangement of trainers in training programmes under RGSA from good, very good to excellent, whereas the remaining 30.6 percent sample respondents rated arrangement of trainers as poor & satisfactory. In terms of arrangement & quality of trainers, the better performing states were West Bengal (99.6 percent), Kerala (98.5 percent) & Andhra Pradesh (95.6 percent).

F. Methods and design of Trainings

The methodology adopted for training in all the cases is dominated by lecture/interactive lecture method with some display of audio-visuals/films, group exercises and plenary sessions. In sample States namely, Rajasthan, Kerala, Uttar Pradesh, Uttarakhand, Jharkhand, Oddisha, West Bengal, Sikkim, Assam and Maharashtra films on development concerns are screened for the participants. In West Bengal, video clips on different thematic areas like health, water and sanitation etc. are played. The use of visual aids in training has been beneficial, especially for the ERs of GPs and IPs. Open house discussions are being encouraged by the faculty members for clarifying the doubts of the trainees.

Although different methodologies are being adopted to make the trainees understand the subject matter, the use of a variety of methodologies in different sessions or in different training programmes is rather sporadic. It basically depends upon the ability and understanding of the trainers to use such tools and techniques during training. While use of a variety of methodologies is found at the state level trainings and to some extent at the district levels, its percolation to the block and GP level is quite poor. Secondly, use of different methodologies also depends upon the number of participants. When the number of participants is more, many training methods become ineffective and remain unsuitable.

The findings of Impact Assessment study on use of methods and design of trainings collected from the ERs and Panchayat functionaries who have undergone trainings are presented in the following section.

G.1 Various Facilities in Capacity Building & training (CB&T) programmes under RGSA

Availability and quality of various facilities during training programme are important. This will certainly ensure its long-term impact at field level. Thus, various facilities in training programmes under RGSA were rated on five point scale.

Rating of arrangements & facilities in training programmes

Rating of Trainers

Figure 2.13: Rating of arrangements & facilities in training programmes (Panchayat Functionaries)

Availability of trainers, their qualification, experience, way of imparting training & taking sessions of training decide effectiveness of training. Hence, sample respondents were asked to rate trainers in the training programmes they participated. 2 percent sample respondents rated trainers' arrangement in the training programme poor followed by 12.5 percent sample respondents rated satisfactory, 46.5 percent sample respondents rated good & 23.4 percent sample respondents rated very good & 15.6 percent sample respondents rated excellent. Hence, 85.5 percent sample respondents rated arrangement of trainers in training programmes under RGSA from good, very good to excellent, whereas the remaining 14.5 percent sample respondents rated arrangement of trainers as poor & satisfactory. In terms of arrangement & quality of trainers, the better performing states were West Bengal & Arunachal Pradesh (100 percent each) & Karnataka (96.7 percent).

Rating of Learning Environment

Conducive learning environment during training programme enables participants to learn & gain knowledge. Regarding rating of learning environment during training programme 1.6 percent sample respondents rated it poor followed by 14.9 percent sample respondents rated satisfactory, 32.3 percent sample respondents rated good, 38.1 percent sample respondents rated very good & 13.1 percent sample respondents rated excellent. Hence, 83.5 percent sample respondents rated learning environment in training programmes under RGSA from good, very good to excellent, whereas the remaining 16.5 percent sample respondents rated learning environment as poor & satisfactory. In terms of creating conducive learning environment during training programme, the better performing states were Sikkim, Uttarakhand & Arunachal Pradesh (100 percent each)

Rating of Training Venue, Seating Facilities & Training Aids

Proper selection of training venue, seating facility at training venue & availability & use of training aids are equally important for effectiveness of training programme. Training venue, seating facilities & training aids were rated 'poor' by 2 percent sample respondents followed by 18.6 percent sample respondents rated 'satisfactory', 42.4 percent sample respondents rated 'good', 20.7 percent sample respondents rated 'very good' & 16.2 percent sample respondents rated 'excellent'. Hence, 79.3 percent sample respondents' rated training venue, seating facilities & training aids in training programmes under RGSA from good, very good to excellent, whereas the remaining 20.6 percent sample respondents rated the same as poor & satisfactory. In terms of

providing training venue, seating facilities & training aids, the better performing states were Sikkim, Uttarakhand (100 percent each) & Karnataka (98.9 percent).

Rating of Lodging & Boarding facilities

As far as rating of lodging & boarding facilities is concerned, 10.5 percent sample respondents rated lodging & boarding facilities during training programme 'poor' followed by 26.2 percent sample respondents rated 'satisfactory', 33.6 percent sample respondents rated 'good', 19.4 percent sample respondents rated 'very good' &10.3 percent sample respondents rated 'excellent'. Hence, 63.3 percent sample respondents rated lodging & boarding facilities in training programmes under RGSA from good, very good to excellent, whereas the remaining 36.7 percent sample respondents rated the same as poor & satisfactory. In terms of providing lodging & boarding facilities, the better performing states were Uttarakhand (100 percent), Orissa (89 percent) &West Bengal (87.7 percent).

Case Study-1

Irrelevant Reading Materials to Newly Elected Sarpanch & Sabhay (Ward Panch) in Tribal dominated district (PESA Area)

Dahod district in Gaujarat is tribal dominated. The team visited Dahod, Garwara & Dhanpur blocks of Dahod district during impact assessment of PRI. The training programme in the district was conducted by local agency. The agency develops their reading materials for training. During interaction with the newly elected Sarpanch & Sabhay (Ward Panch), they expressed their view that the reading material distributed to them in training programme was of no use. According to them, these reading materials were like "heap of garbage" for them. They did not understand the language & content of the reading materials. Also, they did not understand the trainers' language & what the trainers used to deliver during training programme. These Sarpanchs & Sabhays were elected from reserved seat. Majority of sarpanchs & ward panchs from the tribal dominated district were illiterate or merely literate. Hence, training programmes organized for the Panchayat representatives in this tribal dominated district were not much relevant for them.

Rating of Reading materials/ Training materials

Regarding rating of reading materials/ training materials provided to trainees during training programme, 5 percent sample respondents rated reading materials/ training materials provided to them as 'poor' followed by 25.6 percent sample respondents rated 'satisfactory', 37.5 percent sample respondents rated 'good', 20.3 percent sample respondents rated 'very good' & 11.6 rated distribution of reading materials/ training materials provided to them as excellent. Hence, 69.5 percent sample respondents rated reading materials/ training materials provided to trainees during training programme from good, very good to excellent, whereas remaining 30.5 percent sample respondents rated the same as poor & satisfactory. In terms of arranging reading materials/ training materials provided to trainees during training programme, the better performing states were Uttarakhand (100 percent), Arunachal Pradesh (92 percent) & Orissa (90.2 percent).

Session on best practices, Case studies, Experience sharing etc.

As far as rating of session on best practices, case studies, experience sharing etc during training programmes was concerned, 7.3 percent sample respondents rated the same as 'poor' followed by 22.8 percent sample respondents rated 'satisfactory', 35.2 percent sample respondents rated 'good', 23.6 percent sample respondents rated 'very good' and 11.1 percent sample respondents rated session on best practices, case studies, experience sharing etc during training programmes as 'excellent'. Hence, 69.9 percent sample respondents rated session on best practices, case studies, experience sharing etc during training programmes from good, very good to excellent, whereas remaining 30.1 percent sample respondents rated the same as poor & satisfactory. In terms of best practices, case studies, experience sharing etc during training programmes, the better performing states were Uttarakhand (97 percent), Orissa (92.6 percent) & Assam (89.7 percent).

113478/2020/789

Best Practices in Trainings in States

Virtual Classroom at Wadkkanchery Block in Trissur district

Inside of Virtual Classroom at Wadkkanchery Block in Trissur district

113478/2020/789

Best Practices in Trainings in States

Teaching & Learning Materials, Uttar Pradesh

Good Training Hall at DPRC, Solan

Rating of field visit & group discussion

Regarding rating of field visit & group discussions during training programmes, 10.1 percent sample respondents reported that field visit & group discussion were not arranged during training programme followed by 7.2 percent sample respondents rated the same as 'poor', 22.6 percent sample respondents rated 'satisfactory', 33.3 percent sample respondents rated 'good', 16.3 percent sample respondents rated 'very good' & 10.6 percent sample respondents rated 'excellent'.

Table 2.13: Rating of arrangement & facilities in training programmes

S.No.	Assessment areas	Not arranged	Poor	Satisfactory	Good	Very good	Excellent	Total
1.	Trainers	0 (0)	34 (2)	210 (12.5)	778 (46.5)	391 (23.4)	261 (15.6)	1674 (100)
2.	Learning environment	0 (0)	27 (1.6)	250 (14.9)	541 (32.3)	637 (38.1)	219 (13.1)	1674 (100)
3.	Training venue, seating facility& training aids	0 (0)	34 (2)	311 (18.6)	710 (42.4)	347 (20.7)	272 (16.2)	1674 (100)
4.	Lodging & boarding facilities	0 (0)	175 (10.5)	438 (26.2)	563 (33.6)	325 (19.4)	173 (10.3)	1674 (100)
5.	Reading materials provided	0 (0)	83 (5)	429 (25.6)	627 (37.5)	340 (20.3)	195 (11.6)	1674 (100)
6.	Session on best practices, case studies	0 (0)	122 (7.3)	381 (22.8)	590 (35.2)	395 (23.6)	186 (11.1)	1674 (100)
7.	Field visit & Group discussions	168 (10.1)	120 (7.2)	378 (22.6)	558 (33.3)	273 (16.3)	177 (10.6)	1674 (100)

Note: Figures within brackets are the percentages

Mode of training & hours of training

Regarding mode of training during training programmes under RGSA, 19.9 percent sample respondents reported that interactive/ participatory mode of training was used followed by 19 percent sample respondents opted for lecture method, 60.6 percent sample respondents opted for mixed viz. interactive/ participatory & lecture method & 0.5 percent sample respondents opted for ICT based / SATCOM.

As far as hours of training programmes are concerned, 8.1 percent sample respondents reported that trainings were organized up to 3 hours followed by 69.2 percent sample respondents reported that trainings were organized for 4 to 6 hours & 22.7 percent sample respondents opted for 6-9 hours.

Regarding whether Panchayat functionaries had access to online (ICT) mode of training, 74 percent sample respondents reported that they had accesss to online mode of training, whereas 26 percent sample respondents reported that they did not have accesss to online mode of training. Regarding usefulness of online (ICT) mode of training, out of 74 percent sample respondents who had accesss to online mode of training, 98.8 percent sample respondents opined that online (ICT) mode of training was useful, whereas 1.2 percent sample respondents did not report for the same.

Table 2.14: Mode & hours of trainings

S.No.	Particulars	Responses	Nos.& %
1	Mode of training	Interactive/participative	333 (19.9)
		Lecture	318 (19.0)
		Mixed	1015 (60.6)
		ICT based/ SATCOM	8 (0.5)
		Total	1674 (100)
2	Training hours	Up to 3 hours	135 (8.1)
		4-6 hours	1159 (69.2)
		6-9 hours	380 (22.7)
		Total	1674 (100)
3	Access to online (ICT) mode of training	Yes	1238 (74)
		No	436 (26)
		Total	1674 (100)
4.	ICT mode of training useful	Yes	1211 (98.8)
		No	27 (1.2)
		Total	1238 (100)

Note: Figures within brackets are the percentages

State-wise Strengths & Weaknesses of training programmes – Quality, methods and thematic & convergent trainings (views of RPs/ Master Trainers)

State	Strengths	Weaknesses
Andhra Pradesh	• Participatory & use of good materials • Selection of regular RPs • Training well organized • Field visit was impressive	• Very precise & trainings were of less duration • Schedule lapses looking to the duration and understanding levels of ERs
Arunachal Pradesh	• Full participation (attendance-wise) • Urge for knowledge amongst stakeholders	• Inadequate infrastructure at training venue • Limited duration(1-2 days) of trainings to cover large number of topics
Assam	• Training arrangement & facilities were satisfactory	• Overload of training • Limited resource persons
Goa	• Sharing of experience during training • Capacity building	• Lack of infrastructures during training • Continuity & accountability missing • Lack of follow-up after training
Gujarat	• Target group • Specific modules, with subject clarity	• Starting training just to deliver content without understanding need & level of trainees
Haryana	• Knowledge & information on various topics/ issues • Built confidence	• Trainees were less in number during training • Lack of experienced RPs • Lack of follow-up after training
Himachal Pradesh	• The changing attitude of stakeholders towards training • Better learning atmosphere • Use of new techniques during training	• Lack of enough infrastructures in districts • Inadequate strength of trainees • No mechanism for capturing feedback & training needs
Jharkhand	• Knowledge gained on various issues/ subjects	• Trainees were not in time during training & left venue before training time was over.

		• Trainees' participation is not satisfactory
Karnataka	• Built confidence • Knowledge gained on various issues/ subjects	• Lower percentage attendance of ERs and is regularity in trainings • Lack of handholding support
Kerala	• Good trainers, good modules • Knowledge gained • Information about new subjects/ areas	• Lack of participants • Non-participation of trainees • No follow-up
Madhya Pradesh	• Distribution of teaching materials	• Low attendance of participants • Trainings not planned in a proper way • No follow-up • Trainings organized for ERs after 1-2 years of election.
Maharashtra	• Distribution of reference material • Knowledge & information gained • Good quality of trainers	• Lecture method was prominent, Hence largely one sided communication • Group discussions should be initiated, examples as per experience by MTS/ RPs & communication with trainees is important during training • Training was organized for short time, full day was not utilized • Capacity of PRIs to improve are still long way to go. • Training organized block-wise/ block based • Limited technique of imparting training • Field visit should be done with each & every schedule of training. • Low attendance of trainees
Oddisha	• Gained knowledge • Helped in building confidence	• Low attendance of participants • Lack of follow-up support
Rajasthan	• Gain of knowledge & information	• Teaching material should be in simple language & of less pages so that Sarpanch/ ward panch can read it easily

		• Trainings were organized at block level. Participation of PRIs was low at block level training, especially of women PRIs • No follow-up • Lack of proper and qualified trainers in the district. • Department functionaries/ officials (BDO/CDPO etc.) are regularly placed as trainer affect trainings due to engagement with regular responsibilities. • No arrangement for left out ERs for training.
Sikkim	• Planned and participatory training • Department officials were involved during training • Helped to build more confidence on various topics/ issues	• Practical learning should be part of theoretical learning during training • Lodging facility needs improvement
Uttarakhand	• Discussions on various issues • Training as per schedule & timetable • Gain of knowledge & information on various issues. • ERs are selected and working as trainers	• Trainees not coming on time during training • Less time for group discussions among trainees
Uttar Pradesh	• Information dissemination & discussions on GPDP & its five steps • Imparting training through various activities & methods	• Selection of task force (TF) members not proper • TF members do not come in time • Training arrangement & facility (cleanliness) not proper. • TF members are illiterate • No support from ADO • No follow-up • Master trainers are not regularly used in training • MTs are not paid timely • Training is generally organized at the end of the financial year • Budget not released in time • District has to depend on State for

		getting date of trainings –No autonomy to plan as per convenience of district/Block
West Bengal	• Elected representatives & officials are getting aware of provisions of act & rules • Experience sharing during training • Motivating the ERs & functionaries for better service delivery • Sessions with local language & exposure visit • Boarding & lodging facilities were good	• Participants were not trained according to their need individually & as per their capacity level • Heterogeneous group & participants being dealt at a time • Less exposure visit

G. Sectoral convergence

Capacity building of ERs and functionaries does not stand as the only initiative under RGPSA/RGSA in all the states. The ERs & functionaries are trained under different programmes/schemes apart from RGPSA, CB-PSA, RGSA. For capacity building, there is no demarcation of capacity building and it gets merged at the apex training institutions whether they are the schemes of Rural Development or Panchayat Raj. It has also been reported that in many States the department like education, Health, Sanitation, DAY-NRLM, Agriculture and Drinking water themselves organized trainings of PRIs.

Capacity requirements of PRIs under PESA and Aspirational districts are somewhat different looking to priority of schemes. It has been observed that in PESA district/ States where PESA villages fall Block / Village trainings were arranged.

In the aspirational districts, the special package of trainings of PRIs has not been reported in any of the sample States. While interacting with representatives in PESA villages there has been less satisfaction on the arrangements and management of development areas. Their priority does not get much space in overall Panchayat plan and also the trainings organized were not very effective.

Convergence of Themes

As is the case with funds, inputs provided during training under RGSA undertake all sectors of importance which have been devolved at Gram Panchayat related to drinking water, Health, Education, Livelihood development, Agriculture, Forestry in addition to FFC, SFC and other Panchayat Raj schemes and programmes.

Training organized for sector convergence (Responses of Panchayat Functionaries)

With regard to sector convergence, 92.7 percent sample respondents reported for the same, whereas, 7.3 percent sample respondents did not report. Regarding rating of understanding developed as per working requirement on training organized for sector convergence, in total, out of 92.7 percent sample respondents who opined that training organized for sector convergence covered it during training, 0.8 percent sample respondents rated it satisfactory followed by 23.9 percent sample respondents rated good, 50.8 percent sample respondents rated very good, 20.1 percent sample respondents rated excellent and 4.4 percent sample respondents rated outstanding.

Similarly, rating of whether training organized for sector convergence was useful in working under RGSA, in total, out of 92.7 percent sample respondents who opined that training organized for sector convergence covered it during training, 1.8 percent sample respondents rated it satisfactory followed by 42.6 percent sample respondents rated good, 41.4 percent sample respondents rated very good, 11.0 percent sample respondents rated excellent and 3.2 percent sample respondents rated outstanding.

2.4 Need based modes of training

Looking to the importance of Capacity building & Training programme of Ministry of Panchayati Raj (MOPR) as envisioned over the period named under various schemes namely, RGSY, RGPSA CB-PSA, & RGSA, the sole purpose is to strengthen the Panchayat Raj Institutions and Elected Representatives to undertake their roles and responsibilities under 73rd Constitutional Amendment Act in a better manner. Therefore, designing a training programme which addresses the training needs of the target group is important. The NCB framework proposes a need assessment of the trainees before conducting training so that trainees can acquire the desired skills and knowledge base. All the states have conducted such assessments following either the 'centralised' or 'decentralised' process of need assessment. Decentralised need assessment process was adopted in Rajasthan where consultative workshops were organized either at division or at district levels. The ERs of different categories were consulted in such workshops and their training needs were identified. All the identified needs were further discussed at the state level and the training requirements were finalized. In Rajasthan, the last PRI election was held in February, 2015. But the TNA for preparing module and training materials and designing training and capacity building strategy was taken up in 2014 with the outgoing ERs rather than for the new ERs. It is obvious that some capacity requirements remain more or less constant for the current and previous ERs but there are always some new emerging needs. In such a situation, it was quite important to assess the needs of the current ERs. In the case of Rajasthan, this did not take place and trainings were framed based on the earlier assessment.

TNA in West Bengal

Training Need Analysis is conducted every year for preparing the Annual Training Calendar for the next Financial Year. Every District is directed to conduct the TNA exercises in two phases, the first phase in the DPT&RCs with representatives from all types of ERs and Functionaries and also the DPT&RCs. Each group discusses their training needs and present it before the house. It is then documented by District Level Training team. In the second phase, the District Training team divides into groups and goes to a few Gram Panchayats with structured questionnaires related to various Training Needs and discusses it with the Elected Representatives and Functionaries in one to one interview. They also conduct FGD with the ERs and Functionaries on various themes for analyzing their training needs. The District Training team then consolidates the reports from both the phases and prepares District-wise TNA Reports. A state level workshop is then conducted with all the districts and a state level consolidated report is prepared from which the Annual Training Calendar for the next Financial Year is prepared as per the Training needs assessed. District specific thematic trainings are also taken into consideration while preparing the calendar.

Similarly, in other States need assessment was done by internal mechanism (Kerala, West Bengal, Rajasthan) and in some states by external agencies (Madhya Pradesh which is still

in process as reported by State Panchayat Raj Department). Almost all States claim for conducting TNA for designing training materials and training schedule. It is of more use of TNA, if it can be done in present situation and ERs. West Bengal claims that they have undertaken TNA in this year and addressed the current needs of the PRIs and ERs. There were reports that the TNA also undertakes into account the operational skills, attitudes and behavioural dimensions (West Bengal & Kerala) which were emphasized in addition to focusing on schemes/ programmes.

The TNA in the form of document which anybody can look into and understand the system and outcome has been reported in States, namely, West Bengal, Oddisha, Assam & Kerala. It would be of much help in the long run in improving personal productivity, unless these aspects are addressed.

Secondly, the identified needs as per the TNA were also more or less similar in all the categories of ERs and functionaries, whereas in actuality their roles and responsibilities are different as they operate at different levels. It is apparent that identified needs are more generic in nature rather than specific to a particular category of ERs and functionaries. There is no specific standardized framework to assess the capacity of different ERs and functionaries. Each state has its own methods of capacity assessment. While this gives flexibility to the states, there is no scope of consolidation of this information at the national level for different categories of ERs.

Table 2.15: Training Need Assessment in the States

S.No.	States	Training Need Assessment		
		Undertaken	Documents/ Reports available	Name of Agency/Institute undertaken Training Need Assessment (TNA)
1.	Andhra Pradesh	Yes	No	APSIRD&PR
2.	Arunachal Pradesh	Yes	No	SIRD (Through Review Process)
3.	Assam	Yes	Yes	SIPRD Assam
4.	Goa	Yes (3 years back)	No	GPARD
5.	Gujarat	Yes	Yes	SIRD Gujarat
6.	Haryana	Yes	No	HIRD Haryana
7.	Himachal Pradesh	Yes	No	PRTI Shimla
8.	Jharkhand	Yes	No	CTI Ranchi
9.	Karnataka	Yes	Yes	ANS SIRD& PR
10.	Kerala	Yes (2017)	Yes	KILA, Trichur
11.	Madhya Pradesh	In process by external agency for last 2 years		Atal Bihari Vajpayee Institute of Good Governance and Policy Analysis
12.	Maharashtra	Yes	No	YASHADA Pune
13.	Oddisha	Yes	No	SIRD& PR Oddisa
14.	Rajasthan	Yes	Yes	IGPRS & GVS Jaipur
15.	Sikkim	Yes (2017)		SIRD& PR South Sikkim
16.	Uttar Pradesh	Yes	No	PRIT, Lucknow
17.	Uttarakhand	Yes	No	Directorate of Panchayati Raj, Dehradun
18.	West Bengal	Yes	Yes	Price Waterhouse Coopers (PwC), Kolkotta

2.5 Institutional set-ups, roles and performances - Performance of Panchayati Raj Departments of States and other concerned authority putting in place the Institutional structure and process

Institutional set-ups are pre-requisite for any organized task in order to assign the responsibility or authority to undertake in a desired manner. In the sample States, Department of Panchayat Raj and Rural Development/ Panchayat Raj Department assign the responsibility to certain institutions having training capacity. The key purpose is to undertake the responsibility of Capacity building training for Elected Representatives and associated functionaries of Panchayat Raj Institutions (PRIs). As per 73rd Constitutional Amendment act, every State has either three tier or two-tier system of Panchayats - Zilla Panchayat (District Panchayat), Block/ Intermediary Panchayat (Middle level/ Block Panchayat) and Gram Panchayat. In the Sample States, SIRD, PRTI, SPRC and State Directorate took the responsibility of undertaking CB&T for ERs. In addition to State level Institutions, the Extension Training Centres, District Training Centres, DPRCs and NGOs / academic Institutions were reported involved in imparting trainings.

Box-1

Trainees Should get the actual Cost of Travel

In the State of Goa participants invariably expressed satisfaction over training logistics and support. But the lodging facilities were not arranged in the trainings of ERs. Also, the training has been organized at GIPARD. The ERs and functionaries have to travel distance of even 30-60 kms. Also, they get travel cost for one time coming and back. But the ER has to spend even 100-200 per day. The ERs have to pay from their pocket. The poor ERs specially Members show inability to attend the trainings.

In States namely, Andhra Pradesh (APSIRD & PR), Arunachal Pradesh, Assam, Goa (GIPARD), Gujarat, Haryana, Karnataka, Madhya Pradesh (MGSIRD), Maharashtra (YASHADA), Oddisha, Rajasthan and Sikkim SIRD of the State is the Nodal/ apex institution for CB&T under RGSA/ CB-PSA/ RGPSA. States where Panchayat Raj Training Institute is the Nodal institution for CB&T of Panchayat Raj Institutions and Elected Representatives are Uttar Pradesh, Himachal Pradesh. In Uttarakhand, the State Panchayat Raj Directorate took the responsibility and designated as Nodal institution for CB&T. In West Bengal, two Institutions are undertaking the responsibility of CB&T namely, STARPARD is the apex institution for overall management of CB&T for Gram Panchayat level PRIs and BRAIPARD took the responsibility for imparting trainings to Zilla Panchayat and Block Panchayat PRIs and Elected Representatives.

In Kerala, KILA is working as Nodal Training Institution for training and capacity building of PRIs and Elected Representatives in the State. In many States SPRC has been formed to work as State Panchayat Raj Resource agency for trainings. In many States SPRC has been formed. SPRC is supported by infrastructure and the recurring support from MOPR, GOI.

Under RGSA, District Panchayat Raj Resource Centres (DPRCs) have supported in many districts of the country where the support is not available. In Uttar Pradesh, 25 DPRC have been sanctioned with Infrastructures and recurring support under RGSA. The ETCs, PTS and Regional Training Centres of rural development have also undertaken the responsibilities of Capacity building and trainings in the district. In Jharkhand, the Central Training Institute has been designated as Nodal agency for

CB&T under RGSA. The Block level Panchayat Resource centres reported operational in Karnataka and Andhra Pradesh undertaking trainings at Block/Mandal level.

In all the Sample States where SIRD is functional, the nodal agency for CB&T reported that the full capacity of Faculty is still lacking. These institutions require the human resource as well as mobility support to really run the whole show in a desired manner. There were States still looking to get regular academic faculty namely, Arunachal Pradesh, West Bengal, Rajasthan, Andhra Pradesh, Haryana, Goa, Gujarat. In Gujarat, it has been reported that SIRD having only one faculty position filled who has been given the responsibility of Training in the State. In West Bengal BRAIPARD is running on adhoc faculty, which affects the proper working of SIRD for the cause of CB&T under RGSA. Also, SIRD, Gujarat is running in rented building. For trainings, they have to hire Venue and training logistics at State level. In Goa, GIPARD does not have residential facility. Hence, the Trainees under RGSA have to do daily up and down from the training venue. In Arunachal Pradesh, SIRD demanded for vehicle in order to undertake the monitoring of trainings in the State.

It has been observed that the State and District level training institutions namely, SIRD, CTI, STARPARD ad PRTI which took the role of nodal institutions for undertaking the CB&T under RGSA are undertaking the responsibilities in a desired manner at large. However, in principle as every institution gets older, it certainly requires revamping/ overhauling in terms of Human resource support, infrastructure support and mobility support to really meet the present demand in quality a manner and should be more relevant for the RGSA trainings in the State. The details of Institutional set-up in the sample States are given in the table,

Table 2.16: Institutional Set-ups for Training in the Sample States

S.No.	States	Institutional set-ups					Remarks
		SIRD	ETCs	SPRC	DPRC	BPRC	
1.	Andhra Pradesh	-	-	1	13	660 BPRCs	Building is in process but Team at 13 District is working as DPRC
2.	Arunachal Pradesh	1	-	1 (Staff recruited)	Not in function		The training is managed by SIRD & SPRC
3.	Assam	1	12	1	11 (Not Functional)		Good Training arrangement
4.	Goa	1	-	-	-		GIPARD undertakes all the training in-campus mostly
5.	Gujarat	1	0	0	0		Training of State level organized by SIRD and District level by NGOs and DDO
6.	Haryana	1					HIRD undertakes training by team of Master Trainers and logistics arranged by BDO/PDO
7.	Himachal Pradesh	-	-	1	7 (Solan district DPRC has been constructed and functional)		Training organized PRTIs in the States/ DPO

8.	Jharkhand	-	-	Yes	17 (12 building constructed & functional)		CTI & 04 Regional training Institute (22 subjects have devolved).Trainings organized in districts by empanelled NGOs
9.	Karnataka	1		1	13 (not functional)	BPRC-176 (Functional 175)	ANS SIRD&PR is situated at Mysore, undertake whole training
10.	Kerala	KILA					KILA undertakes trainings
11.	Madhya Pradesh	1					MGSIRD & ETCs undertake training with support from Zilla & Janpad Panchayat
12.	Maharashtra	1					• 11 PRTCs • 9 GTCs run by Pvt. organization • 03 run by Govt Organization. • GPDP training organized by district CEOs • PESA Block have coordinator
13.	Oddisha	1	0 (Training at Field level by NGOs	0	0		SIRD understates States level trainings and in district by Academic Institutions & NGOs
14.	Rajasthan	1	6 PTCs (3 ETC+3 PTC)	1	13 (Not functional)		SIRD facilitates whole training in the State with support from CEO of District
15.	Sikkim	1		1(Non Functional)	3 (Non Functional)		SIRD
16.	Uttar Pradesh	PRTI	District level training centres 50		25		PRIT at State level and district level by DPRCs and Regional Training Centres of Rural Development
17.	Uttarakhand	State Directorate through NGOs					State Directorate through NGOs
18.	West Bengal	1	5 (all functional)	1 STARPARD	20 DPTRCs		BRAIPARD for District and Block Panchayat and STARPARD undertake training of Gram Pradhan and members

State-wise Facilities and System for trainings – Some Key Strengths and Weaknesses

States	Strengths	Weaknesses
Andhra Pradesh	1. Government Policies taken up to GP Level 2. Strengthening of PRI's 3. Group Presentations 4. Teaching by Skilled personnel 5. Technical Presentations like PPT 6. Guest lecture by the subject experts	1. No Basic Infrastructure to APSIRD & PR 2. No Support to HR at State level 3. Supply of material (Hard Copy) on the last day of training. 4. DPRCs buildings remain incomplete due to increase of cost of construction.
Arunachal Pradesh	1. Developed eagerness of ERs to learn about Panchayat development issues and schemes. 2. SIRD have trained and experienced faculties 3. Faculties willing to travel to remote areas of the State.	1. Due to inaccessible terrain, it is difficult to cover training of ERs in time. 2. Non-availability of trained and experienced persons persons at Blocks and below level. 3. Devolution of Funds, functions and functionaries has not been done in the State. 4. Majority of GPs (2/3) do not have their own building. 5. Lack of Internet connectivity. 6. Inaccessible terrains. 7. DPRC & Gram Panchayat buildings have been completed but not in use.
Assam	1. Use of SATCOM and ICT based training enhanced the coverage.	1. Operation of SATCOM has some problem of pause during communication because in Assam, SATCOM has two-way communications.
Goa	1. Sensitized on current issues 2. Empowerment of Women ERs through trainings	1. No control on poor participation of PRIs in trainings 2. Timely implementation of the action plan not made.
Gujarat	1. Training partners were engaged in training of ERs in the districts	1. No training has been organized since 2018 by SIRD
Haryana	1. Strong team of Master Trainers at HIRD level. 1. Master trainers were satisfied with the amount of honorarium.	1. The control of quality of training lies on BDPO (Block Development & Panchayat Officer). 2. The ward members are not ready to come for trainings. 3. Sarpanchs do not involve in Panchayat works. Therefore, they do not inform the ward members for trainings.

		4. No arrangement of feedback in trainings. 5. Sarpanch and Panchayat Secretary participation is low. 6. The coordination between SIRD and Department is reported poor. 7. It is difficult to ensure quality and uniformity in off-campus trainings, may be at district/ Blocks. 8. Food quality is not good.
Himachal Pradesh	1. Change in attitude of the stakeholders regarding trainings. Training now has been recognized as an important element for PRs. 2. Use of modern techniques and methods of training. 3. Better leaning atmosphere during trainings.	1. Lack of enough infrastructures for trainings at district and sub district level. 2. Inadequate strength of specialized trainers. 3. No mechanism for capturing feedback and training needs.
Jharkhand	1. Strong Trainers at State level. 2. Good reading and reference materials on various subjects of importance	1. Size of trainees in training is high, may be 60-80. 2. Reading material is not useful for Illiterate or poor education level ERs. 3. The Wards' member participation in training reported low. 4. Sarpanch do not support ward members.
Karnataka	1. At Block training centres large groups are covered.	1. Training environment not conducive to learning specially for women and lower education level ERs.
Kerala	1. Ability to cover all persons within each stakeholders group. 2. Panchayats look forward to KILA for right knowledge and skills. 3. Trainings are module based and following training cycle.	1. Large groups of ERs to be covered. Quality can be affected. 2. Many thematic areas might lead to overload trainees.
Madhya Pradesh	1. Capacity building of PRIs with trainings. 2. Get exposure to various new approaches 3. Good reading materials developed. 4. Good infrastructure for trainings.	1. Training of Gram Pradhan and ward members was organized as one day meeting. 2. Lack of proper coordination between State, District and training Institutions. 3. Low attendance of Trainees 4. Lack of vehicle support for mobility
Maharashtra	1. Decentralized trainings. Zilla Parishads themselves undertake trainings.	1. Low trainees attendance 2. Vacancy of staffs/ core faculty in GTC (Government Training

	2. Good amount of reading and reference material developed for PRIs. 3. State level good infrastructure for trainings. 4. NGOs and Private Institutions are engaged in trainings. 5. Pooling of resources at State and district level. 6. Dedicated staffs of training institution (GTC). 7. Expert and experienced trainers	Centres).
Oddisha	1. Public Private Partnership through a tri-party agreement (SIRD&PR, DRDAs & CPOs). Reaching out large numbers of participants in a short span. 2. Ownership by the District Administration for monitoring the field level training and earmarked human resources at DRDA level (APD (SD)) for coordination. 3. Empanelled Resource Persons of SIRD&PR for facilitating field level training programme	1. Changes in the priority of the State sometimes hamper the Capacity Building & Training Programme at Field Level. 2. Difficulties in catering the needs of heterogeneous clientele groups 3. Lack of timely Impact Assessment by the Third Party
Rajasthan	1. Positivity & Enthusiasm in working of PRIs has increased 2. Increased knowledge of Roles, Rules, Schemes and Procedures 3. Greater Inclusive & Gender – Responsive Vision of Development Planning	1. Gaps in timely release of funds 2. Great turn-over in the Trainers trained in each Training Campaign 3. The trainings venue at District and Block level restricts participation of women members and ward members. 4. Rotation of Reserved Categories of ERs every 5 years
Sikkim	1. Strong plan for trainings. 2. Field facilitator Training organized. 3. Strong coordination between department and SIRD.	1. Geographical inaccessibility 2. Reading materials mostly in English. ERs having low education level found difficult to use.
Uttar Pradesh	1. Good team of MTs at State level 2. Reference materials developed 3. Help ERs in developing confidence, exposure to new world and develop visioning. 4. ERs reported positive for the development of their village/Gram Panchayat	1. Release of Budget by the department in almost 4th Quarter. Hence, DPRO office unable to plan at last hours. 2. Low attendance of Ward members as they do not find much role in Gram Panchayat works. 3. DRG members were not used in trainings -60-70%.

Uttarakhand	1. Proper organizing of trainings. 2. Knowledge sharing by Govt. expert/ Dept. officials. 3. Covers large number of ERs in less time.	1. Poor attendance of Ward members 2. Time duration of training is less to complete the whole course as expected
West Bengal	1. Huge cliental of ERs and Functionaries covered within the stipulated time 2. Dedicated resource pool for training 3. Well equipped training infrastructure in the State 4. Comprehensive training module for each of the category of ERs and Panchayat Functionaries 5. Participatory method training has been used 6. Residential training programmes were organized with active participation of ERs/ Trainees 7. Professional training management 8. Continuous updating broad based information sharing system 9. Dissemination of knowledge through PRI functionaries & system	1. Since the huge number and heterogeneous group of cliental is to be dealt with, the time is not enough 2. No exposure visit during trainings (Birbhum PTC)

2.5.1Management & Functions of State Level Training Institutions - Assessment of functions & system of training institutions

The management of Capacity Building & Training of PRIs is the sole responsibility of the State level institutes namely, SIRDs, SPRCs, Department & PRTIs. The overall functioning of State level nodal institute in the State is facilitated with infrastructure, Human resource and given autonomy for its effective functioning. The better availability of dedicated human resource, Infrastructure and Autonomy certainly function as building blocks of Institute and instrumental in better management and execution of Capacity Building & Training programme for Panchayati Raj Institutions.

The table below shows assessment of functions & system of training institutions (SIRDs, SPRCs, Department & PRTIs) as per their performances on various indicators viz. Human resource, management practices, Training programmes, Course material development, Documentation, Innovation, Infrastructure & equipment, Financial practices, Received awards appreciations & awards etc.

The assessment of the various qualitative and quantitative components of the training institutions was done out of score of 200 marks. Each of the components has been given weightage & score. The total weightage is 100 and score is 200. Out of the achieved score from 200 by training institutions, the percentage has been calculated for each training institution.

The weightage and score has been allotted to each of the 09 components based on which the training Institutions functions have been assessed. Out of the total weightage of 100 marks, the weightage to each of the 09 component was given as per their importance and stake in the functioning of the training institutions. It ranges from minimum 05 to maximum 20 marks. Similarly, the maximum score is of 200 marks. Out of 200 marks, each of the 09 components was given maximum allotted score as per their importance & stake in the functioning of the training institutions. It ranges from minimum 10 to maximum 40 marks. The maximum weightage and score allotted to each of the 09 components as per the objectives of the study.

The achievement of the highest score means better the Roles, responsibilities and infrastructure with training institutions for trainings. In total, the final score percentage was the highest reported of Kerala (96 percent) followed by Karnataka (90 percent), Oddisha (88.3percent), Sikkim (83.3percent), Maharashtra (82.5 percent), Madhya Pradesh (82.2 percent), West Bengal (81.3 percent), Rajasthan (80.5 percent), Uttarakhand (80.4 percent), Assam (79.9 percent), Himachal Pradesh (70.4percent), Andhra Pradesh(66.7 percent), Goa (66.3 percent), Haryana (64.6 percent), Uttar Pradesh (62.4 percent), Jharkhand (61.3 percent), Arunachal Pradesh (52.1percent) and the lowest by Gujarat (51.7 percent). The rating of training institutions as per their performances on various indicators viz. human resource, management practices, training programmes, course material development, documentation, innovation, infrastructure & equipment, financial practices, received awards appreciations & awards are stated here under.

Table 2.17: Rating of Functions & System of Training Institutions

Rating	Grade	Name of State
Excellent (Above 75%)	O	Kerala, Karnataka, Oddisha, Madhya Pradesh, Sikkim, Maharashtra, Rajasthan, Uttarakhand, West Bengal, & Assam
Very Good (61-75%)	A	Himachal Pradesh, Andhra Pradesh, Goa, Haryana, Uttar Pradesh & Jharkhand
Good (51-60%)	B	Arunachal Pradesh & Gujarat
Satisfactory (40-50%)	C	-
Poor (Below 40%)	D	-

Table 2.18: Assessment of Functions & System of Training Institutions in overall trainings

Name of State	Name of Institute	Score on various parameters as per Schedule as per Weightage									Total score	Final score in percentage
		Human Resource	Management practices	Training programmes	Course Material Development	Documentation	Innovation	Infrastructure and equipment	Financial practices	Received Awards Appreciation & awards		
	Weightage	**5**	**10**	**20**	**15**	**10**	**10**	**20**	**5**	**5**	**100**	
	Points	**20**	**20**	**40**	**30**	**20**	**10**	**30**	**20**	**10**	**200**	
Andhra Pradesh	APSIRD&PR	250	500	1500	1000	500	500	1666.7	500	250	6666.7	66.7
Arunachal Pradesh	APSIRD&PR	375	750	1000	1000	500	0	1333.3	250	0	5208.3	52.1
Assam	ASIRD&PR	375	750	2000	1200	1000	500	1666.7	500	0	7991.7	79.9
Goa	GPARD	400	800	1600	1000	750	500	1333.3	250	0	6633.3	66.3
Gujarat	SIRD	250	500	1250	750	500	0	1666.7	250	0	5166.7	51.7
Haryana	HIRD	250	750	1500	1250	500	500	1333.3	375	0	6458.3	64.6
Himachal Pradesh	PRTI	375	750	1250	1250	750	500	1666.7	500	0	7041.7	70.4
Jharkhand	CTI	375	750	1500	1250	500	500	1000	250	0	6125.0	61.3
Karnataka	ANS SIRD& PR	450	1000	1750	1350	950	1000	2000	500	0	9000.0	90.0
Kerala	KILA	450	1000	1750	1400	1000	1000	2000	500	500	9600.0	96.0
Madhya Pradesh	MGSIRD&PR	375	750	1500	1500	1000	800	1666.7	375	250	8216.7	82.2
Maharashtra	YASHADA	500	750	1500	1250	750	1000	2000	500	0	8250.0	82.5
Oddisha	SIRD& PR	500	1000	1650	1250	900	800	2000	375	350	8825.0	88.3
Rajasthan	IGPRS & GVS	375	750	1750	1250	500	800	2000	375	250	8050.0	80.5
Sikkim	SIRD& PR	375	750	1750	1250	700	500	2000	500	500	8325.0	83.3
Uttarakhand	Directorate of Panchayati Raj	375	750	1750	1250	750	1000	1666.7	500	0	8041.7	80.4
Uttar Pradesh	PRIT	375	600	1000	1250	600	500	1666.7	250	0	6241.7	62.4
West Bengal	BRAIPARD	375	600	1750	1400	750	500	2000	500	250	8125.0	81.3

The assessment on each of 09 components is discussed in detail hereunder.

I. Human Resource Management

The availability of academic staff qualified/ experts as per MOPR/ SIRD & academic staff trained under TOT under Panchayati Raj training/ RGSA was assessed under human resource management. The training institutions of Maharashtra, Oddisha, Karnataka, Kerala, West Bengal, Rajasthan, Sikkim, Uttar Pradesh, Himachal Pradesh, Uttarakhand, Madhy Pradesh, Jharkhand, Arunachal Pradesh, Assam &, Goa reported better performances, whereas training institutions in Andhra Pradesh, Gujarat & Haryana need to improve their performances in terms of human resource management.

II. Management Practices

The categories of trainers/ RPs recruited as per Panchayat Raj/ RGSA training guidelines were assessed under management practices. The training institutions of Maharashtra, Oddisha, Karnataka, Kerala, West Bengal, Rajasthan, Sikkim, Madhya Pradesh, Uttarakhand, Jharkhand, Arunachal Pradesh, Himachal Pradesh, Haryana, Assam & Goa reported better performances, whereas training institutions in Andhra Pradesh, Gujarat & Uttar Pradesh need to improve their performances in terms of management practices.

III. Training Programmes

Training institution whether had undertaken training need assessment, percentage of programmes conducted as allotment in time, preparation of training calendar, training preparedness, training programmes evaluated, use of participatory techniques during training, participants' satisfaction with the performance of resource persons & quality of content of training material was assessed during impact assessment under training programmes. The State level training institutions of Maharashtra, Oddisha, Karnataka, Kerala, West Bengal, Rajasthan, Sikkim, Uttar Pradesh, Himachal Pradesh, Uttarakhand, Jharkhand , Andhra Pradesh , Haryana, Assam & Goa reported better performances, whereas training institutions in Arunachal Pradesh, Gujarat & Uttar Pradesh need to improve their performances in terms of training programmes.

IV. Course Material Development

Types of material developed by training institutions, various aspects covered during material development, need for the material assessed, field test of developed material, quality of content of

material, effective presentation with adequate pictorial/ charts/graphs, prepared training material new or repetition of the old one was assessed under course material development. The training institutions of Maharashtra, Oddisha, Karnataka, Kerala, West Bengal, Himachal Pradesh, Rajasthan, Sikkim, Madhya Pradesh, Uttarakhand, Jharkhand, Haryana, and Uttar Pradesh & Assam reported better performances, whereas training institutions in Arunachal Pradesh, Goa, Andhra Pradesh & Gujarat need to improve their performances in terms of course material development.

V. Documentation

The variety of documents prepared, quality of these documents & dissemination of documents were assessed under documentation. The training institutions of Maharashtra, Oddisha, Karnataka, Kerala, Goa, West Bengal, Himachal Pradesh Sikkim, Madhya Pradesh, Uttarakhand & Assam reported better performances, whereas training institutions in Arunachal Pradesh, Andhra Pradesh, Rajasthan, Uttar Pradesh, Jharkhand, Haryana, & Gujarat need to improve their performances in terms of documentation.

VI. Innovation

The innovation in training & innovation in material development were assessed under innovation. The training institutions of Maharashtra, Oddisha, Karnataka, Kerala, Goa, West Bengal, Sikkim, Madhya Pradesh, Uttarakhand, Himachal Pradesh, Andhra Pradesh, Rajasthan, Uttar Pradesh, Jharkhand, Haryana, & Assam reported better performances, whereas training institutions in Arunachal Pradesh & Gujarat need to improve their performances in terms of innovation.

VII. Infrastructure & equipment

The location of training centre, other essential facilities at training centre viz. training hall, LCD & visual aids, lodging & boarding by training institutions, library & information centre, food/ canteen facility, safe drinking water & clean & usable toilet etc were assessed under infrastructure & equipment. The training institutions of Maharashtra, Oddisha, Karnataka, Kerala, West Bengal, Sikkim, Madhya Pradesh, Uttarakhand, Andhra Pradesh, Rajasthan, Uttar Pradesh, Himachal Pradesh, & Assam reported better performances, whereas training institutions in Arunachal Pradesh, Goa, Jharkhand & Haryana, need to improve their performances in terms of infrastructure & equipment.

VIII. Financial Practices & reporting

Proper & timely utilization of grants for the purpose given, timely submission of accounts/ utilization certificates, regularity in conducting financial audit by training institution were assessed under financial practices. The training institutions of Maharashtra, Oddisha, Karnataka, Kerala, West Bengal, Sikkim, Uttarakhand, Himachal Pradesh, Andhra Pradesh, Rajasthan, Haryana & Assam reported better performances, whereas training institutions in Arunachal Pradesh, Goa, Gujarat, Uttar Pradesh & Jharkhand need to improve their performances in terms of Financial practices and reporting.

IX. Received appreciation & awards

The training institution awards and appreciation received for Panchayati Raj/ RGSA trainings were assessed under appreciation & awards. The training institution in Andhra Pradesh, Kerala, Madhya Pradesh, Oddisha, West Bengal & Sikkim received appreciations & awards, whereas Arunachal Pradesh, Assam, Haryana, Himachal Pradesh, Karnataka, Maharashtra, Rajasthan, Uttarakhand, Uttar Pradesh, Goa & Gujarat & Jharkhand did not receive appreciations & awards.

2.6 Quality of Plans for providing training in mandatory, specialized, thematic and devolved sectors related areas

The Capacity building & Trainings of PRIs and officials have been a focus of all the sample states under RGSA. All the states view capacity building in totality as per 73rd Constitutional Amendment Act. The aspirational districts and PESA districts were not much focused in the plan of trainings reviewed for last 4 years. However, the aspects of training of ER & PRIs functionaries are focused as per requirement of RGSA. All the sample States have operational plan for all the three tiers of trainings except (Goa, Assam [part of Assam having Village Development Council]).

The unified approach to capacity building recognizes that the capacity needs of the ERs and officials, irrespective of the district category, are similar. A road map for capacity building of ERs and officials is prepared by all the states and serves as a guiding document for implementing capacity building activities in the sample States. The capacity building plan encompasses a range of capacity requirements for ERs and officials. Every year State level nodal agency prepares Training calendar/ plan for trainings to be taken up also included the RGSA training in case of SIRDs.

The capacity-building plan is more of an activity plan for a period of one year in which number of persons to be trained on various training programmes, infrastructure to be developed and budget to be utilised are detailed. However, the overall outcome of all such trainings that contribute towards strengthening of the governance system and decentralization process is not spelled out clearly. Training/capacity building as a continuing activity is definitely a means to improve Gram Sabha functioning but planning with clearly spelt out outcomes is also vital but it is found missing in the state plans. Secondly, the capacity-building plan prepared at the state level is more a state level document with no relation to the district level plans. Districts do not have plan for training. They only undertake the allotted trainings as per the State norms and requirements. Many district level plans also do not reflect the capacity-building component of RGSA in their plans explicitly. The ERs and officials at the district level are not even aware of any such plans including the NCB Framework. This indicates that the plans are more centralized and there is a need to share the plans with various stakeholders vertically and horizontally across the State with varied stakeholders.

The thematic areas covered in various States in the Plan for capacity building & Trainings includes,

State Name	Thematic Areas in the Training Plan
Andhra Pradesh	SDGs, GPDP action plan, Digital Panchayat, SBM, APPR Act, , e-governance, RTI Act, Gram sabha, citizen charter, RTI
Arunachal Pradesh	SDGs, GPDP, PRIs & PR Act, Schemes of RD&PR, Roles and Responsibilities and Accountability
Assam	GPDP, Gender, SDGs, PRIs, Rural Development Programmes, PR Act (73rd amendment), Decentralized planning, social audit, MGNREGA, PRI, e-governance
Goa	SDGs, Planning & development, Panchayat raj Act, SBM-G & CPWD manual, PR Act, Schemes of RD&PR, Roles and Responsibilities and Accountability
Gujarat	SDGs, Leadership, SHGs, Record maintenance, Monitoring, Communication, GPDP, PR Act, Schemes of RD&PR, Roles and Responsibilities and Accountability

Haryana	GPDP, PR Act, Women empowerment, HIV/ AID, HPR Act 1994,Social audit, MGNREGA, RTE, Sustainable development, leadership quality, Rural development, GRAVIT, Mission Antyodaya, SDGs, Roles and Responsibilities and Accountability
Himachal Pradesh	SDGs, Mission Antodaya, GPDP, Plan Plus, E-district, E-pariwar, RD Schemes, RTI 2005, Financial management
Jharkhand	SDGs, SBM, 14th Finance commission, RGSA, Health , education, PR Act, Schemes of RD&PR, Roles and Responsibilities and Accountability
Karnataka	SDGs, GPDP, NREGA, PR Act, Schemes of RD&PR, Roles and Responsibilities and Accountability
Kerala	Women empowerment, Leadership, Gram Sabhas, IT,PR Act, MGNREGA, Gender development, SDGs, Roles and Responsibilities and Accountability
Madhya Pradesh	GPDP, EWR, SBM, PMAY, PR Act, Schemes of RD&PR, Roles and Responsibilities and Accountability
Maharashtra	SDGs, GPDP, MSRLM, MGNREGA, Mission Antyodaya, RTI, Panchayati raj Act, PESA, Women empowerment, Social development, Krantijyoti, Apna gaon apna vikas, Schemes of RD&PR, Roles and Responsibilities and Accountability
Oddisha	SDGs, Induction cum GPDP, Social Welfare & other line department schemes, Financial accounting & management, DTS- ToT module, PRI Induction, GPDP, Women leadership, Gender sensitive, DISHA
Rajasthan	SDGs, Women empowerment, SBM, Health, Panchayat raj, Women health, PR Act, MGNREGA, Schemes of RD&PR, Roles and Responsibilities and Accountability
Sikkim	SDGs, PR Act, Rural development, GPDP, Menstrual Hygiene management, local governance, 73rd Amendment Act, Gram sabha, SWM, Sanitation, leadership development
Uttarakhand	SDGs, GPDP, Gender issue, solid waste management, Uttarakhand Panchayati Raj Act, PES application, RTI, Schemes of RD&PR, Roles and Responsibilities and Accountability
Uttar Pradesh	SDGs, GPDP, water harvesting, e-governance, training of TF members, leadership & communication, SBM, PES application, PRA, Mission Antyodaya, Resource mapping, Panchayati Raj Act & 73rd amendment
West Bengal	SDG, Module development & preparation of study materials, Planning process, livelihood, SWM, livelihood, PRA/ PLA, GPDP, Panchayat system, Education, Women & child development, RTI, RTPs, RTE

Best Practices –State-wise

S.No.	States	Best Practices
1.	Andhra Pradesh	• State had organized trainings for elected representatives within six months of election. • State training institute (SIRD) was designated for managing the trainings of Elected Representatives & Panchayat Functionaries in the State. • Good coordination reported between State training Institutes and districts helped in organization of smooth & quality trainings. • Training Materials and Module for Zilla Panchayat, Block Panchayat, Gram Panchayat and People's plan campaign have been developed in local language they have been reported useful. • Full time district level coordination support is available (District Training Coordinator). • State mobilizes funds for trainings to organize timely trainings. • Every district has a group of 4-5 Resource teams to undertake trainings of Panchayat Raj department, which visits across the district and Block Panchayats and provides trainings and handholding support. • Department of Panchayat Raj is coordinating well, providing support and have concern for PRIs trainings. • GPDP plan executed at the village level.
2.	Arunachal Pradesh	• State training institute (SIRD) has been designated for managing the trainings of Elected Representatives & Panchayat Functionaries in the State. • Moderate coordination has been reported between State training Institutes and districts and it has helped in organization of trainings. • Training Materials and Modules for Zilla Panchayat, Gram Panchayat and People's plan campaign have been developed in English. • Department of Panchayat Raj is coordinating well, providing support and have concern for PRIs trainings. • GPDP plan executed at the village level.
3.	Assam	• Department of Panchayat Raj is coordinating well, providing support and have concern for PRIs trainings. • State had organized trainings for elected representatives within six months of election. • State training institute (SIRD) has been designated for managing the trainings of Elected Representatives & Panchayat Functionaries in the State. • Good coordination has been reported between State training Institutes and districts and it has helped in organization of smooth & quality trainings. • Films on development concerns are screened for the participants.

		• Training Materials and Modules for Zilla Panchayat, Block Panchayat, Gram Panchayat and People's plan campaign have been developed in local language and they have been reported useful. • Trainings Institutes at District level/ Regional Training centres/ETC have been set-up at district level. • State mobilizes funds for trainings to organize timely trainings. • SATCOM has been used in trainings. It is functioning well in the State/ sample districts.
4.	Goa	• State had organized trainings for elected representatives within six months of election. • State training institute (GIPARD) has been designated for managing the trainings in of Elected Representatives & Panchayat Functionaries in the State. • Moderate coordination has been reported between State training Institutes and districts and it has helped in organization of trainings in English. • Training Materials and Modules for Zilla Panchayat, Gram Panchayat and People's plan campaign have been developed. • Training Materials and Modules for Zilla Panchayat, Gram Panchayat and People's plan campaign have been developed.
5.	Gujarat	• State training institute (SIRD) has been designated for managing the trainings of Elected Representatives & Panchayat Functionaries in the State. • Training Materials and Modules for Gram Panchayat and People's plan campaign have been developed in local language and they have been reported useful.
6.	Haryana	• State training institute (HIRD) has been designated for managing the trainings of Elected Representatives & Panchayat Functionaries in the State. • Training Materials and Modules for Zilla Panchayat, Block Panchayat, Gram Panchayat and People's plan campaign have been developed in Hindi language & they have been reported useful. • Good Master Trainers have been created and they are paid well in trainings.
7.	Himachal Pradesh	• State Panchayat Resource Centre is functioning in the State and it has been designated for managing the trainings of Elected Representatives & Panchayat Functionaries in the State. • Department of Panchayat Raj is coordinating well, providing support and have concern for PRIs trainings. • Good coordination has been reported between State training Institutes and districts and it has helped in organization of smooth & quality trainings in Hindi. • Training Materials and Modules for Zilla Panchayat, Block Panchayat, Gram Panchayat and People's plan campaign

		have been developed.
8.	Jharkhand	• Central Training Institute (CTI) is functioning in the State and it has been designated for managing the trainings of Elected Representatives & Panchayat Functionaries in the State. • Department of Panchayat Raj is coordinating well, providing support and have concern for PRIs trainings. • Good coordination has been reported between State training Institutes and districts and it has helped in organization of smooth & quality trainings. • Training Materials and Modules for Zilla Panchayat, Block Panchayat, Gram Panchayat and Peoples plan campaign have been developed in Hindi and they have been reported useful. • Films on development concerns are screened for the participants.
9.	Karnataka	• State had organized trainings for elected representatives within six months of election. • Abdul Nazeer Sab State Institute for Rural Development & Panchayat Raj (**ANSSIRD** & PR) is functioning in the State and it has been designated for managing the trainings of Elected Representatives & Panchayat Functionaries in the State. • Department of Panchayat Raj is coordinating well, providing support and have concern for PRIs trainings. • Films on development concerns are screened for the participants. • Good coordination has been reported between State training Institutes and districts and it has helped in the organization of smooth & quality trainings. • Training Materials and Modules for Zilla Panchayat, Block Panchayat, Gram Panchayat and People's plan campaign have been developed in local language and they have been reported useful. • State mobilizes funds for trainings to organize timely trainings. • Use of SATCOM system has been reported functional and useful for trainings of PRIs. The Screen is installed at Capacity building hall in the Blocks.
10.	Kerala	• State had organized trainings for elected representatives within six months of election. • Kerala Institute of Local Administration (KILA), a State training institute has been designated for managing the trainings of Elected Representatives & Panchayat Functionaries in the State. • Good coordination has been reported between State training Institutes and districts and it has helped in the organization of smooth & quality trainings. • Training Materials and Modules for Zilla Panchayat, Block Panchayat, Gram Panchayat and People's plan campaign

		have been developed in local language and they have been reported useful. • Department of Panchayat Raj is coordinating well, providing support and have concern for PRIs trainings. • Resource team has been mobilized in every district to manage and monitor the trainings, which is helping in a better organization of quality trainings. • State mobilizes funds for trainings to organize timely trainings. • Films on development concerns are screened for the participants. • GPDP plan executed at the village level.
11.	Madhya Pradesh	• State training institute (SIRD) /ETCs were designated for managing the trainings of Elected Representatives & Panchayat Functionaries in the State. • Moderate coordination has been reported between State training Institutes and districts & it has helped in organization of trainings. • Training Materials and Modules for Zilla Panchayat, Block Panchayat, Gram Panchayat and People's plan campaign have been developed in State language Hindi. • GPDP trainings were taken up in the State in strategic manner & GPDP plan executed at the village level.
12.	Maharashtra	• YASHADA State training institute has been designated for managing the trainings of Elected Representatives & Panchayat Functionaries in the State. • Good coordination has been reported between State training Institutes and districts and it has helped in organization of smooth & quality trainings. • Training Materials and Modules for Zilla Panchayat, Block Panchayat, Gram Panchayat and People's plan campaign have been developed in local language they have been reported useful. • Department of Rural development & Panchayat Raj is coordinating well, providing support and have concern for PRIs trainings. • Films on development concerns are screened for the participants. • SATCOM has been installed at YASHADA, which were reported in use for trainings.
13.	Oddisha	• State had organized trainings for elected representatives within six months of election. • State training institute (SIRD) has been designated for managing the trainings of Elected Representatives & Panchayat Functionaries in the State. • Department of Panchayat Raj is coordinating well, providing support and have concern for PRIs trainings. • Good coordination has been reported between State

		training Institutes and districts and it has helped in organization of smooth & quality trainings. • Training Materials and Modules for Zilla Panchayat, Block Panchayat, Gram Panchayat and People's plan campaign have been developed in local language and they have been reported useful. • State mobilizes funds for trainings to organize timely trainings. • Films on development concerns are screened for the participants. • Trainers pool has been developed in the State. Also, regular grading and training has been done. • Private partners/ NGOs were engaged in trainings at District & Blocks.
14.	Rajasthan	• State had organized trainings for elected representatives within six months of election. • Indira Gandhi Panchayat Raj Sansthan (State training institute) has been designated for managing the trainings of Elected Representatives & Panchayat Functionaries in the State. • Moderate coordination has been reported between State training Institutes and districts and it has helped in organization of trainings. • Department of Panchayat Raj is coordinating well, providing support and have concern for PRIs trainings. • Training Materials and Modules for Zilla Panchayat, Block Panchayat, Gram Panchayat and People's plan campaign have been developed in Hindi. • Cascade mode of training has been executed. • Films on development concerns are screened for the participants. • GPDP plan executed at the village level.
15.	Sikkim	• State training institute (SIRD) has been designated for managing the trainings of Elected Representatives & Panchayat Functionaries in the State. • Good coordination has been reported between State training Institutes and districts and it has helped in organization of smooth & quality trainings. • Training Materials and Modules for Zilla Panchayat, Gram Panchayat and People's plan campaign have been developed in English. • Department of Panchayat Raj is coordinating well, providing support and have concern for PRIs trainings. • District level position of MIS has been working well with regard to imparting training and handholding support to ERs and Gram Panchayat. • State mobilizes funds for trainings to organize timely trainings.

		• GPDP plan executed at the village level.
16.	Uttar Pradesh	• Panchayat Raj Training Institute (PRTI) has been designated for managing the trainings of Elected Representatives & Panchayat Functionaries in the State. • Moderate coordination has been reported between State training Institutes and districts and it has helped in organization of trainings. • Training Materials and Modules for Zilla Panchayat, Block Panchayat, Gram Panchayat and People's plan campaign have been developed in Hindi and they have been reported useful. • Department of Panchayat Raj is coordinating well, providing support and have concern for PRIs trainings. • DPRCs have been established in almost all the districts and are equipped with trainers and staffs. • District MIS has been in position in every district and it has been helpful in managing trainings. • Films on development concerns are screened for the participants. • GPDP plan executed at the village level.
17.	Uttarakhand	• Directorate of Panchayat Raj, Govt. of Uttrakhand took the responsibility of managing the trainings of Elected Representatives & Panchayat Functionaries in the State. • Films on development concerns are screened for the participants. • Good coordination has been reported between State and districts and it has helped in organization of smooth & quality trainings. • Department of Panchayat Raj is coordinating well, providing support and have concern for PRIs trainings. • Training Materials and Modules for Zilla Panchayat, Block Panchayat, Gram Panchayat and People's plan campaign have been developed in Hindi and they have been reported useful. • State has rope in NGOs to organize training in the State. Also, State and districts are undertaking the organization of trainings in a planned manner.
18.	West Bengal	• State had organized trainings for elected representatives within six months of election. • B. R. Ambedkar Institute Of Panchayats And Rural Development a State training institute (BRAIPARD) has been designated for managing the trainings of District & Block Panchayat level Elected Representatives & Panchayat Functionaries in the State. • Department of Panchayat Raj is coordinating well, providing support and have concern for PRIs trainings. • STARPARD a State level training institute has been designated for managing the trainings of Gram Panchayat level Elected Representatives & Panchayat Functionaries

		in the State. • Good coordination has been reported between State training Institutes and districts and it has helped in organization of smooth & quality trainings. • Training Materials and Modules for Zilla Panchayat, Block Panchayat, Gram Panchayat and People's plan campaign have been developed in local language and they have been reported useful. • DPT&RCs have been established in almost all the districts and are equipped with trainers and staffs. • District level resource team has been positioned in every district and they have been helpful in managing trainings. • The preparedness for quality trainings has been thought off in the State right from State to Block Panchayat and there is active involvement of Panchayat Raj Department & STARPARD, DP&RDOs & BDOs. • The districts getting support from ISGP-II (Institutional strengthening of Gram Panchayat) project supported by World Bank providing support to Gram Panchayats in Planning for social, economic and infrastructure development, IT and web enabled requirements. • State mobilizes funds for trainings to organize timely trainings. • Films on development concerns are screened for the participants. • Video clips on different thematic areas like health, water and sanitation etc. are played. The use of visual aids in training has been beneficial, especially for the ERs of GPs and IPs. Open house discussions are being encouraged by the faculty members for clarifying the doubts of the trainees. • GPDP plan executed at the village level.

Chapter - 3

Impact of Training of PRIs
Achievements, Outcomes, Impact & Gaps

3.1 Outcome of Training - Knowledge levels and capacities & overall functioning of PRIs

The impact assessment process involved various indicators that were used to assess the effectiveness and efficiency of training programmes in the light of to what extent, the primary aim of strengthening Panchayati Raj Institutions (PRIs), for better undertaking GPDP in their Gram Panchayat, achieving Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) with main thrust on convergence with Mission Antyodaya and emphasis on strengthening PRIs in the 117 Aspirational districts has been achieved.

This study titled 'Impact Assessment of Training of PRIs' largely focused on impact assessment of training in terms of increasing knowledge, developing capacity, increasing participation, developing interest and largely improving the overall functioning of the Panchayat Raj Institutions to have better delivery of development schemes and exercise the devolved powers under 73rd Constitutional Amendment Act as envisaged.

The study covers assessment of PRIs in two folds.

First involves the assessment of Impact Trainings on ERs of three tiers, and

Second focuses on impact of trainings of Panchayati Raj functionaries.

3.1.1. Impact of Trainings on Elected Representatives: An Exploration into Knowledge levels, Capacities &Overall Management

A. Profile of Elected Representatives in the Sample

During our extensive field survey, we have collected the responses of elected representatives at all the three levels, viz. Zilla Panchayat, Block Panchayat and Gram Panchayat, through detailed informal interviews. In addition, we have also conducted 'Focus Group Discussions' (FGDs) to get the opinions of elected representatives about the CB&T in which they have participated. Also, the assessment has been made to examine the impact of Training of PRIs i.e. CB&T under RGSA.

In fact, the respondents played a great role in informing about the benefits of training in getting acquaintance about various schemes of development of Panchayat, roles and responsibilities, planning & execution procedures, GPDP and People's Plan campaign.

The study covers 9151 sample respondents (District, Block & Panchayat level elected representatives) in eighteen states including forty-seven districts. Their views on training's quality, training organization and impact of training have been gathered through questionnaire.

Gender emerged as an important variable in a given social situation, which is variably affected by any social or economic phenomenon. Hence, the variable gender is investigated. The data related to gender/sex of the sample respondents are summarized in the table & figure. In total, 57 percent sample respondents were male & the remaining 43 percent sample respondents were female.

B. Facilities, Environment and Logistics

Rating of Trainers

Trainers constitute the core of the training process. A training can be effective only if it is provided through capable trainers having sufficient knowledge and experience. Regarding rating of trainers during training programme, it is observed through analysis of primary data that 2.3 percent sample respondents rated it poor followed by 28.4 percent sample respondents who rated satisfactory, 42.5 percent sample respondents rated it good, 17.7 percent sample respondents rated very good & 9.1 percent sample respondents rated excellent (Table A6). Hence, 69.3 percent sample respondents rated trainers in training programmes under RGSA from good, very good to excellent, whereas the remaining 30.7 percent sample respondents rated trainers as poor & satisfactory. In West Bengal, Andhra Pradesh and Kerala, the rating of trainers is found to be very high.

Figure 3.1: Rating of Trainers across States

Rating of learning environment

Conducive learning environment during training programme enables participants to learn & gain knowledge. Regarding rating of learning environment during training programme, it is observed through analysis of primary data that 3.0 percent sample respondents rated it poor followed by 24.7 percent sample respondents who rated satisfactory, 31.6 percent sample respondents rated it good, 29.6 percent sample respondents rated very good & 11.1 percent sample respondents rated excellent (Table A7). Hence, 72.3 percent sample respondents rated learning environment in training programmes under RGSA from good, very good to excellent, whereas the remaining 27.6 percent sample respondents rated learning environments poor & satisfactory. In terms of creating conducive learning environment during

Figure 3.2: Rating of Learning Environment across States

training programme, the better performing states are Kerala, Andhra Pradesh, West Bengal, Himachal Pradesh, Karnataka, Orissa and Maharashtra.

Rating of Training Venue, Seating Facilities & Training

Proper selection of training venue, seating facility at training venue & availability & use of training aids are equally important for effectiveness of training programme. Training venue, seating facilities & training aids were rated 'poor' by 4.6 percent sample respondents followed by 33.7 percent sample respondents rated 'satisfactory', 30.6 percent sample respondents rated 'good', 18.3 percent sample respondents rated 'very good' & 12.8 percent sample respondents rated 'excellent' (Table A8). Hence, 61.7 percent sample respondents rated training venue, seating facilities & training aids in training programmes under RGSA from good, very good to excellent, whereas the remaining 38.3 percent sample respondents rated the same as poor & satisfactory. In terms of providing training venue, seating facilities & training aids, the better performing states are West Bengal, Kerala, Andhra Pradesh, Orissa and Maharashtra.

Figure 3.3: Rating of Training Venue, Seating Facilities & Training across States

Rating of lodging & boarding facilities

As far as rating of lodging & boarding facilities is concerned, 12.6 percent sample respondents rated lodging & boarding facilities during training programme 'poor' followed by 25.6 percent sample respondents rated 'satisfactory', 28.9 percent sample respondents rated 'good', 21.1 percent sample respondents rated 'very good' &11.9 percent sample respondents rated 'excellent' (Table A9). Hence, 61.2 percent sample respondents rated training venue, seating facilities & training aids in training programmes under RGSA from good, very good to excellent, whereas the remaining 38.2 percent sample respondents rated the same as poor & satisfactory. In terms of providing lodging & boarding facilities, the better

Figure 3.4: Rating of Lodging & Boarding Facilities across States

performing states are West Bengal, Kerala, Maharashtra, Orissa, Andhra Pradesh and Himachal Pradesh.

Rating of reading materials/ training materials

Figure 3.5: Rating of Reading / Training Materials across States

Regarding rating of reading materials/ training materials provided to trainees during training programme, 10.1 percent sample respondents rated reading materials/ training materials provided to them as 'poor' followed by 33.7 percent sample respondents rated 'satisfactory', 37.2 percent sample respondents rated 'good', 12.3 percent sample respondents rated 'very good' &6.7 rated distribution of reading materials/ training materials provided to them as excellent (Table A10). Hence, 54.8 percent sample respondents rated reading materials/ training materials provided to trainees during training programme from good, very good to excellent, whereas the remaining 45.2 percent sample respondents rated the same as poor & satisfactory. In terms of arranging reading materials/ training materials provided to trainees during training programme, the better performing states are West Bengal, Andhra Pradesh, Maharashtra, Arunachal Pradesh, Uttarakhand and Kerala.

Rating of session on best practices, case Studies, experience sharing etc.

As far as rating of session on best practices, case studies, experience sharing etc during training programme is concerned, 10.2 percent sample respondents rated the same as 'poor' followed by 32.1 percent sample respondents rated 'satisfactory', 28.1 percent sample respondents rated 'good', 22.6 percent sample respondents rated 'very good' and 7.1 percent sample respondents rated session on best practices, case studies, experience sharing etc during training programme as 'excellent' (Table A11). Hence, 57.8 percent sample respondents rated session on best practices, case studies, experience sharing etc during training programme from good, very good to excellent, whereas the remaining 42.3 percent sample respondents rated the same as poor & satisfactory. In terms of best practices, case studies, experience sharing etc during training programme, the better performing states are West Bengal, Andhra Pradesh, Uttarakhand, Maharashtra and Kerala.

Figure 3.6: Rating of Session on Best Practices, Case Studies, Experience Sharing etc. across States

Rating of field visit and group discussion

As far as rating of field visit and group discussions during training programme is concerned, it is observed through analysis of primary data that 11.7 percent sample respondents rated the same as 'poor' followed by 20.8 percent sample respondents rated 'satisfactory', 28.7 percent sample respondents rated 'good', 12.8 percent sample respondents rated 'very good' and 9.7 percent sample respondents rated field visit and group discussions during training programme as 'excellent'. Hence, 67.5 percent sample respondents rated field visit and group discussion during training programme from good, very good to excellent, whereas the remaining 32.5 percent sample respondents rated the same as poor & satisfactory. In terms of field visit and group discussions during training programme, the better performing states are Maharashtra, West Bengal, Kerala, Goa and Andhra Pradesh.

Figure 3.7: Rating of Field Visit and Group Discussion across States

State Rank Analysis

State-wise rank analysis across various indicators discussed above, Table 3.1, indicates that the state of West Bengal has been the best performer across all the indicators except a few such as learning arrangement and field visits and group discussions. Then comes Andhra Pradesh which performed well across all indicators except training venue, lodging & boarding and field visit &

Table 3.1: State-wise Ranking as per Respondents' Rating Status

State	Overall	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Andhra Pradesh	2	2	2	3	5	2	2	5
Arunachal Pradesh	5	5	8	9	7	4	6	6
Assam	12	15	12	12	11	10	10	10
Goa	8	13	10	7	13	9	13	4
Gujarat	18	12	18	18	18	16	18	18
Haryana	17	16	17	17	16	18	17	16
Himachal Pradesh	10	8	4	6	6	12	9	14
Jharkhand	13	10	13	15	14	13	14	9
Karnataka	11	11	5	11	10	17	11	8
Kerala	3	3	1	2	2	6	5	3
Madhya Pradesh	16	18	15	16	17	15	16	12
Maharashtra	4	7	7	5	3	3	4	1
Orissa	6	4	6	4	4	8	8	11
Rajasthan	14	14	14	13	12	11	12	15
Sikkim	7	6	11	10	9	7	7	7
Uttar Pradesh	15	17	16	14	15	14	15	13
Uttarakhand	9	9	9	8	8	5	3	17
West Bengal	1	1	3	1	1	1	1	2

Note: A-Trainers; B-Learning Arrangement; C-Training Venue; D-Lodging & Boarding; E-Reading Materials; F-Best Practices & Case Studies; G-Field Visit & Group Discussion

group discussions. The state of Kerala could perform the best only in providing learning arrangement but it has remained behind West Bengal and Andhra Pradesh in all other aspects. Here, the rating of the provision of reading materials and best practices & case studies is not rated very high. It may be due to the prevalence of high levels of literacy in the state and thus, the ability of the respondents to question about the soundness of study materials in the training program. On the other hand, the states of Gujarat, Haryana, Madhya Pradesh, Uttar Pradesh and Rajasthan have been the worst performers across all the above-discussed indicators.

Figure 3.8: State-wise Raking

Mode of trainings & hours

Regarding mode of training during training programmes under RGSA, 14.5 percent sample respondents reported that interactive/ participatory mode of training was used followed by 22 percent sample respondents opted for lecture method, 62.9 percent sample respondents opted for mixed viz. interactive/ participatory & lecture method & 0.6 percent sample respondents opted for ICT based / SATCOM.

As far as hours of training programmes are concerned, 3.5 percent sample respondents reported that trainings were organized up to 3 hours followed by 81.7 percent sample respondents reported that trainings were organized for 4 to 6 hours & 14.8 percent sample respondents opted for 6-9 hours.

Regarding whether Panchayat representatives had access to online mode of training, 27.3 percent sample respondents reported that they had access to online mode of training, whereas 72.7 percent sample respondents reported that they did not have access to online mode of training. Regarding usefulness of ICT mode of training, out of 27.3 percent sample

Figure 3.9: Online mode of training

respondents who reported for ICT mode of training, 70.1 percent sample respondents found it useful, whereas 29.9 percent sample respondents did not report for the same.

Table 3.2: Mode & hours of trainings

S.No.	Particulars	Responses	Nos.& %
1	Mode of training	Interactive/participative	1309(14.5)
		Lecture	1988(22)
		Mixed	5692(62.9)
		ICT based/ SATCOM	56(0.6)
		Total	9045(100)
2	Training hours	Up to 3 hours	314(3.5)
		4-6 hours	7391(81.7)
		6-9 hours	1340(14.8)
		Total	9045(100)
3	Access to online (ICT) mode of training	Yes	2469(27.3)
		No	6576(72.7)
		Total	9045(100)
4.	ICT mode of training useful	Yes	1732(70.1)
		No	737(29.9)
		Total	2469(100)

Note: Figures within brackets are the percentages

C. Advantages of various trainings

Need based training

Of the total sample respondents, 99.9 percent respondents reported that training imparted to them under RGSA was need based, whereas 0.1 percent sample respondents reported training attended by them was not need based. Regarding rating of need based training, out of 99.9 percent sample respondents who reported that the training was need based, 3.3 percent sample respondents rated need based training as poor followed by 33.7 percent sample respondents rated training satisfactory, 43.2 percent sample respondents rated training good, 14.3 percent sample respondents rated training very good & 5.5 percent sample respondents rated training excellent (Table A15).Thus, 63 percent sample respondents rated need based training from good, very good to excellent, whereas the remaining 37 percent sample respondents rated need based training as satisfactory & poor. In terms of organizing need based training, the better performing states are West Bengal, Andhra Pradesh, Arunachal Pradesh, Maharashtra and Himachal Pradesh.

Figure 3.10: Rating of Need-based Training across States

Training programmes useful & beneficial

Figure 3.11: Rating of Training Programmes across States

With regard to usefulness & benefits of training programme, 99.9 percent sample respondents reported that the training programme was useful & beneficial, whereas 0.1 percent sample respondents reported that the training programme was not useful & beneficial.Regarding rating of usefulness & benefits of training programme, 4.4 percent sample respondents rated training poor followed by 25.4 percent sample respondents rated training satisfactory, 31.1 percent sample respondents rated training good, 31.9 percent sample respondents rated training very good & 7.1 percent sample respondents rated training excellent (Table A16). Thus, 70.1 percent sample respondents rated usefulness & benefits of training programme from good, very good to excellent, whereas the remaining 29.8 percent sample respondents rated usefulness & benefits of training programme as satisfactory & poor.In terms of usefulness& benefits of

trainings,the better performing states are West Bengal, Andhra Pradesh, Kerala, Uttarakhand and Karnataka.

Training helps in skills upgradation & knowledge enrichment

Out of total sample respondents, 99.9 percent respondents opined that training helped in skills upgradation & knowledge enrichment, whereas 0.1 percent sample respondents reported that training did not help in skills upgradation & knowledge enrichment. As far as rating of training programme in skills upgradation & knowledge enrichment is concerned, 6.3 percent sample respondents rated training poor followed by 34 percent sample respondents rated training satisfactory, 34.2 percent sample respondents rated training good, 16.4 percent sample respondents rated training very good & 9.1 percent sample respondents rated training excellent (Table A17). Thus, 59.7 percent sample respondents rated training programme in skills upgradation & knowledge enrichment from good, very good to excellent, whereas the remaining 40.3 percent sample respondents rated training programme in skills upgradation & knowledge enrichment as satisfactory & poor.Looking skills upgradation & knowledge enrichment through trainings,the better performing states are Andhra Pradesh, West Bengal and Kerala.

Figure 3.12: Rating of Training Role in Skill Upgradation& Knowledge Enrichment across States

Better perform their responsibilities

Out of the total sample respondents, 99.9 percent sample respondents opined that training under RGSA helped in better performing their responsibilities, whereas the remaining 0.1 percent sample respondents opined that training did not help in better performing their responsibilities. Regarding rating of training programme in better performing their responsibilities, 7.4 percent sample respondents rated poor followed by 29.1 percent sample respondents rated satisfactory, 30.1 percent sample respondents rated good, 26.1 percent sample respondents rated very good & 7.3 percent sample respondents rated

Figure 3.13: Rating of Training Role in Better Performing the Responsibilities across States

excellent (Table A18). Thus, 63.5 percent sample respondents rated training programme in better performing their responsibilities from good, very good to excellent, whereas the remaining 36.5 percent sample respondents rated training programme in better performing their responsibilities as satisfactory & poor. In terms of better performing their responsibilities through trainings, the better performing states are West Bengal, Andhra Pradesh, Kerala, Karnataka, Maharashtra and Uttarakhand.

Develop positive attitude on roles & responsibilities of GP

Figure 3.14: Rating of Training Role in Developing Attitude on Roles & Responsibilities of GP across States

Of the total respondents, 100 percent sample respondents opined that training under RGSA helped in developing positive attitude on roles & responsibilities of Gram Panchayat. As far as rating of training in developing positive attitude on roles & responsibilities of Gram Panchayat by sample respondents is concerned, 8.1 percent sample respondents rated the same as poor followed by 34.9 percent sample respondents rated satisfactory, 33.7 percent sample respondents rated good, 16.1 percent sample respondents rated very good & 7.2 percent sample respondents rated excellent (Table A19). Thus, 57 percent sample respondents rated training programme in developing positive attitude on roles & responsibilities of Gram Panchayat from good, very good to excellent, whereas the remaining 43 percent sample respondents rated training programme in developing positive attitude on roles & responsibilities of Gram Panchayat as satisfactory & poor.In terms of developing positive attitude on roles & responsibilities of Gram Panchayat through trainings, the better performing states are Andhra Pradesh, West Bengal, Kerala, Himachal Pradesh and Maharashtra.

Completely equipped on roles & responsibilities of GP for effective execution of development programmes, Social Justice etc.

Figure 3.15: Rating of Training Role in Completely Equipping on Roles & Responsibilities across States

Out of the total, 99.9 percent sample respondents reported that training under RGSA completely equipped on roles & responsibilities of GP for effective execution of development programmes, social justice etc, whereas 0.1 percent sample respondents reported otherwise. Regarding rating by sample respondents about training under RGSA completely equipped on roles & responsibilities of GP for effective execution of development programmes, social justice etc, 8.3

percent sample respondents rated as poor followed by 31.6 percent sample respondents rated satisfactory, 33.2 percent sample respondents rated good, 19.3 percent sample respondents rated very good & 7.6 percent sample respondents rated as excellent (Table A20). equipped on roles & responsibilities of GP for effective execution of development programmes, social justice etc from good, very good to excellent, whereas the remaining 39.9 percent sample respondents rated training programme under RGSA completely equipped on roles & responsibilities of GP for effective execution of development programmes, social justice etc as satisfactory & poor.In terms of completely equipped on roles & responsibilities of GP for effective execution of development programmes, better performing states are West Bengal, Andhra Pradesh, Kerala and Maharashtra.

State Rank Analysis

State rank analysis across above discussed indicators, table 3.3, reveals that the state of West Bengal has been the best performing state. The next best performing state has been Andhra Pradesh. Kerala got the third position. Among the poor performing states, Gujarat has been at the top. This state has been the least performer. Haryana, Goa and Madhya Pradesh have been other low performing states. The performance of Jharkhand and Uttar Pradesh also has remained consistently low across all the indicators.

Figure 3.16: State Ranking

Table 3.3: State-wise Ranking as per Respondents' Rating Status

State	Overall	A	B	C	D	E	F
Andhra Pradesh	2	2	2	1	2	1	2
Arunachal Pradesh	7	3	6	4	8	8	12
Assam	11	11	9	10	9	11	9
Goa	16	18	16	12	12	12	10
Gujarat	18	15	18	18	18	18	18
Haryana	17	16	17	17	17	17	17
Himachal Pradesh	5	5	8	6	7	4	6
Jharkhand	13	13	14	16	16	15	13
Karnataka	8	10	5	9	4	9	5
Kerala	3	8	3	3	3	3	3
Madhya Pradesh	15	17	12	15	14	14	14
Maharashtra	4	4	7	5	5	5	4
Orissa	9	9	10	8	10	7	8
Rajasthan	14	14	13	14	13	16	16
Sikkim	10	6	11	11	11	10	11
Uttar Pradesh	12	12	15	13	15	13	15
Uttarakhand	6	7	4	7	6	6	7
West Bengal	1	1	1	2	1	2	1

Note: A-Need based training; B-Training programmes useful & beneficial; C-Training helps in skills upgradation & knowledge enrichment; D-Better perform their responsibilities; E-Develop positive attitude on roles & responsibilities of GP; F-Completely equipped on roles & responsibilities of GP for effective execution of development programmes, Social Justice etc.

D. Impact Assessment of capacity Building & Trainings under RGSA

Trainings under RGSA were imparted on various topics/issues. Hence, three aspects of each topic/issue of training were assessed:

- Whether topic/issue covered/shown in area?
- Whether understanding is developed as per working requirement?
- Whether it is useful in functioning of Gram Panchayat and executing various schemes of Panchayati Raj department, Rural development department, Social Justice and economic development etc.

1) Planning & management of Gram Panchayat functions, core areas, Governance, Social inclusion, Gender inequality, economic development & social justice:

In total, 64.9 percent sample respondents reported that planning & management of Gram Panchayat functions core areas were covered during training, whereas 35.1 percent sample respondents did not report for the same. Regarding rating of understanding developed as per working requirement on planning & management of Gram Panchayat functions core areas,Governance, Social inclusion, Gender inequality, economic development & social justice, in total out of 64.9 percent sample respondents who opined that the topic/issue was covered during training, 31 percent sample respondents rated it satisfactory followed by 48.9 percent sample respondents rated good, 17.8 percent sample respondents rated very good & 2.2 percent sample respondents rated excellent (Table A21).In terms of understanding developed as per working requirement on planning & management of Gram Panchayat functions, core areas, Governance, Social inclusion, Gender inequality, economic development & social justice were reported better in the States namely, West Bengal (99 percent), Andhra Pradesh (91.9 percent)& Kerala (90.4 percent).

Similarly, rating of whether planning & management of Gram Panchayat functions, core areas was useful in working under RGSA, in total, out of 64.9 percent sample respondents who opined that the topic/issue was covered during training, 0.6 percent sample respondents rated it poor followed by 47.6 percent sample respondents rated satisfactory, 39.5 percent sample respondents rated good, 9.5 percent sample respondents rated very good and 2.8 percent sample respondents rated excellent (Table A22). In terms of planning & management of Gram Panchayat functions, core areas Governance, Social inclusion, Gender inequality, economic development & social justice was useful in working under RGSA were reported better in the States namely, West Bengal (94.9 percent), Andhra Pradesh (92.5 percent) & Kerala (88.7 percent).

2) Baseline data collection & situational analysis & development of GPDP

In total, 71.4 percent sample respondents reported that baseline data collection & situational analysis & development of GPDP were covered during training, whereas 28.6 percent sample respondents did not report for the same. Regarding rating of understanding developed as per working requirement on baseline data collection & situational analysis & development of GPDP, in total, out of 71.4 percent sample respondents who opined that the topic/issue was covered during training, 0.3 percent sample respondents rated it poor followed by 27.7 percent sample

respondents rated satisfactory, 47.6 percent sample respondents rated good, 20.6 percent sample respondents rated very good and 3.8 percent sample respondents rated excellent (Table A23). In terms of understanding developed as per working requirement on baseline data collection & situational analysis & development of GPDP were reported better in the States namely, West Bengal (99.5 percent), Andhra Pradesh (94.2 percent) & Kerala (95.7 percent).

Similarly, rating of whether baseline data collection & situational analysis & development of GPDP was useful in working under RGSA, in total, out of 71.4 percent sample respondents who opined that the topic/issue was covered during training, 0.8 percent sample respondents rated it poor followed by 46.1 percent sample respondents rated satisfactory, 37.9 percent sample respondents rated good, 11.6 percent sample respondents rated very good and 3.5 percent sample respondents rated excellent (Table A24). In terms of baseline data collection & situational analysis & development of GPDP was useful in working under RGSA were reported better in the States namely, West Bengal (93.7 percent), Kerala (93.4 percent) &Andhra Pradesh (88.5 percent).

3) Training covered various thematic areas of importance-Drinking water/ Sanitation/Rural Development/Social Justice/ Health & Hygiene/ Women Development/ Children development/ Education etc.

Out of total sample respondents, 69.5 percent sample respondents reported that various thematic areas of importance - Drinking water/ Sanitation/Rural Development/Social Justice/ Health & Hygiene/ Women Development/ Children development/ Education etc. were covered during training, whereas 30.5 percent sample respondents did not report for the same.

Further, rating of understanding developed as per working requirement on various thematic areas of importance-Drinking water/ Sanitation/Rural Development/Social Justice/ Health & Hygiene/ Women Development/ Children development/ Education etc, in total, out of 69.5 percent sample respondents who opined that the topic/issue was covered during training, 0.3 percent sample respondents rated it poor followed by 29 percent sample respondents rated satisfactory, 49.2 percent sample respondents rated good, 18.5 percent sample respondents rated very good and 3.5 percent sample respondents rated excellent (Table A25). In terms of understanding developed as per working requirement on various thematic areas of importance - Drinking water/ Sanitation/Rural Development/Social Justice/ Health & Hygiene/ Women Development/ Children development/ Education etc. were reported better in the States namely, Arunachal Pradesh (99.6 percent), West Bengal (99.4 percent) &Kerala (90.5 percent). Similarly, rating of whether thematic areas of importance - Drinking water/ Sanitation/Rural Development/Social Justice/ Health & Hygiene/ Women Development/ Children development/ Education etc, was useful in working under RGSA, in total, out of 69.5 percent sample respondents who opined that the topic/issue was covered during training, 1.3 percent sample respondents rated it poor followed by 47 percent sample respondents rated satisfactory, 37.9 percent sample respondents rated good, 10.7 percent sample respondents rated very good and 3.1 percent sample respondents rated excellent (Table A 26). In terms of various thematic areas of importance - Drinking water/ Sanitation/Rural Development/Social Justice/ Health & Hygiene/ Women Development/ Children development/ Education etc. being reported useful in working under RGSA were reported better in the States namely, West Bengal (94.8 percent), Kerala (89.9 percent) &Andhra Pradesh (89.7 percent).

4) Better Execution of provisions under 14th Finance Commission

In total, 65.5 percent sample respondents reported that better execution of provisions under 14th Finance Commission was covered during training, whereas 34.5 percent sample respondents did not report for the same.

Similarly, rating of understanding developed as per working requirement on better execution of provisions under 14th Finance Commission, in total, out of 65.5 percent sample respondents who

opined that the topic/issue was covered during training, 0.4 percent sample respondents rated it poor followed by 32.2 percent sample respondents rated satisfactory, 47 percent sample respondents rated good, 17.3 percent sample respondents rated very good and 3.1 percent sample respondents rated excellent (Table A27). In terms of understanding developed as per working requirement on better execution of provisions under 14th Finance Commission were reported better in the States namely, West Bengal (98.8 percent), Himachal Pradesh (95.1 percent), & Kerala (90.5 percent).

Similarly, rating of whether better execution of provisions under 14th Finance Commission was useful in working under RGSA, in total out of 65.5 percent sample respondents who opined that the topic/issue was covered during training, 0.8 percent sample respondents rated it poor followed by 53.2 percent sample respondents rated satisfactory, 33.4 percent sample respondents rated good, 9.1 percent sample respondents rated very good and 3.4 percent sample respondents rated excellent (Table A28). In terms of better execution of provisions under 14th Finance Commission was useful in working under RGSA were reported better in the States namely, West Bengal (89.5 percent), Kerala (87.1 percent) & Andhra Pradesh (81 percent).

5) Better Execution of provisions under State Finance Commission

In total, 69.5 percent sample respondents reported that better execution of provisions under State Finance Commission was covered during training, whereas 30.5 percent sample respondents did not report for the same.

Similarly, rating of understanding developed as per working requirement on better execution of provisions under State Finance Commission, in total, out of 69.5 percent sample respondents who opined that the topic/issue was covered during training, 0.4 percent sample respondents rated it poor followed by 30.9 percent sample respondents rated satisfactory, 47.8 percent sample respondents rated good, 18 percent sample respondents rated very good and 2.9 percent sample respondents rated excellent (Table A29). In terms of understanding developed as per working requirement on better execution of provisions under State Finance Commission was reported better in the States namely, West Bengal (99.3 percent), Himachal Pradesh (95 percent), Kerala & Andhra Pradesh (90.5 percent each).

Similarly, rating of whether better execution of provisions under State Finance Commission was useful in working under RGSA, in total, out of 69.5 percent sample respondents who opined that the topic/issue was covered during training, 0.9 percent sample respondents rated it poor followed by 52.2 percent sample respondents rated satisfactory, 34.4 percent sample respondents rated good, 9.4 percent sample respondents rated very good and 3.1 percent sample respondents rated excellent (Table A30). In terms of better execution of provisions under State Finance Commission was useful in working under RGSA were reported better in the States namely, Kerala (88.6 percent) &West Bengal (87.4 percent).

6) Training covered various programmes/schemes namely, MGNREGA, SBM, GPDP, DAY-NRLM, Water quality, Health etc.

In total, 80 percent sample respondents reported that various programmes/schemes namely, MGNREGA, SBM, GPDP, DAY-NRLM, Water quality, Health etc. were covered during training under RGSA, whereas 20 percent sample respondents did not report for the same.

Similarly, rating of understanding developed as per working requirement on various programmes/schemes namely, MGNREGA, SBM, GPDP, DAY-NRLM, Water quality, Health etc., in total, out of 80 percent sample respondents who opined that the topic/issue was covered during training, 0.3 percent sample respondents rated it poor followed by 29.7 percent sample respondents rated satisfactory, 47.1 percent sample respondents rated good, 19.8 percent sample respondents rated very good and 3.2 percent sample respondents rated excellent (Table A31). In

terms of understanding developed as per working requirement on various programmes/schemes namely, MGNREGA, SBM, GPDP, DAY-NRLM, Water quality, Health etc. was reported better in the States namely, West Bengal (99.5 percent), Himachal Pradesh (97.2 percent) &Arunachal Pradesh (98.4 percent).

Similarly, rating of whether various programmes/schemes namely, MGNREGA, SBM, GPDP, DAY-NRLM, Water quality, Health etc were useful in working under RGSA, in total, out of 80 percent sample respondents who opined that the topic/issue was covered during training, 0.8 percent sample respondents rated it poor followed by 49.5 percent sample respondents rated satisfactory, 36 percent sample respondents rated good, 10.6 percent sample respondents rated very good and 3.1 percent sample respondents rated excellent (Table A32). In terms of various programmes/schemes namely, MGNREGA, SBM, GPDP, DAY-NRLM, Water quality, Health etc., was useful in working under RGSA were reported better in the States namely, West Bengal (94.9 percent), Kerala (89.9 percent) &Andhra Pradesh(89.1 percent).

7) Undergone capacity building trainings other than RGSA namely, SBM, NRLM, Water Quality, Health etc.

With regard to capacity building & trainings other than RGSA, it has covered various thematic areas namely, SBM, NRLM, Water Quality, Health etc. 78.3 percent sample respondents reported that they had undergone capacity building trainings whereas, 21.7 percent sample respondents did not report for the same.

Similarly, rating of understanding developed as per working requirement, in total, out of 78.3 percent sample respondents who opined that they had undergone capacity building trainings other than RGSA namely, SBM, NRLM, Water Quality, Health etc, 0.3 percent sample respondents rated it poor followed by 30.6 percent sample respondents rated satisfactory, 46 percent sample respondents rated good, 20.3 percent sample respondents rated very good and 2.8 percent sample respondents rated excellent (Table A33). In terms of understanding developed as per working requirement on SBM, NRLM, Water Quality, Health were reported better in the States namely, Arunachal Pradesh (99.4 percent) West Bengal (98.9 percent) &Himachal Pradesh (97.1 percent).

Like-wise, rating of usefulness in working under RGSA in total, out of 78.3 percent sample respondents who opined that they had undergone capacity building trainings other than RGSA namely, SBM, NRLM, Water Quality, Health etc, 0.7 percent sample respondents rated it poor followed by 50 percent sample respondents rated satisfactory, 35.7 percent sample respondents rated good, 10.9 percent sample respondents rated very good and 2.7 percent sample respondents rated excellent (Table A34). In terms of SBM, NRLM, Water Quality& Health was useful in working under RGSA were reported better in the States namely, West Bengal (93.4 percent), Kerala (88.3 percent) & Andhra Pradesh (87.3 percent).

8) Training in addition to RGSA namely, SBM, NRLM, Water quality, Health etc. organized

In total, 69.6 percent sample respondents reported that trainings in addition to RGSA namely, SBM, NRLM, Water quality, Health etc. were organized whereas 36.4 percent sample respondents did not report for the same.

Similarly, rating of understanding developed as per working requirements, in total, out of 69.6 percent sample respondents who opined that training, in addition to RGSA namely, SBM, NRLM, Water quality, Health etc. were organized, 0.3 percent sample respondents rated them poor followed by 31.3 percent sample respondents rated satisfactory, 46.1 percent sample respondents rated good, 19.4 percent sample respondents rated very good and 2.8 percent sample respondents rated excellent (Table A35). In terms of understanding developed as per working requirement on SBM, NRLM, Water Quality, Health were reported better in the States namely, Arunachal Pradesh (99.1 percent), West Bengal (98.9 percent) &Himachal Pradesh (96.5 percent).

Like-wise, rating of usefulness in working under RGSA, in total, out of 69.6 percent sample respondents who opined that trainings in addition to RGSA namely, SBM, NRLM, Water quality, Health etc. were organized, 1.3 percent sample respondents rated them poor followed by 50.1 percent sample respondents rated satisfactory, 35.7 percent sample respondents rated good, 10.3 percent sample respondents rated very good and 2.6 percent sample respondents rated excellent (Table A36). In terms of SBM, NRLM, Water Quality& Health being useful in working under RGSA were reported better in the States namely, West Bengal (92.7 percent), Kerala (87.9 percent) & Andhra Pradesh (87.5 percent).

9) Training organized for sector convergence

With regard to training organized for sector convergence, 62.9 percent sample respondents reported for the same, whereas, 37.1 percent sample respondents did not report for the same.

Regarding rating of understanding developed as per working requirement on sector convergence, in total, out of 62.9 percent sample respondents who opined that training organized for sector convergence covered it during training, 0.5 percent sample respondents rated it poor followed by 34.6 percent sample respondents rated satisfactory, 44.3 percent sample respondents rated good, 18 percent sample respondents rated very good and 2.6 percent sample respondents rated excellent (Table A37). In terms of understanding developed as per working requirement on sector convergence, was reported better in the States namely, West Bengal (98.8 percent), Himachal Pradesh (96 percent), & Andhra Pradesh (90.1 percent).

Similarly rating of whether training organized for sector convergence was useful in working under RGSA, in total, out of 62.9 percent sample respondents who opined that training organized for sector convergence covered it during training, 0.9 percent sample respondents rated it poor followed by 52.9 percent sample respondents rated satisfactory, 34.6 percent sample respondents rated good, 8.9 percent sample respondents rated very good and 2.6 percent sample respondents rated excellent (Table A38).In terms of sector convergence being useful in working under RGSA was reported better in the States namely, Kerala (87.6 percent) , Andhra Pradesh (82.8 percent) &West Bengal (82.3 percent).

10) Community organization & related issues, conflicts in groups

In total, 70.4 percent sample respondents reported that Community organization & related issues, conflicts in groups were covered during training, whereas 29.6 percent sample respondents did not report for the same. Similarly, rating of understanding developed as per working requirement on Community organization & related issues, conflicts in groups, in total, out of 70.4 percent sample respondents who opined that the topic/issue was covered during training, 0.6 percent sample respondents rated it poor followed by 32.9 percent sample respondents rated satisfactory, 44.7 percent sample respondents rated good, 18.9 percent sample respondents rated very good and 2.9 percent sample respondents rated excellent(Table A39). In terms of understanding developed as per working requirement on various programmes/schemes namely, Community organization & related issues, conflicts in groups were reported better in the States namely, West Bengal (98.2 percent) & Himachal Pradesh (95.1 percent).

Similarly, rating of Community organization & related issues, conflicts in groups was useful in working under RGSA, in total, out of 70.4 percent sample respondents who opined that the topic/issue was covered during training, 1.5 percent sample respondents rated it poor followed by 52.2 percent sample respondents rated satisfactory, 32.7 percent sample respondents rated good, 10.4 percent sample respondents rated very good and 3.2 percent sample respondents rated excellent (Table A40). In terms of Community organization & related issues, conflicts in groups were covered during training and they being useful in working under RGSA were reported better in the States namely, West Bengal (85.5 percent) & Kerala (86.2 percent).

11) Understanding of the core issue of Rural Poverty

In total, 70.3 percent sample respondents reported that core issue of Rural Poverty was covered during training, whereas 29.7 percent sample respondents did not report for the same. Similarly, rating of understanding developed as per working requirement on core issue of Rural Poverty, in total, out of 70.3 percent sample respondents who opined that the topic/issue was covered during training, 0.5 percent sample respondents rated it poor followed by 33.6 percent sample respondents rated satisfactory, 44.6 percent sample respondents rated good, 18.2 percent sample respondents rated very good and 3.1 percent sample respondents rated excellent (Table A41). In terms of understanding developed as per working requirement on core issue of Rural Poverty was reported better in the States namely, West Bengal (98.3 percent), Himachal Pradesh (93 percent) & Kerala (90.4 percent).

Similarly, rating of core issues of Rural Poverty was useful in working under RGSA, in total, out of 70.3 percent sample respondents who opined that the topic/issue was covered during training, 1.8 percent sample respondents rated it poor followed by 52.1 percent sample respondents rated satisfactory, 32.8 percent sample respondents rated good, 9.9 percent sample respondents rated very good and 3.4 percent sample respondents rated excellent (Table A42). In terms of core issue of Rural Poverty which was covered during training being useful in working under RGSA was reported better in the States namely, West Bengal (86.1 percent) & Kerala (88.2 percent).

12) Understanding of the core issue of Inequality

In total, 69.6 percent sample respondents reported that core issue of Inequality was covered during training, whereas 30.4 percent sample respondents did not report for the same. Similarly, rating of understanding developed as per working requirement on core issues of Inequality, in total, out of 69.6 percent sample respondents who opined that the topic/issue was covered during training, 0.6 percent sample respondents rated it poor followed by 34.6 percent sample respondents rated satisfactory, 44.1 percent sample respondents rated good, 18 percent sample respondents rated very good and 2.7 percent sample respondents rated excellent (Table A43). In terms of understanding developed as per working requirement on core issue of Inequality was reported better in the States namely, West Bengal (98.6 percent), Himachal Pradesh (93.6 percent) & Kerala (90.3 percent).

Similarly, rating of core issues of Inequality was useful in working under RGSA, in total, out of 69.6 percent sample respondents who opined that the topic/issue was covered during training, 1.9 percent sample respondents rated it poor followed by 52.6 percent sample respondents rated satisfactory, 32.6 percent sample respondents rated good, 9.8 percent sample respondents rated very good and 3.1 percent sample respondents rated excellent (Table A44). In terms of core issue of inequality which was covered during training being useful in working under RGSA were reported better in the States namely, West Bengal (87.9 percent) & Kerala (88.1 percent).

13) Understanding of the core issue of Poor Human Indices

In total, 69.3 percent sample respondents reported that core issue of Poor Human Indices was covered during training, whereas 30.7 percent sample respondents did not report for the same. Similarly, rating of understanding developed as per working requirement on core issues of Poor Human Indices, in total, out of 69.3 percent sample respondents who opined that the topic/issue was covered during training, 0.5 percent sample respondents rated it poor followed by 35.1 percent sample respondents rated satisfactory, 43 percent sample respondents rated good, 19.5 percent sample respondents rated very good and 1.9 percent sample respondents rated excellent (Table A45). In terms of understanding developed as per working requirement on core issues of Human Indices were reported better in the States namely, West Bengal (98.9 percent), Himachal Pradesh (96.4 percent) & Andhra Pradesh (90.6 percent).

Similarly, rating of core issues of Poor Human Indices was useful in working under RGSA, in total, out of 69.3 percent sample respondents who opined that the topic/issue was covered during training, 1.7 percent sample respondents rated it poor followed by 50.6 percent sample respondents rated satisfactory, 34.6 percent sample respondents rated good, 11.1 percent sample respondents rated very good and 2 percent sample respondents rated excellent (Table A46). In terms of core issues of Poor Human Indices which were covered during training being useful in working under RGSA were reported better in the States namely, West Bengal (95.7 percent) & Andhra Pradesh (90.6 percent).

14) Understanding of core issue of unemployment

In total, 70.7 percent sample respondents reported that core issue of unemployment was covered during training, whereas 29.3 percent sample respondents did not report for the same. Similarly, rating of understanding developed as per working requirement on core issue of unemployment, in total, out of 70.7 percent sample respondents who opined that the topic/issue was covered during training, 0.4 percent sample respondents rated it poor followed by 33.7 percent sample respondents rated satisfactory, 45.9 percent sample respondents rated good, 16.8 percent sample respondents rated very good and 3.2 percent sample respondents rated excellent (Table A47). In terms of understanding developed as per working requirement on core issue of unemployment was reported better in the States namely, West Bengal (98.6 percent), Himachal Pradesh (95.1 percent) & Andhra Pradesh (89.9 percent).

Similarly, rating of core issue of unemployment was useful in working under RGSA, in total, out of 70.7 percent sample respondents who opined that the topic/issue was covered during training, 1.5 percent sample respondents rated it poor followed by 52 percent sample respondents rated satisfactory, 33.9 percent sample respondents rated good, 9.4 percent sample respondents rated very good and 3.3 percent sample respondents rated excellent (Table A48). In terms of core issue of unemployment which was covered during training being useful in working under RGSA was reported better in the States namely, West Bengal (93.9 percent) & Andhra Pradesh (88.1 percent).

15) GP Fund & its importance

In total, 70.3 percent sample respondents reported that core issue of GP Fund & its importance was covered during training, whereas 29.7 percent sample respondents did not report for the same. Similarly, rating of understanding developed as per working requirement on core issue of GP Fund & its importance, in total, out of 70.3 percent sample respondents who opined that the topic/issue was covered during training, 0.3 percent sample respondents rated it poor followed by 32.6 percent sample respondents rated satisfactory, 46.4 percent sample respondents rated good, 17.1 percent sample respondents rated very good and 3.7 percent sample respondents rated excellent (Table A49). In terms of understanding developed as per working requirement on core issue of GP fund & its importance was reported better in the States namely, West Bengal (98.9 percent), Himachal Pradesh (97.2 percent) & Andhra Pradesh (92 percent).

Similarly, rating of core issue of GP Fund & its importance was useful in working under RGSA, in total, out of 70.3 percent sample respondents who opined that the topic/issue was covered during training, 1.5 percent sample respondents rated it poor followed by 52.2 percent sample respondents rated satisfactory, 33.1 percent sample respondents rated good, 9.5 percent sample respondents rated very good and 3.5 percent sample respondents rated excellent (Table A50). In terms of GP Fund & its importance which was covered during training being useful in working under RGSA was reported better in the States namely, West Bengal (92.6 percent) & Andhra Pradesh (88.5 percent).

16) **Importance of Participatory Development**

In total, 69 percent sample respondents reported that core issue of importance of participatory development was covered during training, whereas 31 percent sample respondents did not report

for the same. Similarly, rating of understanding developed as per working requirement on core issue of importance of participatory development, in total, out of 69 percent sample respondents who opined that the topic/issue was covered during training, 0.4 percent sample respondents rated it poor followed by 33.1 percent sample respondents rated satisfactory, 46 percent sample respondents rated good, 17 percent sample respondents rated very good and 3.5 percent sample respondents rated excellent (A51). In terms of understanding developed as per working requirement on core issue of importance of participatory development was reported better in the States namely, West Bengal (99.2 percent), Himachal Pradesh (95.1 percent) & Andhra Pradesh (94.8 percent).

Similarly, rating of core issue of importance of participatory development was useful in working under RGSA, in total, out of 69 percent sample respondents who opined that the topic/issue was covered during training, 1.6 percent sample respondents rated it poor followed by 52.2 percent sample respondents rated satisfactory, 33.1 percent sample respondents rated good, 9.6 percent sample respondents rated very good and 3.5 percent sample respondents rated excellent (A52). In terms of core issue of importance of participatory development which was covered during training being useful in working under RGSA was reported better in the States namely, Andhra Pradesh (92.5 percent) & West Bengal (91.4 percent).

17) Developing understanding about gender

In total, 69 percent sample respondents reported that core issue of gender development was covered during training, whereas 31 percent sample respondents did not report for the same. Similarly, rating of understanding developed as per working requirement on core issue of importance of participatory development, in total, out of 69 percent sample respondents who opined that the topic/issue was covered during training, 0.3 percent sample respondents rated it poor followed by 33.1 percent sample respondents rated satisfactory, 43.6 percent sample respondents rated good, 17.8 percent sample respondents rated very good and 5.1 percent sample respondents rated excellent (Table A53). In terms of understanding developed as per working requirement on core issue of gender development was reported better in the States namely, West Bengal (99.2 percent), Andhra Pradesh (95.8 percent) & Himachal Pradesh (95.1 percent).

Similarly, rating of core issue of gender development was useful in working under RGSA, in total, out of 69 percent sample respondents who opined that the topic/issue was covered during training, 1.5 percent sample respondents rated it poor followed by 51.2 percent sample respondents rated satisfactory, 32.9 percent sample respondents rated good, 10.6 percent sample respondents rated very good and 3.7 percent sample respondents rated excellent (Table A54). In terms of core issue of gender development which was covered during training was useful in working under RGSA and it was reported better in the States namely, Andhra Pradesh (92.3 percent) & West Bengal (87.9 percent).

18) Gender & its relation with development

In total, 69.1 percent sample respondents reported that core issue of gender & its relation with development was covered during training, whereas 30.9 percent sample respondents did not report for the same. Similarly, rating of understanding developed as per working requirement on core issue of gender & its relation with development, in total, out of 69.1 percent sample respondents who opined that the topic/issue was covered during training, 0.3 percent sample respondents rated it poor followed by 33.9 percent sample respondents rated satisfactory, 44.1 percent sample respondents rated good, 17.7 percent sample respondents rated very good and 3.9 percent sample respondents rated excellent(Table A55). In terms of understanding developed as per working requirement on core issue of gender& its relation with development was reported better in the States namely, West Bengal (99.1 percent), Himachal Pradesh (98.6 percent) & Andhra Pradesh (93.5 percent).

Similarly, rating of core issue of gender& its relation with development was useful in working under RGSA, in total, out of 69.1 percent sample respondents who opined that the topic/issue was covered during training, 1.5 percent sample respondents rated it poor followed by 52.1 percent sample respondents rated satisfactory, 32.9 percent sample respondents rated good, 10.6 percent sample respondents rated very good and 3 percent sample respondents rated excellent (Table A56). In terms of gender & its relation with development which was covered during training was useful in working under RGSA and it was reported better in the States namely, Andhra Pradesh (91.1 percent) & West Bengal (87.7 percent).

19) Planning through justice

In total, 68.9 percent sample respondents reported that Planning through justice was covered during training, whereas 31.1 percent sample respondents did not report for the same. Similarly, rating of understanding developed as per working requirement on planning through justice, in total, out of 68.9 percent sample respondents who opined that the topic/issue was covered during training, 0.3 percent sample respondents rated it poor followed by 33.3 percent sample respondents rated satisfactory, 44.1 percent sample respondents rated good, 17.8 percent sample respondents rated very good and 4.5 percent sample respondents rated excellent (Table A57). In terms of understanding developed as per working requirement on core issue of gender& its relation with development was reported better in the States namely, West Bengal (99.2 percent), Himachal Pradesh (97.9 percent) & Andhra Pradesh (94.1 percent).

Similarly, rating of Planning through justice was useful in working under RGSA, in total, out of 68.9 percent sample respondents who opined that the topic/issue was covered during training, 1.4 percent sample respondents rated it poor followed by 52.1 percent sample respondents rated satisfactory, 32.5 percent sample respondents rated good, 11.1 percent sample respondents rated very good and 2.9 percent sample respondents rated excellent (Table A58). In terms of Planning through justice which was covered during training was useful in working under RGSA and it was reported better in the States namely, Andhra Pradesh (92.19percent) & West Bengal (85.8 percent).

20) Better understanding of Village level institutions: (Watershed Committee, Self Help Group, User Group) concept, nature & need

In total, 68.8 percent sample respondents reported that Village level institutions: (Watershed Committee, Self Help Group, User Group) concept, nature & need were covered during training, whereas 31.2 percent sample respondents did not report for the same. Similarly, rating of understanding developed as per working requirement on Village level institutions, in total, out of 68.8 percent sample respondents who opined that the topic/issue was covered during training, 0.3 percent sample respondents rated it poor followed by 31.1 percent sample respondents rated satisfactory, 46 percent sample respondents rated good, 18.8 percent sample respondents rated very good and 3.8 percent sample respondents rated excellent (Table A59). In terms of understanding developed as per working requirement on better understanding of Village level institutions with development were reported better in the States namely, West Bengal (99.4 percent), Himachal Pradesh (99.3 percent) & Andhra Pradesh (92.6 percent).

Similarly, rating of Village level institutions: concept, nature & need was useful in working under RGSA, in total, out of 68.8 percent sample respondents who opined that the topic/issue was covered during training, 0.3 percent sample respondents rated it poor followed by 31.1 percent sample respondents rated satisfactory, 46 percent sample respondents rated good, 18.8 percent sample respondents rated very good and 3.8 percent sample respondents rated excellent (Table A60). In terms of Village level institutions: concept, nature & need which was covered during training was useful in working under RGSA and it was reported better in the States namely, West Bengal (92.2 percent) & Andhra Pradesh (88.9percent).

21) Social work, social issues & responsible factors

In total, 69.8 percent sample respondents reported that Social work, social issues & responsible factors were covered during training, whereas 30.2 percent sample respondents did not report for the same. Similarly, rating of understanding developed as per working requirement on Social work, social issues & responsible factors, in total, out of 69.8 percent sample respondents who opined that the topic/issue was covered during training, 0.2 percent sample respondents rated it poor followed by 31.8 percent sample respondents rated satisfactory, 44.8 percent sample respondents rated good, 19.5 percent sample respondents rated very good and 3.6 percent sample respondents rated excellent (Table A61). In terms of understanding developed as per working requirement on Social work, social issues & responsible factors were reported better in the States namely, Himachal Pradesh (99.3 percent), West Bengal (98.9 percent), & Arunachal Pradesh (98.3 percent).

Similarly, rating of Social work, social issues & responsible factors was useful in working under RGSA, in total, out of 69.8 percent sample respondents who opined that the topic/issue was covered during training, 1.4 percent sample respondents rated it poor followed by 50.2 percent sample respondents rated satisfactory, 33.9 percent sample respondents rated good, 10 percent sample respondents rated very good and 4.5 percent sample respondents rated excellent (Table A62). In terms of Social work, social issues & responsible factors which was covered during training was useful in working under RGSA were reported better in the States namely, West Bengal (95 percent) & Andhra Pradesh (92.4 percent).

22) Social development, method, nature & concepts

In total, 68.2 percent sample respondents reported that Social development, method, nature & concepts were covered during training, whereas 31.8 percent sample respondents did not report for the same. Similarly, rating of understanding developed as per working requirement on Social development, method, nature & concepts, in total, out of 68.2 percent sample respondents who opined that the topic/issue was covered during training, 0.2 percent sample respondents rated it poor followed by 32 percent sample respondents rated satisfactory, 44.4 percent sample respondents rated good, 20 percent sample respondents rated very good and 3.4 percent sample respondents rated excellent (Table A63). In terms of understanding developed as per working requirement on Social development, method, nature & concepts were reported better in the States namely, West Bengal (99.4 percent), Arunachal Pradesh (99 percent) & Himachal Pradesh (98.6 percent).

Similarly, rating of Social development, method, nature & concepts was useful in working under RGSA. In total, out of 68.2 percent sample respondents who opined that the topic/issue was covered during training, 1.6 percent sample respondents rated it poor followed by 49.6 percent sample respondents rated satisfactory, 34.7 percent sample respondents rated good, 9.8 percent sample respondents rated very good and 4.3 percent sample respondents rated excellent (Table A64). In terms of Social development, method, nature & concepts which was covered during training was useful in working under RGSA were reported better in the States namely, West Bengal (96 percent) & Andhra Pradesh (88.8 percent).

23) Skill to work with different social groups

In total, 67.8 percent sample respondents reported that Skill to work with different social groups was covered during training, whereas 32.2 percent sample respondents did not report for the same. Similarly, rating of understanding developed as per working requirement on Social development, method, nature & concepts, in total, out of 67.8 percent sample respondents who opined that the topic/issue was covered during training, 0.3 percent sample respondents rated it poor followed by 31.5 percent sample respondents rated satisfactory, 43.8 percent sample respondents rated good, 21.1 percent sample respondents rated very good and 3.3 percent sample respondents rated

excellent (Table A65). In terms of understanding developed as per working requirement on Skill to work with different social groups were reported better in the States namely, West Bengal & Andhra Pradesh (99.4 percent each), Arunachal Pradesh (99.3 percent) & Himachal Pradesh (98.5 percent).

Similarly, rating of Skill to work with different social groups was useful in working under RGSA. In total, out of 67.8 percent sample respondents who opined that the topic/issue was covered during training, 1.6 percent sample respondents rated it poor followed by 49.5 percent sample respondents rated satisfactory, 34.8 percent sample respondents rated good, 9.6 percent sample respondents rated very good and 4.5 percent sample respondents rated excellent(Table A66). In terms of Skill to work with different social groups which was covered during training was useful in working under RGSA and they were reported better in the States namely, West Bengal (95 percent) & Andhra Pradesh (88.1 percent).

24) Attitude & behaviour change

In total, 68.5 percent sample respondents reported that Attitude & behaviour change was covered during training, whereas 31.5 percent sample respondents did not report for the same. Similarly, rating of understanding developed as per working requirement on Attitude & behaviour change, in total, out of 68.5 percent sample respondents who opined that the topic/issue was covered during training, 0.3 percent sample respondents rated it poor followed by 32 percent sample respondents rated satisfactory, 44.2 percent sample respondents rated good, 20.3 percent sample respondents rated very good and 3.3 percent sample respondents rated excellent (Table A67). In terms of understanding developed as per working requirement on Skill to work with different social groups were reported better in the States namely, Arunachal Pradesh (99.1 percent), Andhra Pradesh (98.9 percent), Himachal Pradesh (98.5 percent) & West Bengal (98 percent).

Similarly, rating of Attitude & behaviour change was useful in working under RGSA. In total, out of 68.5 percent sample respondents who opined that the topic/issue was covered during training, 1.4 percent sample respondents rated it poor followed by 50.2 percent sample respondents rated satisfactory, 34.7 percent sample respondents rated good, 10 percent sample respondents rated very good and 3.7 percent sample respondents rated excellent (Table A68). In terms of Attitude & behaviour change which was covered during training was useful in working under RGSA and it was reported better in the States namely, West Bengal & Andhra Pradesh (92.3 percent each).

25) Develop better communication skill & leadership qualities

In total, 67.9 percent sample respondents reported that communication skill & leadership qualities was covered during training, whereas 32.1 percent sample respondents did not report for the same. Similarly, rating of understanding developed as per working requirement on communication skill & leadership qualities was useful in working under RGSA. In total, out of 67.9 percent sample respondents who opined that the topic/issue was covered during training, 0.3 percent sample respondents rated it poor followed by 32.2 percent sample respondents rated satisfactory, 43 percent sample respondents rated good, 20.7 percent sample respondents rated very good and 3.7 percent sample respondents rated excellent(Table A69). In terms of understanding developed as per working requirement on communication skill & leadership qualities was reported better in the States namely, West Bengal (99.7 percent), Arunachal Pradesh (99.3 percent) & Himachal Pradesh (97.8 percent).

Similarly, rating of communication skill & leadership qualities was useful in working under RGSA. In total, out of 67.9 percent sample respondents who opined that the topic/issue was covered during training, 1.5 percent sample respondents rated it poor followed by 49.5 percent sample respondents rated satisfactory, 34.4 percent sample respondents rated good, 10.5 percent sample respondents rated very good and 4.1 percent sample respondents rated excellent(Table A70). In terms of communication skill & leadership qualities which were covered during training

being useful in working under RGSA were reported better in the States namely, West Bengal (93.6 percent) & Andhra Pradesh (92.8 percent).

26) Preparing Detailed Project Report (DPR) for the consideration of Gram Sabha

In total, 67.4 percent sample respondents reported that preparation of Detailed Project Report (DPR) for the consideration of Gram Sabha was covered during training, whereas 32.6 percent sample respondents did not report for the same. Similarly, rating of understanding developed as per working requirement on preparation of Detailed Project Report (DPR) for the consideration of Gram Sabha, in total, out of 67.4 percent sample respondents who opined that the topic/issue was covered during training, 0.3 percent sample respondents rated it poor followed by 31.8 percent sample respondents rated satisfactory, 44.6 percent sample respondents rated good, 20.1 percent sample respondents rated very good and 3.2 percent sample respondents rated excellent (Table A71). In terms of understanding developed as per working requirement on preparation of Detailed Project Report (DPR) for the consideration of Gram Sabha were reported better in the States namely, Arunachal Pradesh (99.3 percent), Himachal Pradesh (98.5 percent) &West Bengal (98 percent).

Similarly, rating of preparation of Detailed Project Report (DPR) for the consideration of Gram Sabha was useful in working under RGSA. In total, out of 67.4 percent sample respondents who opined that the topic/issue was covered during training, 1.3 percent sample respondents rated it poor followed by 49.7 percent sample respondents rated satisfactory, 34.4 percent sample respondents rated good, 9.8 percent sample respondents rated very good and 4.8 percent sample respondents rated excellent(Table A72). In terms of preparation of Detailed Project Report (DPR) for the consideration of Gram Sabha which was covered during training being useful in working under RGSA was reported better in the States namely, West Bengal (92.1 percent) & Andhra Pradesh (88.5 percent).

27) Help in getting acquainted with Digital inclusiveness- using mobile apps, GIS/GPS based tracking of assets/works/ using online data management system etc.

Digital inclusiveness was also reported significant. In total, 14.8 percent sample respondents reported that training under RGSA helped in getting acquainted with digital inclusiveness, whereas the remaining 85.2 percent sample respondents did not report for the same.

As far as rating of understanding developed as per working requirement on getting acquainted with digital inclusiveness is concerned, in total, out of 14.8 percent sample respondents who opined that getting acquainted with digital inclusiveness was covered during training, 1 percent sample respondents rated it poor followed by 29.2 percent sample respondents rated satisfactory, 44.6 percent sample respondents rated good, 17.5 percent sample respondents rated very good and 7.7 percent sample respondents rated excellent. (Table A73) In terms of understanding developed as per working requirement on getting acquainted with digital inclusiveness, was reported better in the States namely, Karnataka (95 percent) & Andhra Pradesh (91.5 percent).

Similarly, rating of whether training organized for getting acquainted with digital inclusiveness was useful in working under RGSA, in total, out of 14.8 percent sample respondents who opined that preparing detailed project report (DPR) for the consideration of Gram Sabha-GPDP/ development plan was covered during training, 3.1 percent sample respondents rated it poor followed by 38.5 percent sample respondents rated satisfactory, 37.7 percent sample respondents rated good, 13.5 percent sample respondents rated very good and 7.3 percent sample respondents rated excellent(Table A74). In terms of training organized for getting acquainted with digital inclusiveness was useful in working under RGSA and it was reported better in the States namely, Karnataka (95.1 percent) & Andhra Pradesh (90.5 percent).

28) Understanding importance of e-governance, online (ICT) or e-enablement of Panchayats

On the issue of importance of e-governance, 12.7 percent sample respondents reported that training under RGSA helped in understanding importance of e-governance, online (ICT) or e-enablement of Panchayats, whereas the remaining 87.3 percent sample respondents did not report for the same.

As far as rating of understanding developed as per working requirement on understanding importance of e-governance, online (ICT) or e-enablement of Panchayats is concerned, in total, out of 12.7 percent sample respondents who opined that understanding importance of e-governance, online (ICT) or e-enablement of Panchayats was covered during training, 1.8 percent sample respondents rated it poor followed by 28 percent sample respondents rated satisfactory, 40.8 percent sample respondents rated good, 19.1 percent sample respondents rated very good and 10.2 percent sample respondents rated excellent(Table A75). In terms of understanding developed as per working requirement on importance of e-governance, online (ICT) or e-enablement of Panchayats, it was reported better in the States namely, Andhra Pradesh (95.8 percent) &Karnataka (88.8 percent).

Similarly, rating of whether training organized for getting understanding its importance of e-governance, online (ICT) or e-enablement of Panchayats was useful in working under RGSA. In total, out of 12.7 percent sample respondents who opined that understanding the importance of e-governance, online (ICT) or e-enablement of Panchayats was covered during training, 4 percent sample respondents rated it poor followed by 34.6 percent sample respondents rated satisfactory, 36.3 percent sample respondents rated good, 14.9 percent sample respondents rated very good and 10.2 percent sample respondents rated excellent (Table A76). In terms of importance of e-governance, online (ICT) or e-enablement of Panchayats was useful in working under RGSA and it was reported better in the States namely, Karnataka (95.1 percent), Andhra Pradesh (91.5 percent) &Maharashtra (88.2 percent).

State Rank Analysis

On giving due weightage to these responses, when we index and rank state's performance across different indicators, a more vivid picture emerges. Detailed state-wise ranks across 28 indicators discussed above are presented in Table 3.4 and 3.5. However, an aggregate picture of performance across states is also derived. In terms of the understanding developed as per the working requirement, it is observed that the impact of trainings has been the highest in the case of West Bengal. Similar has been the case with Andhra Pradesh where the respondents rated their responses very high while indicating the relevance of training in developing understanding as per working requirement across different aspects. Other better performing states have been Maharashtra, Himachal Pradesh, Uttarakhand and Kerala. But,

Figure 3.17: State Ranking

the performance of states like Goa, Haryana, Gujarat, Madhya Pradesh and Jharkhand has been found consistently low across these indicators.

Figure 3.18: State Ranking

Similar to the above analysis, a detailed analysis of the responses about the usefulness of the training program about its various aspects reveals that the state of West Bengal has been the best performing state. Similarly, high performance has been recorded by the state of Andhra Pradesh. In fact, the responses in both these states along with Maharashtra indicate that the training program has been very much instrumental in developing an understanding about various aspects helpful in working under RGSA. The state of Kerala is rated relatively low along with Karnataka, Sikkim and Assam. On the other hand, the usefulness of the training program to work under RGSA is rated very low in the case of Goa, Gujarat, Madhya Pradesh, Haryana, Rajasthan, Himachal Pradesh and Jharkhand. It may also be noted that the degree of dissatisfaction with the training program has been relatively high in Goa in contrast to other poor performing states.

Table 3.4: State Ranks: Understanding Developed in Trainings as per Working Requirement

	Over-all	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28
Andhra Pradesh	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	4	2	2	2	2	3	2	2	2	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	1
Arunachal Pradesh	8	3	3	3	6	7	3	3	3	7	9	12	13	12	7	9	13	13	13	12	8	5	3	3	3	3	3	9	16
Assam	10	9	9	10	9	9	8	8	10	9	10	10	9	9	10	10	9	9	9	9	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	5	7
Goa	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	17
Gujarat	16	15	15	16	16	16	14	14	14	16	17	17	17	16	14	14	16	16	16	16	14	14	15	14	14	14	14	17	17
Haryana	17	17	17	17	17	17	17	17	17	17	16	16	16	17	17	17	17	17	17	17	17	17	17	17	17	17	16	16	10
Himachal Pradesh	4	4	7	7	5	5	6	5	5	4	5	5	5	3	5	4	5	5	4	5	4	4	6	6	5	5	6	2	2
Jharkhand	14	14	14	14	14	14	16	16	15	14	14	14	14	14	16	16	15	15	15	15	15	15	14	15	15	15	15	7	3
Karnataka	11	13	12	11	12	11	11	11	11	11	11	9	10	10	12	11	10	10	10	10	11	12	12	11	11	11	12	6	5
Kerala	6	5	4	5	3	4	4	4	4	3	3	3	2	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	7	7	7	7	7	8	8	13	13
Madhya Pradesh	15	16	16	15	15	15	15	15	16	15	15	15	15	15	15	15	14	14	14	14	16	16	16	16	16	16	17	15	15
Maharashtra	3	7	5	4	4	3	5	7	6	5	4	4	3	4	3	3	3	1	3	3	3	3	4	4	4	4	4	8	9
Orissa	7	10	8	9	8	8	10	9	8	8	7	7	7	7	8	7	7	7	7	7	6	8	8	8	8	7	7	14	12
Rajasthan	12	11	11	12	11	12	12	12	12	12	12	11	11	11	11	12	11	11	11	11	12	11	11	12	12	12	11	10	11
Sikkim	9	8	10	8	10	10	9	10	9	10	8	8	8	8	9	8	8	8	8	8	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	4	4
Uttar Pradesh	13	12	13	13	13	13	13	13	13	13	13	13	12	13	13	13	12	12	12	13	13	13	13	13	13	13	13	12	14
Uttarakhand	5	6	6	6	7	6	7	6	7	6	6	6	6	5	4	5	4	4	5	4	5	6	5	5	6	6	5	3	6
West Bengal	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	2	2	2	2	11	8

1) Planning & management of Gram Panchayat functions, core areas, Governance, Social inclusion, Gender inequality, economic development & social justice; 2) Baseline data collection & situational analysis & development of GPDP; 3) Training covered various thematic areas of importance-Drinking water/ Sanitation/Rural Development/Social Justice/ Health & Hygiene/ Women Development/ Children development/ Education etc.; 4) Better Execution of provisions under 14th Finance Commission; 5) Better Execution of provisions under State Finance Commission; 6) Training covered various programmes/schemes namely, MGNREGA, SBM, GPDP, DAY-NRLM, Water quality, Health etc.; 7) Undergone capacity building trainings other than RGSA namely, SBM, NRLM, Water Quality, Health etc.; 8) Training in addition to RGSA namely, SBM, NRLM, Water quality, Health etc. organized; 9) Training organized for sector convergence; 10) Community organization & related issues, conflicts in groups; 11) Understanding of the core issues of Rural Poverty; 12) Understanding of the core issues of Inequality; 13) Understanding of the core issues of Poor Human Indices; 14) Understanding of core issues of unemployment; 15) GP Fund & its importance; 16) Importance of Participatory Development; 17) Developing understanding about gender; 18) Gender & its relation with development; 19) Planning through justice; 20) Better understanding of Village level institutions: (Watershed Committee, Self Help Group, User Group) concept, nature & need; 21) Social work, social issues & responsible factors; 22) Social development, method, nature & concepts; 23) Skill to work with different social groups; 24) Attitude & behaviour change; 25) Develop better communication skill & leadership qualities; 26) Preparing Detailed Project Report (DPR) for the consideration of Gram Sabha; 27) Help in getting acquainted with Digital inclusiveness- using mobile apps, GIS/GPS based tracking of assets/works/ using online data management system etc.; 28) Understanding importance of e-governance, online (ICT) or e-enablement of Panchayats

Table 3.5: State Ranks: Usefulness in Working under RGSA

	Over-all	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28
Andhra Pradesh	1	1	2	2	3	4	2	2	2	1	4	4	4	2	2	2	1	2	1	1	2	1	2	3	1	1	2	1	1
Arunachal Pradesh	11	5	7	8	12	13	8	7	7	14	17	17	14	12	12	13	16	17	17	17	11	9	7	5	5	5	5	17	16
Assam	7	6	6	9	5	5	7	8	9	6	7	7	8	8	8	7	7	8	8	8	8	7	8	8	9	9	8	7	8
Goa	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	17
Gujarat	17	16	17	17	15	15	16	16	16	17	15	16	16	16	14	17	17	15	15	15	16	16	17	15	14	14	14	16	18
Haryana	15	15	15	15	14	14	15	15	15	13	13	13	13	14	16	15	14	14	14	13	15	15	15	16	15	15	15	14	15
Himachal Pradesh	13	13	14	13	13	12	13	13	13	15	12	12	12	13	13	12	12	12	12	12	13	13	13	13	13	13	13	4	4
Jharkhand	12	11	11	11	10	10	11	11	11	10	10	10	10	11	11	11	11	11	11	11	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	9	2
Karnataka	5	8	5	6	7	6	5	5	6	5	5	5	6	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	6	6	6	7	6	3	3
Kerala	4	3	3	4	4	3	4	4	3	3	3	3	3	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	8	11
Madhya Pradesh	16	17	16	16	17	16	17	17	17	16	16	15	17	17	17	16	15	16	16	16	17	17	16	17	17	17	17	10	10
Maharashtra	3	4	4	3	2	2	3	3	4	2	2	2	2	3	3	3	3	1	2	2	3	3	3	2	3	3	1	5	5
Orissa	8	9	9	7	8	8	9	9	8	8	8	8	7	7	7	8	8	7	7	7	7	8	9	9	8	8	9	15	14
Rajasthan	14	14	13	14	16	17	14	14	14	12	14	14	15	15	15	14	13	13	13	14	14	14	14	14	16	16	16	13	13
Sikkim	6	7	8	5	6	7	6	6	5	7	6	6	5	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	5	7	7	6	7	6	7
Uttar Pradesh	9	10	10	10	9	9	10	10	10	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	10	9	9	9	9	10	11	11	11	11	10	11	12
Uttarakhand	10	12	12	12	11	11	12	12	12	11	11	11	11	10	10	10	9	10	10	10	10	11	10	10	10	10	11	2	6
West Bengal	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	4	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	3	3	3	1	2	1	1	2	2	3	12	9

1) Planning & management of Gram Panchayat functions, core areas, Governance, Social inclusion, Gender inequality, economic development & social justice; 2) Baseline data collection & situational analysis & development of GPDP; 3) Training covered various thematic areas of importance-Drinking water/ Sanitation/Rural Development/Social Justice/ Health & Hygiene/ Women Development/ Children development/ Education etc.; 4) Better Execution of provisions under 14th Finance Commission; 5) Better Execution of provisions under State Finance Commission; 6) Training covered various programmes/schemes namely, MGNREGA, SBM, GPDP, DAY-NRLM, Water quality, Health etc.; 7) Undergone capacity building trainings other than RGSA namely, SBM, NRLM, Water Quality, Health etc.; 8) Training in addition to RGSA namely, SBM, NRLM, Water quality, Health etc. organized; 9) Training organized for sector convergence; 10) Community organization & related issues, conflicts in groups; 11) Understanding of the core issues of Rural Poverty; 12) Understanding of the core issues of Inequality; 13) Understanding of the core issues of Poor Human Indices; 14) Understanding of core issues of unemployment; 15) GP Fund & its importance; 16) Importance of Participatory Development; 17) Developing understanding about gender; 18) Gender & its relation with development; 19) Planning through justice; 20) Better understanding of Village level institutions: (Watershed Committee, Self Help Group, User Group) concept, nature & need; 21) Social work, social issues & responsible factors; 22) Social development, method, nature & concepts; 23) Skill to work with different social groups; 24) Attitude & behaviour change; 25) Develop better communication skill & leadership qualities; 26) Preparing Detailed Project Report (DPR) for the consideration of Gram Sabha; 27) Help in getting acquainted with Digital inclusiveness- using mobile apps, GIS/GPS based tracking of assets/works/ using online data management system etc.; 28) Understanding importance of e-governance, online (ICT) or e-enablement of Panchayats

E. Outcome of Trainings under RGSA

The Capacity building & Trainings of representatives of Panchayat - Zilla Panchayat, Block Panchayat and Gram Panchayat certainly helped in developing better understanding on various schemes and programs, their roles and responsibilities, do & don'ts etc. It also helped in getting know about the ins and outs of the various programmes related to GPDP, DAY-NRLM, SBM, MGNREGS etc.

1) Developed confidence & increased sense of responsibility for economic development, people participation & social justice

The important aspect for elected representatives is development of confidence and sense of responsibility. It has reported positive impact as 66.3 percent sample respondents reported that training helped in developing confidence & increased sense of responsibility for economic development, people participation & social justice, whereas the remaining 33.7 percent sample respondents did not report for the same. Regarding rating by the sample respondents to the extent the same was beneficial for undertaking roles/ responsibilities, 0.2 percent sample respondents rated the same as poor followed by 36.6 percent sample respondents rated satisfactory, 43 percent sample respondents rated good, 17.3 percent sample respondents rated very good & 3 percent sample respondents rated excellent (Table A77). In terms of developed confidence & increased sense of responsibility for economic development, people participation & social justice being reported beneficial for undertaking roles/ responsibilities were reported better in the States namely, West Bengal (96.7 percent), Arunachal Pradesh (96.6 percent), & Andhra Pradesh (94.6 percent).

2) Better approach and working for Planning & management of functioning of Gram Panchayat core areas- Governance, Social Inclusion, Gender inequality, economic development & Social Justice

Out of the total, 66.5 percent sample respondents opined that training helped them in developing better approach and working for Planning & management of functioning of Gram Panchayat core areas, whereas 33.5 percent sample respondents did not opt for the same. Regarding rating by the sample respondents to the extent the same was beneficial for undertaking roles/ responsibilities,0.2 percent sample respondents rated the same as poor followed by 36.1 percent sample respondents rated satisfactory, 43.5 percent sample respondents rated good, 16.9 percent sample respondents rated very good & 3.4 percent sample respondents rated excellent(Table A78). In terms of training helping them in developing better approach and working for Planning & management of functioning of Gram Panchayat core areas was reported beneficial for undertaking roles/ responsibilities. They were reported better in the States namely, West Bengal (98.6 percent) Andhra Pradesh (98.1 percent), & Arunachal Pradesh (96.5 percent).

3) Undertaking baseline data collection & situational analysis & development of GP development plan

Favouring usefulness of CB&T for elected representatives, 64.2 percent sample respondents reported that training helped in undertaking baseline data collection & situational analysis & development of GP development plan, whereas 35.8 percent sample respondents did not report for the same. Regarding rating by the sample respondents to the extent the same was beneficial for undertaking roles/ responsibilities, 0.1 percent sample respondents rated the same as poor followed by 36.9 percent sample respondents rated satisfactory, 41.6 percent sample respondents rated good, 17.7 percent sample respondents rated very good & 3.7 percent sample respondents rated excellent(Table A79). In terms of undertaking baseline data collection & situational analysis &

development of GP development plan being reported beneficial for undertaking roles/ responsibilities they were reported better in the States namely, Arunachal Pradesh (90.9 percent), West Bengal (95.6 percent) & Andhra Pradesh (95.7 percent).

4) Better understanding of village issues and required action to be taken- Drinking water/ Sanitation/ Rural Development/ Social Justice/ Health & Hygiene/ Women development/ Children development/ Education etc.

In total, 65.8 percent sample respondents opined that training helped them in better understanding of village issues and required action to be taken, whereas 34.2 percent sample respondents did not opt for the same. Regarding rating by the sample respondents to the extent the same was beneficial for undertaking roles/ responsibilities,0.2 percent sample respondents rated the same as poor followed by 36.6 percent sample respondents rated satisfactory, 41.4 percent sample respondents rated good, 17.8 percent sample respondents rated very good & 4.1 percent sample respondents rated excellent (Table A80). In terms of training helped them in better understanding of village issues and required action to be taken was reported beneficial for undertaking roles/ responsibilities and it was reported better in the States namely, Andhra Pradesh (98 percent) & West Bengal (96.8 percent).

5) Help in understanding Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) in Gram Panchayat perspectives-poverty, gender, social justice etc.

In terms of understanding of the development and sustainable development goals, 65.7 percent sample respondents opined that training helped in understanding Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) in gram Panchayat perspectives-poverty, gender, social justice etc, whereas the remaining 34.3 percent sample respondents did not report for the same. Regarding rating by the sample respondents to the extent the same was beneficial for undertaking roles/ responsibilities,0.3 percent sample respondents rated the same as poor followed by 38.2 percent sample respondents rated satisfactory, 41.4 percent sample respondents rated good, 17 percent sample respondents rated very good & 3.2 percent sample respondents rated excellent (Table A81).In terms of understanding Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) in gram Panchayat perspectives-poverty, gender, social justice etc was reported beneficial for undertaking roles/ responsibilities and it was reported better in the States namely, Andhra Pradesh (92 percent), West Bengal (94 percent) & Maharashtra (84.8 percent).

6) Able to manage Community organization & related issues, & conflict in better way

In total, 65.9 percent sample respondents opined that training helped them to manage Community organization & related issues, & conflict in a better way, whereas 34.1 percent sample respondents did not opt for the same. Regarding rating by the sample respondents to the extent the same was beneficial for undertaking roles/ responsibilities,0.4 percent sample respondents rated the same as poor followed by 39.3 percent sample respondents rated satisfactory, 40.1 percent sample respondents rated good, 16.7 percent sample respondents rated very good & 3.5 percent sample respondents rated excellent(Table A82). In terms of training helped them to manage Community organization & related issues, & conflict in better way was reported beneficial for undertaking roles/ responsibilities and it was reported better in the States namely, Arunachal Pradesh (99.7 percent), Andhra Pradesh (98.8 percent) & West Bengal (96.2 percent).

7) Better understanding of the core issues of Rural poverty

In total, 65.8 percent sample respondents opined that training helped them in better understanding of the core issues of rural poverty & conflict in a better way, whereas 34.2 percent sample respondents did not opt for the same. Regarding rating by the sample respondents to the extent the same was beneficial for undertaking roles/ responsibilities,0.4 percent sample respondents rated the same as poor followed by 39.4 percent sample respondents rated satisfactory, 39.1 percent

sample respondents rated good, 17.5 percent sample respondents rated very good & 3.5 percent sample respondents rated excellent(Table A83). In terms of training helped them in better understanding of the core issues of rural poverty was reported beneficial for undertaking roles/ responsibilities and it was reported better in the States namely, West Bengal (95.6 percent), Kerala (84.3 percent) & Andhra Pradesh (83.7 percent).

8) **Training organized covering various programmes/schemes namely, MGNREGS, SBM, GPDP, DAY-NRLM etc. helped in improving the performance of execution in the Panchayat**

Out of the total, 67.2 percent sample respondents opined that training helped them in improving the performance of execution of various programmes in the Panchayat, whereas 32.8 percent sample respondents did not opt for the same. Regarding rating by the sample respondents to the extent the same was beneficial for undertaking roles/ responsibilities,0.1 percent sample respondents rated the same as poor followed by 36.2 percent sample respondents rated satisfactory, 40.7 percent sample respondents rated good, 19 percent sample respondents rated very good & 3.9 percent sample respondents rated excellent(Table A84). In terms of training helped them in improving the performance of execution of various programmes in the Panchayat was reported beneficial for undertaking roles/ responsibilities and it was reported better in the States namely, West Bengal (96.5 percent), Andhra Pradesh (90.5 percent) & Arunachal Pradesh (89.9 percent).

9) Training in addition to RGSA namely, SBM, NRLM, Water quality, Health etc. found effective & useful in Gram Panchayat

There were different programmes being implemented in Gram Panchayats related to Health, Sanitation, Income Generation, skill development and Social Justice. In total, 67.4 percent sample respondents reported that training in addition to RGSA namely, SBM, NRLM, Water quality, Health etc. was found effective & useful in gram Panchayat, whereas 32.6 percent sample respondents did not report for the same. Like-wise, rating by the sample respondents to the extent the same was beneficial for undertaking roles/ responsibilities,0.1 percent sample respondents rated the same as poor followed by 36.8 percent sample respondents rated satisfactory, 41.1 percent sample respondents rated good, 18.5 percent sample respondents rated very good & 3.5 percent sample respondents rated excellent(Table A85).In terms of training in addition to RGSA namely, SBM, NRLM, Water quality, Health etc. was found effective & useful in gram Panchayat and it was reported beneficial for undertaking roles/ responsibilities. It was reported better in the States namely, Andhra Pradesh (96.6 percent), West Bengal (96 percent) & Maharashtra (86.6 percent).

10) Developed better understanding about the importance of e-governance, online (ICT) e-enablement of Panchayats

In today's world, ICT and e-Governance are the important areas which help in effective execution, monitoring and reporting of the development programmes at Panchayat level. Out of the total, 67 percent sample respondents reported that training helped them in developing better understanding about the importance of e-governance, online (ICT) or e-enablement of Panchayats, whereas 33 percent sample respondents did not report for the same. Regarding rating by the sample respondents to the extent the same was beneficial for undertaking roles/ responsibilities,0.3 percent sample respondents rated the same as poor followed by 26 percent sample respondents rated satisfactory, 49.9 percent sample respondents rated good, 21.5 percent sample respondents rated very good & 2.3 percent sample respondents rated excellent(Table A86).In terms of developing better understanding about the importance of e-governance, online (ICT) or e-enablement of Panchayats was reported beneficial for undertaking roles/ responsibilities and it was reported better in the States namely, Andhra Pradesh (88.5 percent), Maharashtra (87.8 percent) &West Bengal (84.7 percent).

113478/2020/789

Case Study -2
Expanding Vision & Enhancing Capacity to address Village Development

Nainkhedi Gram Panchayat is located in Gangoh block of Saharanpur district. Like other villages, village Nainkhedi has disposal system of wastewater in the outskirts in the low lying water collection point that to an old pond. The place was breeding ground for mosquitoes, insects & gives foul smell to passersby. The newly Elected Gram Pradhan and other Panchayat representatives received training on GPDP, people participation, coordination between different department &support from government. After training they discuss village core problems and associated issues. For them, the questions sounds well that -How to overcome the issues related to wastewater & how to get people participation for the village development?

PRIs training – enhances knowledge, broadens vision and helps in developing perspective planning for village development

- **Training enhanced the capacity of Elected Representatives & developed an understanding about village development & people participation.**
- **Get an opportunity to work with specific strategy for development of Panchayat.**
- **Prioritization of work/issues with participation of villagers for village development.**
- **Work as per priority/issues in the village helped population to get an opportunity.**
- **Information about various government programmes.**
- **Preparation of action plan (GPDP) with support of Panchayat functionaries.**

They Panchayat members and Gram Pradhan discussed the issues of village with villagers' and reached to consensus on four main issues, which was necessary to address for overall development of village.

- Cleaning & renovation of pit where village wastewater used to collect.
- Making government primary school child friendly & attractive so that parents send their wards to the government school.
- Mobilizing & motivating village farmers for organic farming & slowly reducing use of chemical fertilizers.
- Developing eco-tourism & motivating tourists to visit their village for boating, organic farming etc.

The district coordinator of Swach Bharat Mission visited Nainkhedi village for promotion of the programme. He also met Gram Pradhan and seeks his support for Swach Bharat mission. However, Gram Pradhan discussed about the place where village wastewater used to collect & expressed his view that if this village problem was solved then the villagers would be motivated to participate in Swach Bharat Mission. Gram Pradhan opined that firstly the priority should be given for cleaning & renovation of the old pond

Transformation of Old dirty pond into Beautiful Lake

presently collection point of village wastewater. The District Coordinator also supported the Gram Pradhan & he decided for night stay at the village to discuss the problem with villagers, community leaders & elected representatives etc. During meeting with them the Gram Pradhan & district coordinator discussed about people's participation & "Shramdan" for cleaning & renovation of the Pond filled with wastewater. Also, an action plan was developed. The first initiative was taken by Gram Pradhan and he entered into the wastewater pond for cleaning. Also, support from MNREGA was taken. Cleaning of pond was done & huge quantity of polythene and unused items were removed from the old pond. Further, the soakage pits were made at various places in the village so that village waste water flows only towards the soakage pits. Also, village drain system was developed so that rain water also collects in the pits. At present, the wastewater collection pit has been converted into a beautiful lake. Boating facility has also been started in the lake. The charge for boating is Rs. 3 to 5 per member for ten minute of boating. The nearby environment around the lake was attractive & healthy due to plantation of trees all around the lake. This initiative has also helped in ground water recharging and water level in the village has increased. With joint efforts, the dirty wastewater pit has become a point of prestige for the village. Every villager had contributed for the transformation through "Shramdan."

In order to address the case of school education, Gram Pradhan & elected representatives have initiated various activities to make school child friendly & attractive. School walls have been painted with child friendly colours depicting various stories, alphabet & rhyms etc. Also, various other activities were organized so that parents are motivated to enroll their wards in the school & with the initiative the children get quality education in the school.

Child Friendly Govt. Primary School

Gram Pradhan has himself initiated organic farming in five bighas of farm land for promotion of organic farming. He has also motivated other farmers for the same. Initially, a few farmers initiated organic farming at small scale. They discussed with others & made them aware about organic farming. However, it will take some time for the farmers to adopt organic farming.

Organic Farming

Though, it is hard to bring change yet sustained efforts and proper guidance certainly make things happen in village development perspective.

Case Study -3

Capacity Building of PRIs Opens windows for Economic development of SHGs & Strengthening the Village Level Institutions

Varavoor panchayat is situated at Vadakkamchery block in Thrissur district. The assessment team visited the panchayat & its adjoining villages during impact assessment study of PRIs. The team had a meeting with newly elected Panchayat President, ex panchayat President, other panchayat members, villagers & teachers of Primary School Varavoor. Total number of children enrolled in the Primary School Varavoor was 512. All children in the village were enrolled in the school & the attendance of children on the visit day was more than 90 percent. The school ambience was child friendly. Various types of birds & rabbits were nurtured in the campus of the school. Children came to school regularly as they loved watching birds & rabbits. Children felt comfortable in the school. Child friendly classroom was developed for the children with green colour depicting stories, rhymes, alphabet etc. Also, LCD projector & Computer were installed in the classroom to make teaching learning process interesting & easy. Various other activities were organized at the school for children's retention & attendance

Child friendly Classroom

Rabbits & birds in the school

While interacting with Panchayat President & other elected representatives, they shared about the panchayat training they received at KILA. They opined that various arrangements viz. boarding lodging, availability of reading material & trainers were outstanding during the training programme. After training they feel more responsible to work for overall development of panchayat. The Panchayat President expressed that she gives responsibility to all other members of the panchayat, conducts regular village/ panchayat meeting, seeks opinion of villagers, community leaders on various issues/ work. The ex panchayat President, members, villagers & all others also provide their support & cooperation for overall development of panchayat/village. Hence, Panchayat President & other elected representatives are involved in panchayat/village development & also mobilize villagers & others for overall development.

Meeting with panchayat representatives & teachers

Definitely, the training of PRIs opens windows for development of village level institutions, namely, Schools and ensure child participation and quality education. SHGs undertake viable economic activity of processing of Jackfruit in order to made available in off season.

11) Able to undertake Gram Panchayat development work as per Government norms & people's requirements

Out of the total, 66.6 percent sample respondents opined that training helped them to undertake Gram Panchayat development work as per Government norms & people's requirements, whereas 33.4 percent sample respondents did not opt for the same. Regarding rating by the sample respondents to the extent the same was beneficial for undertaking roles/ responsibilities,0.2 percent sample respondents rated the same as poor followed by 36.7 percent sample respondents rated satisfactory, 44.9 percent sample respondents rated good, 14.7 percent sample respondents rated very good & 3.5 percent sample respondents rated excellent(Table A87). In terms of training helped to undertake Gram Panchayat development work as per Government norms & people's requirements was reported beneficial for undertaking roles/ responsibilities and it was reported better in the States namely, West Bengal (96.8 percent) & Uttarakhand (91.5 percent).

12) Able to manage development work / programmes/ Abhiyan as per government norms & people's requirements

Out of the total, 66.7 percent sample respondents opined that training helped them to manage development work / programmes/ Abhiyan as per government norms & people's requirements, whereas 33.3 percent sample respondents did not opt for the same. Regarding rating by the sample respondents to the extent the same was beneficial for undertaking roles/ responsibilities,0.3 percent sample respondents rated the same as poor followed by 40.9 percent sample respondents rated satisfactory, 38.4 percent sample respondents rated good, 16.7 percent sample respondents rated very good & 3.6 percent sample respondents rated excellent(Table A88). In terms of training helped to manage development work / programmes/ Abhiyan as per government norms & people's requirements was reported beneficial for undertaking roles/ responsibilities and it was reported better in the States namely, West Bengal (97.8 percent) & Arunachal Pradesh (84.6 percent).

13) Is Plan developed in the Gram Panchayat? If "Yes" then rating on five point scale

Development plan of Gram Panchayat is an important element under RGSA. In total, 69.7 percent sample respondents reported that plan was developed in the Gram Panchayat, whereas 30.3 percent sample respondents did not report for the same. Regarding rating by sample respondents of Gram Panchayat plan, 41.9 percent sample respondents rated the same as good followed by 38.7 percent sample respondents rated very good, 19.7 percent sample respondents rated excellent (Table A89). In terms of plan developed in the Gram Panchayat was reported beneficial and it was reported better in the States namely, Andhra Pradesh (85.2 percent), West Bengal (95.6percent) & Maharashtra (84.3 percent).

14) Impart training to other functionaries & Panchayat members on the subject you have been trained

Practicing what has been learnt is the important outcome. 69 percent sample respondents reported that they could give training to other functionaries & Panchayat members on the subject they had been trained, whereas 31 percent sample respondents did not opt for the same. Regarding rating by sample respondents of imparting training to other functionaries & Panchayat members, 43.4 percent sample respondents rated the same as good followed by 40.3 percent sample respondents rated very good, 16.3 percent sample respondents rated excellent(Table A90).

15) Retention of the subjects on which training imparted under RGSA

A good percentage i.e. 64.6 percent sample respondents reported that they had retention of the subjects on which they had been given training under RGSA, whereas 35.4 percent sample respondents did not opt for the same(Table A91).

16) Undertaking e-governance or e-enablement at Panchayat level:

In total, 23.1 percent sample respondents reported that they had undertaken e-governance or e-enablement in the Gram Panchayat, whereas 76.9 percent sample respondents did not report for the same. Out of 23.1 percent sample respondents who reported undertaking e-governance or e-enablement at Panchayat level, 71.7 percent sample respondents reported it beneficial for better functioning of Panchayat, whereas 28.3 percent sample respondents did not find it beneficial (Table A92).

17) Training under RGSA developed better coordination amongst PRIs

The CB&T under RGSA has got instrumental role in developing better coordination amongst ERs & Panchayat functionaries was reported by 99.9 percent sample respondents, whereas, the remaining 0.1 percent sample respondents did not report for the same. However, in reality due to lack of devolution of powers at the lowest level majority of time department functionaries used to work as per their department guideline, mandate & priority rather than Panchayat priority.

Further, 99.9 percent sample respondents reported that training of elected representatives helped reduction of conflict amongst PRIs & others, whereas 0.1 percent sample respondents did not opt for the same. Like-wise, 100 percent sample respondents reported that training of elected representatives helped in better execution of development programmes related to social justice, poverty alleviation & gender development.

Case Study-4

Elected Women Representative: The Emerging Leadership

Smt. Sangeeta Devi, a young woman from the marginalized Schedule Caste (SC) community of Bajuhadi Panchayat is currently serving as Gram Pradhan of her Panchayat. She was elected as Gram Pradhan in the year 2015-16. She was educated up to middle level. This Panchayat is located in the Roorkee block of District Haridwar in Uttrakhand. This case study explores how elected women leaders in the PRI succeed in their role despite the highly patriarchal and traditional social norms prevalent in the region. It is an excellent story of women-empowerment, leadership in PRI and community development.

Sangeeta Devi has significantly contributed in the development of her Panchayat. Both intrinsic and extrinsic factors led to the success of Sangeeta. These factors include developing herself first through awareness and trainings, good intention to do something for herself and through network with government before the leadership role of becoming an effective and capable Pradhan. She did commendable job by engaging people in PRI not by just knowing and understanding the PRI process, issues and challenges but taking concrete actions for results. She also received training under RGSA. The training under RGSA helped her in understanding various aspects of RGSA viz. 14 th Finance Commission, GPDP, ICT, sector convergence etc. Other participants during training presented their Panchayat development plan. This helped in developing knowledge & information. She added that GPDP was prepared at Panchayat level with participation of villagers & Panchayat functionaries. According to her, they are working as per priority & plan.

She also worked as Master trainer & imparted training to participants during training in the district. She was also actively involved in proper & safe disposal of solid waste at Panchayat level. Department of Panchayat Raj, Uttrakhand selected her and other Pradhans for an exposure visit to Delhi & Andhra Pradesh. This visit helped her in learning good work of Panchayats of other states.

She thanks the team of Directorate of Panchayat Raj, Government of Uttrakhand for the trainings and orientations which has added not only feathers but confidence and aspirations too.

State Rank Analysis

Above discussed responses about the benefits of capacity building & training are further weighted and indexed to derive the state-wise inferences in the form of Rank analysis. These results across various indicators are presented in Table 3.6. However, when we analyse the benefits of capacity building & training at the aggregate level, we find that the state of West Bengal got the highest rating about the benefits of capacity building and training. The next best states have been Andhra Pradesh and Maharashtra. The state of Kerala got the fourth position followed by Arunachal Pradesh and Uttarakhand. On the other hand, the states like Goa, Gujarat, Jharkhand, Haryana, Madhya Pradesh, Himachal Pradesh, Rajasthan and Uttar Pradesh got low rating across these indicators.

Figure 3.21: State Ranking

Table 3.6: State Ranks: Rating of Benefits of Capacity Building & Training

	Over-all	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Andhra Pradesh	2	1	1	1	1	1	3	3	2	1	2	2	3	2	15	15
Arunachal Pradesh	5	4	4	4	5	8	7	9	5	6	14	5	4	6	5	5
Assam	8	7	9	7	9	6	10	6	7	8	9	10	7	4	8	9
Goa	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	9	8
Gujarat	17	17	17	17	17	17	17	17	16	17	6	17	17	16	7	7
Haryana	15	16	15	15	15	15	15	16	15	15	16	13	14	14	16	16
Himachal Pradesh	13	13	12	14	13	13	14	13	13	13	17	14	13	13	11	11
Jharkhand	16	15	16	16	16	16	16	15	17	16	13	16	15	15	17	17
Karnataka	10	11	11	10	10	10	9	10	10	10	5	12	9	7	4	4
Kerala	4	6	6	6	4	5	4	5	6	5	4	9	5	3	2	2
Madhya Pradesh	14	14	14	13	14	14	13	14	14	14	11	15	16	17	18	18
Maharashtra	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	2	3	3	1	3	2	5	3	3
Orissa	9	9	8	8	7	7	6	7	9	7	10	6	6	9	10	10
Rajasthan	12	12	13	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	7	11	11	14	14
Sikkim	7	8	7	9	8	9	8	8	8	9	8	8	8	8	6	6
Uttar Pradesh	11	10	10	11	11	11	11	11	11	11	15	11	12	12	13	13
Uttarakhand	6	5	5	5	6	4	5	4	4	4	7	4	10	10	12	12
West Bengal	1	2	2	2	2	2	1	1	1	2	3	1	1	1	1	1

1) Developed confidence & increased sense of responsibility for economic development, people participation & social justice; 2) Better approach and working for Planning & management of functioning of Gram Panchayat core areas- Governance, Social Inclusion, Gender inequality, economic development & Social Justice; 3) Undertaking baseline data collection & situational analysis & development of GP development plan; 4) Better understanding of village issues and required action to be taken- Drinking water/ Sanitation/ Rural Development/ Social Justice/ Health & Hygiene/ Women development/ Children development/ Education etc.; 5) Help in understanding Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) in Gram Panchayat perspectives-poverty, gender, social justice etc.; 6) Able to manage Community organization & related

issues, & conflict in better way; 7) Better understanding of the core issues of Rural poverty; 8) Training organized covering various programmes/schemes namely, MGNREGS, SBM, GPDP, DAY-NRLM etc. helped in improving the performance of execution in the Panchayat; 9) Training in addition to RGSA namely, SBM, NRLM, Water quality, Health etc. found effective & useful in Gram Panchayat; 10) Developed better understanding the importance of e-governance, online (ICT) e-enablement of Panchayats; 11) Able to undertake Gram Panchayat development work as per Government norms & people requirements; 12) Able to manage development work / programmes/ Abhiyan as per government norms & people requirements; 13) Is Plan developed in the Gram Panchayat? If "Yes" then rating on five point scale; 14) Impart training to other functionaries & Panchayat members on the subject you have been trained; 15) Retention of the subjects on which training imparted under RGSA

Spearman Rank Correlation Analysis

In order to get a better picture of the impact of various training related aspects such as trainers, learning environment, reading / training materials, sessions on best practices, case studies, experience sharing etc. and field visits and group discussions on the outcome indicators such as the development of understanding about various aspects of the functioning of PRIs, its usefulness in working under RGSA and the capacity building role of training, a correlation exercise was considered to be the most appropriate one. As the responses are recorded at the scale of five which implies that these are the ordinal responses in the form of ranks. In such a situation, it would be better to examine the magnitude of 'Spearman Rank Correlation' to infer about the presence of relation between the two variables.

Emerging results of Spearman Rank Correlation of the rating of trainers with different outcome aspects are presented in Table 3.7. It may be observed that the ranking coefficient for all the outcome indicators is found to be positive and significant which implies that a high rating of the trainers performance has led to the development of better understanding besides being useful and beneficial. Such positive and significant correlation is observed across most of the states except a few. In the case of understanding developed, rank correlation is not significant for Arunachal Pradesh, Goa, Haryana, Orissa and West Bengal.

Table 3.7: Spearman Rank Correlation of Trainers' Rating with

	Understanding Developed	Useful in Working under RGSA	Training Beneficial for Taking Roles /Responsibilities
Andhra Pradesh	.310**	.325**	.176*
Arunachal Pradesh	.040	.169**	.076
Assam	.250**	.224**	.268**
Goa	-.028	-.089	-.137
Gujarat	.155**	.167**	.129**
Haryana	.084	.088	.145**
Himachal Pradesh	.190**	.061	-.027
Jharkhand	.230**	.223**	.207**
Karnataka	.149**	.120**	.114**
Kerala	.258**	.045	.276**
Madhya Pradesh	.434**	.374**	.400**
Maharashtra	.164**	.173**	.357**
Orissa	.070	.110	.033
Rajasthan	.094*	.070	.148**
Sikkim	.192**	.086	.172*
Uttar Pradesh	.253**	.228**	.200**
Uttarakhand	.254**	.229**	.239**
West Bengal	.160	.852	.122**
All	.313**	.288**	.318**

Note 1: * implies that the rank correlation is significant at 0.05 level of significance (2-tailed).
Note 2: ** implies that the rank correlation is significant at 0.01 level of significance (2-tailed).

Table 3.8: Spearman Rank Correlation of Learning Environment's Rating with

	Understanding Developed	Useful in Working under RGSA	Training Beneficial for Taking Roles /Responsibilities
Andhra Pradesh	.113	-.014	-.054
Arunachal Pradesh	.023	-.165**	-.072
Assam	.304**	.287**	.311**
Goa	-.097	-.183**	-.138*
Gujarat	.090*	.045	.136**
Haryana	-.098*	-.079	-.088
Himachal Pradesh	.198**	-.032	-.012
Jharkhand	-.066	-.023	.012
Karnataka	.301**	.279**	.276**
Kerala	.355**	.102	.296**
Madhya Pradesh	.295**	.220**	.246**
Maharashtra	.134**	.146**	.333**
Orissa	.273**	.285**	.231**
Rajasthan	-.073	-.127**	-.020
Sikkim	.220**	.213**	.231**
Uttar Pradesh	.233**	.178**	.225**
Uttarakhand	.024	-.007	.022
West Bengal	-.111*	-.050	-.002
All	.298**	.267**	.294**

Note 1: * implies that the rank correlation is significant at 0.05 level of significance (2-tailed).
Note 2: ** implies that the rank correlation is significant at 0.01 level of significance (2-tailed).

Spearman Rank Correlation results as presented in Table 3.8 indicate that in aggregate, the correlation coefficient has been positive and significant which implies that a better provision of learning environment is positively related with better development of understanding, high usefulness in working under RGSA and its being beneficial for taking roles and responsibilities. But, in some states like West Bengal, Haryana, Rajasthan etc., the rank correlation along with being significant is found to be negative which implies that even at low levels of learning environment / infrastructure, these states could provide better outcomes.

Table 3.9: Spearman Rank Correlation of Reading / Training Materials Rating with

	Understanding Developed	Useful in Working under RGSA	Training Beneficial for Taking Roles /Responsibilities
Andhra Pradesh	.329**	.378**	.322**
Arunachal Pradesh	.086	.117*	.080
Assam	.283**	.271**	.294**
Goa	-.098	-.274**	-.117
Gujarat	.024	-.012	-.004
Haryana	-.003	-.026	.062
Himachal Pradesh	.068	.200**	.040
Jharkhand	.201**	.193**	.145**
Karnataka	.147**	.100**	.069
Kerala	.182**	-.004	.205**
Madhya Pradesh	.301**	.251**	.246**
Maharashtra	.170**	.176**	.394**
Orissa	.139*	.106	.057
Rajasthan	.041	.006	.070
Sikkim	.225**	.159*	.215**
Uttar Pradesh	.201**	.129**	.198**
Uttarakhand	.147*	.119	.170*
West Bengal	-.110*	-.044	-.106*
All	.262**	.224**	.286**

Note 1: * implies that the rank correlation is significant at 0.05 level of significance (2-tailed).
Note 2: ** implies that the rank correlation is significant at 0.01 level of significance (2-tailed).

Table 3.9 presents Spearman Rank Correlation results of the rating of reading / training material with the outcome variables. It may be observed that on an average, the rank correlation coefficients are positive and significant which implies that a better provision of the reading materials is linked positively with the positive outcomes. In some states, the rank correlation coefficients are found to be negative but they are not found to be significant except a few, e.g. West Bengal in case of understanding developed and training beneficial in taking roles / responsibilities and Goa in case of useful in working under RGSA.

Table 3.10: Spearman Rank Correlation of Session on Best Practices, Case Studies, Experience Sharing Rating with

	Understanding Developed	Useful in Working under RGSA	Training Beneficial for Taking Roles /Responsibilities
Andhra Pradesh	.345**	.376**	.311**
Arunachal Pradesh	.071	-.044	.011
Assam	.242**	.275**	.292**
Goa	-.108	-.294**	-.138*
Gujarat	-.010	-.053	-.007
Haryana	-.058	-.042	-.026
Himachal Pradesh	.128	.144*	.092
Jharkhand	.083	.093	.066
Karnataka	.243**	.192**	.181**
Kerala	.196**	.018	.144*
Madhya Pradesh	.312**	.235**	.243**
Maharashtra	.127**	.130**	.334**
Orissa	.127	.085	.069
Rajasthan	-.149**	-.188**	-.113**
Sikkim	.224**	.222**	.252**
Uttar Pradesh	.154**	.061**	.187**
Uttarakhand	-.092	-.141*	-.024
West Bengal	-.102*	-.078	-.021
All	.261**	.223**	.284**

Note 1: * implies that the rank correlation is significant at 0.05 level of significance (2-tailed).
Note 2: ** implies that the rank correlation is significant at 0.01 level of significance (2-tailed).

Table 3.10 presents Spearman Rank Correlation results of the rating of Session on best practices, case studies, experience sharing with the outcome indicators. It may be observed that the rank correlation coefficients in aggregate are found to be positive and significant which implies that a better provision of such sessions is related with better outcomes. In some states, the correlations are found to be negative but in most cases, these are non-significant. But, there are some exceptions like Rajasthan, Uttarakhand, West Bengal and Goa where even at low rating of sessions on best practices, case studies and experiencesharing, a high rating of outcome indicators is reported.

Table 3.11: Spearman Rank Correlation of Field Visit and Group Discussion Rating with

	Understanding Developed	Useful in Working under RGSA	Training Beneficial for Taking Roles /Responsibilities
Andhra Pradesh	.257**	.362**	.256**
Arunachal Pradesh	-.015	-.055	-.079
Assam	.059	.062	.072
Goa	-.163*	-.261**	-.167*
Gujarat	.031	-.006	.121**
Haryana	-.153**	-.140**	-.137**
Himachal Pradesh	.023	.249**	-.037
Jharkhand	.170**	.154**	.092
Karnataka	.256**	.223**	.204**
Kerala	.195**	.102	.194**
Madhya Pradesh	.306**	.250**	.244**

	Understanding Developed	Useful in Working under RGSA	Training Beneficial for Taking Roles /Responsibilities
Maharashtra	.116**	.114**	.188**
Orissa	-.352**	-.363**	-.343**
Rajasthan	-.019	-.034	.071
Sikkim	.235**	.229**	.284**
Uttar Pradesh	.177**	.084**	.096**
Uttarakhand	.470**	.512**	.438**
West Bengal	-.084	-.024	.082
All	.241**	.247**	.274**

Note 1: * implies that the rank correlation is significant at 0.05 level of significance (2-tailed).
Note 2: ** implies that the rank correlation is significant at 0.01 level of significance (2-tailed).

Table 3.11 reports Spearman Rank Correlation results of rating of field visits and group discussions with the outcome indicators. It may be observed that there exists a positive correlation between the field visit and group discussion and the outcome indicators. Such trend is found across most of the states except Goa, Haryana and Orissa where a negative and significant rank correlation coefficient is found.

The Strengths, Weaknesses & Suggestions given by sample respondents to improve the effectiveness of Capacity building & trainings are stated here under:

Strengths	Issues	Suggestions
1. Training helped in getting information about various government schemes. **2. Arrangement & facilities viz. seating, food & other facilities during training programme were satisfactory.** **3. Trainers/RPs are retired departmental officials of Rural development and Panchayati raj department.** **4. Gap between Panchayat Directorate and Gram**	1. Training in most of the districts and Blocks of ERs has been organized after 1-2 years of election 2. Basic knowledge on PRIs is lacking 3. Less time given on PR Act. able to develop less understanding. Hence, cause litigations. 4. Training Need Assessment was not properly done. 5. ERs have low education level. 6. Participation of ward members is low. 7. Budget in the districts released at the end of the financial year. Therefore, it is difficult to undertake trainings timely. 8. Gram Pradhans/PRIs of GPs were not given autonomy. Always some directions come from top to spend the budget of FFC/SFC and others as per directions rather than	1. Autonomy for decision making for trainings should be given to State training Institute. 2. Pre-test and Post-test should be done before and after trainings. It facilitates in better organization of quality trainings by the organizers. 3. RPs should be appointed on payment basis. 4. Pool of trainers must be ensured in the State and districts with proper support to them rather having a list only. 5. Audio-visual modules should be prepared. 6. Ward members should be compensated for wage loss from the training fund. 7. Analysis of trainers at District level. 8. Training budget to districts may be given at the beginning of the financial year. 9. The Gram Panchayat as local self governance should be facilitated to use its autonomy for GP development. 10. There should be regular monitoring and supervision of trainings by the State level experts / officials/ team and should provide both academic and administrative support to undertake CB&T properly as per the mandate of NCBF 2014. 11. In GP budget should be based on real situation rather than mode budget for work. This affects the working fame of Gram Pradhan. ERs get

Panchayat has been reduced due to CB&T of ERs. **5. ERs were mobilized to take part in CB&T.** **6. ER get exposure to outside area / districts which develop a vision amongst them for their Gram Panchayat.** **7. Women ERs developed capacity to deal with the situation and various facets of Gram Panchayat development effectively.** **8. ERs acquainted with functioning of Gram Panchayat, Panchayat Raj Act, Roles and responsibilities of Gram Panchayat and Gram Pradhan for economic development and social justice.** **9. Development of communication skills.** **10. Well**	the demand of Gram Panchayat. 9. In the State there are DRG of 30-40.But in reality hardly 4-5 find themselves engaged in the trainings. (Uttar Pradesh) 10. Participants were not much interested in training. 11. Sarpanchs not much interested for trainings because they don't want to involve themselves with other department schemes for social and human development (Haryana). 12. No proper coordination of department & HIRD. (Haryana) 12. No mechanism for feedback on training. 13. Participation of Sarpanch and Panchayat secretaries is low. 14. Gram Panchayat not getting budget as per Gram Panchayat Development Plan. 15. The activities do not get implemented due to shortage of budget 16. In training projectors were not available for visual aids (Haryana). 17. Not getting proper food during training. 18. Online training methods were not explained in trainings (Sikkim). 19. Lack of proper infrastructure for training. 20. Lack of technical support. 21. Lacking practical knowledge. 22. Reading materials /	disinterested in various activities. 12. Training should be organized as per the availability of ERs and should consider the agriculture seasons, festivals and marriage seasons. 13. ERs should be trained along with Panchayat functionaries. 14. There is greater need to equip GP with required number of staffs may be Gram Vikas Adhikari, Computer operators, in addition to CB&T in order to really run GP as per Panchayati Raj Act. 15. The ward members in case of State of Uttar Pradesh not have been given much space in the GP in terms of active role in participation in planning and management. Hence, their interests were at lower level. 16. The Gram Panchayats in reality have no control over any line department namely, Health, education, ICDS, SafaiKaramchari. Hence, even after good CB&T not much impact has been registered in development of social sectors. 17. In GPDP no other sectors put their budget as per GP requirement. The fund available is only FFC and SFC. Hence, not much mobilization of GP has been visible even after good trainings of ERs. Thus, it is time to think upon the devolution of Subjects/department as per eleventh schedule in real sense. 18. Gram Panchayat has not much role in deciding the Pradhan Manti Awaas Yojana /pension Yojana. Hence, the stake of Gram Pradhan is not much recognized by the citizens too and participation of citizens in the Gram Panchayat is at lower level. 19. Training duration should be of 4 to 5 days & more number of trainings should be organized in order to have proper understanding of various issues. 20. Information to participants regarding training date should be given two-three days before organizing training. 21. Residential training should be organized for effective training so that participants are not in a hurry for early return during training programme. 22. CB&T should be linked to budget allocations. 23. Trainings should be linked to rewards and promotions.

experienced & knowledgeable trainers imparted training to participants (Andhra Pradesh). **11. The newly elected representatives had an opportunity to learn about govt. schemes & GPDP during training programme (Rajasthan).**	reference materials were given in English (Goa). 23. Lack of boarding & lodging facility during training programme (Maharashtra). 24. Field visit not organised during training programme. 25. Boarding & lodging was not proper for participants during training programme (Andhra Pradesh). 26. Organizing training programme was merely completion of formality (Rajasthan). 27. Now more frequent gram sabhas (10 to 15 in a year) were organized at panchayat level which was wastage of time & largely the object of Gram Sabha is getting lost.	24. Gram Panchayat fund allocation should be increased. 25. Training should be organized for five days. Trainings were organized as one day meeting in which we find it difficult to cover all aspects of GPDP (Madhya Pradesh). 26. Training should be organized in time. 27. Training should be organized at Gram Panchayat level so that the attendance of Ward Members may be ensured at least 70-80%. 28. Foundation training should be organized for 5 days. 29. The ERs should be taken to Model GPs where works are better implemented. 30. Every year training should be organized. 31. Reference materials/reading material should be given in local language. 32. Field/ exposure visit should be organized during training programme. 33. Group discussion & other teaching techniques should be used for imparting training to participants. 34. Practical classes by visiting villages for preparation of GPDP & implementation of govt. schemes should be taken during training programme. 35. Training hours should be 6 to 8 so that all issues can be covered during training programme. 36. Training should be organized at panchayat level rather than block level. 37. Practical training for preparation of GPDP should be imparted for participants. 38. Training should be imparted in small groups, may be 30 to 40 members. 39. Completion of all training to PRIs should be within six months of election.

The State Rank Analysis & sample respondents' responses can be summarized as follow:

- State rank analysis across advantages of training indicators reveals that the state of West Bengal has been the best performing state. The next best performing state has been Andhra Pradesh. Kerala got the third position. Among the poor performing states, Gujarat has been at the top. This state has been the least performer. Haryana, Goa and Madhya Pradesh have been other low performing states.
- In terms of the understanding developed as per the working requirement, it is observed that the impact of trainings has been the highest in the case of West Bengal. Similar has been the case with Andhra Pradesh where the respondents rated their responses very high while indicating the relevance of training in developing understanding as per working requirement across different aspects. Other better performing states have been Maharashtra, Himachal Pradesh, Uttarakhand and Kerala. But, the performance of states like Goa, Haryana, Gujarat, Madhya Pradesh and Jharkhand has been found consistently low across these indicators.
- In response to the usefulness of the training program about its various aspects reveals that the state of West Bengal has been the best performing state. Similarly, high performance has been recorded by the state of Andhra Pradesh. In fact, the responses in both these states along with Maharashtra indicate that the training program has been very much instrumental in developing an understanding about various aspects helpful in working under RGSA. The state of Kerala is rated relatively low along with Karnataka, Sikkim and Assam. On the other hand, the usefulness of the training program to work under RGSA is rated very low in the case of Goa, Gujarat, Madhya Pradesh, Haryana, Rajasthan, Himachal Pradesh and Jharkhand. It may also be noted that the degree of dissatisfaction with the training program has been relatively high in Goa in contrast to other poor performing states.
- About the benefits of capacity building & training, the state of West Bengal got the highest rating about the benefits of capacity building and training. The next best states have been Andhra Pradesh and Maharashtra. The state of Kerala got the fourth position followed by Arunachal Pradesh and Uttarakhand. On the other hand, the states like Goa, Gujarat, Jharkhand, Haryana, Madhya Pradesh, Himachal Pradesh, Rajasthan and Uttar Pradesh got low rating across these indicators.
- Majority of sample respondents (99.9 percent) opined that training programme was useful & helpful. Training helped them in getting information & knowledge about various government schemes. It also helped in knowledge enrichment & skill upgradation.
- Regarding mode of training, majority of sample respondents (62.9 percent) reported for mixed method viz. interactive/ participatory & lecture method. Majority of (81.7 percent) sample respondents reported that trainings were organized for 4 to 6 hours
- Regarding whether Panchayat representatives had access to online mode of training, 32 percent sample respondents reported that they had access to online mode of training. These sample respondents were sarpanches who had access to online mode of training. Out of them 72 percent sample respondents found it useful.
- Regarding facilities in Capacity Building & training programmes, 69.3 percent sample respondents rated arrangement of trainers in training programmes from good, very good to excellent,72.3 percent sample respondents rated learning environment in training programmes from good, very good to excellent, 61.7 percent sample respondents rated training venue, seating facilities & training aids from good, very good to excellent, 62.2 percent sample respondents rated training venue, seating facilities & training aids in training programmes from good, very good to excellent.

3.1.2 Impact of Trainings on Panchayati Raj Functionaries – Knowledge levels and capacities & overall Functioning

A. Profile of Panchayati Raj Functionaries

The Panchayat functionaries and Functionaries of line department devolved with Gram Panchayat. The frontline workers of the Gram Panchayats namely, Teachers, ASHA, AWWs, Panchayat Secretary etc. and Panchayat Facilitation team (Community members/SHGs) etc. were interviewed as well as focus Group discussions were organized to get their view about the CB&T in which they had participated. Also, assessment has been made so far as impact of Training of PRIs i.e. CB&T under RGSA is concerned. In the study respondents have significant role to play in expressing and giving the responses about the benefits of training in getting acquaintance about the various schemes of development of Panchayat, roles and responsibilities, planning & execution procedures, GPDP and People's Plan campaign. The study covers 1674 sample respondents (District, Block &Panchayat level functionaries) in eighteen states including forty-seven districts. Their views on trainings quality, training organization and impact of training have been gathered through questionnaire. The findings related to impact of various CB&T are presented in this section.

Table 3.12: Basic Profile of Respondents

S.No.	Particulars	Responses	Nos.& %
1	Respondents' Sex	Male	1205(72)
		Female	469(28)
		Total	1674(100)
2	Age - group (in years)	Up to 25	77(4.6)
		26-50	1319(78.8)
		51-75	276(16.5)
		Above 75	2(0.1)
		Total	1674(100)
3.	Educational level	Primary	4(0.2)
		Middle	51(3)
		Secondary	62(3.7)
		Sr. secondary	277(16.5)
		Graduate & above	1280(76.5)
		Total	1674(100)
4.	Respondents' social category	SC	233(13.9)
		ST	206(12.3)
		OBC	642(38.4)
		General	593(35.4)
		Total	1674(100)
5.	Respondents' Post	District level officers	7(0.4)
		Block level officers	137(8.2)
		Panchayat Secretary	1205(72)
		ICDS functionaries	190(11.4)
		Health functionaries	102(6.1)
		SHG members	3(0.2)
		Others	30(3.6)
		Total	1674(100)

Note: Figures within brackets are the percentages

Respondents' Sex

Gender/Sex is an important variable in a given social situation, which is invariably affected by any social or economic phenomenon. Hence, the variable gender was investigated for this study. The data related to gender/sex of the sample respondents are summarized in the table & figure. In total, 72 percent sample respondents were male & remaining 28 percent sample respondents were female (Table B1). State-wise, maximum & minimum percentages of male respondents were reported in Madhya Pradesh (96.9 percent) & Haryana (18.4 percent) respectively. Similarly, maximum & minimum percentages of female respondents were reported in Haryana (81.6 percent) & Madhya Pradesh (3.1 percent).

Respondents' Age

Age of respondents is one of the most important characteristics in understanding their views about the particular problems; by and large, age indicates level of maturity of individuals in that sex, and age becomes more important to examine the response. The data related to sample respondents' age group are summarized in table & figure. In total, 4.6 percent sample respondents were up to 25 years followed by 78.8 percent sample respondents were between 26-50 years age group, 16.5 percent sample respondents were between 51-75 years age group & 0.1 percent sample respondents were above 75 years (Table B1). State-wise, maximum & minimum percentages of sample respondents in the age group up to 75 years was reported in Sikkim (34.4 percent) & West Bengal (0.9 percent) respectively followed by maximum & minimum percentages of sample respondents in the age group 26-50 years was reported in Goa (96.9 percent) & Jharkhand (47.5 percent) respectively and maximum & minimum percentages of sample respondents in the age group 51-75 years was reported in Jharkhand (49.2 percent) & Goa & Sikkim (3.1 percent each) respectively.

Respondents' Education

Education is one of the most important characteristics that might affect person's attitudes and the way of looking and understanding any particular social phenomena. In a way, the response of an individual is likely to be determined by his educational status and therefore it becomes imperative to know educational background of the respondents. Hence, the data pertaining to education have been summarized in table & figure. In total, out of total sample respondents 0.2 percent sample respondents had education up to primary level followed by 3 percent sample respondents had education up to middle level. These Panchayat functionaries who had education either up to primary or middle were ICDS functionaries' viz. AWW & ASHA. Further, 3.7 percent sample respondents had education up to secondary followed by 16.5 percent sample respondents had education up to senior secondary & 76.5 percent sample respondents had education up to graduation& above(Table B2).

Respondents' Social Category

The data related to social category of sample respondents have been summarized in table & figure. In total, 13.9 percent sample respondents were SC followed by 12.3 percent sample respondents were ST, 38.4 percent sample respondents were OBC & 35.4 percent sample respondents belonged to general category (Table B3). State-wise, maximum and minimum percentages of sample respondents in SC category were reported in Uttarakhand (26.5 percent) & Assam (4.1 percent) respectively. Maximum and minimum percentages of sample respondents in ST category were reported in Arunachal Pradesh (75.8 percent) & Goa (3.1 percent) respectively. Maximum and

minimum percentages of sample respondents in OBC category were reported in Sikkim (59.4 percent) & Arunachal Pradesh (9.7 percent) respectively. Maximum and minimum percentages of sample respondents in general category were reported in Kerala (67.9 percent) & Sikkim (9.4 percent) respectively.

Respondents' Post

The data related to respondents' post have been summarized in the table & figure. In total, 0.4 percent sample respondents were district level officers followed by 8.2 percent sample respondents were block level officers, 72 percent sample respondents were Panchayat Secretary, 11.4 percent sample respondents were ICDS functionaries, 6.1percent sample respondents were health functionaries, 0.2 percent sample respondents were SHG members& 1.8 percent sample respondents come under other category viz. teachers, agriculture assistants, & Computer cum office assistants (Table B4).

B. Advantage of various trainings

Need based training

Out of the total respondents, 98.3 percent sample respondents reported that training imparted to them under RGSA was need based, whereas 1.7 percent sample respondents reported training attended by them was not need based (Table B15). Regarding rating of need based training, out of 98.3 percent sample respondents who reported that the training was need based, 3.9 percent sample respondents rated need based training as satisfactory followed by 19 percent sample respondents rated training good, 43.8 percent sample respondents rated training very good, 23.4 percent sample respondents rated training excellent & 9.8 percent sample respondents rated training outstanding. Thus, 96.1 percent sample respondents rated need based training from good, very good,excellent to outstanding, whereas 3.9 percent sample respondents rated need based training as satisfactory. In terms of organizing need based trainings, the better performing states are Haryana, Maharashtra, West Bengal, Andhra Pradesh, Arunachal Pradesh, Uttar Pradesh, Sikkim, Uttarkhand, Gujarat, Kerala and Goa.

Figure 3.23: Rating of Need-based Training across States

Training programmes - Useful & Beneficial

With regard to usefulness & benefits of training progamme, 99 percent sample respondents reported that the training programme was useful & beneficial, whereas 1 percent sample respondents reported that the training programme was not useful & beneficial(Table B16). Regarding rating of usefulness & benefits of training programme, 2.8 percent sample respondents rated training satisfactory followed by 17.1 percent sample respondents rated training good, 28.3 percent sample respondents rated training very good, 40.3 percent sample respondents rated training excellent & 11.4 percent sample respondents rated training outstanding. Hence, 97.2 percent sample respondents rated usefulness & benefits of training programme from good, very good,excellent to outstanding, whereas 2.8 percent sample respondents rated usefulness & benefits of training programme as satisfactory. In case of usefulness & benefits of training, better performing states are Kerala, Maharashtra, Andhra Pradesh, Madhya Pradesh, Sikkim and Uttar Pradesh.

Figure 3.24: Rating of Training Programmes across States

Training helps in skills upgradation & knowledge enrichment

Out of total respondents, 98.8 percent sample respondents opined that training helped in skills upgradation & knowledge enrichment, whereas 1.2 percent reported that training did not help in skills upgradation & knowledge enrichment (Table B17). As far as rating of training programme in skills upgradation & knowledge enrichment is concerned, 3 percent sample respondents rated training satisfactory followed by 21.6 percent sample respondents rated training good, 41.2 percent sample respondents rated training very good, 22.8 percent sample respondents rated training excellent & 11.4 percent sample respondents rated training outstanding. Thus, 97 percent sample respondents rated training programme helps in skill upgradation & knowledge enrichment from good, very good,excellent to outstanding, whereas 3 percent sample respondents rated training programme helps in skill upgradation & knowledge enrichment as satisfactory. Looking at skills upgradation & knowledge enrichment

Figure 3.25: Rating of Training Role in Skill Upgradation& Knowledge Enrichment across States

through training programmes, the better performing states are Sikkim, Arunachal Pradesh, Karnataka, Kerala, Maharashtra, Orissa, West Bengal, Andhra Pradesh, Uttar Pradesh, Assam and Haryana.

Better perform their responsibilities

Out of the total sample respondents, 99.7 percent sample respondents opined that training under RGSA helped in better performing their responsibilities, whereas as 0.3 percent opined that training did not help in better performing their responsibilities (Table B18). Regarding rating of training programme in better performing their responsibilities, 3.1 percent sample respondents rated satisfactory followed by 22.3 percent sample respondents rated good, 34.1 percent sample respondents rated very good, 29.1 percent sample respondents rated excellent & 11.4 percent sample respondents rated outstanding. Thus, 96.9 percent sample respondents rated training programme in better performing their responsibilities from good, very good, excellent to outstanding, whereas 3.1 percent rated training programme in better performing their responsibilities as satisfactory. In terms of better performing their responsibilities through trainings, the better performing states are Karnataka, Kerala, Uttarakhand, Orissa, Sikkim, Assam, Maharashtra, Arunachal Pradesh, West Bengal, Andhra Pradesh and Uttar Pradesh.

Figure 3.26: Rating of Training Role in Better Performing their Responsibilities across States

Develop positive attitude on roles & responsibilities of GP

Figure 3.27: Rating of Training Role in Developing Positive Attitude on Roles & Responsibilities across States

Of the total respondents, 99 percent sample respondents opined that training under RGSA helped in developing positive attitude on roles & responsibilities of Gram Panchayat, whereas the remaining 1 percent sample respondents reported that training did not help in developing positive attitude on roles & responsibilities of Gram Panchayat(Table B19). As far as rating of training in developing positive attitude on roles & responsibilities of Gram Panchayat by sample respondents is concerned, 4.1 percent sample respondents rated the same as

satisfactory followed by 22.7 percent sample respondents rated good, 41.6 percent sample respondents rated very good, 20.9 percent sample respondents rated excellent & 10.6 percent sample respondents rated outstanding. Thus, 95.9 percent sample respondents rated training programme in developing positive attitude on roles & responsibilities of Gram Panchayat from good, very good,excellent to outstanding, whereas 4.1 percent sample respondents rated training programme in developing positive attitude on roles & responsibilities of Gram Panchayat as satisfactory. In terms of developing positive attitude on roles & responsibilities of Gram Panchayat through trainings, the better performing states are Sikkim, Karnataka, Kerala, Orissa, Maharashtra, Uttarkhand, Assam, Andhra Pradesh, West Bengal, Uttar Pradesh and Arunachal Pradesh. The worst performing states have been Himachal Pradesh, Gujarat, Jharkhand, Madhya Pradesh, Goa, Rajasthan and Haryana.

Completely equipped on roles & responsibilities of GP for effective execution of development programmes, Social Justice etc

Figure 3.28: Rating of Training Role in Equipping GP for Execution of Development Programmes across States

Out of the total, 97.8 percent sample respondents reported that training under RGSA was completely equipped on roles & responsibilities of GP for effective execution of development programmes, social justice etc, whereas 2.2 percent sample respondents reported otherwise (Table B20). Regarding rating by sample respondents about training under RGSA completely equipped on roles & responsibilities of GP for effective execution of development programmes, social justice etc, 4.4 percent sample respondents rated as satisfactory followed by 26.3 percent sample respondents rated good, 37 percent sample respondents rated very good, 22 percent sample respondents rated excellent & 10.4 percent sample respondents rated as outstanding. Hence, 95.6 percent sample respondents rated training programme under RGSA completely equipped on roles & responsibilities of GP for effective execution of development programmes, social justice from good, very good,excellent to outstanding, whereas 4.4 percent sample respondents rated training programme under RGSA completely equipped on roles & responsibilities of GP for effective execution of development programmes, social justice as satisfactory. In terms of completely equipped on roles & responsibilities of GP for effective execution of development programmes, social justice, the better performing states are Karnataka, Maharashtra, Sikkim, Orissa, Assam, Uttarakhand, Andhra Pradesh, West Bengal and Uttar Pradesh. The worst performing states have been Kerala, Himachal Pradesh, Gujarat, Arunachal Pradesh, Madhya Pradesh, Rajasthan and Goa.

State Rank Analysis

State rank analysis across above discussed indicators in table 3.13 reveals that the state of Karnataka has been the best performing state. The next best performing state has been Sikkim. Maharashtra got the third position. Among the poor performing states, Himachal Pradesh has been at the top. This state has been the least performer. Gujarat, Madhya Pradesh, Goa and Jharkhand have been other low performing states. The performance of Rajasthan and Kerala also has remained consistently low across all the indicators.

Figure 3.29: Ranking across States

Table 3.13: State-wise Ranking as per Respondents' Rating Status

State	Overall	A	B	C	D	E	F
Andhra Pradesh	8	9	11	8	10	8	7
Arunachal Pradesh	9	1	4	2	8	11	15
Assam	6	11	7	10	6	7	5
Goa	15	17	17	14	14	14	12
Gujarat	17	15	16	17	17	17	16
Haryana	11	12	12	11	12	12	10
Himachal Pradesh	18	6	18	18	18	18	17
Jharkhand	14	16	13	16	16	16	11
Karnataka	1	7	1	3	1	2	1
Kerala	12	13	8	4	2	3	18
Madhya Pradesh	16	18	15	15	15	15	14
Maharashtra	3	5	5	5	7	5	2
Orissa	4	8	6	6	4	4	4
Rajasthan	13	14	14	13	13	13	13
Sikkim	2	2	3	1	5	1	3
Uttar Pradesh	10	10	10	9	11	10	9
Uttarakhand	5	4	2	12	3	6	6
West Bengal	7	3	9	7	9	9	8

Note: A-Need based training; B-Training programmes useful & beneficial; C-Training helps in skills upgradation & knowledge enrichment; D-Better perform their responsibilities; E-Develop positive attitude on roles & responsibilities of GP; F-Completely equipped on roles & responsibilities of GP for effective execution of development programmes, Social Justice etc.

C. Impact Assessment of capacity Building & Trainings

Trainings under RGSA were imparted on various topics/issues. Hence, three aspects of each topic/issue of training were assessed - whether topic/issue covered/shown in area, understanding developed as per working requirement and useful in functioning of Gram Panchayat and executing various schemes of Panchayati Raj department, Rural development department, Social Justice and economic development etc.

1) Planning & management of Gram Panchayat functions core areas-Governance, Social inclusion, Gender inequality, economic development & social justice:

In total, 95.9 percent sample respondents reported that planning & management of Gram Panchayat functions core areas were covered during training, whereas 4.1 percent sample respondents did not report for the same.

Regarding rating of understanding developed as per working requirement on planning & management of Gram Panchayat functions core areas, in total, out of 95.9 percent sample respondents who opined that the topic/issue was covered during training, 1.1 percent sample respondents rated it satisfactory followed by 22.8 percent sample respondents rated good, 51.2 percent sample respondents rated very good, 21.8 percent sample respondents rated excellent and 3.1 percent sample respondents rated outstanding (Table B 21).

Similarly, rating of whether planning& management of Gram Panchayat functions core areas was useful in working under RGSA, in total, out of 95.9 percent sample respondents who opined that the topic/issue was covered during training, 1.3 percent sample respondents rated it satisfactory followed by 38.2 percent sample respondents rated good, 43.6 percent sample respondents rated very good, 13.7 percent sample respondents rated excellent and 3.2 percent sample respondents rated outstanding(Table B 22).

2) Baseline data collection & situational analysis & development of GPDP

In total, 97.8 percent sample respondents reported that baseline data collection & situational analysis & development of GPDP were covered during training, whereas 2.2 percent sample respondents did not report for the same.

Regarding rating of understanding developed as per working requirement on baseline data collection & situational analysis & development of GPDP, in total, out of 97.8 percent sample respondents who opined that the topic/issue was covered during training, 1.0 percent sample respondents rated it satisfactory followed by 21.3 percent sample respondents rated good, 50.7 percent sample respondents rated very good, 22.6 percent sample respondents rated excellent and 4.3 percent sample respondents rated outstanding (Table B 23).

Similarly, rating of whether baseline data collection & situational analysis & development of GPDP was useful in working under RGSA, in total, out of 97.8 percent sample respondents who opined that the topic/issue was covered during training, 1.2 percent sample respondents rated it satisfactory followed by 38.1 percent sample respondents rated good, 43.0 percent sample respondents rated very good, 14.5 percent sample respondents rated excellent and 3.2 percent sample respondents rated outstanding (Table B 24).

3) Training covered various thematic areas of importance-Drinking water/ Sanitation/Rural Development/Social Justice/ Health & Hygiene/ Women Development/ Children development/ Education etc.:

Out of total respondents, 97.6 percent sample respondents reported that various thematic areas of importance-Drinking water/ Sanitation/Rural Development/Social Justice/ Health & Hygiene/ Women Development/ Children development/ Education etc. were covered during training, whereas 2.4 percent sample respondents did not report for the same.

Further, rating of understanding developed as per working requirement on various thematic areas of importance-Drinking water/ Sanitation/Rural Development/Social Justice/ Health & Hygiene/ Women Development/ Children development/ Education etc, in total, out of 97.6 percent sample respondents who opined that the topic/issue was covered during training, 0.7 percent sample respondents rated it satisfactory followed by 21.8 percent sample respondents rated good, 50.6 percent sample respondents rated very good, 21.7 percent sample respondents rated excellent and 5.1 percent sample respondents rated outstanding (Table B 25).

Similarly, rating of whether thematic areas of importance-Drinking water/ Sanitation/Rural Development/Social Justice/ Health & Hygiene/ Women Development/ Children development/ Education etc, was useful in working under RGSA, in total, out of 97.6 percent sample respondents who opined that the topic/issue was covered during training, 1.1 percent sample respondents rated it satisfactory followed by 40 percent sample respondents rated good, 42.2 percent sample respondents rated very good, 12.6 percent sample respondents rated excellent and 4.1 percent sample respondents rated outstanding (Table B 26).

4) Better Executions of provisions under 14th Finance Commission

In total, 98.7 percent sample respondents reported that better execution of provisions under 14th Finance Commission were covered during training, whereas 1.3 percent sample respondents did not report for the same.

Similarly, rating of understanding developed as per working requirement on better execution of provisions under 14th Finance Commission, in total, out of 98.7 percent sample respondents who opined that the topic/issue was covered during training, 0.6 percent sample respondents rated it satisfactory followed by 24.7 percent sample respondents rated good, 48.0 percent sample respondents rated very good, 20.9 percent sample respondents rated excellent and 5.8 percent sample respondents rated outstanding (Table B 27).

Similarly, rating of whether better execution of provisions under 14th Finance Commission was useful in working under RGSA, in total, out of 98.7 percent sample respondents who opined that the topic/issue was covered during training, 1.9 percent sample respondents rated it satisfactory followed by 40.7 percent sample respondents rated good, 41.3 percent sample respondents rated very good, 12.2 percent sample respondents rated excellent and 3.9 percent sample respondents rated outstanding (Table B 28).

5) Better Execution of provisions under State Finance Commission

In total, 97.7 percent sample respondents reported that better execution of provisions under State Finance Commission were covered during training, whereas 2.3 percent sample respondents did not report for the same.

Similarly, rating of understanding developed as per working requirement on better execution of provisions under State Finance Commission, in total, out of 97.7 percent sample respondents who opined that the topic/issue was covered during training, 0.6 percent sample respondents rated it satisfactory followed by 23.7 percent sample respondents rated good, 50.9 percent sample respondents rated very good, 20.3 percent sample respondents rated excellent and 4.4 percent sample respondents rated outstanding (Table B 29).

Similarly, rating of whether better execution of provisions under State Finance Commission was useful in working under RGSA, in total, out of 97.7 percent sample respondents who opined that the topic/issue was covered during training, 1.8 percent sample respondents rated it satisfactory followed by 41.2 percent sample respondents rated good, 42.0 percent sample respondents rated very good, 11.4 percent sample respondents rated excellent and 3.6 percent sample respondents rated outstanding (Table B 30).

6) Training covered various programmes/schemes namely,MGNREGA, SBM, GPDP, DAY-NRLM, Water quality, Health etc.

In total, 97.3 percent sample respondents reported that various programmes/schemes namely, MGNREGA, SBM, GPDP, DAY-NRLM, Water quality, Health etc. were covered during training under RGSA, whereas 2.7 percent sample respondents did not report for the same.

Similarly, rating of understanding developed as per working requirement on various programmes/schemes namely,MGNREGA, SBM, GPDP, DAY-NRLM, Water quality, Health etc., in total, out of 97.3 percent sample respondents who opined that the topic/issue was covered during training, 0.8 percent sample respondents rated it satisfactory followed by 21.9 percent sample respondents rated good, 48.6 percent sample respondents rated very good, 22.8 percent sample respondents rated excellent and 5.9 percent sample respondents rated outstanding(Table B 31).

Similarly, rating of whether various programmes/schemes namely, MGNREGA, SBM, GPDP, DAY-NRLM, Water quality, Health etc was useful in working under RGSA, in total, out of 97.3 percent sample respondents who opined that the topic/issue was covered during training, 1.3 percent sample respondents rated it satisfactory followed by 40.6 percent sample respondents rated good, 40.9 percent sample respondents rated very good, 13.1 percent sample respondents rated excellent and 4.2 percent sample respondents rated outstanding(Table B 32).

7) Undergone capacity building trainings other than RGSA namely, SBM, NRLM,Water Quality, Health etc.

With regard to capacity building& trainings other than RGSA, it has covered various thematic areas namely, SBM, NRLM, Water Quality, Health etc. 94.8 percent sample respondents reported that they had undergone capacity building trainings whereas, 5.2 percent sample respondents did not report for the same.

Similarly, rating of understanding developed as per working requirement, in total, out of 94.8 percent sample respondents who opined that they had undergone capacity building trainings other than RGSA namely, SBM, NRLM, Water Quality, Health etc, 0.8 percent sample respondents rated it satisfactory followed by 21.7 percent sample respondents rated good, 50.1 percent sample respondents rated very good, 23 percent sample respondents rated excellent and 4.4 percent sample respondents rated outstanding (Table B 33).

Like-wise, regarding rating of usefulness in working under RGSA, in total, out of 94.8 percent sample respondents who opined that they had undergone capacity building trainings other than RGSA namely, SBM, NRLM, Water Quality, Health etc, 0.9 percent sample respondents rated it satisfactory followed by 40.6 percent sample respondents rated good, 43.0 percent sample respondents rated very good, 12.2 percent sample respondents rated excellent and 3.3 percent sample respondents rated outstanding (Table B 34).

8) Training in addition to RGSA namely, SBM, NRLM, Water quality, Health etc. organized

In total, 93.9 percent sample respondents reported that trainings in addition to RGSA namely, SBM, NRLM, Water quality, Health etc. were organized whereas 6.1 percent sample respondents did not report for the same.

Similarly, regarding rating of understanding developed as per working requirement, in total, out of 93.9 percent sample respondents who opined that trainings in addition to RGSA namely, SBM, NRLM, Water quality, Health etc. were organized, 0.6 percent sample respondents rated it satisfactory followed by 22.8 percent sample respondents rated good, 50 percent sample respondents rated very good, 22.5 percent sample respondents rated excellent and 4 percent sample respondents rated outstanding (Table B 35).

Like-wise, regarding rating of usefulness in working under RGSA, in total, out of 93.9 percent sample respondents who opined that trainings in addition to RGSA namely, SBM, NRLM, Water quality, Health etc. were organized, 0.9 percent sample respondents rated them satisfactory followed by 41.6 percent sample respondents rated good, 42.1 percent sample respondents rated very good, 12.5 percent sample respondents rated excellent and 2.9 percent sample respondents rated outstanding (Table B 36).

9) Sector Convergence

Organisation of training for sector convergence was reported by 92.7 percent sample respondents whereas, 7.3 percent sample respondents did not report for the same.

Regarding rating of understanding developed as per working requirement on training organisation for sector convergence, in total, out of 92.7 percent sample respondents who opined that trainings are organised for sector convergence, 0.8 percent sample respondents rated it satisfactory followed by 23.9 percent sample respondents rated good, 50.8 percent sample respondents rated very good, 20.1 percent sample respondents rated excellent and 4.4 percent sample respondents rated outstanding(Table B 37).

Similarly rating of whether training organized for sector convergence was useful in working under RGSA, in total, out of 92.7 percent sample respondents who opined that trainings are organised for sector convergence, 1.8 percent sample respondents rated it satisfactory followed by 42.6 percent sample respondents rated good, 41.4 percent sample respondents rated very good, 11.0 percent sample respondents rated excellent and 3.2 percent sample respondents rated outstanding (Table B 38).

10) Community organizations & related issues, conflicts in groups

The coverage of community organizations & related issues, conflicts in groups were reported by 92.1 percent sample respondents whereas, 7.9 percent sample respondents did not report for the same.

Regarding rating of understanding developed as per working requirement on community organizations & related issues, conflicts in groups, in total, out of 92.1 percent sample respondents who opined that community organizations & related issues, conflicts in groups were covered during training, 0.8 percent sample respondents rated it satisfactory followed by 25.4 percent sample respondents rated good, 50 percent sample respondents rated very good, 20.1 percent sample respondents rated excellent and 3.7 percent sample respondents rated outstanding (Table B 39).

Similarly rating of whether training organized for community organizations & related issues, conflicts in groups was useful in working under RGSA, in total, out of 92.1 percent sample respondents who opined that community organizations & related issues, conflicts in groups were covered during training, 1.7 percent sample respondents rated it satisfactory followed by 43.5 percent sample respondents rated good, 41 percent sample respondents rated very good, 10.9 percent sample respondents rated excellent and 2.9 percent sample respondents rated outstanding(Table B 40).

11) Understanding of the core issues of rural poverty

The core issues of rural poverty were covered during Capacity Building &94.8 percent sample respondents reported training under RGSA, whereas, the remaining 5.2 percent sample respondents did not report for the same. In lieu of response, either the session on core issues of rural poverty was not covered or may be the trainees were unable to recall it.

As far as rating of understanding developed as per working requirement on core issues of rural poverty is concerned, in total, out of 94.8 percent sample respondents who opined that core issues of rural poverty were covered during training, 1.0 percent sample respondents rated it satisfactory followed by 25.2 percent sample respondents rated good, 49.3 percent sample respondents rated very good, 20.4 percent sample respondents rated excellent and 4 percent sample respondents rated outstanding (Table B 41).

Similarly, regarding rating of whether training organized for core issues of rural poverty was useful in working under RGSA, in total, out of 94.8 percent sample respondents who opined that core issues of rural poverty were covered during training, 1.5 percent sample respondents rated it satisfactory followed by 44 percent sample respondents rated good, 40.3 percent sample respondents rated very good, 11.2 percent sample respondents rated excellent and 3 percent sample respondents rated outstanding (Table B 42).

12) Understanding of core issue of Inequality

In total, 92.5 percent sample respondents reported that core issue of inequality was covered during training under RGSA, whereas the remaining 7.5 percent sample respondents did not report for the same.

As far as rating of understanding developed as per working requirement on core issue of inequality is concerned, in total, out of 92.5 percent sample respondents who opined that core issue of inequality was covered during training, 1.1 percent sample respondents rated it satisfactory followed by 26.3 percent sample respondents rated good, 48.4 percent sample respondents rated very good, 20.9 percent sample respondents rated excellent and 3.3 percent sample respondents rated outstanding (Table B 43).

Similarly, regarding rating of whether training organized for core issue of inequality was useful in working under RGSA, in total, out of 92.5 percent sample respondents who opined that core issue of inequality was covered during training, 1.7 percent sample respondents rated it satisfactory followed by 44.3 percent sample respondents rated good, 40.1 percent sample respondents rated very good, 11.4 percent sample respondents rated excellent and 2.5 percent sample respondents rated outstanding (Table B 44).

13) Understanding of core issues of Poor Human Indices

In total, 88.9 percent sample respondents reported that core issue of poor human indices was covered during training under RGSA, whereas the remaining 11.1 percent sample respondents did not report for the same.

As far as rating of understanding developed as per working requirement on core issue of poor human indices is concerned, in total, out of 88.9 percent sample respondents who opined that core issue of poor human indices was covered during training, 1.2 percent sample respondents rated it satisfactory followed by 24.2 percent sample respondents rated good, 50 percent sample respondents rated very good, 21.6 percent sample respondents rated excellent and 2.9 percent sample respondents rated outstanding(Table B 45).

Similarly, regarding rating of whether training organized for core issues of poor human indices, was useful in working under RGSA, in total, out of 88.9 percent sample respondents who opined that core issue of poor human indices was covered during training, 1.5 percent sample respondents rated it satisfactory followed by 40.7 percent sample respondents rated good, 42.7 percent sample respondents rated very good, 12.8 percent sample respondents rated excellent and 2.2 percent sample respondents rated outstanding(Table B 46).

14) Understanding of core issues of unemployment

In total, 93.7 percent sample respondents reported that core issue of unemployment was covered during training under RGSA, whereas the remaining 6.3 percent sample respondents did not report for the same.

As far as rating of understanding developed as per working requirement on core issues of unemployment is concerned, in total, out of 93.7 percent sample respondents who opined that core issue of unemployment was covered during training, 0.9 percent sample respondents rated it satisfactory followed by 23.5 percent sample respondents rated good, 49.6 percent sample respondents rated very good, 21.9 percent sample respondents rated excellent and 4 percent sample respondents rated outstanding (Table B 47).

Similarly, regarding rating of whether training organized for core issue of unemployment was useful in working under RGSA, in total, out of 93.7 percent sample respondents who opined that core issues of unemployment was covered during training, 1.3 percent sample respondents rated it satisfactory followed by 40.6 percent sample respondents rated good, 42.6 percent sample respondents rated very good, 11.7 percent sample respondents rated excellent and 3.8 percent sample respondents rated outstanding(Table B 48).

15) GP fund & its importance

In total, 98.8 percent sample respondents reported that GP fund & its importance were covered during training under RGSA, whereas the remaining 1.2 percent sample respondents did not report for the same.

As far as rating of understanding developed as per working requirement on GP fund & its importance is concerned, in total, out of 98.8 percent sample respondents who opined that GP fund & its importance were covered during training, 0.5 percent sample respondents rated it satisfactory followed by 24 percent sample respondents rated good, 48.8 percent sample respondents rated very good, 21.3 percent sample respondents rated excellent and 5.4 percent sample respondents rated outstanding(Table B 49).

Similarly, rating of whether training organized for GP fund & its importance was useful in working under RGSA, in total, out of 98.8 percent sample respondents who opined that GP fund & its importance was covered during training, 1.1 percent sample respondents rated it satisfactory followed by 39.5 percent sample respondents rated good, 43.7 percent sample respondents rated very good, 11.1 percent sample respondents rated excellent and 4.5 percent sample respondents rated outstanding (Table B 50).

16) Importance of Participatory development

In total, 97.5 percent sample respondents reported that importance of participatory development was covered during training under RGSA, whereas the remaining 2.5 percent sample respondents did not report for the same.

As far as rating of understanding developed as per working requirement on importance of participatory development is concerned, in total, out of 97.5 percent sample respondents who opined that importance of participatory development was covered during training, 0.7 percent sample respondents rated it satisfactory followed by 24.4 percent sample respondents rated good, 48.6 percent sample respondents rated very good, 22 percent sample respondents rated excellent and 4.2 percent sample respondents rated outstanding (Table B 51).

Similarly, rating of whether training organized for importance of participatory development was useful in working under RGSA, in total, out of 97.5 percent sample respondents who opined that importance of participatory development was covered during training, 1.3 percent sample respondents rated it satisfactory followed by 41.6 percent sample respondents rated good, 41.6 percent sample respondents rated very good, 11.9 percent sample respondents rated excellent and 3.6 percent sample respondents rated outstanding (Table B 52).

17) Developing understanding about gender

Out of total, 91.8 percent sample respondents reported that developing understanding about gender was covered during training under RGSA, whereas the remaining 8.2 percent sample respondents did not report for the same.

As far as rating of understanding developed as per working requirement on developing understanding about gender is concerned, in total, out of 91.8 percent sample respondents who opined that developing understanding about gender was covered during training, 1 percent sample respondents rated it satisfactory followed by 25.2 percent sample respondents rated good, 47.9 percent sample respondents rated very good, 21.6 percent sample respondents rated excellent and 4.3 percent sample respondents rated outstanding (Table B 53).

Similarly, regarding rating of whether training organized for developing understanding about gender was useful in working under RGSA, in total, out of 91.8 percent sample respondents who opined that developing understanding about gender was covered during training, 1.3 percent sample respondents rated it satisfactory followed by 42.6 percent sample respondents rated good, 41.4 percent sample respondents rated very good, 11.1 percent sample respondents rated excellent and 3.7 percent sample respondents rated outstanding (Table B 54).

18) Gender & its relation with development

Majority of sample respondents (90.9 percent) reported that gender& its relation with development were covered during training under RGSA, whereas the remaining 9.1 percent sample respondents did not report for the same.

As far as rating of understanding developed as per working requirement on gender& its relation with development is concerned, in total, out of 90.9 percent sample respondents who opined that gender& its relation with development was covered during training, 0.9 percent sample respondents rated it satisfactory followed by 24.5 percent sample respondents rated good, 48.7 percent sample respondents rated very good, 21.2 percent sample respondents rated excellent and 4.8 percent sample respondents rated outstanding (Table B 55).

Similarly, regarding rating of whether training organized for gender& its relation with development was useful in working under RGSA, in total, out of 90.9 percent sample respondents who opined that gender& its relation with development was covered during training, 1.5 percent sample respondents rated it satisfactory followed by 41.6 percent sample respondents rated good, 41.6 percent sample respondents rated very good, 12 percent sample respondents rated excellent and 3.4 percent sample respondents rated outstanding (Table B 56).

19) Planning through Justice

In total, 92 percent sample respondents reported that planning through justice was covered during training under RGSA, whereas the remaining 8 percent sample respondents did not report for the same.

As far as rating of understanding developed as per working requirement on planning through justice is concerned, in total, out of 92 percent sample respondents who opined that planning through justice was covered during training, 0.8 percent sample respondents rated it satisfactory followed by 24.4 percent sample respondents rated good, 48.4 percent sample respondents rated very good, 21.8 percent sample respondents rated excellent and 4.6 percent sample respondents rated outstanding (Table B 57).

Similarly, regarding rating of whether training organized for planning through justice was useful in working under RGSA, in total, out of 92 percent sample respondents who opined that planning through justice was covered during training, 1.1 percent sample respondents rated it satisfactory followed by 42.7 percent sample respondents rated good, 41.2 percent sample respondents rated very good, 11.5 percent sample respondents rated excellent and 3.5 percent sample respondents rated outstanding (Table B 58).

20) Better Understanding of Village level Institutions: (Watershed Committee, SHGs, User Group) concept, nature & need

Out of the total, 96.2 percent sample respondents reported that better understanding of village level institutions was covered during training under RGSA, whereas the remaining 3.8 percent sample respondents did not report for the same.

As far as rating of understanding developed as per working requirement on understanding of village level institutions is concerned, in total, out of 96.2 percent sample respondents who opined that understanding of village level institutions was covered during training, 0.5 percent sample respondents rated it satisfactory followed by 23.9 percent sample respondents rated good, 49.3 percent sample respondents rated very good, 21.7 percent sample respondents rated excellent and 4.6 percent sample respondents rated outstanding (Table B 59).

Similarly, regarding rating of whether training organized for understanding of village level institution was useful in working under RGSA, in total, out of 96.2 percent sample respondents who opined that understanding of village level institutions was covered during training, 0.9 percent sample respondents rated it satisfactory followed by 42.0 percent sample respondents rated good, 41.6 percent sample respondents rated very good, 12 percent sample respondents rated excellent and 3.5 percent sample respondents rated outstanding (Table B 60) .

21) Social work, social issues & responsible factors

In total, 95.2 percent sample respondents reported that social work, social issues & responsible factors were covered during training under RGSA, whereas the remaining 4.8 percent sample respondents did not report for the same.

As far as rating of understanding developed as per working requirement on social work, social issues & responsible factors is concerned, in total, out of 95.2 percent sample respondents who opined that social work, social issues & responsible factors were covered during training, 0.8 percent sample respondents rated it satisfactory followed by 24.7 percent sample respondents rated good, 48.6 percent sample respondents rated very good, 21.8 percent sample respondents rated excellent and 4.1 percent sample respondents rated outstanding (Table B 61).

Similarly, regarding rating of whether training organized for social work, social issues & responsible factors was useful in working under RGSA, in total, out of 95.2 percent sample respondents who opined that social work, social issues & responsible factors were covered during training, 1.5 percent sample respondents rated it satisfactory followed by 43.0 percent sample respondents rated good, 40.6 percent sample respondents rated very good, 11.8 percent sample respondents rated excellent and 3.1 percent sample respondents rated outstanding (Table B 62).

22) Social development, method, nature & concept

Out of the total sample respondents, 94.6 percent sample respondents reported that social development, method, nature & concept were covered during training under RGSA, whereas the remaining 5.4 percent sample respondents did not report for the same.

As far as rating of understanding developed as per working requirement on social development, method, nature & concept is concerned, in total, out of 94.6 percent sample respondents who opined that social development, method, nature & concept were covered during training, 0.6 percent sample respondents rated it satisfactory followed by 25.7 percent sample respondents rated good, 47.1 percent sample respondents rated very good, 22.4 percent sample respondents rated excellent and 4.2 percent sample respondents rated outstanding (Table B 63).

Similarly, regarding rating of whether training organized for social development, method, nature & concept was useful in working under RGSA, in total, out of 94.6 percent sample respondents who opined that social development, method, nature & concept were covered during training, 1.2 percent sample respondents rated it satisfactory followed by 42.1 percent sample respondents rated good, 42.5 percent sample respondents rated very good, 11.2 percent sample respondents rated excellent and 2.9 percent sample respondents rated outstanding (Table B 64).

23) Skill to work with different social groups

Out of the total, 96.7 percent sample respondents reported that skills to work with different social groups were covered during training under RGSA, whereas the remaining 3.3 percent sample respondents did not report for the same.

As far as rating of understanding developed as per working requirement on skills to work with different social groups is concerned, in total, out of 96.7 percent sample respondents who opined that skills to work with different social groups were covered during training, 1 percent sample respondents rated it satisfactory followed by 24.5 percent sample respondents rated good, 47.8 percent sample respondents rated very good, 22.1 percent sample respondents rated excellent and 4.6 percent sample respondents rated outstanding (Table B 65).

Similarly, regarding rating of whether training organized for skill to work with different social groups was useful in working under RGSA, in total, out of 96.7 percent sample respondents who opined that skills to work with different social groups were covered during training, 1.4 percent sample respondents rated it satisfactory followed by 40.8 percent sample respondents rated good,

42.9 percent sample respondents rated very good, 11.4 percent sample respondents rated excellent and 3.5 percent sample respondents rated outstanding (Table B 66).

24) Attitude &Behavior change

A total of 97.4 percent sample respondents reported that attitude & behavior change were covered during training under RGSA, whereas the remaining 2.4 percent sample respondents did not report for the same.

As far as rating of understanding developed as per working requirement on attitude &behavior change is concerned, in total, out of 97.4 percent sample respondents who opined that attitude &behavior change were covered during training, 0.7 percent sample respondents rated it satisfactory followed by 23.3 percent sample respondents rated good, 48.2 percent sample respondents rated very good, 22.9 percent sample respondents rated excellent and 5 percent sample respondents rated outstanding (Table B 67).

Similarly, regarding rating of whether training organized for attitude &behavior change was useful in working under RGSA, in total, out of 97.4 percent sample respondents who opined that attitude &behavior change was covered during training, 1.6 percent sample respondents rated it satisfactory followed by 39.5 percent sample respondents rated good, 43.8 percent sample respondents rated very good, 11.2 percent sample respondents rated excellent and 3.9 percent sample respondents rated outstanding (Table B 68).

25) Development of better communication skill & leadership qualities

In total, 98.2 percent sample respondents reported that development of better communication skill & leadership qualities were covered during training under RGSA, whereas the remaining 1.8 percent sample respondents did not report for the same.

As far as rating of understanding developed as per working requirement to develop better communication skill & leadership qualities is concerned, in total, out of 98.2 percent sample respondents who opined that development of better communication skill & leadership qualities were covered during training, 0.5 percent sample respondents rated it satisfactory followed by 22.9 percent sample respondents rated good, 47 percent sample respondents rated very good, 24.3 percent sample respondents rated excellent and 5.3 percent sample respondents rated outstanding (Table B 69).

Similarly, regarding rating of whether training organized for development of better communication skill & leadership qualities was useful in working under RGSA, in total, out of 98.2 percent sample respondents who opined that development of better communication skills & leadership qualities were covered during training, 1.4 percent sample respondents rated it satisfactory followed by 39 percent sample respondents rated good, 43.6 percent sample respondents rated very good, 12 percent sample respondents rated excellent and 4 percent sample respondents rated outstanding (Table B 70).

26) Preparing Detailed Project Report (DPR) for the consideration of Gram Sabha-GPDP/ Development Plan

Trainees talk positively about the capacity building trainings in which they have participated. Total 97.8 percent sample respondents reported that preparing detailed project report (DPR) for the consideration of Gram Sabha-GPDP/ development plan was covered during training under RGSA, whereas the remaining 2.2 percent sample respondents did not report for the same.

As far as rating of understanding developed as per working requirement on preparing detailed project report (DPR) for the consideration of Gram Sabha-GPDP/ development plan is concerned, in total, out of 97.8 percent sample respondents who opined that preparing detailed project report (DPR) for the consideration of Gram Sabha-GPDP/ development plan were covered during training, 0.4 percent sample respondents rated it satisfactory followed by 23.4 percent sample

respondents rated good, 47.3 percent sample respondents rated very good, 23.9 percent sample respondents rated excellent and 5.1 percent sample respondents rated outstanding (Table B 71).

Similarly, regarding rating of whether training organized for preparing detailed project report (DPR) for the consideration of Gram Sabha-GPDP/ development plan was useful in working under RGSA, in total, out of 97.8 percent sample respondents who opined that preparing detailed project report (DPR) for the consideration of Gram Sabha-GPDP/ development plan was covered during training, 0.9 percent sample respondents rated it satisfactory followed by 39.3 percent sample respondents rated good, 43.2 percent sample respondents rated very good, 12.8 percent sample respondents rated excellent and 3.8 percent sample respondents rated outstanding (Table B 72).

27) Help in getting acquainted with Digital inclusiveness- using mobile apps, GIS/GPS based tracking of assets/works/ using online data management system etc.

Digital inclusiveness was also reported significant. In total, 83.6 percent sample respondents reported that training under RGSA helped in getting acquainted with digital inclusiveness, whereas the remaining 16.4 percent sample respondents did not report for the same.

As far as rating of understanding developed as per working requirement on getting acquainted with digital inclusiveness is concerned, in total, out of 83.6 percent sample respondents who opined that getting acquainted with digital inclusiveness was covered during training, 0.7 percent sample respondents rated it satisfactory followed by 19.5 percent sample respondents rated good, 53.7 percent sample respondents rated very good, 20.9 percent sample respondents rated excellent and 5.2 percent sample respondents rated outstanding (Table B 73).

Similarly, regarding rating of whether training organized for getting acquainted with digital inclusiveness was useful in working under RGSA, in total, out of 83.6 percent sample respondents who opined that preparing detailed project report (DPR) for the consideration of Gram Sabha-GPDP/ development plan was covered during training, 1.5 percent sample respondents rated it satisfactory followed by 40 percent sample respondents rated good, 42.8 percent sample respondents rated very good, 11.6 percent sample respondents rated excellent and 4.1 percent sample respondents rated outstanding (Table B 74).

28) Understanding importance of e-governance, online (ICT) or e-enablement of Panchayats

On the issue of importance of e-governance, 80.9 percent sample respondents reported that training under RGSA helped in understanding importance of e-governance, online (ICT) or e-enablement of Panchayats, whereas the remaining 19.1 percent sample respondents did not report for the same.

As far as rating of understanding developed as per working requirement on understanding importance of e-governance, online (ICT) or e-enablement of Panchayats is concerned, in total, out of 80.9 percent sample respondents who opined that understanding importance of e-governance, online (ICT) or e-enablement of Panchayats was covered during training, 0.9 percent sample respondents rated it satisfactory followed by 22.6 percent sample respondents rated good, 51.8 percent sample respondents rated very good, 19.7 percent sample respondents rated excellent and 5.0 percent sample respondents rated outstanding (Table B 75).

Similarly, regarding rating of whether training organized for getting understanding importance of e-governance, online (ICT) or e-enablement of Panchayats was useful in working under RGSA, in total, out of 80.9 percent sample respondents who opined that understanding importance of e-governance, online (ICT) or e-enablement of Panchayats was covered during training, 1.8 percent sample respondents rated it satisfactory followed by 43.4 percent sample respondents rated good, 40.2 percent sample respondents rated very good, 10 percent sample respondents rated excellent and 4.6 percent sample respondents rated outstanding (Table B 76).

State Rank Analysis

On giving due weightage to these responses, when we index and rank state's performance across different indicators, a more vivid picture emerges. Detailed state-wise ranks across 28 indicators discussed above are presented in Table 3.14 and 3.15. However, an aggregate picture of performance across states is also derived. In terms of the understanding developed as per the working requirement, it is observed that the impact of trainings has been the highest in the case of Uttarakhand. Similar has been the case with Himachal Pradesh where the respondents rated their responses very high while indicating the relevance of training in developing understanding as per working requirement across different aspects. Other better performing states have been Karnataka, Maharashtra, Orissa, Assam, Sikkim and Kerala. But, the performance of states like Haryana, Arunachal Pradesh, Goa etc. has been found consistently low across these indicators.

Figure 3.30: Ranks across Sates

Similar to the above analysis, a detailed analysis of the responses about the usefulness of the training program about its various aspects reveals that the state of Karnataka has been the best performing state. Similarly, high performance has been recorded by the state of Himachal Pradesh. In fact, the responses in both these states along with Kerala and Assam indicate that the training program has been very much instrumental in developing an understanding about various aspects helpful in working under RGSA. The state of Maharashtra is rated relatively low along with Sikkim, Gujarat and Uttarakhand. On the other hand, the usefulness of the training program to work under RGSA is rated very low in the case of Haryana, Arunachal Pradesh, Goa, Madhya Pradesh, West Bengal, Orissa, Andhra Pradesh and Rajasthan. It may also be noted that the degree of dissatisfaction with the training program has been relatively high in Haryana in contrast to other poor performing states.

Figure 3.31: Ranks across Sates

Table 3.14: State Ranks: Understanding Developed in Trainings as per Working Requirement

	Over-all	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28
Andhra Pradesh	15	15	14	13	16	17	15	16	16	15	15	15	15	13	15	14	16	15	14	13	11	12	12	11	12	14	11	12	10
Arunachal Pradesh	17	18	4	18	4	9	18	17	17	7	18	18	18	18	18	7	8	18	18	18	18	18	18	13	11	6	3	17	16
Assam	6	5	5	7	10	8	6	6	5	8	6	6	7	6	7	8	7	7	7	6	7	7	5	7	8	8	7	6	6
Goa	16	16	17	17	17	14	16	18	18	17	16	17	17	16	16	17	17	16	16	16	16	16	16	17	17	16	18	16	15
Gujarat	9	9	10	9	9	10	7	7	8	10	9	8	9	8	9	10	9	9	8	8	9	9	8	8	9	9	9	7	7
Haryana	18	17	18	16	18	18	17	15	15	18	17	16	16	17	17	18	18	17	17	17	17	17	17	18	18	18	17	18	17
Himachal Pradesh	2	3	2	2	2	2	3	2	2	3	1	1	2	1	3	4	2	2	2	2	2	3	4	2	2	1	2	4	5
Jharkhand	14	14	15	15	15	16	14	14	14	16	14	14	14	12	13	15	15	13	13	15	15	14	15	15	16	17	15	14	14
Karnataka	3	2	3	5	3	4	5	3	3	4	2	3	3	3	2	2	3	3	3	3	3	2	1	3	3	4	5	2	4
Kerala	8	6	5	6	7	5	9	9	9	9	8	9	8	7	5	6	5	4	6	7	8	8	7	5	5	5	16	15	18
Madhya Pradesh	13	13	16	14	14	15	13	13	13	14	13	13	12	15	14	16	14	14	15	12	14	15	14	14	15	15	14	13	13
Maharashtra	4	4	7	3	6	7	4	4	7	5	4	4	4	4	4	5	4	6	4	4	4	4	3	4	4	3	4	3	2
Orissa	5	8	9	8	8	6	8	5	6	6	7	7	6	5	6	9	6	5	5	5	5	5	6	6	7	7	6	5	3
Rajasthan	11	11	12	11	11	11	10	12	12	13	10	11	13	10	8	11	10	11	12	10	13	13	11	12	14	11	13	10	9
Sikkim	7	7	8	4	5	3	1	8	4	2	5	5	5	14	12	3	13	8	11	14	6	6	13	16	6	10	8	9	8
Uttar Pradesh	10	10	11	10	12	12	11	10	10	12	11	10	10	9	10	12	11	10	9	9	10	10	9	9	10	12	10	8	12
Uttarakhand	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	3	2	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	2	1	1	1
West Bengal	12	12	13	12	13	13	12	11	11	11	12	12	11	11	11	13	12	12	10	11	12	11	10	10	13	13	12	11	11

1) Planning & management of Gram Panchayat functions, core areas, Governance, Social inclusion, Gender inequality, economic development & social justice; 2) Baseline data collection & situational analysis & development of GPDP; 3) Training covered various thematic areas of importance-Drinking water/ Sanitation/Rural Development/Social Justice/ Health & Hygiene/ Women Development/ Children development/ Education etc.; 4) Better Execution of provisions under 14th Finance Commission; 5) Better Execution of provisions under State Finance Commission; 6) Training covered various programmes/schemes namely, MGNREGA, SBM, GPDP, DAY-NRLM, Water quality, Health etc.; 7) Undergone capacity building trainings other than RGSA namely, SBM, NRLM, Water Quality, Health etc.; 8) Training in addition to RGSA namely, SBM, NRLM, Water quality, Health etc. organized; 9) Training organized for sector convergence; 10) Community organization & related issues, conflicts in groups; 11) Understanding of the core issues of Rural Poverty; 12) Understanding of the core issues of Inequality; 13) Understanding of the core issues of Poor Human Indices; 14) Understanding of core issues of unemployment; 15) GP Fund & its importance; 16) Importance of Participatory Development; 17) Developing understanding about gender; 18) Gender & its relation with development; 19) Planning through justice; 20) Better understanding of Village level institutions: (Watershed Committee, Self Help Group, User Group) concept, nature & need; 21) Social work, social issues & responsible factors; 22) Social development, method, nature & concepts; 23) Skill to work with different social groups; 24) Attitude & behaviour change; 25) Develop better communication skill & leadership qualities; 26) Preparing Detailed Project Report (DPR) for the consideration of Gram Sabha; 27) Help in getting acquainted with Digital inclusiveness- using mobile apps, GIS/GPS based tracking of assets/works/ using online data management system etc.; 28) Understanding importance of e-governance, online (ICT) or e-enablement of Panchayats

Table 3.15: State Ranks: Usefulness in Working under RGSA

	Over-all	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28
Andhra Pradesh	12	11	12	11	15	16	13	15	14	12	15	12	14	11	12	10	11	15	14	13	10	11	10	8	10	10	8	7	6
Arunachal Pradesh	17	18	6	17	5	8	17	16	16	10	18	18	18	18	18	8	9	18	18	18	17	18	18	10	9	5	5	17	16
Assam	4	6	5	6	6	5	7	6	5	4	4	6	6	3	4	6	5	4	4	3	5	5	4	4	5	8	7	5	5
Goa	16	16	16	15	17	17	16	17	18	17	16	16	16	16	14	16	17	16	16	15	15	14	15	16	16	14	16	13	13
Gujarat	7	7	8	7	7	7	6	7	7	8	7	7	7	6	7	7	7	8	7	6	7	7	6	6	7	7	6	8	10
Haryana	18	17	18	18	18	18	18	18	17	18	17	17	17	17	17	18	18	17	17	17	18	17	17	18	18	18	18	18	17
Himachal Pradesh	2	2	3	3	2	2	3	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	3	3	1	2	2	3	2	2	2	3	2	1	2	4
Jharkhand	10	9	11	9	11	11	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	11	13	13	10	10	10	11	10	9	12	12	13	11	9	7
Karnataka	1	1	1	2	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	1
Kerala	3	4	4	3	4	4	4	4	4	3	3	4	3	4	3	2	2	3	3	4	4	4	3	3	2	3	13	10	18
Madhya Pradesh	15	15	17	16	16	15	15	14	15	16	14	15	15	15	16	17	16	14	15	16	16	16	16	17	17	17	17	15	14
Maharashtra	5	5	7	5	8	6	5	5	6	5	6	5	5	5	5	5	4	6	5	5	6	6	5	5	6	6	4	3	2
Orissa	13	12	13	13	13	13	12	12	11	11	12	11	11	12	13	14	14	12	11	12	13	13	13	15	14	16	15	14	12
Rajasthan	11	13	14	12	10	10	10	11	12	13	10	13	12	13	9	11	12	11	12	11	12	12	12	13	13	11	12	11	9
Sikkim	6	3	2	1	3	3	1	3	3	6	5	3	4	8	8	4	8	5	8	8	2	3	8	9	4	4	3	12	11
Uttar Pradesh	9	10	10	10	12	12	11	10	10	14	11	10	10	10	10	12	10	9	9	9	9	9	11	11	11	12	10	6	8
Uttarakhand	8	8	9	8	9	9	8	8	8	7	8	8	8	7	6	9	6	7	6	7	8	8	7	7	8	9	9	4	3
West Bengal	14	14	15	14	14	14	14	13	13	15	13	14	13	14	15	15	15	13	13	14	14	15	14	14	15	15	14	16	15

1) Planning & management of Gram Panchayat functions, core areas, Governance, Social inclusion, Gender inequality, economic development & social justice; 2) Baseline data collection & situational analysis & development of GPDP; 3) Training covered various thematic areas of importance-Drinking water/ Sanitation/Rural Development/Social Justice/ Health & Hygiene/ Women Development/ Children development/ Education etc.; 4) Better Execution of provisions under 14th Finance Commission; 5) Better Execution of provisions under State Finance Commission; 6) Training covered various programmes/schemes namely, MGNREGA, SBM, GPDP, DAY-NRLM, Water quality, Health etc.; 7) Undergone capacity building trainings other than RGSA namely, SBM, NRLM, Water Quality, Health etc.; 8) Training in addition to RGSA namely, SBM, NRLM, Water quality, Health etc. organized; 9) Training organized for sector convergence; 10) Community organization & related issues, conflicts in groups; 11) Understanding of the core issues of Rural Poverty; 12) Understanding of the core issues of Inequality; 13) Understanding of the core issues of Poor Human Indices; 14) Understanding of core issues of unemployment; 15) GP Fund & its importance; 16) Importance of Participatory Development; 17) Developing understanding about gender; 18) Gender & its relation with development; 19) Planning through justice; 20) Better understanding of Village level institutions: (Watershed Committee, Self Help Group, User Group) concept, nature & need; 21) Social work, social issues & responsible factors; 22) Social development, method, nature & concepts; 23) Skill to work with different social groups; 24) Attitude & behaviour change; 25) Develop better communication skill & leadership qualities; 26) Preparing Detailed Project Report (DPR) for the consideration of Gram Sabha; 27) Help in getting acquainted with Digital inclusiveness- using mobile apps, GIS/GPS based tracking of assets/works/ using online data management system etc.; 28) Understanding importance of e-governance, online (ICT) or e-enablement of Panchayats

D. Outcome of Trainings

The Capacity building & Trainings of functionaries of Panchayat - Zilla Panchayat, Block Panchayat and Gram Panchayat certainly helped in developing better understanding on various schemes and programs, their roles and responsibilities, do's & don'ts etc. It also helped in getting know about the ins and outs of the various programmes related to GPDP, DAY-NRLM, SBM, MGNREGA etc (Table B 77).

1) Developed confidence & increased sense of responsibility for economic development, people participation & social justice

The important aspect for functionaries is development of confidence and sense of responsibilities. It has reported positive impact as 96.8 percent sample respondents reported that training helped in developing confidence & increased sense of responsibility for economic development, people participation & social justice, whereas the remaining 3.2 percent sample respondents did not report for the same. Regarding rating by the sample respondents to the extent the same was beneficial for undertaking roles/ responsibilities,0.6 percent sample respondents rated the same as satisfactory followed by 23.3 percent sample respondents rated good, 49.3 percent sample respondents rated very good, 22.5 percent sample respondents rated excellent & 4.4 percent sample respondents rated outstanding (Table B 77).

2) Better approach & working for planning & management of functioning of Gram Panchayat core areas- Governance, Social Inclusion, Gender inequality, economic development & social justice

On the issue of training helped in developing better approach & working for planning & management of functioning of Gram Panchayat core areas,96.2 percent sample respondents reported beneficial whereas, 3.8 percent sample respondents did not report for the same. Further, regarding rating by the sample respondents to the extent the same was beneficial for undertaking roles/ responsibilities,0.4 percent sample respondents rated the same as satisfactory followed by 24.7 percent sample respondents rated good, 47.7 percent sample respondents rated very good, 21.9 percent sample respondents rated excellent & 5.4 percent sample respondents rated outstanding (Table B 78).

3) Undertaking baseline data collection & situational analysis & development of GP development plan

Favouring usefulness of CB&T for functionaries, 97.5 percent sample respondents reported that training helped in undertaking baseline data collection & situational analysis & development of GP development plan, whereas 2.5 percent sample respondents did not report for the same. Regarding rating by the sample respondents to the extent the same was beneficial for undertaking roles/ responsibilities,0.6 percent sample respondents rated the same as satisfactory followed by 24.6 percent sample respondents rated good, 47.7 percent sample respondents rated very good, 21.6 percent sample respondents rated excellent & 5.5 percent sample respondents rated outstanding (Table B 79).

4) Better understanding of village issues & required action to be taken- Drinking water/ sanitation/ rural development/ social justice/ health & hygiene/ women development/ children development/ education etc

CB&T under RGSA helped in developing better understanding of issues related to village and village development favored by 98 percent sample respondents reported that training helped in better understanding of village issues & required action to be taken, whereas 2 percent sample respondent did not report for the same. Like-wise, rating by the sample respondents to the extent the same was beneficial for undertaking roles/ responsibilities,0.7 percent sample respondents rated the same as satisfactory followed by 23.7 percent sample respondents rated good, 46.2

percent sample respondents rated very good, 22 percent sample respondents rated excellent & 7.5 percent sample respondents rated outstanding (Table B 80).

5) Help in understanding Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) in Gram Panchayat perspectives-poverty, gender, social justice etc.

In terms of understanding of the development and sustainable development, 96.2 percent sample respondents opined that training helped in understanding Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) in gram Panchayat perspectives-poverty, gender, social justice etc, whereas the remaining 3.8 percent sample respondents did not report for the same. Regarding rating by the sample respondents to the extent the same was beneficial for undertaking roles/ responsibilities,0.4 percent sample respondents rated the same as satisfactory followed by 25.7 percent sample respondents rated good, 46.3 percent sample respondents rated very good, 22.2 percent sample respondents rated excellent & 5.4 percent sample respondents rated outstanding (Table B 81).

6) Able to manage community organization & related issues & conflict in better way

Management skills amongst the Panchayat functionaries of all three levels are must. The CB&T under RGSA helped in developing ability to manage community organization issues and conflict was reported by 95.2 percent sample respondents whereas, 4.8 percent sample respondents did not opt for the same. Regarding rating by the sample respondents to the extent the same was beneficial for undertaking roles/ responsibilities,1.1 percent sample respondents rated the same as satisfactory followed by 27.9 percent sample respondents rated good, 45.1 percent sample respondents rated very good, 21.6 percent sample respondents rated excellent & 4.3 percent sample respondents rated outstanding (Table B 82).

7) Better understanding of the core issues of rural poverty

The training has developed better understanding on the poverty issue reported by 98 percent sample respondents, whereas, 2 percent sample respondents did not report for the same. Regarding rating by the sample respondents to the extent the same was beneficial for undertaking roles/ responsibilities,1 percent sample respondents rated the same as satisfactory followed by 26.8 percent sample respondents rated good, 47 percent sample respondents rated very good, 20.3 percent sample respondents rated excellent & 4.9 percent sample respondents rated outstanding (Table B 83).

8) Training organized covering various programmes/schemes namely, MGNREGA, SBM, GPDP, DAY-NRLM etc. helped in improving the performance of execution in the Panchayat

Out of the total, 98.6 percent sample respondents opined that training helped them in improving the performance of execution of various programmes in the Panchayat, whereas 1.4 percent sample respondents did not opt for the same. Regarding rating by the sample respondents to the extent the same was beneficial for undertaking roles/ responsibilities,0.6 percent sample respondents rated the same as satisfactory followed by 24 percent sample respondents rated good, 46.2 percent sample respondents rated very good, 23.3 percent sample respondents rated excellent & 5.9 percent sample respondents rated outstanding (Table B 84).

9) Training in addition to RGSA namely, SBM, NRLM, Water quality, Health etc. found effective & useful in Gram Panchayat

There were different programmes being implemented in Gram Panchayats related to Health, Sanitation, Income Generation, skill development and Social Justice. In total, 97 percent sample respondents reported that trainings in addition to RGSA namely, SBM, NRLM, Water quality, Health etc. were found effective & useful in gram Panchayat, whereas 3 percent sample respondents did not report for the same. Like-wise, regarding rating by the sample respondents to the extent the same was beneficial for undertaking roles/ responsibilities,0.4 percent sample respondents rated the same as satisfactory followed by 24.2 percent sample respondents rated

good, 48.6 percent sample respondents rated very good, 21.2 percent sample respondents rated excellent & 5.6 percent sample respondents rated outstanding (Table B 85).

10) Developed better understanding importance of e-governance, online (ICT) or e-enablement of Panchayats

In today's world, ICT and e-Governance are the important areas, which help in effective execution, monitoring and reporting of the development programmes at Panchayat level. Out of the total, 87.8 percent sample respondents reported that training helped them in developing better understanding importance of e-governance, online (ICT) or e-enablement of Panchayats, whereas 12.2 percent sample respondents did not report for the same. Regarding rating by the sample respondents to the extent the same was beneficial for undertaking roles/ responsibilities,1 percent sample respondents rated the same as satisfactory followed by 24 percent sample respondents rated good, 48.9 percent sample respondents rated very good, 21.1 percent sample respondents rated excellent & 5 percent sample respondents rated outstanding (Table B 86).

11) Able to take Gram Panchayat development work as per government norms & people's requirements

Rules, regulations and norms were followed by Gram Panchayat. 97.4 percent sample respondents reported that training enabled them to take gram Panchayat development work as per government norms & people's requirements, whereas 2.6 percent sample respondents did not report for the same. Regarding rating by the sample respondents to the extent the same was beneficial for undertaking roles/ responsibilities,0.5 percent sample respondents rated the same as satisfactory followed by 23.3 percent sample respondents rated good, 50.9 percent sample respondents rated very good, 20.5 percent sample respondents rated excellent & 4.8 percent sample respondents rated outstanding (Table B 87).

12) Able to manage development work/ programmes/ Abhiyan as per government norms & people's requirements

Out of the total, 95.9 percent sample respondents reported that training enabled them to manage development work/ programmes/ Abhiyan as per government norms & people's requirements, whereas 4.1 percent sample respondents did not report for the same. Regarding rating by the sample respondents to the extent the same was beneficial for undertaking roles/ responsibilities,1.1 percent sample respondents rated the same as satisfactory followed by 27.9 percent sample respondents rated good, 45.1 percent sample respondents rated very good, 21.4 percent sample respondents rated excellent & 4.5 percent sample respondents rated outstanding (Table B 88).

13) Is Plan developed in the Gram Panchayat? If "Yes" then rating on five point scale

Development plan of Gram Panchayat is an important element under RGSA. In total, 96.5 percent sample respondents reported that plan was developed in the Gram Panchayat, whereas 3.5 percent sample respondents did not report for the same. Regarding rating by sample respondents of Gram Panchayat plan, 0.6 percent sample respondents rated the same as satisfactory followed by 28 percent sample respondents rated good, 45.2 percent sample respondents rated very good, 20.2 percent sample respondents rated excellent &5.9 percent sample respondents rated outstanding (Table B 89).

14) Impart training to other functionaries &Panchayat members on the subject you have been trained

Practicing what has been learnt is the important outcome. Almost 2/3rd (69.5 percent) sample respondents reported that they could give training to other functionaries &Panchayat members on the subject they had been trained, whereas 30.5 percent sample respondents did not opt for the same (Table B 90).

113478/2020/789

Best Practices – Outcome of Training in sample States

Display of various Schemes of Gram Panchayat in Dharampur Gram Panchayat district Solan, HP

Gram Panchayat executed Organic Farming, Haridwar District

Best Practices – Outcome of Training in sample States

Gram Panchayat supporting economic development activities for SHG member in Gumla Block, Jharkhand

PRI showing Quality CC road with drainage in Ganjam district, Oddisha

15) Retention of the subjects on which training imparted under RGSA

A good percentage i.e. 64.4 percent sample respondents reported that they had retention of the subjects on which they had been given training under RGSA, whereas 35.6 percent sample respondents did not opt for the same (Table B 91).

Undertaking e-governance or e-enablement at Panchayat level: 80.5 percent sample respondents reported that they had undertaken e-governance or e-enablement at Panchayat level, whereas 19.5 percent sample respondents did not report for the same. Out of 80.5 percent sample respondents who reported undertaking e-governance or e-enablement at Panchayat level, 99.5 percent sample

respondents reported it beneficial for better functioning of Panchayat, whereas 0.5 percent sample respondents did not find it beneficial (Table B 92).

16) Training under RGSA developed better coordination amongst PRIs

The CB&T under RGSA has got instrumental role in developing better coordination amongst PRIs was reported by 99.5 percent sample respondents, whereas the remaining 0.5 percent sample respondents did not report for the same. Further, 99.3 percent sample respondents reported that training of Panchayat functionaries helped reduction of conflict amongst PRIs & others, whereas 0.7 percent sample respondents did not opt for the same. Like-wise, 99.4 percent sample respondents reported that training of Panchayat functionaries helped in better execution of development programmes related to social justice, poverty alleviation & gender development, whereas 0.6 percent sample respondents did not report for the same.

State Rank Analysis

Above discussed responses about the benefits of capacity building & training are further weighted and indexed to derive the state-wise inferences in the form of Rank analysis. These results across various indicators are presented in Table 3.16. However, when we analyse the benefits of capacity building & training at the aggregate level, we find that the state of Uttarakhand got the highest rating about the benefits of capacity building and training. The next best states have been Maharashtra and Karnataka. The state of Assam got the fourth position followed by Himachal Pradesh, Gujarat, Kerala, Sikkim, Orissa and Uttar Pradesh. On the other hand, the states like Haryana, Arunachal Pradesh, Goa, Jharkhand, Madhya Pradesh, West Bengal, Andhra Pradesh and Rajasthan got low rating across these indicators.

Figure 3.33: Ranks across Sates

Table 3.16: State Ranks: Rating of Benefits of Capacity Building & Training

	Over-all	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Andhra Pradesh	12	11	11	11	11	14	14	15	12	14	15	12	14	14	8	6
Arunachal Pradesh	17	18	18	5	17	17	18	11	11	18	9	17	18	17	18	16
Assam	4	6	6	4	6	4	6	5	4	7	8	6	5	4	3	5
Goa	16	16	16	16	16	16	16	17	17	16	17	18	16	16	10	13
Gujarat	6	8	8	8	7	8	9	9	8	6	6	7	8	7	6	10
Haryana	18	17	17	18	18	18	17	18	18	17	18	15	17	18	17	17
Himachal Pradesh	5	7	7	7	8	5	5	7	6	5	4	5	6	5	4	4
Jharkhand	15	15	15	17	15	15	15	16	16	15	16	16	15	15	14	7
Karnataka	3	3	3	2	4	2	3	3	3	2	3	2	2	2	16	1
Kerala	7	5	4	6	5	6	7	6	5	8	11	4	4	3	5	18
Madhya Pradesh	14	12	13	13	13	13	13	12	14	11	13	14	12	13	15	14
Maharashtra	2	4	5	3	3	3	4	2	2	3	2	3	3	6	1	2
Orissa	9	10	9	9	9	7	8	8	9	10	5	8	7	8	13	12
Rajasthan	11	14	14	15	12	11	12	14	13	13	12	10	10	12	7	9
Sikkim	8	2	2	14	2	9	2	4	7	4	14	11	13	10	12	11
Uttar Pradesh	10	9	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	9	7	9	9	9	9	8
Uttarakhand	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	3
West Bengal	13	13	12	12	14	12	11	13	15	12	10	13	11	11	11	15

1) Developed confidence & increased sense of responsibility for economic development, people participation & social justice; 2) Better approach and working for Planning & management of functioning of Gram Panchayat core areas- Governance, Social Inclusion, Gender inequality, economic development & Social Justice; 3) Undertaking baseline data collection & situational analysis & development of GP development plan; 4) Better understanding of village issues and required action to be taken- Drinking water/ Sanitation/ Rural Development/ Social Justice/ Health & Hygiene/ Women development/ Children development/ Education etc.; 5) Help in understanding Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) in Gram Panchayat perspectives-poverty, gender, social justice etc.; 6) Able to manage Community organization & related issues, & conflict in better way; 7) Better understanding of the core issues of Rural poverty; 8) Training organized covering various programmes/schemes namely, MGNREGS, SBM, GPDP, DAY-NRLM etc. helped in improving the performance of execution in the Panchayat; 9) Training in addition to RGSA namely, SBM, NRLM, Water quality, Health etc. found effective & useful in Gram Panchayat; 10) Developed better understanding the importance of e-governance, online (ICT) e-enablement of Panchayats; 11) Able to undertake Gram Panchayat development work as per Government norms & people requirements; 12) Able to manage development work / programmes/ Abhiyan as per government norms & people requirements; 13) Is Plan developed in the Gram Panchayat? If "Yes" then rating on five point scale; 14) Impart training to other functionaries & Panchayat members on the subject you have been trained; 15) Retention of the subjects on which training imparted under RGSA

Spearman Rank Correlation Analysis

In order to get a better picture of the impact of various training related aspects such as trainers, learning environment, reading / training materials, sessions on best practices, case studies, experience sharing etc. and field visits and group discussions on the outcome indicators such as the development of understanding about various aspects of the functioning of PRIs, its usefulness in working under RGSA and the capacity building role of training, a correlation exercise was considered to be the most appropriate one. As the responses are recorded at the scale of five which implies that these are the ordinal responses in the form of ranks. In such situation, it would be better to examine the magnitude of 'Spearman Rank Correlation' to infer about the presence of relation between the two variables.

Emerging results of Spearman Rank Correlation of the rating of trainers with different outcome aspects are presented in Table 3.17. It may be observed that the ranking coefficient for all the outcome indicators is found to be positive and significant which implies that a high rating of the trainers' performance has led to the development of better understanding besides being useful and beneficial. Such positive and significant correlation is observed across most of the states except a few. In case of Assam, the rank correlation is found to be negative and significant. Similar is the case with Orissa (for training beneficial for taking roles / responsibilities).

Table 3.17: Spearman Rank Correlation of Trainers' Rating with

	Understanding Developed	Useful in Working under RGSA	Training Beneficial for Taking Roles /Responsibilities
Andhra Pradesh	.553**	.529**	.614**
Arunachal Pradesh	.276*	.310*	.198
Assam	-.261**	-.219*	-.212*
Goa	.157	.204	.148
Gujarat	.136	.260**	.195*
Haryana	.102	-.138	.111
Himachal Pradesh	.007	.094	-.018
Jharkhand	.335**	.293*	.313*
Karnataka	.393**	.448**	.330**
Kerala	-.010	-.001	-.176
Madhya Pradesh	.177*	.137	.245**
Maharashtra	.461**	.525**	.357**
Orissa	-.103	-.126	-.225*
Rajasthan	.231*	.234*	.152
Sikkim	.060	.051	.152
Uttar Pradesh	.214**	.214**	.233**
Uttarakhand	.460**	.613**	.448**
West Bengal	.158	.149	.249**
All	.190**	.158**	.185**

Note 1: * implies that the rank correlation is significant at 0.05 level of significance (2-tailed).
Note 2: ** implies that the rank correlation is significant at 0.01 level of significance (2-tailed).

Table 3.18: Spearman Rank Correlation of Learning Environment's Rating with

	Understanding Developed	Useful in Working under RGSA	Training Beneficial for Taking Roles /Responsibilities
Andhra Pradesh	.557**	.535**	.575**
Arunachal Pradesh	.313*	.350**	.260*
Assam	-.014	-.004	.040
Goa	-.010	-.014	-.039
Gujarat	.161	.158	.267**
Haryana	.123	-.022	-.113
Himachal Pradesh	-.092	.160	.139
Jharkhand	-.068	.016	.035
Karnataka	.154	.190	.138
Kerala	-.082	-.082	-.299
Madhya Pradesh	.170*	.133	.206**
Maharashtra	.560**	.504**	.443**
Orissa	-.013	.019	-.043
Rajasthan	.420**	.308**	.402**
Sikkim	.310	.237	.116
Uttar Pradesh	.135*	.084	.168*
Uttarakhand	.067	.106	-.023
West Bengal	.142	.153	.192*
All	.253*	.216**	.218**

Note 1: * implies that the rank correlation is significant at 0.05 level of significance (2-tailed).
Note 2: ** implies that the rank correlation is significant at 0.01 level of significance (2-tailed).

Spearman Rank Correlation results as presented in Table 3.18 indicate that in aggregate, the correlation coefficient has been positive and significant which implies that a better provision of learning environment is positively related with better development of understanding, high usefulness in working under RGSA and its being beneficial for taking roles and responsibilities. The correlation coefficient is found to be positive and significant for most of the states. But, in some states like Assam, Goa, Himachal Pradesh, Jharkhand, Kerala and Orissa, it is found to be negative. As it is not significant, it does not affect the general relation observed across states.

Table 3.19: Spearman Rank Correlation of Reading / Training Materials Rating with

	Understanding Developed	Useful in Working under RGSA	Training Beneficial for Taking Roles /Responsibilities
Andhra Pradesh	.609**	.650**	.659**
Arunachal Pradesh	.002	-.021	.126
Assam	-.028	.057	.097
Goa	.331	.414*	.327
Gujarat	.079	.217*	.167
Haryana	-.006	-.199*	-.097
Himachal Pradesh	-.224	.117	-.036
Jharkhand	-.017	-.002	-.111
Karnataka	.329**	.217*	.376**
Kerala	.007	.010	-.246
Madhya Pradesh	.333**	.254**	.323**
Maharashtra	.501**	.479**	.456**
Orissa	.007	-.029	.056
Rajasthan	.334**	.318**	.330**
Sikkim	.310	.290	.331
Uttar Pradesh	.174**	.119**	.168**
Uttarakhand	.324	.335	.262
West Bengal	.077	.129	.210*
All	.225**	.169**	.233**

Note 1: * implies that the rank correlation is significant at 0.05 level of significance (2-tailed).
Note 2: ** implies that the rank correlation is significant at 0.01 level of significance (2-tailed).

Table 3.19 presents Spearman Rank Correlation results of the rating of reading / training material with the outcome variables. It may be observed that on an average, the rank correlation coefficients are positive and significant which implies that a better provision of the reading materials is linked positively with the positive outcomes. The correlation coefficient is found to be positive and significant for most of the states. But, in some states like Assam, Haryana, Himachal Pradesh and Jharkhand, it is found to be negative. The reason may be the functionaries might not have referred the training/ reading materials given by the State.

Table 3.20: Spearman Rank Correlation of Session on Best Practices, Case Studies, Experience Sharing Rating with

	Understanding Developed	Useful in Working under RGSA	Training Beneficial for Taking Roles /Responsibilities
Andhra Pradesh	.766**	.739**	.776**
Arunachal Pradesh	.060	-.005	.095
Assam	-.150	-.095	-.145
Goa	.435*	.496**	.408*
Gujarat	.127	.298**	.253**
Haryana	.010	-.143	-.201*
Himachal Pradesh	-.272	.075	.107
Jharkhand	-.090	-.004	-.053
Karnataka	.259*	.350**	.455**
Kerala	.110	.112	-.143
Madhya Pradesh	.311**	.251**	.340**
Maharashtra	.559**	.565**	.445**
Orissa	-.184	-.055	-.208
Rajasthan	.407**	.356**	.435**
Sikkim	.320	.301	.392*
Uttar Pradesh	.099	.024	.125*
Uttarakhand	.479**	.668**	.352*
West Bengal	.074	.010	.089
All	.197**	.162**	.204**

Note 1: * implies that the rank correlation is significant at 0.05 level of significance (2-tailed).
Note 2: ** implies that the rank correlation is significant at 0.01 level of significance (2-tailed).

Table 3.20 presents Spearman Rank Correlation results of the rating of Session on best practices, case studies, experience sharing with the outcome indicators. It may be observed that the rank correlation coefficients in aggregate are found to be positive and significant which implies that a better provision of such sessions is related with better outcomes. In some states, the correlations are found to be negative but in most cases, these are non-significant. But, there are some exceptions like Haryana where even at low rating of sessions on best practices, case studies and experience sharing, a high rating of training beneficial for taking roles / responsibilities is reported.

Table 3.21: Spearman Rank Correlation of Field Visit and Group Discussion Rating with

	Understanding Developed	Useful in Working under RGSA	Training Beneficial for Taking Roles /Responsibilities
Andhra Pradesh	.668**	.634**	.685**
Arunachal Pradesh	.031	.055	.097
Assam	.031	.092	.075
Goa	.334	.435*	.336
Gujarat	.270**	.153	.403**
Haryana	-.086	-.129	-.109
Himachal Pradesh	-.363*	-.195	.072
Jharkhand	.141	.031	.056
Karnataka	.193	.208*	.415**
Kerala	.191	.176	-.083
Madhya Pradesh	.093	.161*	.183*
Maharashtra	.346**	.435**	.413**
Orissa	-.086	-.070	-.081
Rajasthan	.210*	.301**	.216*
Sikkim	.407*	.409*	.512**
Uttar Pradesh	.072	.036	.117*
Uttarakhand	.633**	.837**	.467**
West Bengal	.190*	.066	.144
All	.168**	.172**	.185**

Note 1: * implies that the rank correlation is significant at 0.05 level of significance (2-tailed).
Note 2: ** implies that the rank correlation is significant at 0.01 level of significance (2-tailed).

Table 3.21 reports Spearman Rank Correlation results of rating of field visits and group discussions with the outcome indicators. It may be observed that the exists a positive correlation between the field visit and group discussion and the outcome indicators. Such trend is found across most of the states except Himachal Pradesh where a negative rank correlation coefficient is found for understanding developed.

3.2 Key outcome of Training – Knowledge levels and capacities & overall functioning of PRIs

Most of these indicators call upon ERs' recall to assess the effective use of training. It has been reported that the responses of the trainees were more general rather than specific. Normally each training programme covers a number of themes related to the subjects of training. In a majority of the cases, theme of the training is informative and contents were related to Panchayat Raj and rural development schemes/ programmes like MGNREGA, SBM & DAY-NRLM etc. It is well understood that the information about various schemes is quite important for the trainees in all the states to help them understand and implement them effectively. The general impact of the trainings has increased in the knowledge base of the trainees regarding the Panchayat Raj system; understanding of different schemes, their implementation procedures and administrative arrangements. A significant number of PRIs/ ERs feel that after undergoing training they are able to explain schemes with more clarity. As a result, the villagers are more receptive and collective action in planning and implementation of different schemes is facilitated. At large, training inputs help the ERs feel empowered and confident in performing their role and raising their voice /views/ opinions in the Panchayat confidently.

Views & Opinions of Zilla Panchayat Members

Majority of Zilla Parishads opined that lecture method was largely used in training sessions. There were limited or no field visits to understand and analyze different issues and find solution. The reference materials provided to them are in vernacular language in most of the States. In Goa, the reference materials were made in English. It would be better if it is developed in Marathi/ Konkani. However, many states, majority of them failed to comply with the content of the reading/reference materials for the following reasons:

1. The materials are more academic in nature rather than containing illustrative examples, pictorial presentation etc.
2. Many ERs are not able to make use of such materials due to poor educational standards, and
3. In many cases, they do not find it interesting enough to go through.
4. They even do not know what the use of these materials is.

The trainings have had a positive impact on the selected women PRIs. Some women ERs are now able to understand different proposals and schemes due to training inputs. Some ERs who had gone through the training earlier found no newness in the content. Some educated ZP members feel that Information provided in training has been very superficial and it needs to be more in-depth and informative through better content design. A significant realization commonly expressed by the ZP members was that the current functional powers of PRI members were inadequate to be able to exercise the knowledge gained through training.

Views & Opinions of Block /Intermediary Panchayat and Gram Panchayat Members

In almost all the States, more or less similar responses were received from the ERs of Block Intermediary Panchayat (Block Panchayat) and Gram Panchayat members. As far as GP members are concerned, they felt more confident and empowered in terms of facing the community and providing clarity on different schemes and their provisions. Their participation in Gram Sabha is more active and they can actively participate in the GP meetings by providing their opinion/views/ suggestions.

Functionaries of PRI/ Officials

The officials are trained on the various subjects/ issues namely, Panchayati Raj Act, Panchayat level structure/ system, Schemes for Socio-economic development namely, MGNREGA, SBM, PMAY, DAY-NRLM. They also have wider understanding on SDGs, Mission Antodaya and government schemes of devolved departments. The training methodology has largely been lectures by people from various departments and officials. They were also shown some video films and power point presentations. All of them have received reading materials for reference. However, most of them have only glanced through it. In addition to scheme based inputs, inputs on PR institutions helped them to understand the importance of the ERs. The functionaries now have a better understanding of PRI functioning, SDGs, DAY-NRLM etc. As far as rendering support to PRI to strengthen governance, barring a few demonstrative cases where personal initiatives were taken, hardly any change is observed in systematic interventions.

3.3 Benefits/ Outcome of CB&T – Comparison of SCs, STs, EWR and Overall aggregates

This section presents the comparison of benefits /outcome of CB&T amongst SC, ST, Elected women Representatives in comparison with the overall respondent PRIs aggregate. The responses about the benefits of capacity building & training are further weighted and indexed to derive the state-wise and category-wise namely, SC, ST, Elected women Representatives & Overall respondents inferences in the form of Rank analysis. These results across various indicators are presented in Figure 3.34 However, when we analyze the benefits of capacity building & training

Figure 3.34 : Benefits of CB &T- Comparison of EWR, SC, ST & Overall PRIs

amongst the SC, ST, Elected women Representatives & aggregate level, we find that the SCs (24 percent) and STs (24.1 percent) get more benefitted in comparison with EWR (20.1 percent) and the aggregate result (22.5 percent). STs were benefitted more in comparison to SCs, Women and overall respondents in seven States namely, West Bengal, Maharashtra, Uttarakhand, Sikkim, Himachal Pradesh, Madhya Pradesh and Gujarat. Similarly, SCs were benefitted more in comparison to STs, Women and overall respondents in eight States namely, Andhra Pradesh, Assam, Oddisha, Haryana, Karnataka, Kerala, Rajasthan & Jharkhand. In Goa State, the benefits of training were reported lowest amongst PRIs.

The above analysis show that the induction training and refresher/ thematic trainings under RGSA and other development works in the States provided better opportunity to SCs and STs to come forward and undertake the responsibilities related to Gram Panchayat development.

3.4 Constraints & Usefulness – Some Issues

In the sample states, trainings were organized as mandated namely, Induction trainings and refresher/ Thematic trainings. However, in Oddisha (2017), Assam (2018), Sikkim (2017), Maharashtra (20% every year) and West Bengal (2018) only Induction training has been reported because the election was held in 2017 and 2018. In states where a majority of ERs are educationally backward i.e. illiterate or semi-literate, this short training of 2 to 5 days is not sufficient to enhance their understanding on various issues. Thus, measuring the impact of the programme at this stage does not seem so relevant. However, attempt has been made to understand how the training has been beneficial to the ERs and what constraints they have been experiencing in utilizing the training inputs. The impact of training of PRIs has been assessed.

The respondents, especially those who are being trained for the first time, on issues of governance have responded positively on the gain in knowledge at the training programmes. Majority of the trainees agreed that training programmes helped them learn about various aspects of 73rd amendment, roles and responsibilities, understand schemes/programmes and devolved subjects. However, the application of this knowledge in the work sphere is limited due to a number of factors:

- In many States except Kerala, West Bengal, Sikkim, Karnataka and Maharashtra, limited devolution of funds is available for implementation. Functionaries provide limited scope to the ERs to perform as per the given inputs during training, making the learning merely textual and not practical.
- In two States namely, Andhra Pradesh and Arunachal Pradesh, the term of ZP, BP and GP expired in year 2018. Hence, not much action has been observed.
- The reference materials given to ERs are found higher than their mental receptivity levels, especially for those who have lower educational background.
- In the training programme, discussions are held on various powers and functions of PRI members including the flow of funds through the PRIs for various purposes. However, in actuality, some of the funds supposed to be spent by the PRIs are not made available to them and unfortunately, most of them are ignorant about fund utilization.The ERs, therefore, consider the trainings a mere formality as the gap in preaching and practice persists.
- Training often is a onetime event for trainees and there is no follow-up at the PRI level neither by the trainers nor by the institutions imparting training. After training, it is assumed that it is the job of the trainees to use this in an environment, which is not always conducive to implement the newly learnt inputs.
- The standing committees are either defunct or in most cases do not get involved in the functionaries performing their responsibilities except in Kerala, Sikkim, Goa, West Bengal and Karnataka where it was reported more profound.
- Participation of members and their active involvement in the process are key to the success of any training program. The present capacity building programme scores favorably on presence of target participants but active participation of the members in the process remains a challenge. Many ERs failed to participate actively in the process barring a few vocal persons. Looking at the methodologies adopted and inputs adopted at these trainings, they seem to only improve the awareness levels rather than facilitate attitudinal and skill related improvements. These were namely, Haryana, Madhya Pradesh and Uttar Pradesh, where trainings were

organized even after 2 years and more period of election.

- The members of Gram Panchayat were not very vibrant as far as the roles and responsibilities are concerned in states like Madhya Pradesh, Oddisha, Rajasthan, U.P., Haryana, Jharkhand etc. The active participation has been reported more visible of Sarpanch/Gram Pradhan only. It cannot be supported as per the fundamental spirit of Gram Panchayat.
- Looking to the roles of Gram Panchayat in GPDP, SDGs, and Mission Antyodaya, the training methodology requires more focus on visuals and pictures for effective communication along with presentations with practical presentation through case studies and demonstrations. A change in the current working environment will also be critical to ensure learning translated into action. This may require some handholding or facilitative support to Gram Panchayat with a proper redressal mechanism for grievances. For officials, trainings have been useful to understand Panchayat Raj system, administrative procedures and their own roles and responsibilities. This was felt most by the first time appointees, particularly the secretaries of Gram Panchayats.

3.5 Key Findings and Suggestions

Certainly the trainings of PRIs has positively contributed in getting information and knowledge about various development programmes of Government for economic development and social justice, provision of Panchayat Raj act as per 73rd Constitutional Amendment Act, roles and responsibilities etc. In addition, they helped PRIs in better exposure to development interventions, developing better skills, positive attitude, understand the planning process, deciding the priority and the poor can be given space in the overall Gram Panchayat development Plan etc. However, with many good experiences there were some learning which definitely need to be taken care in order to have effective and useful capacity building & training interventions.

As we all know, that Capacity development is a process driven approach rather than target realization and encompasses large scope for improvement, innovation and sustenance. In comparison to the initial years, capacity development is gradually inculcating this perspective and building a focus around ERs for sustained decentralization and governance with more focus on SDGs, GPDP and Mission Antyodaya. With the efforts of MOPR and State Governments, capacity building of ERs has now been mainstreamed and has been one of the key intervention areas in all the States. To strengthen the capacity building initiatives and make them more meaningful, the assessment team interacted with a number of stakeholders at the Gram Panchayat, Block, district and State levels and arrived at the following conclusions:

a. Present capacity development approach is much more focused on trainings while other means of capacity building are equally essential to realize the objectives of developing human resource and strengthening PR institutions. Along with trainings, the NCBF 2014 suggests focus on capacity building modes like hand holding, escorting, exposure, spot guidance, campaign mode in PESA areas etc. Theoretical in-puts blended with practical experience and exposure will help the ERs learn better and much faster.

b. Present design and strategy of capacity development is more focused on developing knowledge and sharing information related to schemes/programmes etc. with the trainees in formal set up. Though, these are two important aspects of capacity development, without proper attitudes and operational skills, the training cannot be applied at the work sphere. Developing a positive attitude, bringing a behavioural change in one's approach and imparting skills to perform should be considered as major inputs of capacity development. Achieving sustainability through capacity utilization is more important than only imparting training which does not cascade down for the benefit of the people. The present pattern of organizing training does not seem

conducive to dealing with skill and behavioural components of capacity development for all the categories of ERs and functionaries.

c. Quite sizeable portion of ERs i.e. ward members and Sarpanchs and also many Block Panchayat /Intermediary Panchayat members are educationally backward. The reference materials and training modules have very little significance for them. This is one of the reasons why more than 50 per cent trained members never go through the materials after the training. Therefore, it is important to design the reference materials in such a way that they are informative, create an interest and ERs are compelled to refer to them. Embodying visuals, illustrations, thematic pictures etc. in a flow chart mode along with minimizing text would be of much help. Different IEC materials and flipbooks can be developed and distributed to the semi-literate/poorly educated ERs.

d. Most of the trainings depend heavily on the lecture method to convey messages related to different themes. Use of other training methods is not widespread which makes it difficult for the trainees, especially for GP and Block Panchayat members to remember the inputs. There is poor follow-up of trainings, providing less scope for them to get clarity on operational issues from time to time. Use of adult learning principles with rigorous follow-up can be of immense help to minimize the input losses. The trainers need to be oriented accordingly to use different methodologies suitable for themes in the content to create interest among the trainees.

e. In order to make the training sessions more participatory, interactive and learning oriented, it is a prerequisite that number of trainees should be of a manageable size. It has been reported almost in many cases the size of trainees per training is even more than 60, which is suitable for a workshop but not for training. Large numbers restrict two- way sharing and learning and hinder imparting quality inputs in a participatory manner. The ideal size of 40 trainees per training could be helpful in overcoming this limitation.

f. Capacity development of ERs in just three to four days and covering a gamut of subjects is difficult to achieve. This time allows for mere awareness creation rather than training. ERs find the inputs very useful and are interested in attending more such programmes for gaining knowledge. It may be helpful to organize more trainings in a cascade mode to cover the high number of ERs at GP and block levels.

g. While organizing training for ERs, specially Sarpanch /Gram Pradhan and Ward members, the suitable time should be thought of when the ERs are free from agriculture and other necessary engagements. The season during which the training sessions are organized have an impact on the trainees' turn out and their continuity in the programme. Trainings organized in the agricultural sessions are usually not a conducive period for the ERs as many are engaged in agricultural activities. Such factors need to be kept in mind when preparing the training calendar.

h. Many of trainers selected from line departments are not interested in conducting the training programmes. The trainers' selection is driven more by departmental processes rather than any initiative on their part. Apart from performing their primary responsibility, these trainers also facilitate different training programmes. As a result, there has been lack of follow-up learning in real life situations and trainer involvement in the process at the ground level.

i. The honorarium paid to trainers in the States other than Kerala, Karnataka & Haryana has not been lucrative enough to motivate external experts to g42et involved and deliver the inputs in a regular manner. An improvement in the remuneration package of the external RPs and financial incentives for trainers selected from government should be considered to bring in and retain good resource persons. Apart from this, an assessment of trainers from time to time is also essential.

j. States have devised different mechanisms to monitor and supervise the training programmes, but operationally, it has been a challenge to assess them. The present system of monitoring the

training programmes concentrates more on organizational aspects rather than the quality of the programme, inputs and its utility. An independent monitoring team is highly essential both at State and District level.

k. The Impact assessment team observed certain problems in the management of information, its compilation/processing and analysis. A system oriented approach to information management needs to be followed both at the state and district levels to strengthen the capacity development initiatives. The team has also experienced that the data management system of trainings and ERs are not objectively done. Hence, it is difficult to track which ERs have undergone which training, what could be the future requirement, etc.

l. To increase the outreach of the capacity development programmes and impart the inputs well, the present State level and regional level training institutions need to be staffed with core faculty members and infrastructure needs to be improved. Many SIRDs, PRTI, ETCs and DPRCs in sample states are deficient in these aspects. Secondly, number of core faculties dealing with PRI acts and governance aspect is low at SIRD level which has been a problem in delivery of this theme. So, improvement in staffing and infrastructure would be helpful in strengthening the capacity development initiative.

m. Some other critical issues that have come up and which need attention include first, training of ERs within six months of their election, currently this was reported delayed in a few States; second, refresher programmes should be conducted as a follow-up measure; third, increase in the number of days of training to cover all the components of the curriculum as per their understanding and educational level; fourth, ICT based training programmes to be conducted as follow-up of earlier training inputs; fifth, exposure visits should be conducted during the training programmes to enrich the learning; sixth, provision of honorarium /wage loss especially for ward members; seventh, mixed training of PRIs and officials should be encouraged so that operational issues can be sorted out and also they can understand their roles and responsibilities in each others jurisdiction.

n. It is ultimately the people and Gram Sabha, who are the most important stakeholders of the Panchayats. The success of establishing a more responsive and efficient Panchayat system has to be judged by the people, who have the ultimate power to take corrective measures for improving the system. But the initiatives taken to strengthen Gram Sabha under the scope of the scheme are very poor. It is essential that special sensitization measures should be taken up to make people aware of different dimensions of PRI, role and responsibilities of PRI members, different programmes/schemes/ Missions etc.

o. However, the Resource team/Master Trainers should be regularly engaged in follow-up and handholding support which will add value to the effective functioning of Gram Panchayats in light of GPDP, Mission Antodaya and SDGs. It will help in multifold ways. First, the Master trainer really looks into the system and functions of Gram Panchayat as per the mandate and issues covered in the trainings; secondly, facilitate necessary correction or address the problem and thirdly, ensure the outcome/impact as per the guidelines of the various development programmes, SDGs, Mission Antyodaya, Aspirational and PESA. The regular support and involvement of Master trainers will camouflage the Gram Panchayats, if it is done seriously beyond only on papers.

State-wise suggestions to improve the Effectiveness of CB&T

State	Suggestions
Andhra Pradesh	1. Own training building should be available in district. 2. A/V aids should used to understand subject. 3. The incomplete DPRC need to be completed so that investment under the project can be meaningful and supportive for the initiatives of CB&T. 4. Exposure visit should be a part of training. 5. Training should be imparted with digital PPTs 6. Training duration should be increased 7. Pre-planning for training (viz. proper scheduling, planning & material disposal) is necessary & need to be assessed before organizing training
Arunachal Pradesh	1. Timely availability of the funds. 2. Provision of engaging adjunct faculties/ RPs from the HR support funds under RGSA. 3. Liberty to be given to the State to use available experienced persons in the State to use the HR funds within the permissible limits of SPRC and DPRC level. 4. Undertake the use of infrastructures of DPRC and Gram Panchayats. 5. All Gram Panchayats should have their own building. 6. Exposure visit to best practicing Panchayat 7. Participatory approach with audio visual presentation & satellite training 8. Role play, street play for proper dissemination of information 9. Less theory – more stress on practical 10. Training must be given at village level to all PRI members
Assam	1. GPDP are not linked at district and State level. Therefore, it does not associate with sector plan and activities. 2. Need to specify role of Anchal Panchayat with funds and functions 3. Provision of capacity building & cross learning to RGSA training faculties 4. More TOT is required for better performance of training
Goa	1. Strong support from State Directorate of Panchayat Raj in mobilizing the districts and Blocks for Trainings. 2. SPRC should be set and work independently for Capacity Building, Research and Resource support. 3. Departmental officials should also be involved during trainings. 4. Proper infrastructures for training 5. Field visit/trips during training & documentation of success stories 6. Accountability of the ERs has to be ensured. After attending the trainings they must be told to create awareness in their respective panchayat
Gujarat	1. Committed coordination & support from State Directorate of Panchayat Raj in setting the tone of trainings in a planned manner with required level of monitoring, supervision and stock taking of situation regularly. 2. SPRC should be set and work independently for Capacity Building, Research and Resource support.

	3. Faculty and experts at State level should be placed as per the mandate of SIRD. 4. More visual contents should be involved during training. The environment should be more comfortable
Haryana	1. Capacity building and participation of PRIs in trainings should be linked with budget allocations. 2. CB&T of functionaries should be linked with promotions and rewards. 3. The training should bring ERs specially the ward panch/ member so that their participation can be ensured. 4. The trainings should provide space to trainees' sarpanch and ward Panch to participate in the trainings rather simply listening the lectures. 5. The reference materials/ reading materials/ modules given should be referred in the trainings rather than distribution only. 6. Training should be organized time to time & regularly. 7. Teaching aids such as chart paper, projector & laptop should be used for effective training 8. Time to time follow-up of training 9. All Gram Panchayat members & sarpanch should participate in training 10. Coordination between RPs& department staff is important 11. Training should be imparted in small groups (30-40 members)
Himachal Pradesh	1. The qualified trainers should impart trainings and should have high qualifications. 2. Training should be imparted as per need of the stakeholders for which online mechanism can be developed for conducting TNA. 3. Impact assessment and analysis of trainings should be done so that quality trainings can be planned and executed. 4. Pool of trainers should be available at SPRC &DPRC. 5. The DPRC buildings should be completed and ready to use. 6. Training should be as per need of stakeholders
Jharkhand	1. Need for full-fledged centre for trainings for ERs and Panchayati Raj Functionaries. 2. The Ward members should be given equal space in trainings. In addition, they should be empowered rather than given only information in the trainings. The real purpose of training and capacity building is to really trigger the zeal and enthusiasm for the Panchayat/ Ward development. 3. Training should be organized at regular intervals 4. Proper dissemination of information amongst trainees about training 5. Training material should be crisp & concise. 6. More IEC material may be developed.
Karnataka	1. SATCOM facility can be made two ways for better results. 2. Timely disbursement of GOI funds to SIRD. It will help in planning training activity round the year which is presently, organized for 7-8 months. 3. ToT should be subject-wise 4. More number of refresher trainings should be organized
Kerala	1. Ensure Quality of trainings by putting the batch of 30-35 trainees

	per batch. 2. Timely release of Funds for Trainings. 3. Training should be more participatory than theoretical 4. Decentralized training at grassroots level 5. Enhancement of capacity & knowledge of the trainers 6. Improvement in campus facility for accommodation
Madhya Pradesh	1. Training should be organized soon after Panchayat election. 2. All the ERs should be given training. 3. Every year at least one refresher training should be arranged for ERs. 4. There is greater need to institutionalize the trainings for the purpose they have been planned under RGSA for ERs. 5. Trainers should be informed about training at least a week in advance so that they can prepare their training content in advance 6. Participation of trainees should be ensured 7. Use of training aids during training 8. Training methodology 9. Participants should be informed about training in advance 10. Training should be imparted in simple language
Maharashtra	1. Efforts should be made in order to mobilize ERs for the trainings. 2. Trainings should be organized at Taluka/ cluster level rather than taking the trainees to Training centre located in other district. 3. The core faulty vacancy at training centres should be filled in order to institutionalize the trainings. 4. Training should be as per need of villagers. 5. Members to be asked whether they are available for the training programme in advance 6. Frequency of training must be more 7. Field visit should be done with each & every schedule of training. 8. Training programme should involve other methods of training viz. case studies, presentation etc. 9. Training period should be of long duration to have group discussions etc. Interactive sessions must be arranged participative learning tools should be used during training 10. Training should be compulsory for participants
Oddisha	1. More number of CPOs and Empanelled Resource Persons are required to be engaged for ensuring quality delivery of training in schedule time. 2. SIRD&PR has planned for monitoring of training programmes. 3. Adoption of robust MIS for real time based monitoring of training programme 4. Upgradation of the domain knowledge of the Faculty members through Capacity Building & Exposure Visits to the Organizations of National and International repute. 5. Reading/ reference materials should be given to the participants 6. Duration of the training can be 4 days instead of 3 days to make sessions more participatory 7. Training sessions extended 3 to 5 days. 8. All modules should be completed within time
Rajasthan	1. Fund flow should be ensured at the beginning of the each financial

	year, to ensure timely roll-out of Training Campaigns 2. The tenure of Reserved Category ERs should be increased to at least 10 years 3. More Trainers need to be brought under MRP certification process of NIRD&PR 4. Permanent Core Faculty positions to be created under SPRC & DPRCs 5. Dissemination of information regarding training schedule should be given in advance to PRIs
Sikkim	1. Impact assessment needs of trainings to be done periodically 2. Timely handholding support to the trained ERs/PRIs 3. Follow-up & handholding support by officials 4. Time to time assessment of training should be done. 5. Training should not be a-day long to get it properly utilized. 6. Exposure visit during training or after training is very important for practical learning as well. 7. LCD & other training materials should be provided. 8. Need to take some creative measurement to impart more efficient training
Uttarakhand	1. Coordination with line department need to be ensured for better execution of trainings and execution of GPDP plan at Gram Panchayat level. 2. Impact assessment need of trainings to be done periodically 3. Timely handholding support to the trained ERs/PRIs 4. Fund flow should be ensured at the beginning of the each financial year, to ensure timely roll-out of Training Campaigns 5. The tenure of Reserved Category ERs should be increased to at least 10 years 6. More Trainers need to be brought under MRP certification process of NIRD&PR 7. Permanent Core Faculty positions to be created under SPRC & DPRCs 8. Training duration should be increased 9. Time to time training should be organized. 10. Training should be organized immediately after panchayat election. 11. Interesting facts & pictorial presentation should be part of training. 12. Environment building & awareness generation at village level regarding PRI training.
Uttar Pradesh	1. Training materials should be developed for last trainees. 2. Content delivery should be specific. 3. Strengthening the role of DPRC into monitoring the trainings. 4. Resource persons of district should be used regularly into trainings. 5. The MTs/RPs should also be involved into handholding support of GPs in order to hold meetings, prepare effective and specific GPDP, ensure proper convergence etc. 6. Strengthening DPRCs with Human resources, Logistics and Financial support. 7. Training support materials should be developed for ERs having lower level of education/ Illiterate, may be in the form of

	pictorials, visual aids etc. 8. More participation of PRIs during training 9. Time to time training should be organized. 10. Selection of TF members should be based on application & interview 11. Local & simple language & also training should be imparted as per understanding level of TF members 12. Other than lecture method should be used for imparting training 13. Efforts from block & panchayat level for timely presence of trainees during training 14. TF members should be given some responsibility/ work after training 15. Required materials & facilities should be available during training
West Bengal	1. Regional workshops to be held frequently to disseminate effectiveness of the training programmes. (STARPARD) 2. Need to make RPs/MTs more responsive (Birbhum DPT&RC) 3. Quality Planning for the training by MTs/RPs (Birbhum DPT&RC) 4. Largely, the faculties at SIRD, Kalyani (BRAIPRD) are on contract i.e. 4 out of 7. They should be made permanent in order to improve their participation and commitment. 5. More horizontal learning process in curriculum may be incorporated. Effective practices may be replicated in each & every curriculum. (BRAIPRD) 6. More field visits are needed 7. Hands-on training is required 8. Participatory methods to be followed during the training programme 9. More handholding & practical sessions required 10. Training content should be updated time to time 11. Process documentation of training programme 12. Pictorial training materials &RPs having ground experience may be selected for training 13. Continuous & frequent intervals of training to be arranged

Chapter - 4

Conclusion & Recommendations

The task of the Impact Assessment study titled **'Impact Assessment of Training of PRIs'** in the country was assigned by Ministry of Panchayati Raj (MOPR), Government of India. The study was carried out with a purpose to assess the impact of capacity building activities undertaken in various states for all three tiers of PRIs with regard to the enhanced capacities of elected representatives and other stakeholders to perform their official roles effectively and efficiently and developing a systematic means of analysing and quantifying changes in capacity building initiatives provided to the elected representatives of PRIs, Panchayat functionaries and others in the context of basic orientation, various thematic areas and Gram Panchayat Development Planning.

The sole purpose of this assessment study is to document the issues of strategic importance relating to Capacity Building & Trainings of elected representatives of Panchayati Raj system with regards to outreach of training programmes conducted for all the three-tiers/ two-tiers of state, coverage of elected women representatives, SCs and STs in the trainings. The training for PRIs has been planned as per the recommendation of National Capability Building Framework, 2014 on various aspects of Capacity Building in which the quality training provided to various Zilla Panchayat, Block Panchayat and Gram Panchayat stakeholders with practical and effective methods & procedure, need based, thematic and sectors convergent training. The study also assess the performance of Panchayati Raj Departments of States and other concerned authorities putting in place the Institutional structure and process sanctioned by Government for CB & T, their maintenance/ upkeep and upgradation for optimum results. For the purpose, the assessing the quality of Plans for providing training in mandatory, specialized, thematic, devolve sectors related areas and establishing appropriate network is important. The whole CB&T should bring improvement in knowledge levels and capacities of trained elected representatives and other stakeholders to perform their official roles effectively and efficiently. The study also document whether the whole CB&T has helped in enhancement of knowledge levels and capacities of trained elected representatives and other stakeholders to perform their official roles effectively and efficiently.

However, the Capacity Building & Training of around 31 Lac ERs remains a challenge not only because of their number but also because majority of them are illiterate and semi-literate, diverse age group and experiences. Secondly, every election sees a rotation of minimum 30-40 percent of the ERs which poses a challenge in addressing their capacity needs in a sustained and regular manner. A one- time initiative to build their capacity only through training cannot serve the purpose; rather it demands a continuous and regular effort. Thematic and refresher trainings on multiple sessions on various issues are required from time to time based on the needs and functions of different categories of ERs. Thus, classroom trainings, exposure visits, exposure to various electronic and non-electronic media, reading and reference materials on various schemes, roles and responsibilities, Government rules and procedure etc. are the important elements to be taken into accounts in order to have better delivery from the local self-Governance in more effective, efficient and quality manner.

The findings of the assessment study are the outcome of the whole exercise undertaken during study. The findings, conclusions and suggestions of the assessment study are stated in the chapter 4 which is given in the subsequent section.

4.1 Findings & Conclusion of the Study

4.1.1 Outreach of training programmes conducted for all stakeholders of Panchayati Raj System with particular stress on elected representatives amongst SC and ST categories, Elected Women Representatives and from other marginalized sections

Outreach of Induction Training (Overall within 6 months of Election)

A. In all the sample 18 States, trainings for elected Representatives of Zilla Panchayats and Intermediary /Block Panchayats were organized within the period of six months of election. However, looking to the organization of trainings of ERs at Gram Panchayat level namely, Sarpanch/ Gram Pradhan and ward members there were 08 States which had organized trainings for elected representatives within six months of election namely, Andhra Pradesh, Assam, Goa, Karnataka, Kerala, Oddisha, Rajasthan, and West Bengal. But there were 10 States namely, Gujarat, Maharashtra, Uttar Pradesh, Uttarakhand, Madhya Pradesh, Jharkhand, Sikkim, Arunachal Pradesh, Himachal Pradesh and Haryana, which despite of all efforts were unable to organize training within six months of election of Gram Panchayats ERs.

B. The State namely, Sikkim & Andhra Pradesh has reported 100 percent achievement with regard to the training of elected representatives over last five years (Outreach of Induction training).

C. In the year 2014-15, Himachal Pradesh, Kerala, Oddisha, Maharashtra & Uttarakhand States have reported less than 50 percent achievement with regard to training of elected panchayat representatives. Rajasthan & Karnataka have reported an achievement between 50 to 70 percent. Assam reported an achievement between 70 to 90 percent. Andhra Pradesh, Goa & Sikkim reported an achievement of more than 90 percent.

D. In the year 2015-16, Himachal Pradesh, Jharkhand, Kerala, Madhya Pradesh, Oddisha, Maharashtra & Rajasthan have reported less than 50 percent achievement with regard to training of elected panchayat representatives. Arunachal Pradesh has shown an achievement between 50 to 70 percent, Assam & Uttarakhand reported an achievement between 70 to 90 percent. Andhra Pradesh, Karnataka, Uttar Pradesh, Goa & Sikkim reported an achievement of more than 90 percent.

E. In the year 2016-17, Himachal Pradesh, Kerala, Gujarat& Uttarakhand States have reported less than 50 percent achievement with regard to training of elected panchayat representatives. Arunachal Pradesh & Goa have reported an achievement between 50 to 70 percent, Assam & Haryana reported an achievement between 70 to 90 percent. Andhra Pradesh, Jharkhand, Maharashtra, Oddisha, Rajasthan, West Bengal, Karnataka & Sikkim reported an achievement of more than 90 percent.

F. Arunachal Pradesh, Haryana, Kerala & Karnataka have shown less than 50 percent achievement with regard to training of elected panchayat representatives. Gujarat, Himachal Pradesh, Uttarakhand & Uttar Pradesh have reported an achievement between 50 to 70 percent, Jharkhand, Madhya Pradesh, Maharashtra, Oddisha & West Bengal reported

an achievement between 70 to 90 percent. Andhra Pradesh, Assam, Rajasthan, Goa & Sikkim reported an achievement of more than 90 percent in the year 2017-18.

G. In the year 2018-19, Himachal Pradesh, Arunachal Pradesh, Gujarat, Karnataka,& Oddisha States have reported less than 50 percent achievement with regard to training of elected panchayat representatives. Jharkhand & Kerala have reported an achievement between 50 to 70 percent, Goa, Maharashtra, Uttarakhand & West Bengal reported an achievement between 70 to 90 percent. Andhra Pradesh, Assam, Haryana, Madhya Pradesh, Rajasthan & Sikkim reported an achievement of more than 90 percent.

Outreach of induction training programme of EWRs (Elected Women Representatives), SCs & STs after the election result

H. Andhra Pradesh, Rajasthan, Karnataka, Sikkim & Kerala have shown 100 percent achievement of EWRs, SCs & STs in the induction training programme after the election result.

I. Induction training of 100 percent EWRs/SCs & STs was not reported by Gujarat, Madhya Pradesh & Oddisha State within six month of election result. However, Oddisha has reported 100 percent achievement with regard to induction training of EWRs in the next year.

J. The States like Arunachal Pradesh, Goa, Haryana, Himachal Pradesh, Jharkhand, Maharashtra, Uttar Pradesh & Uttarakhand did not provide data of participation of EWRs, SC & STs in the induction training programme after the election result.

Outreach of Refresher/ Thematic training programme of EWRs, SCs & STs after the election result

K. Similar to Induction training, the States like Andhra Pradesh, Kerala & Rajasthan have reported 100 percent achievement regarding Refresher/ Thematic training of EWRs, SCs& STs.

L. Assam & West Bengal has reported 90 percent coverage of EWRs, SCs& STs regarding Refresher/ Thematic training.

M. The remaining 13 states viz. Arunachal Pradesh, Goa, Gujarat, Haryana, Himachal Pradesh, Jharkhand, Madhya Pradesh, Maharashtra, Oddisha, Karnataka, Sikkim, Uttarakhand & Uttar Pradesh did not provide data related to participation of EWRs, SCs& STs in Refresher/ Thematic training.

4.1.2 Quality training provided to various stakeholders, methods & procedure adopted for need based, thematic and sectors convergent training

A. Ability of the trainers to provide effective training is rated relatively high in most of the states. However, in some states like Madhya Pradesh, Uttar Pradesh, Haryana, Assam, Rajasthan, Goa and Gujarat, some more effort is needed. In these states, there is a need for provision of better qualified and experienced trainers.

B. Learning environment is also rated high in most of the states. However, in states like Gujarat, Haryana, Uttar Pradesh, Madhya Pradesh, Rajasthan and Jharkhand, the rating of learning environment has remained relatively low which is a cause of concern and definitely, asks for devoting more effort to the provision of better learning environment.

C. Training venue, seating facilities and training is rated high in most of the states but in Gujarat, Haryana, Madhya Pradesh, Jharkhand and Uttar Pradesh, the rating of such provision has remained low. Definitely, it urges for devoting more effort to provide better training venue and seating facilities in these states.

D. The state of lodging and boarding facilities has been found to be low in Gujarat, Madhya Pradesh, Haryana, Uttar Pradesh, Jharkhand and Goa, which urges for devoting more resources to the provision of better lodging and boarding facilities in these states.

E. The provision of reading / training materials is rated very low in Haryana, Karnataka, Gujarat, Madhya Pradesh, Uttar Pradesh, Jharkhand and Himachal Pradesh. In some states, the content of such provisions is rated high. Given this disparity across states, a uniform pattern of study materials needs to be devised so that all PRIs across states get similar insights.

F. Similar to the reading materials, it is observed that in some states like Gujarat, Haryana, Madhya Pradesh, Uttar Pradesh, Jharkhand and Goa, the trainings did not give much emphasis on discussing best practices, case studies and sharing of experiences. This needs to be corrected.

G. Similarly, there has been a lack of balance between field visits and group discussions in the training program. In states like Gujarat, Uttarakhand, Haryana, Rajasthan, Himachal Pradesh, Uttar Pradesh, Madhya Pradesh and Orissa, this aspect is rated very low.

H. While contrasting the rating of trainers with that observed for various outcome indicators such as 1) development of understanding about various aspects of PRIs' functioning, 2) usefulness of training to work under RGSA and the 3) outcome of the training under RGSA, it is observed that the availability of a better qualified trainer is influencing positive outcomes in general and across many states.

I. A similar relation is found between the outcome variables and learning environment, reading / training materials, best practices / case studies and field-visits / group discussions. It urges for the need to strengthen these input variables to get the better outcomes from the training of the PRIs.

J. While deriving insights from this state-wise analysis, there is a need to factor-in the literacy level of the states. In some states like Kerala where literacy levels are high, definitely a high demand for a better-quality trainers and infrastructure is made while in other states where literacy levels are low, PRIs respondents might not be having the exposure to put forward such demands in their rating responses. But, that does not undermine the requirement for such inputs in those states. In such situation, the provision of better infrastructure across all the states at par would be the best solution to bring all PRIs across nation on a similar footing.

K. It is well known that capacity development encompasses more than imparting training. It encompasses strengthening institutional framework, providing handholding support, giving exposure to different initiatives and facilitating an environment where the capacity development inputs can be exercised. The current initiatives under RGSA primarily consist of classroom training of different durations while other important components are missing.

L. It was observed during the study that all the sample states focus more on training and pay less attention towards other components of capacity building. This has been one of important

obstacles in effective utilization of financial resources. Utilization of capacity development fund is also dependent upon some other factors like number of trainings organized, its outreach and achievement of other capacity building components such as exposure etc.

M. Though trainings conducted at present adopt different methodologies, the lecture method of training is being adopted overwhelmingly in all the states. Use of other methods of capacity building, as suggested by NCBF 2014 is less practiced. The methodology for training is designed based on the theme and the category of the trainees. A methodology adopted for a specific theme for ZP members might not be the same for GP members as level of understanding differs significantly.

N. **Training Modules, Manuals and Content -** Currently, the developed training modules/manuals/training materials are state specific, though they cover a number of schemes, which are common for all states like 73rd CAA, guidelines of central schemes/ central sponsored schemes, GPDP, DAY-NRLM etc.

O. Exposure visit to Adarsh Panchayat/ beacon Panchayats to gain from promising practices is one of the prescriptions of the NCBF 2014. However, in most cases, it is restricted to selected trainers, ERs and functionaries. Very few members of all the three levels were found visiting such Adarsh Panchayats/ Beacon Panchayats.

P. Organizing trainings in mixed groups of ERs and functionaries have shown better results in the States namely Rajasthan, West Bengal, Kerala and Karnataka and it has helped in minimizing the differences and solving operational problems.

Q. Satellite communication and information technology is not utilized to the fullest extent in many states for addressing capacity development requirements of the ERs. It has been reported in use in Maharashtra, Karnataka and Assam only.

R. The level of reference materials given to ERs has been found higher than their mental receptivity levels, specially for those who have lower educational background.

S. Capacity development requirements of the ERs who have been elected for the first time differs from those who have been elected multiple times. In such a case, prescribing the same subject and curriculum for both the categories would not be beneficial for the multi-termers. The data from different state elections show that more than 30-40 per cent ERs are multi-termers.

T. State rank analysis across advantages of training indicators, reveals that the state of West Bengal has been the best performing state. The next best performing state has been Andhra Pradesh. Kerala got the third position. Among the poor performing states, Gujarat has been at the top. This state has been the least performer. Haryana, Goa and Madhya Pradesh have been other low performing states.

4.1.3 Impact of the suggestions, recommendations and strategies as contained in National Capability Building Framework, 2014 on various aspects of Capacity Building

A. It has been realized that the all the sample states are aware of NCBF, 2014 and to a larger extent, they have followed the various recommendations framed into six different parameters namely, *Expanding the outreach of CB&T, Modes of training, Areas of training, Quality of training, Training of ERs of SC, ST and women and Institutional structure & processes*.

B. The magnitude of following the various recommendations varied in States based on the available system and resources. The ranking of States based on the following/practicing the

recommendations shows that States followed the recommendations in descending order are –West Bengal (I), Kerala (II), Karnataka (III), Assam (IV), Maharashtra & Oddisha (V), Uttarakhand (VI), Sikkim (VII), Jharkhand (VIII), Andhra Pradesh (IX), Rajasthan & Himachal Pradesh (X), Uttar Pradesh (XI), Goa & Madhya Pradesh (XII), Gujarat & Haryana (XIII) & Arunachal Pradesh (XIV).

C. Fund–Flow from MoPR, GoI and State Government is not released in time, especially since inception of RGSA and mandate of 60:40 ratio of GoI-GoR funding.

D. The States lacking in staffs, system and arrangement of institutions were ranked at lower level.

4.1.4 Need based modes of training adopted for respective sectors/ categories of stakeholders and extent of success achieved

A. Though the guidelines talk about the demand driven approach to capacity development, it does not seem practically feasible, especially when many ERs fail to articulate their needs. Interactions with many ERs confirm that they need more days of training along with other capacity development measures for better functioning.

B. It has also been reported that as per training schedule, many topics and issues were discussed but they were not understood by the trainees in many States amongst ward members namely, Haryana, Uttar Pradesh, Jharkhand, Madhya Pradesh, Goa, Arunachal Pradesh, Oddisha, Gujarat, Maharashtra, Rajasthan, Himachal Pradesh and Assam etc.

C. The special trainings for PESA village members reported organized in Andhra Pradesh at Block level. In States namely, Uttar Pradesh, Madhya Pradesh, Uttarakhand, Jharkhand, Oddisha, Rajasthan, Karnataka, Arunachal Pradesh and West Bengal no special efforts have been made for PESA members. The trainings have been organized as regular trainings similar to other ERs.

D. It has been realized that the States, which perform better in CB&T in terms of coverage and organizing quality trainings, certainly have a system of regular monitoring and supervision. It has been reported in the States of Kerala, Andhra Pradesh, Oddisha, West Bengal and Sikkim. Similarly, the States, which do not have a system of regular monitoring of CB&T, have performed poorer in terms of timely coverage, attendance and quality trainings. These States are Gujarat, Haryana, Madhya Pradesh, Goa and Arunachal Pradesh.

E. Collection of required information, processing and providing feedback (Information Management System) to the programme for improvement have been grey areas in all the states. Required information/data are not available in the expected order when required for analysis. For example, number of trainings conducted along with fund utilization and trainee details were not available in the sample states for ready analysis. It reflects that either information is not managed properly or there is no such information available with the department and training institutions. Organizing trainings as a part of capacity development would not be of that help, if learning generated from such programmes is not used properly.

F. In many States except Kerala, West Bengal, Sikkim, Karnataka and Maharashtra, limited devolution of funds is available for implementation. Functionaries provide limited scope to the ERs to perform as per the given inputs during training, making the learning merely textual and not practical.

G. In two States namely, Andhra Pradesh and Arunachal Pradesh, the term of ZP, BP and GP expired in year 2018. Hence, not much action has been observed. The administrator has been appointed to Gram Panchayats.

H. Participation of members and their active involvement in the process are key to the success of any training program. The present capacity building programme scores favorably on presence of target participants but active participation of the members in the process remains a challenge. Many ERs failed to participate actively in the process barring a few vocal persons. Looking at the methodologies followed and inputs adopted at these trainings, they seem to only improve the awareness levels rather than facilitate attitudinal and skill related improvements. These were States namely, Haryana, Madhya Pradesh and Uttar Pradesh, where trainings were organized even after 2 years and more period of election.

I. The members of Gram Panchayat were not very vibrant as far as the roles and responsibilities are concerned in states like Madhya Pradesh, Oddisha, Rajasthan, U.P., Haryana, Jharkhand etc. The active participation has been reported more visible of Sarpanch/Gram Pradhan only. The role of Gram Panchayat ward members were reported marginal. It cannot be supported as per the fundamental spirit of Gram Panchayat.

J. Training often is a onetime event for trainees and there is no follow-up at the PRI level neither by the trainers nor by the institutions imparting training. After training, it is assumed that it is the job of the trainees to use this in an environment, which is not always conducive to implementing the newly learnt inputs.

4.1.5 Performance of Panchayati Raj Departments of States and other concerned authorities putting in place the Institutional structure and process sanctioned by Government for CB & T, their maintenance/ upkeep and upgradation for optimum results.

A. The training institutions in the State and districts namely, SPRC/SIRD/DPRC and ETC levels have largely the availability of adequate facilities at most of the States except SIRD Gujarat which does not have hostel facilities and it is run in a private building, Arunachal Pradesh SIRD does not have good hostel facilities.

B. The infrastructure support from Ministry of Panchayati Raj, Government of India (MOPR, GOI) is well acknowledged in supporting states for SPRC and DPRCs. But still, it has been reported that there were states namely, Arunachal Pradesh, Sikkim, Andhra Pradesh, Himachal Pradesh & Rajasthan etc., where still the building is incomplete or if completed is not in use. May be some budget can be supported so that the investment from the Ministry can be well utilized for the purpose of CB&T.

C. In addition, it has been reported that training at District and block level does not have desired facilities for sitting, boarding and lodging arrangement. It has been reported that due to poor availability of infrastructure in most of the Blocks and Cluster level, the size of batch of trainees was reported large i.e. 60-100.

D. It has been observed that in the States namely, Uttar Pradesh, Haryana, Gujarat, Goa, and Jharkhand etc., the Master trainers/ resource persons were selected and trained. However, the Stake and regularity of involvement in trainings was reported erratic.

E. The Impact assessment team observed certain problems in the management of information, its compilation/processing and analysis. A system oriented approach to information management needs to be followed both at the state and district levels to strengthen the capacity development initiatives. The team has also experienced that the data management system of trainings and ERs are not objectively done. Hence, it is difficult to track which ERs have undergone which training, what could be the future requirement, etc.

4.1.6 Quality of Plans for providing training in mandatory, specialized, thematic, devolve sectors related areas and establishing appropriate network

A. The Induction trainings of District and Block officials and Functionaries were organized for 2-3 days in almost all the Sample States. Similarly, induction training was organized for 3-6 days for Sarpanchs/ Gram Pradhans and Up-Pradhans and for 2-3 days for ward members.

B. There were States where cascade mode of trainings was adopted. It results into completion of trainings. It has been reported in sample States of Rajasthan, Madhya Pradesh, Gujarat, Arunachal Pradesh etc. However, the question arises whether all the ERs were trained. If not, then what is the mechanism to train them? Also, it has been reported that the training has been organized in the State in a period of 6 months or so, but what about the quality of training, to what extent it helped in proper development of knowledge, skill and capacity to really undertake panchayat level execution and help in better functioning of local governance in effective and efficient manner?

C. In the sample states, trainings were organized as mandated namely, Induction trainings and refresher/ Thematic trainings. However, in Oddisha (2017), Assam (2018), Sikkim (2017), Maharashtra (20% every year) and West Bengal (2018) only Induction training has been reported because the election was held in 2017 and 2018. In states where a majority of ERs are educationally backward i.e. illiterate or semi-literate, this short training of 2 to 5 days is not sufficient to enhance their understanding on various issues. Thus, measuring the impact of the programme at this stage does not seem so relevant. However, attempt has been made to understand how the training has been beneficial to the ERs and what constraints they have been experiencing in utilizing the training inputs. The impact of training of PRIs has been assessed.

D. It has been reported that the refresher training and thematic trainings has been listed in the training calendar of the State. These trainings are also mixed with other sectors trainings namely, SBM, Child Rights, GPDP etc. Also, the arrangements has been made to organize the thematic/ refresher trainings as per the available budget.

E. Majority of the ERs undergone training reported that the refresher/ thematic trainings in which they have participated lacked in getting solutions of real problem and subjects we have concern. The training programme simply follow their plan/ module and give lecture on the subject in ideal situation. The practical aspects were mostly lacking even in the trainings of members of Zilla, Block and Gram Panchayat.

F. The respondents, especially those who are being trained for the first time, on issues of governance have responded positively on the gain in knowledge at the training programmes. Majority of the trainees agreed that training programmes helped them learn about various aspects of 73rd amendment, roles and responsibilities, understand schemes/programmes and devolved subjects.

4.1.7 Knowledge levels and capacities of trained elected representatives and other stakeholders to perform their official roles effectively and efficiently

A. In terms of the understanding developed as per the working requirement, it is observed that the impact of trainings has been the highest in the case of West Bengal. Similar has been the case with Andhra Pradesh where the respondents rated their responses very high while indicating the relevance of training in developing understanding as per working requirement across different aspects. Other better performing states have been Maharashtra, Himachal Pradesh, Uttarakhand and Kerala. But, the performance of states like Goa, Haryana, Gujarat, Madhya Pradesh and Jharkhand has been found consistently low across these indicators.

B. In response to the usefulness of the training program about its various aspects reveals that the state of West Bengal has been the best performing state. Similarly high performance has been recorded by the state of Andhra Prasdesh. In fact, the responses in both these states along with Maharashtra indicate that the training program has been very much instrumental in developing an understanding about various aspects helpful in working under RGSA. The state of Kerala is rated relatively low along with Karnataka, Sikkim and Assam. On the other hand, the usefulness of the training program to work under RGSA is rated very low in the case of Goa, Gujarat, Madhya Pradesh, Haryana, Rajasthan, Himachal Pradesh and Jharkhand. It may also be noted that the degree of dissatisfaction with the training program has been relatively high in Goa in contrast to other poor performing states.

C. About the benefits of capacity building & training, the state of West Bengal got the highest rating about the benefits of capacity building and training. The next best states have been Andhra Pradesh and Maharashtra. The state of Kerala got the fourth position followed by Arunachal Pradesh and Uttarakhand. On the other hand, the states like Goa, Gujarat, Jharkhand, Haryana, Madhya Pradesh, Himachal Pradesh, Rajasthan and Uttar Pradesh got low rating across these indicators.

D. Majority of sample respondents (99.9 percent) opined that training programme was useful & helpful. Training helped them in getting information & knowledge about various government schemes. It also helped in knowledge enrichment & skill upgradation.

E. Regarding mode of training, majority of sample respondents (62.9 percent) reported for mixed method viz. interactive/ participatory & lecture method. Majority of (81.7 percent) sample respondents reported that trainings were organized for 4 to 6 hours in a day.

F. Regarding whether Panchayat representatives had access to online mode of training, 27.3 percent sample respondents reported that they had access to online mode of training. These sample respondents were sarpanches who had access to online mode of training. Out of them 70.1 percent sample respondents found it useful.

G. Regarding facilities in Capacity Building & training programmes, 69.3 percent sample respondents rated arrangement of trainers in training programmes from good, very good to excellent,72.3 percent sample respondents rated learning environment in training programmes from good, very good to excellent, 61.7 percent sample respondents rated training venue, seating facilities & training aids from good, very good to excellent, 62.2 percent sample respondents rated training venue, seating facilities & training aids in training programmes from good, very good to excellent.

H. In terms of impact of training of PRIs especially on elected representatives, give the positive trend in especially getting information & developing knowledge about various government schemes, Panchayati Raj act, GPDP etc. Majority of sample elected panchayat

representatives (99.9 percent) reported that the training imparted to them under RGSA was useful & beneficial. Further, adding to its usefulness & benefits of training programme, 4.4 percent sample respondents rated training poor followed by 25.4 percent sample respondents rated training satisfactory, 31.1 percent sample respondents rated training good, 31.9 percent sample respondents rated training very good & 7.1 percent sample respondents rated training excellent. Thus, 70.1 percent sample respondents rated usefulness & benefits of training programme from good, very good to excellent, whereas remaining 29.8 percent sample respondents rated usefulness & benefits of training programme as satisfactory & poor.

I. The PRIs during field level assessment opined that the training organized was need based. In terms of organizing need based trainings, the better performing states were Andhra Pradesh (94 percent), West Bengal (97.6 percent) & Kerala (93.2 percent). The sample elected representatives (99.9 percent) opined that the training helped in skills upgradation & knowledge enrichment. Looking to skills upgradation & knowledge enrichment through trainings, the better performing states were West Bengal (98.1 percent), Kerala (95.5 percent) & Andhra Pradesh (93.6 percent). In addition, training under RGSA helped them in better performing their responsibilities. Further, training also helped elected panchayat representatives (100 percent) in developing positive attitude on roles & responsibilities of Gram Panchayat. Training enabled them & completely equipped on roles & responsibilities of GP for effective execution of development programmes, Social Justice etc.

J. The important aspect of training under RGSA for elected representatives was development of confidence and sense of responsibilities for economic development, people participation & social justice as reported by 66.3 percent sample respondents. In terms of developed confidence & increased sense of responsibility for economic development, people participation & social justice being reported beneficial for undertaking roles/ responsibilities were reported better in the States namely, Arunachal Pradesh (96.6 percent), West Bengal (96.7 percent) & Andhra Pradesh (94.6 percent).

K. In addition, training helped sample elected representatives in undertaking baseline data collection & situational analysis & development of GP development plan (64.2 percent).

L. Like-wise, training helped them (65.6 percent) in understanding Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) in gram Panchayat perspectives-poverty, gender, social justice etc. In terms of understanding Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) in gram Panchayat perspectives-poverty, gender, social justice etc being reported beneficial for undertaking roles/ responsibilities were reported better in the States namely, Andhra Pradesh (92 percent), West Bengal (94 percent) & Maharashtra (84.8 percent).

M. Training helped elected panchayat representatives in improving the performance of execution of various programmes in the Panchayat (67.2 percent). In addition, 67.4 percent sample respondents reported that training in addition to RGSA namely, SBM, NRLM, Water quality, Health etc. was found effective & useful in gram Panchayat.

N. It is evident from the impact assessment study that the training under RGSA on e-enablement of Panchayats is lagging behind as only 12.7 percent sample respondents who opined that understanding importance of e-governance, online (ICT) or e-enablement of Panchayats was covered during training.

O. The CB&T under RGSA has got instrumental role in developing better coordination amongst ERs & Panchayat functionaries was reported by 99.9 percent sample elected representatives. Further, training of elected representatives also helped reduction of conflict amongst PRIs & others. 100 percent sample respondents reported that training of elected

representatives helped in better execution of development programmes related to social justice, poverty alleviation & gender development.

P. In the training programme, discussions are held on various powers and functions of PRI members including the flow of funds through the PRIs for various purposes. However, in actuality, some of the funds supposed to be spent by the PRIs are not made available to them and unfortunately, most of them are ignorant about fund utilization. The ERs, therefore, consider the trainings a mere formality as the gap in preaching and practice persists.

Q. The standing committees are either defunct or in most cases do not get involved in the functionaries performing their responsibilities except in Kerala, Sikkim, Goa, West Bengal and Karnataka where it was reported more profound.

R. Elected representatives are the result of people's action and participation to elect their Panchayat leaders. Participation is also one of the most important components of good governance. Other components such as transparency, accountability, rule of law are also linked closely with the participation. Hence, the ERs are capable of mobilizing their people for development and meeting their economic development & social justice needs. This potential of ERs should be used in Trainings and then further addition can be done about the Panchayat Raj Act, schemes and prorgammes for development of areas and people and addressing the SDGs. In addition, ER should be empowered during trainings to use existing forums such as Gram Sabha and programmes such as MGNREGA, GPDP for utilisation of Fourteenth Finance Commission could be used as an opportunity to facilitate and trigger participation.

S. People want to participate in the decisions affecting their lives. Participation is also one of the most important components of good governance. Other components such as transparency, accountability, rule of law are also linked closely with the participation. If people participate in the public affairs, it is natural that they will be able to have better access to information and will seek answers from public authorities for their actions and non-actions. Hence, participation has the potential to not only deepen democracy but to strengthen good governance.

T. Participation is one of the most important dimensions of good governance and has positive correlations with other dimensions such as transparency and accountability. Enabling legal framework, although necessary, alone does not ensure people's participation in rural local governance. It needs to be facilitated and triggered with conscious and planned activities. Entry points for facilitating participation can be anyone of the development cycle: planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of development programmes.

U. **Comparison of benefits /outcome of CB&T amongst SC, ST, Elected women Representatives in comparison with the overall respondent PRIs –** It has been reported that the SCs (24 percent) and STs (24.1 percent) get more benefitted in comparison with EWR (20.1 percent) and the aggregate result (22.5 percent). STs were benefitted more in comparison to SCs, Women and overall respondents in seven States namely, West Bengal, Maharashtra, Uttarakhand, Sikkim, Himachal Pradesh, Madhya Pradesh and Gujarat. Similarly, SCs were benefitted more in comparison to STs, Women and overall respondents in eight States namely, Andhra Pradesh, Assam, Oddisha, Haryana, Karnataka, Kerala, Rajasthan & Jharkhand. In Goa State the benefits of training were reported lowest amongst PRIs. Thus, it show that the induction training and refresher/ thematic trainings under RGSA and other development works in the States provided better opportunity to SCs and STs to come forward and undertake the responsibilities related to Gram Panchayat development.

4.2 Recommendations

4.2.1 Improve Outreach of training programmes conducted for all stakeholders of Panchayati Raj System with particular stress on elected representatives amongst SC and ST categories, Elected Women Representatives and also those from other marginalized sections

A. **Ensure Resource Pool of dedicated Master Trainers/Resource Persons -** It is inevitable to have a dedicated team of trainers/resource persons at all the three different levels i.e. at the state, districts and blocks. In case, if the required quality of human resource is not available at the block level, then there should be an additional pool of RPs at the district level. Resource persons / Master trainers in the State should be given prime importance, as they are the backbone of the whole CB&T. It has been reported in many States that the Master trainers/ Resource persons in the trainings from SIRD, PRTI, SPRC, ETC, DPRC are selected and also nominated by the department or being selected based on the posts in many States viz., health functionaries, BDOs, ICDS officials, Agriculture officials and Panchayat development officers etc. While, organizing training at the block level, the RPs should move from districts to the blocks for conducting trainings.

B. The RPs should be from different backgrounds such as previous RPs who have experience of the 73rd amendment, NGO personnel with experience on schemes/programmes, academicians, independent development practitioners, retired government officials from different departments etc.

C. The empanelled resource persons should be reoriented, at least twice in a year at SPRC/ PRTI/SIRD level to update their knowledge, understanding and priority of the State.

D. It has been observed that in the States namely, Uttar Pradesh, Haryana, Gujarat, Goa, and Jharkhand etc., the Master trainers/ resource persons were selected and trained. However, the Stake and regularity of involvement in trainings was reported erratic. The state should develop mechanism to really use the created resource of master trainers/ resource persons regularly.

E. Resource Persons/Master trainers should get significant involvement/ opportunity in terms of getting engaged in productive manner in which they feel being used.

F. Getting honorarium and allowances in lucrative manner would also help in getting their support. In addition, getting involved in training sessions, Resource persons/ Master trainers should be used as handholding support in the periodic manner in the Gram Panchayat so that they should really facilitate in better/ professional manner. The resource persons' support in handholding the panchayat will help to institutionalize the system. In order to have dedicated team of trainers it needs to formalize the system rather than leaving everything adhoc for the purpose of organizing trainings for ERs as per the ritual.

G. In order to formalize the system of Master trainers/ resource persons, a formal agreement should be signed with concerned SIRD/department/ SPRC/ DPRC to conduct stipulated minimum number of sessions per month on his/her specialized subject. State departments may think of hiking the honorarium of the RPs per session/day to make it an attractive option. Each district should have at least four to five subject specific experts to deal with the training sessions. Similarly, at the state level, there should be an adequate number of experts for different subjects to meet the training requirements.

H. **Trainings at Multi-Location -** The State level trainers' resource pool can be involved on a continuous basis to conduct more number of programmes simultaneously in different

locations if SIRD campus does not have the required infrastructure. Secondly, organizing trainings only in PRTI/ SPRC/SIRD/ETC/DPRC/DPR&TC campus, in a phased manner may not contribute towards improving the outreach. Therefore, it is required that capacity development trainings should be organized in multi-locations, at the state level, not restricting it within the SIRD campus. For logistics and monitoring, one person from SIRD/departmental official may tie up with each training location. If required, any private agency/state level NGO may be involved for organizing trainings where the master trainers will conduct different sessions. Use of private institutional campus and other government departmental campus may be thought of for the purpose. The same approach may also be adopted at the district and Block level.

I. **Collaboration of NGOs/ Academic Institutions -** To have better outreach of the CB&T under RGSA, the current availability of infrastructures and human resources may not be conducive to conducting large-scale capacity building training on a sustained basis. Hence, collaboration/ partnership with academic institutions, other training institutions, rural development institutions, reputed NGOs etc. may be the solution. This can serve two different purposes i.e. availability of qualified professionals to deal with different sessions, and secondly, availability of infrastructure for conducting trainings.

J. SATCOM training may be used by all SIRDs for follow-up and reinforcement, in addition to direct training, to further expand the outreach of training.

K. The cascade mode training used by Sates/ SIRDs needs to continue with qualitative improvement in management and effective monitoring & supervision so that the ERs should not be left out and if needed can be dealt as per the situation.

L. Capacity Building &Training of core Panchayat functionaries is the core area and is vital, too. Therefore all States/PRTI/SPRC/ SIRDs need to develop a calendar to train core Panchayat functionaries effectively rather than meeting the numbers.

M. There is need to reach out to decision makers and other people/ institutions with influence may be District administration, Zilla Panchayat, MPs and MLAs to create a supportive environment for Panchayats.

N. To increase the outreach of the capacity development programmes and impart the inputs well, the present State level and regional level training institutions need to be staffed with core faculty members and infrastructure needs to be improved. Many SIRDs, PRTI, ETCs and DPRCs in sample states are deficient in these aspects. Secondly, number of core faculties dealing with PRI acts and governance aspect is low at SIRD level, which has been a problem in delivery of this theme. Therefore, improvement in staffing and infrastructure would be helpful in strengthening the capacity development initiative.

O. The elected representatives, elected women representatives, SC, ST and PESA representatives should be tracked by name at Block, district and State level so that they can be tracked for Induction, Refresher/ Thematic trainings in a regular manner.

4.2.2 Ensure Quality training provided to various stakeholders, methods & procedure adopted for need based, thematic and sectors convergent training

A. **Convergence of Capacity Building Efforts -** The capacity development component of RGSA is largely guided by the NCBF, 2014. It is also difficult to justify that the capacity development requirements of ERs in RGSA, GPDP, PPC are similar. However, there are other programmes in which the Gram Panchayat has different committees of the same ERs and citizens made under the project / schemes viz., Sarva/ Samgra Shiksha Abhiyan, Village Water and

sanitation committee under SBM were reported completely separate from other Gram Panchayat Committee under GPDP. It could be of great use, if the convergence of CB&T under RGSA can be converged with other sectoral departments. Then, addressing the SDGs would be much easier in the Gram Panchayat.

B. **Capacity Development - Output Orientation -** Capacity development approach should focus more on quality of delivery rather than quantum of achievement in terms of trainee coverage and number of trainings organized. When the quantum of coverage in the suggested decentralized/cascading model can be achieved, focus should be on the quality of inputs and delivery efficiency achieved through a mixed mode of capacity development approach suggested in NCBF, 2014. Focusing on the goal of strengthened local governance, it means, the capacity development should be tailored to be more output oriented and action committed in an environment that is conducive and supportive for exercising the inputs at district and Block level.

C. **Exposure Visits/ Field Visits -** Keeping in mind the huge number of members in all the three tiers, it can be planned that at least each ER leader, starting from GP to ZP should visit such Adarsh Panchayats/ Beacon Panchayats. It is recommended that a visit to an Adarsh Panchayat/ Beacon Panchayat by the leaders of ERs [GP Sarpanch, IP and ZP Chairman and vice chairman] in the first year of their term should be made compulsory.

D. While planning and executing the GPDP in the Gram Panchayat, this exposure visit will expand the vision and facilitate peer learning which have better outcome in terms of quality execution and sustainability of the initiatives at Panchayat.

E. Organizing trainings in mixed groups of ERs and functionaries will help to minimize the differences and solve operational problems. So, when trainings are organized on different schemes/programmes like MGNREGA, DAY-NRLM, Water and sanitation etc., mixed group training is highly recommended.

F. A methodology adopted for a specific theme for ZP members might not be the same for GP members as level of understanding differs significantly. More use of participatory and interactive methods is essential e.g., group discussions, case analysis, simulation games, plenary discussions, role-play, field visits etc. Each training session should be designed in such a way that participants can share their views and learn to solve the problems. In addition, there is greater use to really act upon with required methodology for ERs having different social status, women, and their frequency of working ERs (First timer, second timer etc.).

G. Present capacity development approach under RGSA is much more focused on trainings while other means of capacity building are equally essential to realize the objectives of developing human resource and strengthening PR institutions. Along with trainings, the NCBF 2014 suggests focus on capacity building modes like hand holding, escorting, exposure, spot guidance, campaign mode in PESA areas etc. Theoretical in-puts blended with practical experience and exposure will help the ERs learn better and much faster.

H. Largely, the present design and strategy of capacity development is more focused on developing knowledge and sharing information related to schemes/programmes etc. with the trainees in formal setup. Though, these are two important aspects of capacity development, without proper attitudes and operational skills, the training cannot be applied at the work sphere. Developing a positive attitude, bringing a behavioural change in one's approach and imparting skills to perform should be considered as major inputs of capacity development. Achieving sustainability through capacity utilization is more important than only imparting training which does not cascade down for the benefit of the people. The present pattern of organizing training does not seem conducive to dealing with skill and

behavioural components of capacity development for all the categories of ERs and functionaries.

I. Quite sizeable portion of ERs i.e. ward members and Sarpanchs and also many Block Panchayat /Intermediary Panchayat members are educationally backward. The reference materials and training modules have very little significance for them. This is one of the reasons why more than 50 per cent trained members never go through the materials after the training. Therefore, it is important to design the reference materials in such a way that they are informative, create an interest and ERs are compelled to refer to them. Embodying visuals, illustrations, thematic pictures etc. in a flow chart mode along with minimizing text would be of much help. Different IEC materials and flipbooks can be developed and distributed to the semiliterate/poorly educated ERs and given some handholding support to realize the importance of these reading and IEC materials.

J. Most of the trainings depend heavily on the lecture method to convey messages related to different themes. Use of other training methods is not widespread which makes it difficult for the trainees, especially for GP and Block Panchayat members to remember the inputs. There is poor follow-up of trainings, providing less scope for them to get clarity on operational issues from time to time. Use of adult learning principles with rigorous follow-up can be of immense help to minimize the input losses. The trainers need to be oriented accordingly to use different methodologies suitable for themes in the content to create interest among the trainees.

K. In order to make the training sessions more participatory, interactive and learning oriented, it is a prerequisite that number of trainees should be of a manageable size. It has been reported almost in many cases the size of trainees per training is even more than 60, which is suitable for a workshop but not for training. Large numbers restrict two- way sharing and learning and hinder imparting quality inputs in a participatory manner. The ideal size of 40 trainees per training could be helpful in overcoming this limitation.

L. Capacity development of ERs in just three to four days and covering a gamut of subjects is difficult to achieve. Therefore, in the present situation, the time allows for mere awareness creation rather than training. ERs find the inputs very useful and are interested in attending more such programmes for gaining knowledge. It may be helpful to organize more trainings in a cascade mode to cover the high number of ERs at GP and block levels.

M. While organizing training for ERs, specially Sarpanchs /Gram Pradhans and Ward members, the suitable time should be thought of when the ERs are free from agriculture and other necessary engagements. The season during which the training sessions are organized, have an impact on the trainees' turn out and their continuity in the programme. Trainings organized in the agricultural sessions are usually not a conducive period for the ERs as many are engaged in agricultural activities. Such factors need to be kept in mind when preparing the training calendar.

N. In present situation Video conferencing (VC) can be used for solving the problems of ERs through question answer sessions, guidance on operational issues, follow-up of earlier trainings, re-orientation on subject matters, screening of documentaries on success/promising cases etc. State may set a regular system and process to hold VC for mobilizing the PRIs and providing immediate relief, if required.

O. Capacity development requirements of the ERs who have been elected for the first time differs from those who have been elected multiple times. So, it is essential that the capacity development strategy, which also includes training, should be designed differently based on number of times a person is elected by position. Similarly, different training strategies should

be devised for the EWRs, PESA, SCs and STs and hence, exclusive trainings can be organized for them.

P. The training/reading materials may be published/ prepared in local languages, which was demanded by the Elected Representatives in Goa, Sikkim & Arunachal Pradesh.

Q. In addition, looking to the educational level the Capacity building and training can be planned and it would certainly help in better outcome even from ERs having lower educational level. It can be well understood the capacity building in perspective that makes ERs 'Capable' (*Kabil in Hindi language*) rather than pushing /making them for 'Successful' (*Kamyab in Hindi language)*.

R. SPRCs/PRITI/State Panchayat Raj Department/ SIRDs and other training institutes need to review training modes for various training programmes in-depth and periodically and use the training mode as per requirements, the most suitable ones.

S. Institutional capacities need to be built to undertake training in various modes. Each Training Institutes/PRTI/SPRC/SIRD can increase its range continuously to use various modes of training for effective delivery.

4.2.3 Execute the suggestions, recommendations and strategies as contained in National Capability Building Framework, 2014 on various aspects of Capacity Building

A. The State should follow the recommendations given in NCBF, 2014 on six different parameters namely, Expanding the outreach of CB&T, Modes of training, Areas of training, Quality of training, Training of ERs of SC, ST and women and Institutional structure & processes in order to have quality trainings and have cent percent outreach and quality. The States namely, Gujarat, Haryana, Arunachal Pradesh and Madhya Pradesh are doing well but the system, staffs and management need to be improved in terms of following the NCBF, 2014.

B. The Fund should be released in time to the training institutes so that the recommendations of NCBF, 2014 can be well thought of and followed.

C. The SIRDs largely demanded for release of funds directly from the Ministry of Panchayat Raj, GOI as it was done earlier.

D. The NCBF 2014 now needs to be updated in view of new scheme of RGSA and new initiative of People's Plan Campaign of GoI for GPDP, by MoPR & MoRD, GoI.

4.2.4 Strategy to ensure Need based modes of training adopted for respective sectors/ categories of stakeholders

A. **Capacity Building Need Assessment -** Assessment of capacity requirements of ERs and functionaries should be conducted at a regular interval, at least once in two years. It will help to identify and address the changing needs of the ERs and officials. Moreover, such assessments should be conducted separately for the EWRs and ERs of PESA area to understand their specific needs. The need assessment should not be confined only to training but extend to skill requirements for meeting current roles and responsibilities demands.

B. A Logical Capacity Development approach is recommended which would combine capacity development need identification process in a decentralized manner, consolidation of identified needs based on trainee category/first term/second term ERs

etc., designing modules/ manuals/training materials based on identified needs, field testing/piloting the curriculum/ modules, redesigning the curriculum/modules based on piloting, finalizing methodology of input delivery by session, delivering the inputs, monitoring the quality of inputs and improving upon it etc. Looking to the changing nature of capacity requirement, it is suggested that the capacity building need assessment should not be one time activity, rather it should be conducted minimum of twice in a five year term of ERs.

C. **Demand vs. Supply -** Interactions with many ERs confirm that they need more days of training along with other capacity development measures for better functioning. Therefore, the capacity building inputs should be largely supply-based for first termers and demand-based for multi-termers.

D. It has also been reported that as per training schedule, many topics and issues were discussed but the trainees did not understand them. It needs that less issues/ topics should be covered but should be regularly based on their roles and responsibilities rather providing input in the training, which is very much required with that group of ERs.

4.2.5 Improve Performance of Panchayati Raj Departments of States and other concerned authorities putting in place the Institutional structure and process sanctioned by Government for CB & T, their maintenance/ upkeep and upgradation for optimum results

A. **Capacity Development of Trainers/Faculties/Officials -** Faculty improvement programmes for the faculty of SPRC/PRTI/SIRDs and ETCs may be taken up at regular intervals, at least once in six months. By this, the associated trainers/faculties will get opportunities to improve their knowledge on current trends and can update themselves. Importantly, centralized training of trainers would be helpful to standardize the curriculum and course content keeping the broader perspective intact.

However, SPRC and SPMU have been reported formed in many States but their action should be visible in terms of institutional development and more on its delivery outcome rather than having members/ experts team holding some positions. The proactive initiatives in better planning and undertaking quality training can be well thought of in regular manner rather than every time looking for administrative powers and actions only.

B. **Association of NGOs/Other Institutions -** The State should take the outside resource institutions as opportunity and should plan if they really required their support looking to their capacity. There are states, which have started involving NGOs and academic institutions in the capacity building & Training process either directly or indirectly. More specifically, Orissa, Jharkhand, Gujarat, Uttarakhand & Maharashtra have identified and empanelled Institutions/ NGOs who have been organizing training programmes at the district and block levels. The effectiveness of this model of capacity building delivery can be used for involving experienced NGOs/other institutions after scrutinizing them carefully. In order to ensure quality State may devise some monitoring and support mechanism so that quality of delivery can be tracked and improved subsequently. This approach will help to access the service of experienced practitioners, ensure wider outreach, infuse real experience to the theoretical inputs and build a broad platform where NGOs and the government contribute significantly hand in hand to improve the local governance system through capacity building.

C. **Strengthening SPRC/DPRC/ DPT&RC/SIRD/ETCs -** In all the Sample States where SIRD is functional, the nodal agency for CB&T reported that the full capacity of Faculty is still lacking. These institutions require the human resource as well as mobility support to really run the whole show in desired a manner. There were States still looking to get regular

academic faculty namely, Arunachal Pradesh, West Bengal, Rajasthan, Andhra Pradesh, Haryana, Goa, Gujarat. In Gujarat it has been reported that SIRD having only faculty positions filled has been given the responsibility of Training in the State. In West Bengal BRAIPARD is running on adhoc faculty, which affects the proper working of SIRD for the cause of CB&T under RGSA. Also, SIRD, Gujarat is being run in rented building. For trainings, they have to hire Venue and training logistics at State level. In Goa, GIPARD does not have residential facility. Hence, the Trainees under RGSA have to do daily up and down from the training venue (even 70-80 kms). In Arunachal Pradesh, SIRD demanded for vehicle in order to undertake the monitoring of trainings in the State.

D. For quality assurance and monitoring, SPRC/SIRD/PRITI/Training Institutes/ department may constitute the team. Nevertheless, before such trainings are organized, the collaborating agency should discuss with SPRC/SIRD/ department the inputs to be delivered and methodology to be followed for delivery. Based on the directives, such agencies may follow innovative methodologies for imparting trainings.

E. It has been observed that the State and District level training institutions namely, SIRD, CTI, STARPARD and PRTI which took the role of nodal institutions for undertaking the CB&T under RGSA are undertaking the responsibilities in desired manner at large. However, 'in principle as every institution gets older', it certainly requires revamping/ overhauling in terms of Human resource support, infrastructure support and mobility support to really meet the present demand in quality manner and should be more relevant for the RGSA trainings in the State.

F. **Human Resource -** To conduct large-scale programmes, especially for face-to-face trainings, it is essential that the required human resource should be available at the SPRC/SIRD/DPRC and ETC levels. Almost all the state SIRDs have expressed their concern about poor staffing and its negative impact on training outreach. In West Bengal, an institution called STARPARD has been formed which has pool of more than 10 subject experts to conduct trainings. Such systems may be feasible for other states where SPRC/departments/SIRD can recruit experienced persons on an annual contract to support the organization and conduct trainings.

G. There were DPRCs in States where buildings were still in construction phase. There were States where the DPRC has been constructed but not yet functional in terms of staffs and faculties viz. Arunachal Pradesh, Rajasthan and Himachal Pradesh etc. Therefore, there is need to realize/ use the investment made in creation of these institutions.

H. In States like Uttar Pradesh, Madhya Pradesh, Haryana, Gujarat and Jharkhand lack proper manpower at Gram Panchayat level, may be the computer operator and other experts. In Uttar Pradesh, even one Gram Vikas Adhikari/ Panchayat Secretary has to take the responsibility of 5-10 Gram Panchayats.

I. **Knowledge Transfer System -** In addition to formal trainings, handholding support is essential for the ERs to develop their capacity. A district/ block level support team may be constituted for the purpose comprising subject experts, retired government officials, people with a finance background, experienced ERs who have demonstrated a noticeable performance and other experts. In the knowledge and experience transfer system, ERs with experience would be of much help because of their previous working know-how. They can guide and provide support to the Panchayats when required. Initially, after the election of ERs, the senior ERs can extend handholding support regularly. Along with trainings, hand holding support in the initial year will help the newly ERs to understand the overall working process, system and functions.

J. Strengthening monitoring and supervision system is essential to ensure quality of inputs and keep track of the progress on the plan. Monitoring mechanisms need to be devised at the state and district levels ina regular manner.

K. In addition, it needs to track the trainings imparted to the particular ERs. It will help in 100 percent coverage of the ERs/ PRIs. The state and districts should have a proper foolproof system of monitoring the CB&T of ERs.

L. Many of trainers selected from line departments are not interested in conducting the training programmes (namely, Rajasthan, Arunachal Pradesh). The trainers' selection is driven more by departmental processes rather than any initiative on their part. Apart from performing their primary responsibility, these trainers also facilitate different training programmes. As a result, there has been lack of follow-up learning in real life situations and trainer involvement in the process at the ground level.

M. The honorarium paid to trainers in the States other than Kerala, Karnataka & Haryana has not been lucrative enough to motivate external experts to get involved and deliver the inputs in a regular manner. An improvement in the remuneration package of the external RPs and financial incentives for trainers selected from government should be considered to bring in and retain good resource persons. Apart from this, an assessment of trainers from time to time is also essential.

N. States had devised different mechanisms to monitor and supervise the training programmes, but operationally, it has been a challenge to assess them. The present system of monitoring the training programmes concentrates more on organizational aspects rather than the quality of the programme, inputs and its utility. An independent monitoring team is highly essential at both State and District level.

O. Resource team/Master Trainers should be regularly engaged in follow-up and handholding support, which will add value to the effective functioning of Gram Panchayats in light of GPDP, Mission Antodaya and SDGs. It will help in multifold ways. First, the Master trainer really looks into the system and functions of Gram Panchayat as per the mandate and issues covered in the trainings; secondly, facilitate necessary correction or address the problem and thirdly, ensure the outcome/impact as per the guidelines of the various development programmes, SDGs, Mission Antyodaya, Aspirational and PESA. The regular support and involvement of Master trainers will camouflage the Gram Panchayats, if is done seriously beyond only on papers.

P. It is ultimately the people and Gram Sabha, who are the most important stakeholders of the Panchayats. The success of establishing a more responsive and efficient Panchayat system has to be judged by the people, who have the ultimate power to take corrective measures for improving the system. However, the initiatives taken to strengthen Gram Sabha under the scope of the scheme are very poor. It is essential that special sensitization measures should be taken up to make people aware of different dimensions of PRI, roles and responsibilities of PRI members, different programmes/schemes/ Missions etc.

Q. Special focused training interventions have to be designed for training of ERs and officials of PRIs and PESA related departments in PESA regions of the nine schedule-V area in the State.

R. Training for empowerment of Gram Sabhas in PESA areas, has to be taken in a campaign mode to make the Gram sabha truly vibrant in the spirit of PESA provisions.

S. Functionaries hired under RGPSA especially mobilizers for PESA areas have to be rigorously trained for effectively supporting Gram Sabhas in PESA region.

T. **Information Management System -** System oriented information management system needs to be introduced which would not only track the progress but also flag the progress mismatch. Apart from that, it will also be of immense help to capture qualitative components and highlight success cases for learning. Thus, this professional approach need to be installed for the purpose of effective and efficient Planning, execution, Monitoring and finally in overall Management of Quality Capacity Building & Training for PRIs.

4.2.6 Ensure Quality of Plans for providing training in mandatory, specialized, thematic, devolve sectors related areas and establishing appropriate network

A. The quality plan for CB&T is the primary step for quality trainings in order to equip ERs with required knowledge, skills, capacity and motivation. The training plan certainly should include the training dates, batches of training, trainers, venue etc. Thus, considering the total ERs in a state by their functional levels and their position in the PR system, training venues should be arranged accordingly at different levels. For the ERs of GPs, training of ward members can be organized at the cluster levels whereas, training of Sarpanchs and Upa Sarpanchs, can be organized at Block level / district level. Similarly, at the Intermediate Panchayat / Block Panchayat level, training of Intermediate Panchayat members can be organized at the district levels whereas for the district and Block chairman and vice-chairman, it can be organized at the state level. Training of all the ZP members can be organized at the District/ State level as per the convenience.

B. The States should take up capacity building initiatives on a regular basis, adhering to the state plan approved by the MoPR. Along with physical monitoring, MoPR should conduct financial monitoring on a monthly basis checking the proposed plan and achievements made against it. Based on this monthly progress, a quarterly monitoring of physical and financial plans would help MoPR and the states to streamline the effective fund utilization in capacity development. It is suggested that more number of exposure programmes should be organized for Block Panchayat and GP functionaries and ERs at regular intervals. It will break the thoughts of ERs when they see other Panchayats, Blocks and districts perform better and get good support from citizens.

4.2.7 Policy Issues

A. As practical mode of giving training to ERs and Panchayat Functionaries certainly provides, better space to them to learn new dimensions, programme planning and execution process, so that right actions may be taken up at the right time. In addition, there is need to equip GP with required number of staffs, may be Gram Vikas Adhikari/ secretary of Gram Panchayat, Computer operators in addition to CB&T in order to really run GP as per Panchayati Raj Act.

B. At GP level budget should be based on real situation rather than model budget for work. This affects the working fame of Gram Pradhan. ERs get disinterested in various activities.

C. The ward members in case of State having direct election of Panchayat (Gram Pradhan/ Sarpanch) have not been given much space in the GP in terms of active role in participation in planning and management. Hence, their interests were at lower level.

D. The Gram Panchayat in reality has no control over any line department in all the sample states namely, Health, education, ICDS, Agriculture etc. Hence, even after good CB&T not much impact has been registered in development of social sectors.

E. In GPDP no other sectors / department put their budget as per GP requirement. The fund available is only FFC and SFC. Hence, not much mobilization of GP has been visible even

after good trainings of ERs. Thus, it is time to think upon the devolution of Subjects/department and funds as per eleventh schedule in real sense.

F. Gram Panchayat has not much role in deciding the Pradhan Mantri Awaas Yojana (PMAY) /Pension Yojana/ Social security etc. Hence, the stake of Gram Pradhan is not much recognized by the citizens too. As a result, the participation of citizens in the Gram Panchayat is at lower level.

G. Looking to the roles of Gram Panchayat in GPDP, SDGs, and Mission Antyodaya, the training methodology requires more focus on visuals and pictures for effective communication along with presentations with practical presentation through case studies and demonstrations. A change in the current working environment will also be critical to ensure learning translated in to action. This may require some handholding or facilitative support to Gram Panchayat with a proper redressal mechanism for grievances. For officials, trainings have been useful to understand Panchayat Raj system, administrative procedures and their own roles and responsibilities. This was felt most by the first time appointees, particularly the secretaries of Gram Panchayats.

H. The Zilla Panchayat and Block Panchayat Chairperson and members after 14 Finance Commission has not much role as far as budgetary control over Panchayat Development fund. In all the sample States, the first two tiers of Panchayati Raj were not comfortable as they found not much role to play. Thus, it is recommended that the proper participation in the process of development should be thought of for Zilla and Block Panchayat elected representatives.

I. Some other critical issues that have come up and which need attention include first, training of ERs within six months of their election, currently this was reported delayed in a few States; second, refresher programmes should be conducted as a follow-up measure; third, increase in the number of days of training to cover all the components of the curriculum as per their understanding and educational level; fourth, ICT based training programmes to be conducted as follow-up of earlier training inputs; fifth, exposure visits should be conducted during the training programmes to enrich the learning; sixth, provision of honorarium /wage loss especially for ward members; seventh, mixed training of PRIs and officials should be encouraged so that operational issues can be sorted out and also they can understand their roles and responsibility in each other jurisdiction.

J. Capacity Building & Training is a means to achieve the goal of a decentralized governance system, which is vibrant and beneficial for the people. Besides building capacities of individuals, it is important to strengthen the Panchayat Raj institutions to realize this goal. At the same time, to allow elected representatives to play their role effectively, it is important that states should make systematic progress in devolving funds, functions and functionaries to the PRIs as intended in the Constitutional Amendments. In addition, the professional handholding support may be planned should be given all the year round in order to get quality plans, convergence, execution and largely improving the 'Quality of Life' of its citizens what has been envisaged through GPDP to achieve the SDGs in time bound manner.

ANNEXURE

A. Tables of Responses of Elected Representatives

Table A 1: Sex and Age Group of Respondent

	Sex			Age Group				
State	Male	Female	Total	Upto 25	26-50	51-75	Above 75	Total
Andhra Pradesh	120	83	203	69	131	3		203
%	59.1	40.9	100.0	34.0	64.5	1.5		100
Arunachal Pradesh	232	179	411	4	387	20		411
%	56.4	43.6	100.0	1.0	94.2	4.9		100
Assam	356	253	609	17	551	40	1	609
%	58.5	41.5	100.0	2.8	90.5	6.6	0.2	100
Goa	129	74	203	1	169	33		203
%	63.5	36.5	100.0	0.5	83.3	16.3		100
Gujarat	360	246	606	8	478	120		606
%	59.4	40.6	100.0	1.3	78.9	19.8		100
Haryana	262	143	405	26	340	39		405
%	64.7	35.3	100.0	6.4	84.0	9.6		100
Himachal Pradesh	96	110	206	4	157	45		206
%	46.6	53.4	100.0	1.9	76.2	21.8		100
Jharkhand	181	215	396	11	354	31		396
%	45.7	54.3	100.0	2.8	89.4	7.8		100
Karnataka	319	269	588	2	567	19		588
%	54.3	45.7	100.0	0.3	96.4	3.2		100
Kerala	99	100	199		143	55	1	199
%	49.7	50.3	100.0		71.9	27.6	0.5	100
Madhya Pradesh	526	463	989	3	797	189		989
%	53.2	46.8	100.0	0.3	80.6	19.1		100
Maharashtra	410	369	779	26	677	76		779
%	52.6	47.4	100.0	3.3	86.9	9.8		100
Orissa	106	116	222	5	199	18		222
%	47.7	52.3	100.0	2.3	89.6	8.1		100
Rajasthan	322	276	598	43	464	90	1	598
%	53.8	46.2	100.0	7.2	77.6	15.1	0.2	100
Sikkim	98	99	197	1	178	18		197
%	49.7	50.3	100.0	0.5	90.4	9.1		100
Uttar Pradesh	1290	592	1882	43	1526	311	2	1882
%	68.5	31.5	100.0	2.3	81.1	16.5	0.1	100
Uttrakhand	103	92	195	8	159	28		195
%	52.8	47.2	100.0	4.1	81.5	14.4		100
West Bengal	182	281	463	33	361	65	4	463
%	39.3	60.7	100.0	7.1	78.0	14.0	0.9	100
Total	5191	3960	9151	304	7638	1200	9	9151
%	56.7	43.3	100.0	3.3	83.5	13.1	0.1	100

Table A 2: Education Level of Respondent

State	Illiterate	Literate	Primary	Middle	Secondary	Sr. Secondary	Graduate & Above	Total
Andhra Pradesh		7	4	7	14	39	132	203
%		3.4	2.0	3.4	6.9	19.2	65.0	100
Arunachal Pradesh	18	20	66	162	90	47	8	411
%	4.4	4.9	16.1	39.4	21.9	11.4	1.9	100
Assam	6	63	62	143	200	70	65	609
%	1.0	10.3	10.2	23.5	32.8	11.5	10.7	100
Goa	1		3	21	36	37	105	203
%	0.5		1.5	10.3	17.7	18.2	51.7	100
Gujarat	57	52	116	93	157	88	43	606
%	9.4	8.6	19.1	15.3	25.9	14.5	7.1	100
Haryana		5	19	69	34	83	195	405
%		1.2	4.7	17.0	8.4	20.5	48.1	100
Himachal Pradesh	5	6	23	36	73	31	32	206
%	2.4	2.9	11.2	17.5	35.4	15.0	15.5	100
Jharkhand	6	33	27	100	104	80	46	396
%	1.5	8.3	6.8	25.3	26.3	20.2	11.6	100
Karnataka	10	15	21	47	103	203	189	588
%	1.7	2.6	3.6	8.0	17.5	34.5	32.1	100
Kerala		3	2	9	25	44	116	199
%		1.5	1.0	4.5	12.6	22.1	58.3	100
Madhya Pradesh	25	145	221	339	80	111	68	989
%	2.5	14.7	22.3	34.3	8.1	11.2	6.9	100
Maharashtra	13	224	155	170	10	76	131	779
%	1.7	28.8	19.9	21.8	1.3	9.8	16.8	100
Orissa		22	20	56	25	62	37	222
%		9.9	9.0	25.2	11.3	27.9	16.7	100
Rajasthan		143	88	155	59	45	108	598
%		23.9	14.7	25.9	9.9	7.5	18.1	100
Sikkim		9	16	44	71	26	31	197
%		4.6	8.1	22.3	36.0	13.2	15.7	100
Uttar Pradesh	140	342	295	355	203	258	289	1882
%	7.4	18.2	15.7	18.9	10.8	13.7	15.4	100
Uttrakhand	13	52	23	50	17	18	22	195
%	6.7	26.7	11.8	25.6	8.7	9.2	11.3	100
West Bengal	9	10	56	160	114	53	61	463
%	1.9	2.2	12.1	34.6	24.6	11.4	13.2	100
Total	303	1151	1217	2016	1415	1371	1678	9151
%	3.3	12.6	13.3	22.0	15.5	15.0	18.3	100

Table A 3: Social Category of Respondent

State	SC	ST	OBC	General	Total
Andhra Pradesh	12	61	98	32	203
%	5.9	30.0	48.3	15.8	100
Arunachal Pradesh	2	311	16	82	411
%	0.5	75.7	3.9	20.0	100
Assam	52	93	228	236	609
%	8.5	15.3	37.4	38.8	100
Goa	5	3	70	125	203
%	2.5	1.5	34.5	61.6	100
Gujarat	71	184	231	120	606
%	11.7	30.4	38.1	19.8	100
Haryana	76	2	217	110	405
%	18.8	0.5	53.6	27.2	100
Himachal Pradesh	106	7	4	89	206
%	51.5	3.4	1.9	43.2	100
Jharkhand	15	303	65	13	396
%	3.8	76.5	16.4	3.3	100
Karnataka	70	128	147	243	588
%	11.9	21.8	25.0	41.3	100
Kerala	23		63	113	199
%	11.6		31.7	56.8	100
Madhya Pradesh	126	167	515	181	989
%	12.7	16.9	52.1	18.3	100
Maharashtra	108	305	238	128	779
%	13.9	39.2	30.6	16.4	100
Orissa	46	43	51	82	222
%	20.7	19.4	23.0	36.9	100
Rajasthan	102	202	200	94	598
%	17.1	33.8	33.4	15.7	100
Sikkim	9	58	122	8	197
%	4.6	29.4	61.9	4.1	100
Uttar Pradesh	457	42	941	442	1882
%	24.3	2.2	50.0	23.5	100
Uttrakhand	84	6	94	11	195
%	43.1	3.1	48.2	5.6	100
West Bengal	166	60	92	145	463
%	35.9	13.0	19.9	31.3	100
Total	1530	1975	3392	2254	9151
%	16.7	21.6	37.1	24.6	100

Table A4: Category of Respondent

State	Zilla Panchayat Member	Block Panchayat Member	Sarpanch	Panch/ Member	Other	Total
Andhra Pradesh	1	10	16	78	98	203
%	0.5	4.9	7.9	38.4	48.3	100
Arunachal Pradesh	1	21	40	288	61	411
%	0.2	5.1	9.7	70.1	14.8	100
Assam	5	13	151	428	12	609
%	0.8	2.1	24.8	70.3	2.0	100
Goa			29	173	1	203
%			14.3	85.2	0.5	100
Gujarat		3	187	387	29	606
%		0.5	30.9	63.9	4.8	100
Haryana	1		132	271	1	405
%	0.2		32.6	66.9	0.2	100
Himachal Pradesh		3	26	160	17	206
%		1.5	12.6	77.7	8.3	100
Jharkhand	4	15	88	286	3	396
%	1.0	3.8	22.2	72.2	0.8	100
Karnataka	1	29	122	420	16	588
%	0.2	4.9	20.7	71.4	2.7	100
Kerala	5	8	60	126		199
%	2.5	4.0	30.2	63.3		100
Madhya Pradesh	1	7	691	287	3	989
%	0.1	0.7	69.9	29.0	0.3	100
Maharashtra	2	23	206	543	5	779
%	0.3	3.0	26.4	69.7	0.6	100
Orissa	1	2	100	114	5	222
%	0.5	0.9	45.0	51.4	2.3	100
Rajasthan		1	47	550		598
%		0.2	7.9	92.0		100
Sikkim	6		32	155	4	197
%	3.0		16.2	78.7	2.0	100
Uttar Pradesh	2	7	941	578	354	1882
%	0.1	0.4	50.0	30.7	18.8	100
Uttrakhand		1	87	103	4	195
%		0.5	44.6	52.8	2.1	100
West bengal		22	93	333	15	463
%		4.8	20.1	71.9	3.2	100
Total	30	165	3048	5280	628	9151
%	0.3	1.8	33.3	57.7	6.9	100

Table A 5: Name & duration of training

	Name of Training					Duration of Training					
State	No Training	Induction/ Foundation	Refre sher	Both	Total	One day	Two days	Three days	4 -5 days	> 5 days	Total
Andhra Pradesh		168	4	31	203	1	18	77	1	106	203
%		82.8	2.0	15.3	100.0	0.5	8.9	37.9	0.5	52.2	100
Arunachal Pradesh		410		1	411			341	70		411
%		99.8		0.2	100.0			83.0	17.0		100
Assam		486	30	93	609	33	150	306	116	4	609
%		79.8	4.9	15.3	100.0	5.4	24.6	50.2	19.0	0.7	100
Goa		201		2	203		2	201			203
%		99.0		1.0	100.0		1.0	99.0			100
Gujarat		606			606			606			606
%		100.0			100.0			100.0			100
Haryana		347	10	48	405		92	256	53	4	405
%		85.7	2.5	11.9	100.0		22.7	63.2	13.1	1.0	100
Himachal Pradesh		142	1	63	206		37	117	52		206
%		68.9	0.5	30.6	100.0		18.0	56.8	25.2		100
Jharkhand		359	5	32	396	4	1	379	10	2	396
%		90.7	1.3	8.1	100.0	1.0	0.3	95.7	2.5	0.5	100
Karnataka		550	7	31	588	24	3	370	186	5	588
%		93.5	1.2	5.3	100.0	4.1	0.5	62.9	31.6	0.9	100
Kerala		198		1	199	5	1	191	2		199
%		99.5		0.5	100.0	2.5	0.5	96.0	1.0		100
Madhya Pradesh	106	757	50	76	989	499	55	322	6	1	883
%	10.7	76.5	5.1	7.7	100.0	56.5	6.2	36.5	0.7	0.1	100
Maharashtra		550	35	194	779	2	6	766	5		779
%		70.6	4.5	24.9	100.0	0.3	0.8	98.3	0.6		100
Orissa		172	4	46	222	1	3	217	1		222
%		77.5	1.8	20.7	100.0	0.5	1.4	97.7	0.5		100
Rajasthan		441	30	127	598	2	34	560		2	598
%		73.7	5.0	21.2	100.0	0.3	5.7	93.6		0.3	100
Sikkim		154		43	197			1	107	89	197
%		78.2		21.8	100.0			0.5	54.3	45.2	100
Uttar Pradesh		1478	161	243	1882	53	1097	626	98	8	1882
%		78.5	8.6	12.9	100.0	2.8	58.3	33.3	5.2	0.4	100
Uttrakhand		179	7	9	195	2	11	173	7	2	195
%		91.8	3.6	4.6	100.0	1.0	5.6	88.7	3.6	1.0	100
West Bengal		346	43	74	463	1	4	422	30	6	463
%		74.7	9.3	16.0	100.0	0.2	0.9	91.1	6.5	1.3	100
Total	106	7544	387	1114	9151	627	1514	5931	744	229	9045
%	1.2	82.4	4.2	12.2	100.0	6.9	16.7	65.6	8.2	2.5	100

Table A 6: Rating of Arrangements & Facilities: Trainers

State	Poor	Satis factory	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Total
Andhra Pradesh		9	20	113	61	203
%		4.4	9.9	55.7	30.0	100
Arunachal Pradesh	20	5	244	139	3	411
%	4.9	1.2	59.4	33.8	0.7	100
Assam	26	233	239	63	48	609
%	4.3	38.3	39.2	10.3	7.9	100
Goa		73	118	12		203
%		36.0	58.1	5.9		100
Gujarat	19	176	374	26	11	606
%	3.1	29.0	61.7	4.3	1.8	100
Haryana	22	144	200	15	24	405
%	5.4	35.6	49.4	3.7	5.9	100
Himachal Pradesh		42	73	81	10	206
%		20.4	35.4	39.3	4.9	100
Jharkhand	5	130	148	59	54	396
%	1.3	32.8	37.4	14.9	13.6	100
Karnataka		190	280	103	15	588
%		32.3	47.6	17.5	2.6	100
Kerala		3	85	101	10	199
%		1.5	42.7	50.8	5.0	100
Madhya Pradesh	18	389	429	39	8	883
%	2.0	44.1	48.6	4.4	0.9	100
Maharashtra	18	112	221	240	188	779
%	2.3	14.4	28.4	30.8	24.1	100
Orissa	4	16	94	68	40	222
%	1.8	7.2	42.3	30.6	18.0	100
Rajasthan	10	220	288	74	6	598
%	1.7	36.8	48.2	12.4	1.0	100
Sikkim	7	18	87	46	39	197
%	3.6	9.1	44.2	23.4	19.8	100
Uttar Pradesh	49	775	683	260	115	1882
%	2.6	41.2	36.3	13.8	6.1	100
Uttrakhand	5	32	127	13	18	195
%	2.6	16.4	65.1	6.7	9.2	100
West Bengal	1	1	135	150	176	463
%	0.2	0.2	29.2	32.4	38.0	100
Total	204	2568	3845	1602	826	9045
%	2.3	28.4	42.5	17.7	9.1	100

Table A 7: Rating of Learning Arrangement

State	Poor	Satisfactory	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Total
Andhra Pradesh	0	7	23	63	110	203
%	0	3.4	11.3	31.0	54.2	100
Arunachal Pradesh	0	23	173	212	3	411
%	0	5.6	42.1	51.6	0.7	100
Assam	21	80	213	256	39	609
%	3.4	13.1	35.0	42.0	6.4	100
Goa	0	1	172	30		203
%	0	0.5	84.7	14.8		100
Gujarat	55	384	111	49	7	606
%	9.1	63.4	18.3	8.1	1.2	100
Haryana	49	173	89	70	24	405
%	12.1	42.7	22.0	17.3	5.9	100
Himachal Pradesh	0	4	60	90	52	206
%	0	1.9	29.1	43.7	25.2	100
Jharkhand	19	126	163	38	50	396
%	4.8	31.8	41.2	9.6	12.6	100
Karnataka	0	5	243	290	50	588
%	0	0.9	41.3	49.3	8.5	100
Kerala	0		22	80	97	199
%	0		11.1	40.2	48.7	100
Madhya Pradesh	17	334	283	238	11	883
%	1.9	37.8	32.0	27.0	1.2	100
Maharashtra	6	89	192	282	210	779
%	0.8	11.4	24.6	36.2	27.0	100
Orissa	4	23	46	80	69	222
%	1.8	10.4	20.7	36.0	31.1	100
Rajasthan	8	206	239	139	6	598
%	1.3	34.4	40.0	23.2	1.0	100
Sikkim	15	21	40	91	30	197
%	7.6	10.7	20.3	46.2	15.2	100
Uttar Pradesh	67	742	721	259	93	1882
%	3.6	39.4	38.3	13.8	4.9	100
Uttrakhand	6	15	34	123	17	195
%	3.1	7.7	17.4	63.1	8.7	100
West Bengal	0	1	34	290	138	463
%	0	0.2	7.3	62.6	29.8	100
Total	267	2234	2858	2680	1006	9045
%	3.0	24.7	31.6	29.6	11.1	100

Table A 8: Rating of Training Venue

State	Poor	Satisfactory	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Total
Andhra Pradesh	0	16	24	81	82	203
%	0	7.9	11.8	39.9	40.4	100
Arunachal Pradesh	9	57	240	71	34	411
%	2.2	13.9	58.4	17.3	8.3	100
Assam	34	183	132	131	129	609
%	5.6	30.0	21.7	21.5	21.2	100
Goa	0	12	143	47	1	203
%	0	5.9	70.4	23.2	0.5	100
Gujarat	125	342	105	25	9	606
%	20.6	56.4	17.3	4.1	1.5	100
Haryana	57	195	117	17	19	405
%	14.1	48.1	28.9	4.2	4.7	100
Himachal Pradesh	0	37	26	88	55	206
%	0	18.0	12.6	42.7	26.7	100
Jharkhand	27	193	93	30	53	396
%	6.8	48.7	23.5	7.6	13.4	100
Karnataka	0	172	264	100	52	588
%	0	29.3	44.9	17.0	8.8	100
Kerala	0	1	67	51	80	199
%	0	0.5	33.7	25.6	40.2	100
Madhya Pradesh	20	457	319	73	14	883
%	2.3	51.8	36.1	8.3	1.6	100
Maharashtra	11	111	139	265	253	779
%	1.4	14.2	17.8	34.0	32.5	100
Orissa	10	16	57	55	84	222
%	4.5	7.2	25.7	24.8	37.8	100
Rajasthan	7	285	264	34	8	598
%	1.2	47.7	44.1	5.7	1.3	100
Sikkim	20	31	62	58	26	197
%	10.2	15.7	31.5	29.4	13.2	100
Uttar Pradesh	92	921	501	256	112	1882
%	4.9	48.9	26.6	13.6	6.0	100
Uttrakhand	6	20	123	26	20	195
%	3.1	10.3	63.1	13.3	10.3	100
West Bengal	0	1	92	243	127	463
%	0	0.2	19.9	52.5	27.4	100
Total	418	3050	2768	1651	1158	9045
%	4.6	33.7	30.6	18.3	12.8	100

Table A 9: Rating of Lodging & Boarding facilities

State	Poor	Satisfactory	Good	VeryGood	Excellent	Total
Andhra Pradesh	6	21	43	81	52	203
%	3.0	10.3	21.2	39.9	25.6	100
Arunachal Pradesh	0	30	288	83	10	411
%	0	7.3	70.1	20.2	2.4	100
Assam	73	93	213	187	43	609
%	12.0	15.3	35.0	30.7	7.1	100
Goa	1	77	78	47		203
%	0.5	37.9	38.4	23.2		100
Gujarat	462	81	39	17	7	606
%	76.2	13.4	6.4	2.8	1.2	100
Haryana	58	189	107	27	24	405
%	14.3	46.7	26.4	6.7	5.9	100
Himachal Pradesh	0	37	22	91	56	206
%	0	18.0	10.7	44.2	27.2	100
Jharkhand	28	161	126	24	57	396
%	7.1	40.7	31.8	6.1	14.4	100
Karnataka	1	149	247	161	30	588
%	0.2	25.3	42.0	27.4	5.1	100
Kerala	0	19	50	70	60	199
%	0	9.5	25.1	35.2	30.2	100
Madhya Pradesh	178	390	172	133	10	883
%	20.2	44.2	19.5	15.1	1.1	100
Maharashtra	4	82	159	291	243	779
%	0.5	10.5	20.4	37.4	31.2	100
Orissa	12	18	61	45	86	222
%	5.4	8.1	27.5	20.3	38.7	100
Rajasthan	15	207	160	143	73	598
%	2.5	34.6	26.8	23.9	12.2	100
Sikkim	22	29	37	85	24	197
%	11.2	14.7	18.8	43.1	12.2	100
Uttar Pradesh	271	707	633	179	92	1882
%	14.4	37.6	33.6	9.5	4.9	100
Uttrakhand	11	18	81	68	17	195
%	5.6	9.2	41.5	34.9	8.7	100
West bengal	1	3	98	173	188	463
%	0.2	0.6	21.2	37.4	40.6	100
Total	1143	2311	2614	1905	1072	9045
%	12.6	25.6	28.9	21.1	11.9	100

Table A 10: Rating of Reading Materials

State	Poor	Satisfactory	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Total
Andhra Pradesh	1	14	72	43	73	203
%	0.5	6.9	35.5	21.2	36.0	100
Arunachal Pradesh	20	18	328	43	2	411
%	4.9	4.4	79.8	10.5	0.5	100
Assam	83	138	247	111	30	609
%	13.6	22.7	40.6	18.2	4.9	100
Goa	0	78	69	56		203
%	0	38.4	34.0	27.6		100
Gujarat	41	343	169	45	8	606
%	6.8	56.6	27.9	7.4	1.3	100
Haryana	71	204	100	3	27	405
%	17.5	50.4	24.7	0.7	6.7	100
Himachal Pradesh	0	93	88	19	6	206
%	0	45.1	42.7	9.2	2.9	100
Jharkhand	29	207	100	21	39	396
%	7.3	52.3	25.3	5.3	9.8	100
Karnataka	186	164	201	26	11	588
%	31.6	27.9	34.2	4.4	1.9	100
Kerala	1	41	129	20	8	199
%	0.5	20.6	64.8	10.1	4.0	100
Madhya Pradesh	146	385	270	74	8	883
%	16.5	43.6	30.6	8.4	0.9	100
Maharashtra	39	86	245	255	154	779
%	5.0	11.0	31.5	32.7	19.8	100
Orissa	24	45	120	14	19	222
%	10.8	20.3	54.1	6.3	8.6	100
Rajasthan	13	219	338	19	9	598
%	2.2	36.6	56.5	3.2	1.5	100
Sikkim	11	60	73	21	32	197
%	5.6	30.5	37.1	10.7	16.2	100
Uttar Pradesh	241	924	501	132	84	1882
%	12.8	49.1	26.6	7.0	4.5	100
Uttrakhand	4	19	151	10	11	195
%	2.1	9.7	77.4	5.1	5.6	100
West Bengal	1	8	163	204	87	463
%	0.2	1.7	35.2	44.1	18.8	100
Total	911	3046	3364	1116	608	9045
%	10.1	33.7	37.2	12.3	6.7	100

.

Table A 11: Rating of Best Practices & Case Studies

State	Poor	Satisfactory	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Total
Andhra Pradesh	1	11	58	85	48	203
%	0.5	5.4	28.6	41.9	23.6	100
Arunachal Pradesh	1	30	307	70	3	411
%	0.2	7.3	74.7	17.0	0.7	100
Assam	57	169	139	210	34	609
%	9.4	27.8	22.8	34.5	5.6	100
Goa	0	87	60	56		203
%	0	42.9	29.6	27.6		100
Gujarat	60	375	129	34	8	606
%	9.9	61.9	21.3	5.6	1.3	100
Haryana	66	213	59	47	20	405
%	16.3	52.6	14.6	11.6	4.9	100
Himachal Pradesh	1	63	106	29	7	206
%	0.5	30.6	51.5	14.1	3.4	100
Jharkhand	31	212	97	21	35	396
%	7.8	53.5	24.5	5.3	8.8	100
Karnataka	6	207	225	133	17	588
%	1.0	35.2	38.3	22.6	2.9	100
Kerala	0	20	69	100	10	199
%	0	10.1	34.7	50.3	5.0	100
Madhya Pradesh	251	302	184	140	6	883
%	28.4	34.2	20.8	15.9	0.7	100
Maharashtra	20	95	146	317	201	779
%	2.6	12.2	18.7	40.7	25.8	100
Orissa	12	47	107	34	22	222
%	5.4	21.2	48.2	15.3	9.9	100
Rajasthan	5	243	199	140	11	598
%	0.8	40.6	33.3	23.4	1.8	100
Sikkim	16	43	52	60	26	197
%	8.1	21.8	26.4	30.5	13.2	100
Uttar Pradesh	387	763	487	172	73	1882
%	20.6	40.5	25.9	9.1	3.9	100
Uttrakhand	6	14	26	137	12	195
%	3.1	7.2	13.3	70.3	6.2	100
West Bengal	2	7	88	257	109	463
%	0.4	1.5	19.0	55.5	23.5	100
Total	922	2901	2538	2042	642	9045
%	10.2	32.1	28.1	22.6	7.1	100

Table A 12: Mode of Training

State	Interactive/ Participatory	Lecture method	Mixed	ICT Based/ SATCOM	Total
Andhra Pradesh	26	4	171	2	203
%	12.8	2.0	84.2	1.0	100
Arunachal Pradesh	84	3	324		411
%	20.4	0.7	78.8		100
Assam	37	62	503	7	609
%	6.1	10.2	82.6	1.1	100
Goa		5	198		203
%		2.5	97.5		100
Gujarat	349	136	121		606
%	57.6	22.4	20.0		100
Haryana	24	185	194	2	405
%	5.9	45.7	47.9	0.5	100
Himachal Pradesh	3	7	194	2	206
%	1.5	3.4	94.2	1.0	100
Jharkhand	80	34	273	9	396
%	20.2	8.6	68.9	2.3	100
Karnataka	11	7	565	5	588
%	1.9	1.2	96.1	0.9	100
Kerala	4	1	194		199
%	2.0	0.5	97.5		100
Madhya Pradesh	35	228	613	7	883
%	4.0	25.8	69.4	0.8	100
Maharashtra	49	174	551	5	779
%	6.3	22.3	70.7	0.6	100
Orissa	10	5	206	1	222
%	4.5	2.3	92.8	0.5	100
Rajasthan	121	268	203	6	598
%	20.2	44.8	33.9	1.0	100
Sikkim	31	14	151	1	197
%	15.7	7.1	76.6	0.5	100
Uttar Pradesh	222	828	827	5	1882
%	11.8	44.0	43.9	0.3	100
Uttrakhand	8	16	171		195
%	4.1	8.2	87.7		100
West Bengal	215	11	233	4	463
%	46.4	2.4	50.3	0.9	100
Total	1309	1988	5692	56	9045
%	14.5	22.0	62.9	0.6	100

Table A 13: Hours of Training

State	Up to 3 hrs	4-6 hrs	6-9 hrs	Total
Andhra Pradesh		87	116	203
%		42.9	57.1	100
Arunachal Pradesh	2	166	243	411
%	0.5	40.4	59.1	100
Assam	17	524	68	609
%	2.8	86.0	11.2	100
Goa		203		203
%		100.0		100
Gujarat	22	575	9	606
%	3.6	94.9	1.5	100
Haryana	8	394	3	405
%	2.0	97.3	0.7	100
Himachal Pradesh	1	202	3	206
%	0.5	98.1	1.5	100
Jharkhand	14	353	29	396
%	3.5	89.1	7.3	100
Karnataka	4	561	23	588
%	0.7	95.4	3.9	100
Kerala		192	7	199
%		96.5	3.5	100
Madhya Pradesh	65	808	10	883
%	7.4	91.5	1.1	100
Maharashtra	17	410	352	779
%	2.2	52.6	45.2	100
Orissa	1	159	62	222
%	0.5	71.6	27.9	100
Rajasthan	41	550	7	598
%	6.9	92.0	1.2	100
Sikkim	1	191	5	197
%	0.5	97.0	2.5	100
Uttar Pradesh	107	1678	97	1882
%	5.7	89.2	5.2	100
Uttrakhand	7	182	6	195
%	3.6	93.3	3.1	100
West Bengal	7	156	300	463
%	1.5	33.7	64.8	100
Total	314	7391	1340	9045
%	3.5	81.7	14.8	100

Table A 14: Access to Online mode of training

	Access to online			ICT useful		
State	Yes	No	Total	Yes	No	Total
Andhra Pradesh	16	187	203	13	3	16
%	7.9	92.1	100.0	81.3	18.8	100
Arunachal Pradesh	40	371	411	37	3	40
%	9.7	90.3	100.0	92.5	7.5	100
Assam	151	458	609	86	65	151
%	24.8	75.2	100.0	57.0	43.0	100
Goa	29	174	203	22	7	29
%	14.3	85.7	100.0	75.9	24.1	100
Gujarat	187	419	606	132	55	187
%	30.9	69.1	100.0	70.6	29.4	100
Haryana	132	273	405	79	53	132
%	32.6	67.4	100.0	59.8	40.2	100
Himachal Pradesh	26	180	206	22	4	26
%	12.6	87.4	100.0	84.6	15.4	100
Jharkhand	88	308	396	63	25	88
%	22.2	77.8	100.0	71.6	28.4	100
Karnataka	122	466	588	80	42	122
%	20.7	79.3	100.0	65.6	34.4	100
Kerala	60	139	199	42	18	60
%	30.2	69.8	100.0	70.0	30.0	100
Madhya Pradesh	434	449	883	271	163	434
%	49.2	50.8	100.0	62.4	37.6	100
Maharashtra	206	573	779	149	57	206
%	26.4	73.6	100.0	72.3	27.7	100
Orissa	100	122	222	66	34	100
%	45.0	55.0	100.0	66.0	34.0	100
Rajasthan	47	551	598	39	8	47
%	7.9	92.1	100.0	83.0	17.0	100
Sikkim	32	165	197	27	5	32
%	16.2	83.8	100.0	84.4	15.6	100
Uttar Pradesh	640	1242	1882	497	143	640
%	34.0	66.0	100.0	77.7	22.3	100
Uttrakhand	66	129	195	36	30	66
%	33.8	66.2	100.0	54.5	45.5	100
West Bengal	93	370	463	71	22	93
%	20.1	79.9	100.0	76.3	23.7	100
Total	2469	6576	9045	1732	737	2469
%	27.3	72.7	100.0	70.1	29.9	100

Table A 15:Training Need Based

	Training need based			RATING					
State	Yes	No	Total	Poor	Satis factory	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Total
Andhra Pradesh	203		203		12	64	77	50	203
%	100.0		100.0		5.9	31.5	37.9	24.6	100.0
Arunachal Pradesh	411		411	23	5	219	160	4	411
%	100.0		100.0	5.6	1.2	53.3	38.9	1.0	100.0
Assam	609		609	7	232	326	30	14	609
%	100.0		100.0	1.1	38.1	53.5	4.9	2.3	100.0
Goa	203		203		196	5	2		203
%	100.0		100.0		96.6	2.5	1.0		100.0
Gujarat	605	1	606	27	262	297	13	6	605
%	99.8	0.2	100.0	4.5	43.3	49.1	2.1	1.0	100.0
Haryana	404	1	405	60	168	142	15	19	404
%	99.8	0.2	100.0	14.9	41.6	35.1	3.7	4.7	100.0
Himachal Pradesh	206		206	0	29	146	26	5	206
%	100.0		100.0	0.0	14.1	70.9	12.6	2.4	100.0
Jharkhand	396		396	18	162	129	50	37	396
%	100.0		100.0	4.5	40.9	32.6	12.6	9.3	100.0
Karnataka	588		588	16	214	303	48	7	588
%	100.0		100.0	2.7	36.4	51.5	8.2	1.2	100.0
Kerala	199		199	1	51	102	42	3	199
%	100.0		100.0	0.5	25.6	51.3	21.1	1.5	100.0
Madhya Pradesh	878	5	883	35	488	339	14	2	878
%	99.4	0.6	100.0	4.0	55.6	38.6	1.6	0.2	100.0
Maharashtra	779		779	14	110	295	234	126	779
%	100.0		100.0	1.8	14.1	37.9	30.0	16.2	100.0
Orissa	221	1	222	2	63	121	28	7	221
%	99.5	0.5	100.0	0.9	28.5	54.8	12.7	3.2	100.0
Rajasthan	597	1	598	9	268	244	65	11	597
%	99.8	0.2	100.0	1.5	44.9	40.9	10.9	1.8	100.0
Sikkim	197		197	9	28	102	27	31	197
%	100.0		100.0	4.6	14.2	51.8	13.7	15.7	100.0
Uttar Pradesh	1882		1882	65	730	782	256	49	1882
%	100.0		100.0	3.5	38.8	41.6	13.6	2.6	100.0
Uttrakhand	195		195	10	20	142	12	11	195
%	100.0		100.0	5.1	10.3	72.8	6.2	5.6	100.0
West Bengal	463		463	1	10	150	189	113	463
%	100.0		100.0	0.2	2.2	32.4	40.8	24.4	100.0
Total	9036	9	9045	297	3048	3908	1288	495	9036
%	99.9	0.1	100.0	3.3	33.7	43.2	14.3	5.5	100.0

Table A 16: Training Useful

	Training useful			Rating					
State	Yes	No	Total	Poor	Satis factory	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Total
Andhra Pradesh	203		203		13	26	88	76	203
%	100.0		100.0		6.4	12.8	43.3	37.4	100.0
Arunachal Pradesh	411		411		28	175	205	3	411
%	100.0		100.0		6.8	42.6	49.9	0.7	100.0
Assam	609		609	10	120	163	296	20	609
%	100.0		100.0	1.6	19.7	26.8	48.6	3.3	100.0
Goa	203		203		111	91	1		203
%	100.0		100.0		54.7	44.8	0.5		100.0
Gujarat	605	1	606	71	379	111	38	6	605
%	99.8	0.2	100.0	11.7	62.6	18.3	6.3	1.0	100.0
Haryana	403	2	405	93	147	70	69	24	403
%	99.5	0.5	100.0	23.1	36.5	17.4	17.1	6.0	100.0
Himachal Pradesh	206		206		23	73	105	5	206
%	100.0		100.0		11.2	35.4	51.0	2.4	100.0
Jharkhand	396		396	37	107	177	29	46	396
%	100.0		100.0	9.3	27.0	44.7	7.3	11.6	100.0
Karnataka	588		588		27	261	285	15	588
%	100.0		100.0		4.6	44.4	48.5	2.6	100.0
Kerala	199		199	3	4	56	95	41	199
%	100.0		100.0	1.5	2.0	28.1	47.7	20.6	100.0
Madhya Pradesh	881	2	883	33	241	315	287	5	881
%	99.8	0.2	100.0	3.7	27.4	35.8	32.6	0.6	100.0
Maharashtra	779		779	8	98	183	330	160	779
%	100.0		100.0	1.0	12.6	23.5	42.4	20.5	100.0
Orissa	222		222	13	34	79	80	16	222
%	100.0		100.0	5.9	15.3	35.6	36.0	7.2	100.0
Rajasthan	593	5	598	6	204	234	142	7	593
%	99.2	0.8	100.0	1.0	34.4	39.5	23.9	1.2	100.0
Sikkim	197		197	21	32	29	95	20	197
%	100.0		100.0	10.7	16.2	14.7	48.2	10.2	100.0
Uttar Pradesh	1882		1882	90	715	703	313	61	1882
%	100.0		100.0	4.8	38.0	37.4	16.6	3.2	100.0
Uttrakhand	195		195	9	9	27	137	13	195
%	100.0		100.0	4.6	4.6	13.8	70.3	6.7	100.0
West Bengal	463		463	2	4	40	289	128	463
%	100.0		100.0	0.4	0.9	8.6	62.4	27.6	100.0
Total	9035	10	9045	396	2296	2813	2884	646	9035
%	99.9	0.1	100.0	4.4	25.4	31.1	31.9	7.1	100.0

Table A 17: Skills Upgradation

	Skills upgradation			Rating					
State	Yes	No	Total	Poor	Satis factory	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Total
Andhra Pradesh	203		203		13	28	84	78	203
%	100.0		100.0		6.4	13.8	41.4	38.4	100.0
Arunachal Pradesh	411		411		29	275	92	15	411
%	100.0		100.0		7.1	66.9	22.4	3.6	100.0
Assam	609		609	25	188	231	87	78	609
%	100.0		100.0	4.1	30.9	37.9	14.3	12.8	100.0
Goa	203		203		77	125	1		203
%	100.0		100.0		37.9	61.6	0.5		100.0
Gujarat	606		606	123	354	110	8	11	606
%	100.0		100.0	20.3	58.4	18.2	1.3	1.8	100.0
Haryana	405		405	111	160	100	13	21	405
%	100.0		100.0	27.4	39.5	24.7	3.2	5.2	100.0
Himachal Pradesh	206		206		32	53	108	13	206
%	100.0		100.0		15.5	25.7	52.4	6.3	100.0
Jharkhand	396		396	47	208	79	18	44	396
%	100.0		100.0	11.9	52.5	19.9	4.5	11.1	100.0
Karnataka	588		588	1	195	258	86	48	588
%	100.0		100.0	0.2	33.2	43.9	14.6	8.2	100.0
Kerala	199		199	3	6	56	61	73	199
%	100.0		100.0	1.5	3.0	28.1	30.7	36.7	100.0
Madhya Pradesh	878	5	883	40	454	329	48	7	878
%	99.4	0.6	100.0	4.6	51.7	37.5	5.5	0.8	100.0
Maharashtra	779		779	16	121	177	276	189	779
%	100.0		100.0	2.1	15.5	22.7	35.4	24.3	100.0
Orissa	222		222	17	45	79	52	29	222
%	100.0		100.0	7.7	20.3	35.6	23.4	13.1	100.0
Rajasthan	597	1	598	4	300	259	26	8	597
%	99.8	0.2	100.0	0.7	50.3	43.4	4.4	1.3	100.0
Sikkim	197		197	24	50	52	59	12	197
%	100.0		100.0	12.2	25.4	26.4	29.9	6.1	100.0
Uttar Pradesh	1882		1882	145	815	613	242	67	1882
%	100.0		100.0	7.7	43.3	32.6	12.9	3.6	100.0
Uttrakhand	195		195	8	14	139	19	15	195
%	100.0		100.0	4.1	7.2	71.3	9.7	7.7	100.0
West Bengal	463		463	1	8	131	205	118	463
%	100.0		100.0	0.2	1.7	28.3	44.3	25.5	100.0
Total	9039	6	9045	565	3069	3094	1485	826	9039
%	99.9	0.1	100.0	6.3	34.0	34.2	16.4	9.1	100.0

Table A 18: Better Perform responsibilities

	Better perform			Rating					
State	Yes	No	Total	Poor	Satis factory	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Total
Andhra Pradesh	203		203		15	32	98	58	203
%	100.0		100.0		7.4	15.8	48.3	28.6	100.0
Arunachal Pradesh	411		411		57	301	49	4	411
%	100.0		100.0		13.9	73.2	11.9	1.0	100.0
Assam	609		609	33	92	199	257	28	609
%	100.0		100.0	5.4	15.1	32.7	42.2	4.6	100.0
Goa	203		203		74	127	2		203
%	100.0		100.0		36.5	62.6	1.0		100.0
Gujarat	605	1	606	131	356	98	12	8	605
%	99.8	0.2	100.0	21.7	58.8	16.2	2.0	1.3	100.0
Haryana	403	2	405	116	141	78	48	20	403
%	99.5	0.5	100.0	28.8	35.0	19.4	11.9	5.0	100.0
Himachal Pradesh	206		206	2	29	60	103	12	206
%	100.0		100.0	1.0	14.1	29.1	50.0	5.8	100.0
Jharkhand	396		396	56	155	119	24	42	396
%	100.0		100.0	14.1	39.1	30.1	6.1	10.6	100.0
Karnataka	588		588		38	265	265	20	588
%	100.0		100.0		6.5	45.1	45.1	3.4	100.0
Kerala	199		199	1	5	67	95	31	199
%	100.0		100.0	0.5	2.5	33.7	47.7	15.6	100.0
Madhya Pradesh	880	3	883	46	411	205	212	6	880
%	99.7	0.3	100.0	5.2	46.7	23.3	24.1	0.7	100.0
Maharashtra	779		779	12	115	146	302	204	779
%	100.0		100.0	1.5	14.8	18.7	38.8	26.2	100.0
Orissa	222		222	17	41	83	64	17	222
%	100.0		100.0	7.7	18.5	37.4	28.8	7.7	100.0
Rajasthan	595	3	598	12	283	198	95	7	595
%	99.5	0.5	100.0	2.0	47.6	33.3	16.0	1.2	100.0
Sikkim	197		197	28	37	27	91	14	197
%	100.0		100.0	14.2	18.8	13.7	46.2	7.1	100.0
Uttar Pradesh	1882		1882	198	756	563	293	72	1882
%	100.0		100.0	10.5	40.2	29.9	15.6	3.8	100.0
Uttrakhand	195		195	8	17	41	113	16	195
%	100.0		100.0	4.1	8.7	21.0	57.9	8.2	100.0
West Bengal	463		463	1	11	115	232	104	463
%	100.0		100.0	0.2	2.4	24.8	50.1	22.5	100.0
Total	9036	9	9045	661	2633	2724	2355	663	9036
%	99.9	0.1	100.0	7.3	29.1	30.1	26.1	7.3	100.0

Table A 19: Develop Positive Attitude

	Develop attitude			Rating					
State	Yes	No	Total	Poor	Satis factory	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Total
Andhra Pradesh	203		203	4	14	33	82	70	203
%	100.0		100.0	2.0	6.9	16.3	40.4	34.5	100.0
Arunachal Pradesh	411		411	0	104	278	23	6	411
%	100.0		100.0	0.0	25.3	67.6	5.6	1.5	100.0
Assam	609		609	46	172	225	126	40	609
%	100.0		100.0	7.6	28.2	36.9	20.7	6.6	100.0
Goa	203		203	0	99	102	2		203
%	100.0		100.0	0.0	48.8	50.2	1.0		100.0
Gujarat	605	1	606	134	370	82	9	10	605
%	99.8	0.2	100.0	22.1	61.2	13.6	1.5	1.7	100.0
Haryana	405		405	120	151	96	21	17	405
%	100.0		100.0	29.6	37.3	23.7	5.2	4.2	100.0
Himachal Pradesh	206		206	2	30	52	109	13	206
%	100.0		100.0	1.0	14.6	25.2	52.9	6.3	100.0
Jharkhand	396		396	52	197	82	26	39	396
%	100.0		100.0	13.1	49.7	20.7	6.6	9.8	100.0
Karnataka	588		588	1	192	256	121	18	588
%	100.0		100.0	0.2	32.7	43.5	20.6	3.1	100.0
Kerala	199		199	1	8	79	80	31	199
%	100.0		100.0	0.5	4.0	39.7	40.2	15.6	100.0
Madhya Pradesh	881	2	883	57	432	332	51	9	881
%	99.8	0.2	100.0	6.5	49.0	37.7	5.8	1.0	100.0
Maharashtra	779		779	14	125	209	262	169	779
%	100.0		100.0	1.8	16.0	26.8	33.6	21.7	100.0
Orissa	222		222	19	40	76	66	21	222
%	100.0		100.0	8.6	18.0	34.2	29.7	9.5	100.0
Rajasthan	597	1	598	9	359	200	23	6	597
%	99.8	0.2	100.0	1.5	60.1	33.5	3.9	1.0	100.0
Sikkim	197		197	30	36	56	67	8	197
%	100.0		100.0	15.2	18.3	28.4	34.0	4.1	100.0
Uttar Pradesh	1882		1882	237	793	538	236	78	1882
%	100.0		100.0	12.6	42.1	28.6	12.5	4.1	100.0
Uttrakhand	195		195	5	21	138	15	16	195
%	100.0		100.0	2.6	10.8	70.8	7.7	8.2	100.0
West Bengal	463		463	4	13	210	135	101	463
%	100.0		100.0	0.9	2.8	45.4	29.2	21.8	100.0
Total	9041	4	9045	735	3156	3044	1454	652	9041
%	100.0	0.0	100.0	8.1	34.9	33.7	16.1	7.2	100.0

Table A 20: Completely equipped on roles & responsibilities

	Completely equipped			Rating					
State	Yes	No	Total	Poor	Satis factory	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Total
Andhra Pradesh	203		203	4	13	50	84	52	203
%	100		100	2.0	6.4	24.6	41.4	25.6	100
Arunachal Pradesh	411		411		176	213	18	4	411
%	100		100		42.8	51.8	4.4	1.0	100
Assam	426	183	609	32	88	130	154	22	426
%	70.0	30.0	100	7.5	20.7	30.5	36.2	5.2	100
Goa	203		203		47	154	2		203
%	100		100		23.2	75.9	1.0		100
Gujarat	605	1	606	132	373	78	14	8	605
%	99.8	0.2	100	21.8	61.7	12.9	2.3	1.3	100
Haryana	405		405	120	138	109	18	20	405
%	100		100	29.6	34.1	26.9	4.4	4.9	100
Himachal Pradesh	206		206	4	29	67	93	13	206
%	100		100	1.9	14.1	32.5	45.1	6.3	100
Jharkhand	396		396	42	153	115	35	51	396
%	100		100	10.6	38.6	29.0	8.8	12.9	100
Karnataka	588		588	1	44	299	230	14	588
%	100		100	0.2	7.5	50.9	39.1	2.4	100
Kerala	199		199	1	6	79	93	20	199
%	100		100	0.5	3.0	39.7	46.7	10.1	100
Madhya Pradesh	686	197	883	49	315	253	63	6	686
%	77.7	22.3	100	7.1	45.9	36.9	9.2	0.9	100
Maharashtra	779		779	14	98	182	283	202	779
%	100		100	1.8	12.6	23.4	36.3	25.9	100
Orissa	220	2	222	18	40	78	68	16	220
%	99.1	0.9	100	8.2	18.2	35.5	30.9	7.3	100
Rajasthan	596	2	598	12	357	202	18	7	596
%	99.7	0.3	100	2.0	59.9	33.9	3.0	1.2	100
Sikkim	197		197	30	35	28	95	9	197
%	100		100	15.2	17.8	14.2	48.2	4.6	100
Uttar Pradesh	1740	142	1882	245	736	470	204	85	1740
%	92.5	7.5	100	14.1	42.3	27.0	11.7	4.9	100
Uttrakhand	193	2	195	2	25	129	23	14	193
%	99.0	1.0	100	1.0	13.0	66.8	11.9	7.3	100
West bengal	463		463	2	17	188	151	105	463
%	100		100	0.4	3.7	40.6	32.6	22.7	100
Total	8516	529	9045	708	2690	2824	1646	648	8516
%	94.2	5.8	100	8.3	31.6	33.2	19.3	7.6	100

Table A 21: Planning & Management of Gram Panchayat functions core areas

	Training organizations			Understanding Developed					
State	Yes	No	Total	Poor	Satis factory	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Total
Andhra Pradesh	174	29	203	5	9	63	71	26	174
%	85.7	14.3	100.0	2.9	5.2	36.2	40.8	14.9	100
Arunachal Pradesh	316	95	411		1	274	41		316
%	76.9	23.1	100.0		0.3	86.7	13.0		100
Assam	355	254	609	6	82	170	89	8	355
%	58.3	41.7	100.0	1.7	23.1	47.9	25.1	2.3	100
Goa	147	56	203		144	3			147
%	72.4	27.6	100.0		98.0	2.0			100
Gujarat	362	244	606		181	169	11	1	362
%	59.7	40.3	100.0		50.0	46.7	3.0	0.3	100
Haryana	265	140	405		152	84	28	1	265
%	65.4	34.6	100.0		57.4	31.7	10.6	0.4	100
Himachal Pradesh	143	63	206		4	125	12	2	143
%	69.4	30.6	100.0		2.8	87.4	8.4	1.4	100
Jharkhand	264	132	396	1	137	89	31	6	264
%	66.7	33.3	100.0	0.4	51.9	33.7	11.7	2.3	100
Karnataka	519	69	588	1	178	271	68	1	519
%	88.3	11.7	100.0	0.2	34.3	52.2	13.1	0.2	100
Kerala	178	21	199		17	107	52	2	178
%	89.4	10.6	100.0		9.6	60.1	29.2	1.1	100
Madhya Pradesh	531	352	883	1	293	205	31	1	531
%	60.1	39.9	100.0	0.2	55.2	38.6	5.8	0.2	100
Maharashtra	358	421	779	3	58	129	144	24	358
%	46.0	54.0	100.0	0.8	16.2	36.0	40.2	6.7	100
Orissa	143	79	222		34	97	11	1	143
%	64.4	35.6	100.0		23.8	67.8	7.7	0.7	100
Rajasthan	372	226	598		95	231	45	1	372
%	62.2	37.8	100.0		25.5	62.1	12.1	0.3	100
Sikkim	138	59	197	1	23	87	27		138
%	70.1	29.9	100.0	0.7	16.7	63.0	19.6		100
Uttar Pradesh	1104	778	1882	5	380	539	143	37	1104
%	58.7	41.3	100.0	0.5	34.4	48.8	13.0	3.4	100
Uttrakhand	111	84	195		9	82	14	6	111
%	56.9	43.1	100.0		8.1	73.9	12.6	5.4	100
West Bengal	394	69	463	1	3	149	230	11	394
%	85.1	14.9	100.0	0.3	0.8	37.8	58.4	2.8	100
Total	5874	3171	9045	24	1800	2874	1048	128	5874
%	64.9	35.1	100.0	0.4	30.6	48.9	17.8	2.2	100

Table A 22: Planning & Management of Gram Panchayat functions core areas

	Training organizations			USEFUL					
State	Yes	No	Total	Poor	Satis factory	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Total
Andhra Pradesh	174	29	203	2	11	83	52	26	174
%	85.7	14.3	100.0	1.1	6.3	47.7	29.9	14.9	100
Arunachal Pradesh	316	95	411		72	242	2		316
%	76.9	23.1	100.0		22.8	76.6	0.6		100
Assam	355	254	609	6	95	182	63	9	355
%	58.3	41.7	100.0	1.7	26.8	51.3	17.7	2.5	100
Goa	147	56	203		146	1			147
%	72.4	27.6	100.0		99.3	0.7			100
Gujarat	362	244	606		282	76	3	1	362
%	59.7	40.3	100.0		77.9	21.0	0.8	0.3	100
Haryana	265	140	405		196	56	12	1	265
%	65.4	34.6	100.0		74.0	21.1	4.5	0.4	100
Himachal Pradesh	143	63	206		100	31	10	2	143
%	69.4	30.6	100.0		69.9	21.7	7.0	1.4	100
Jharkhand	264	132	396	1	155	78	23	7	264
%	66.7	33.3	100.0	0.4	58.7	29.5	8.7	2.7	100
Karnataka	519	69	588	1	180	307	29	2	519
%	88.3	11.7	100.0	0.2	34.7	59.2	5.6	0.4	100
Kerala	178	21	199		20	146	10	2	178
%	89.4	10.6	100.0		11.2	82.0	5.6	1.1	100
Madhya Pradesh	531	352	883	1	419	96	10	5	531
%	60.1	39.9	100.0	0.2	78.9	18.1	1.9	0.9	100
Maharashtra	358	421	779		80	116	107	55	358
%	46.0	54.0	100.0		22.3	32.4	29.9	15.4	100
Orissa	143	79	222		62	78	2	1	143
%	64.4	35.6	100.0		43.4	54.5	1.4	0.7	100
Rajasthan	372	226	598		258	98	13	3	372
%	62.2	37.8	100.0		69.4	26.3	3.5	0.8	100
Sikkim	138	59	197	1	40	86	11		138
%	70.1	29.9	100.0	0.7	29.0	62.3	8.0		100
Uttar Pradesh	1104	778	1882	25	590	371	93	25	1104
%	58.7	41.3	100.0	2.3	53.4	33.6	8.4	2.3	100
Uttrakhand	111	84	195		69	30	7	5	111
%	56.9	43.1	100.0		62.2	27.0	6.3	4.5	100
West Bengal	394	69	463	1	21	242	109	21	394
%	85.1	14.9	100.0	0.3	5.3	61.4	27.7	5.3	100
Total	5874	3171	9045	38	2796	2319	556	165	5874
%	64.9	35.1	100.0	0.6	47.6	39.5	9.5	2.8	100

Table A 23: Baseline data collection

	Baseline data collection			Understanding Developed					
State	Yes	No	Total	Poor	Satis factory	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Total
Andhra Pradesh	173	30	203	2	8	56	76	31	173
%	85.2	14.8	100.0	1.2	4.6	32.4	43.9	17.9	100
Arunachal Pradesh	316	95	411		1	219	96		316
%	76.9	23.1	100.0		0.3	69.3	30.4		100
Assam	391	218	609	3	78	202	94	14	391
%	64.2	35.8	100.0	0.8	19.9	51.7	24.0	3.6	100
Goa	142	61	203		138	4			142
%	70.0	30.0	100.0		97.2	2.8			100
Gujarat	399	207	606	4	189	192	12	2	399
%	65.8	34.2	100.0	1.0	47.4	48.1	3.0	0.5	100
Haryana	276	129	405		148	97	30	1	276
%	68.1	31.9	100.0		53.6	35.1	10.9	0.4	100
Himachal Pradesh	132	74	206		7	112	11	2	132
%	64.1	35.9	100.0		5.3	84.8	8.3	1.5	100
Jharkhand	250	146	396	2	121	86	32	9	250
%	63.1	36.9	100.0	0.8	48.4	34.4	12.8	3.6	100
Karnataka	556	32	588	1	142	325	85	3	556
%	94.6	5.4	100.0	0.2	25.5	58.5	15.3	0.5	100
Kerala	185	14	199		8	91	83	3	185
%	93.0	7.0	100.0		4.3	49.2	44.9	1.6	100
Madhya Pradesh	615	268	883	1	320	248	42	4	615
%	69.6	30.4	100.0	0.2	52.0	40.3	6.8	0.7	100
Maharashtra	624	155	779	2	73	210	233	106	624
%	80.1	19.9	100.0	0.3	11.7	33.7	37.3	17.0	100
Orissa	143	79	222		25	89	29		143
%	64.4	35.6	100.0		17.5	62.2	20.3		100
Rajasthan	372	226	598		86	243	40	3	372
%	62.2	37.8	100.0		23.1	65.3	10.8	0.8	100
Sikkim	175	22	197	1	41	86	45	2	175
%	88.8	11.2	100.0	0.6	23.4	49.1	25.7	1.1	100
Uttar Pradesh	1192	690	1882	2	392	603	161	34	1192
%	63.3	36.7	100.0	0.2	32.9	50.6	13.5	2.9	100
Uttrakhand	125	70	195		9	89	17	10	125
%	64.1	35.9	100.0		7.2	71.2	13.6	8.0	100
West Bengal	394	69	463		2	125	243	24	394
%	85.1	14.9	100.0		0.5	31.7	61.7	6.1	100
Total	6460	2585	9045	18	1788	3077	1329	248	6460
%	71.4	28.6	100.0	0.3	27.7	47.6	20.6	3.8	100

Table A 24: Baseline data collection

	Baseline data collection			Useful					
State	Yes	No	Total	Poor	Satis factory	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Total
Andhra Pradesh	173	30	203	1	19	93	26	34	173
%	85.2	14.8	100.0	0.6	11.0	53.8	15.0	19.7	100
Arunachal Pradesh	316	95	411		93	218	5		316
%	76.9	23.1	100.0		29.4	69.0	1.6		100
Assam	391	218	609	20	110	172	77	12	391
%	64.2	35.8	100.0	5.1	28.1	44.0	19.7	3.1	100
Goa	142	61	203		140	2			142
%	70.0	30.0	100.0		98.6	1.4			100
Gujarat	399	207	606	4	308	82	3	2	399
%	65.8	34.2	100.0	1.0	77.2	20.6	0.8	0.5	100
Haryana	276	129	405	1	197	63	14	1	276
%	68.1	31.9	100.0	0.4	71.4	22.8	5.1	0.4	100
Himachal Pradesh	132	74	206		96	22	12	2	132
%	64.1	35.9	100.0		72.7	16.7	9.1	1.5	100
Jharkhand	250	146	396		144	72	26	8	250
%	63.1	36.9	100.0		57.6	28.8	10.4	3.2	100
Karnataka	556	32	588	1	154	351	46	4	556
%	94.6	5.4	100.0	0.2	27.7	63.1	8.3	0.7	100
Kerala	185	14	199		12	159	11	3	185
%	93.0	7.0	100.0		6.5	85.9	5.9	1.6	100
Madhya Pradesh	615	268	883		485	110	14	6	615
%	69.6	30.4	100.0		78.9	17.9	2.3	1.0	100
Maharashtra	624	155	779	2	117	169	232	104	624
%	80.1	19.9	100.0	0.3	18.8	27.1	37.2	16.7	100
Orissa	143	79	222		55	84	4		143
%	64.4	35.6	100.0		38.5	58.7	2.8		100
Rajasthan	372	226	598	1	258	91	16	6	372
%	62.2	37.8	100.0	0.3	69.4	24.5	4.3	1.6	100
Sikkim	175	22	197	1	62	87	25		175
%	88.8	11.2	100.0	0.6	35.4	49.7	14.3		100
Uttar Pradesh	1192	690	1882	21	623	428	98	22	1192
%	63.3	36.7	100.0	1.8	52.3	35.9	8.2	1.8	100
Uttrakhand	125	70	195		80	31	6	8	125
%	64.1	35.9	100.0		64.0	24.8	4.8	6.4	100
West Bengal	394	69	463		25	217	136	16	394
%	85.1	14.9	100.0		6.3	55.1	34.5	4.1	100
Total	6460	2585	9045	52	2978	2451	751	228	6460
%	71.4	28.6	100.0	0.8	46.1	37.9	11.6	3.5	100

Table A 25: Training Organized covering various thematic areas of importance

	Training organized			Understanding Developed					
State	Yes	No	Total	Poor	Satis factory	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Total
Andhra Pradesh	174	29	203	2	8	57	82	25	174
%	85.7	14.3	100.0	1.1	4.6	32.8	47.1	14.4	100
Arunachal Pradesh	313	98	411		1	248	64		313
%	76.2	23.8	100.0		0.3	79.2	20.4		100
Assam	460	149	609	4	94	237	110	15	460
%	75.5	24.5	100.0	0.9	20.4	51.5	23.9	3.3	100
Goa	159	44	203		157	2			159
%	78.3	21.7	100.0		98.7	1.3			100
Gujarat	434	172	606	2	222	200	8	2	434
%	71.6	28.4	100.0	0.5	51.2	46.1	1.8	0.5	100
Haryana	280	125	405		153	97	29	1	280
%	69.1	30.9	100.0		54.6	34.6	10.4	0.4	100
Himachal Pradesh	142	64	206		7	119	14	2	142
%	68.9	31.1	100.0		4.9	83.8	9.9	1.4	100
Jharkhand	265	131	396	1	135	84	38	7	265
%	66.9	33.1	100.0	0.4	50.9	31.7	14.3	2.6	100
Karnataka	442	146	588	1	111	291	38	1	442
%	75.2	24.8	100.0	0.2	25.1	65.8	8.6	0.2	100
Kerala	178	21	199		17	95	63	3	178
%	89.4	10.6	100.0		9.6	53.4	35.4	1.7	100
Madhya Pradesh	627	256	883	2	319	259	46	1	627
%	71.0	29.0	100.0	0.3	50.9	41.3	7.3	0.2	100
Maharashtra	542	237	779	2	62	198	207	73	542
%	69.6	30.4	100.0	0.4	11.4	36.5	38.2	13.5	100
Orissa	135	87	222		20	95	20		135
%	60.8	39.2	100.0		14.8	70.4	14.8		100
Rajasthan	386	212	598		106	244	33	3	386
%	64.5	35.5	100.0		27.5	63.2	8.5	0.8	100
Sikkim	138	59	197		23	71	44		138
%	70.1	29.9	100.0		16.7	51.4	31.9		100
Uttar Pradesh	1169	713	1882	1	376	604	146	42	1169
%	62.1	37.9	100.0	0.1	32.2	51.7	12.5	3.6	100
Uttrakhand	114	81	195		9	82	14	9	114
%	58.5	41.5	100.0		7.9	71.9	12.3	7.9	100
West Bengal	329	134	463	1	1	108	205	14	329
%	71.1	28.9	100.0	0.3	0.3	32.8	62.3	4.3	100
Total	6287	2758	9045	16	1821	3091	1161	198	6287
%	69.5	30.5	100.0	0.3	29.0	49.2	18.5	3.1	100

Table A 26: Training Organized covering various thematic areas of importance

	Training organized			Useful					
State	Yes	No	Total	Poor	Satis factory	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Total
Andhra Pradesh	174	29	203	2	16	87	40	29	174
%	85.7	14.3	100.0	1.1	9.2	50.0	23.0	16.7	100
Arunachal Pradesh	313	98	411		88	221	4		313
%	76.2	23.8	100.0		28.1	70.6	1.3		100
Assam	460	149	609	48	128	175	98	11	460
%	75.5	24.5	100.0	10.4	27.8	38.0	21.3	2.4	100
Goa	159	44	203		159				159
%	78.3	21.7	100.0		100.0				100
Gujarat	434	172	606	3	326	101	3	1	434
%	71.6	28.4	100.0	0.7	75.1	23.3	0.7	0.2	100
Haryana	280	125	405	1	201	64	13	1	280
%	69.1	30.9	100.0	0.4	71.8	22.9	4.6	0.4	100
Himachal Pradesh	142	64	206	1	101	30	8	2	142
%	68.9	31.1	100.0	0.7	71.1	21.1	5.6	1.4	100
Jharkhand	265	131	396		157	71	30	7	265
%	66.9	33.1	100.0		59.2	26.8	11.3	2.6	100
Karnataka	442	146	588	1	118	308	14	1	442
%	75.2	24.8	100.0	0.2	26.7	69.7	3.2	0.2	100
Kerala	178	21	199		18	145	12	3	178
%	89.4	10.6	100.0		10.1	81.5	6.7	1.7	100
Madhya Pradesh	627	256	883	1	470	136	15	5	627
%	71.0	29.0	100.0	0.2	75.0	21.7	2.4	0.8	100
Maharashtra	542	237	779	2	113	151	191	85	542
%	69.6	30.4	100.0	0.4	20.8	27.9	35.2	15.7	100
Orissa	135	87	222		38	94	3		135
%	60.8	39.2	100.0		28.1	69.6	2.2		100
Rajasthan	386	212	598		278	93	11	4	386
%	64.5	35.5	100.0		72.0	24.1	2.8	1.0	100
Sikkim	138	59	197		39	72	27		138
%	70.1	29.9	100.0		28.3	52.2	19.6		100
Uttar Pradesh	1169	713	1882	23	618	409	88	31	1169
%	62.1	37.9	100.0	2.0	52.9	35.0	7.5	2.7	100
Uttrakhand	114	81	195		73	27	7	7	114
%	58.5	41.5	100.0		64.0	23.7	6.1	6.1	100
West Bengal	329	134	463	2	15	199	106	7	329
%	71.1	28.9	100.0	0.6	4.6	60.5	32.2	2.1	100
Total	6287	2758	9045	84	2956	2383	670	194	6287
%	69.5	30.5	100.0	1.3	47.0	37.9	10.7	3.1	100

Table A 27: Better Executions of Provisions under 14th Finance Commission

	Better executions of provisions under 14th Finance Commission			Understanding Developed					
State	Yes	No	Total	Poor	Satis factory	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Total
Andhra Pradesh	169	34	203	3	11	61	70	24	169
%	83.3	16.7	100.0	1.8	6.5	36.1	41.4	14.2	100
Arunachal Pradesh	307	104	411		21	250	36		307
%	74.7	25.3	100.0		6.8	81.4	11.7		100
Assam	358	251	609	5	72	162	109	10	358
%	58.8	41.2	100.0	1.4	20.1	45.3	30.4	2.8	100
Goa	147	56	203		144	3			147
%	72.4	27.6	100.0		98.0	2.0			100
Gujarat	438	168	606	4	231	185	16	2	438
%	72.3	27.7	100.0	0.9	52.7	42.2	3.7	0.5	100
Haryana	330	75	405	2	186	110	31	1	330
%	81.5	18.5	100.0	0.6	56.4	33.3	9.4	0.3	100
Himachal Pradesh	143	63	206		7	115	19	2	143
%	69.4	30.6	100.0		4.9	80.4	13.3	1.4	100
Jharkhand	263	133	396	1	133	81	38	10	263
%	66.4	33.6	100.0	0.4	50.6	30.8	14.4	3.8	100
Karnataka	438	150	588		134	264	39	1	438
%	74.5	25.5	100.0		30.6	60.3	8.9	0.2	100
Kerala	178	21	199		17	82	77	2	178
%	89.4	10.6	100.0		9.6	46.1	43.3	1.1	100
Madhya Pradesh	657	226	883	1	341	265	47	3	657
%	74.4	25.6	100.0	0.2	51.9	40.3	7.2	0.5	100
Maharashtra	485	294	779	1	69	166	174	75	485
%	62.3	37.7	100.0	0.2	14.2	34.2	35.9	15.5	100
Orissa	127	95	222		22	73	32		127
%	57.2	42.8	100.0		17.3	57.5	25.2		100
Rajasthan	372	226	598		101	237	30	4	372
%	62.2	37.8	100.0		27.2	63.7	8.1	1.1	100
Sikkim	138	59	197		30	74	32	2	138
%	70.1	29.9	100.0		21.7	53.6	23.2	1.4	100
Uttar Pradesh	1116	766	1882	4	374	543	157	38	1116
%	59.3	40.7	100.0	0.4	33.5	48.7	14.1	3.4	100
Uttrakhand	105	90	195		14	70	12	9	105
%	53.8	46.2	100.0		13.3	66.7	11.4	8.6	100
West Bengal	153	310	463		2	46	104	1	153
%	33.0	67.0	100.0		1.3	30.1	68.0	0.7	100
Total	5924	3121	9045	21	1909	2787	1023	184	5924
%	65.5	34.5	100.0	0.4	32.2	47.0	17.3	3.1	100

Table A 28: Better Executions of Provisions under 14th Finance Commission

	Better executions of provisions under 14th Finance Commission			Useful					
State	Yes	No	Total	Poor	Satis factory	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Total
Andhra Pradesh	169	34	203	2	30	81	30	26	169
%	83.3	16.7	100	1.2	17.8	47.9	17.8	15.4	100
Arunachal Pradesh	307	104	411		201	103	3		307
%	74.7	25.3	100		65.5	33.6	1.0		100
Assam	358	251	609	10	101	147	92	8	358
%	58.8	41.2	100	2.8	28.2	41.1	25.7	2.2	100
Goa	147	56	203		146	1			147
%	72.4	27.6	100		99.3	0.7			100
Gujarat	438	168	606	5	334	94	3	2	438
%	72.3	27.7	100	1.1	76.3	21.5	0.7	0.5	100
Haryana	330	75	405	2	247	66	14	1	330
%	81.5	18.5	100	0.6	74.8	20.0	4.2	0.3	100
Himachal Pradesh	143	63	206		100	31	9	3	143
%	69.4	30.6	100		69.9	21.7	6.3	2.1	100
Jharkhand	263	133	396		157	67	29	10	263
%	66.4	33.6	100		59.7	25.5	11.0	3.8	100
Karnataka	438	150	588		145	270	22	1	438
%	74.5	25.5	100		33.1	61.6	5.0	0.2	100
Kerala	178	21	199		23	145	8	2	178
%	89.4	10.6	100		12.9	81.5	4.5	1.1	100
Madhya Pradesh	657	226	883		520	120	12	5	657
%	74.4	25.6	100		79.1	18.3	1.8	0.8	100
Maharashtra	485	294	779	1	102	126	159	97	485
%	62.3	37.7	100	0.2	21.0	26.0	32.8	20.0	100
Orissa	127	95	222		46	76	5		127
%	57.2	42.8	100		36.2	59.8	3.9		100
Rajasthan	372	226	598	1	292	64	9	6	372
%	62.2	37.8	100	0.3	78.5	17.2	2.4	1.6	100
Sikkim	138	59	197	1	44	80	13		138
%	70.1	29.9	100	0.7	31.9	58.0	9.4		100
Uttar Pradesh	1116	766	1882	26	580	385	97	28	1116
%	59.3	40.7	100	2.3	52.0	34.5	8.7	2.5	100
Uttrakhand	105	90	195		69	24	5	7	105
%	53.8	46.2	100		65.7	22.9	4.8	6.7	100
West Bengal	153	310	463		16	101	32	4	153
%	33.0	67.0	100		10.5	66.0	20.9	2.6	100
Total	5924	3121	9045	48	3153	1981	542	200	5924
%	65.5	34.5	100.0	0.8	53.2	33.4	9.1	3.4	100

Table A 29: Better executions of provisions under State Finance Commission

	Better executions of provisions under State Finance Commission			Understanding Developed					
State	Yes	No	Total	Poor	Satis factory	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Total
Andhra Pradesh	183	20	203	3	15	66	76	23	183
%	90.1	9.9	100.0	1.6	8.2	36.1	41.5	12.6	100
Arunachal Pradesh	316	95	411		34	259	23		316
%	76.9	23.1	100.0		10.8	82.0	7.3		100
Assam	370	239	609	5	72	183	101	9	370
%	60.8	39.2	100.0	1.4	19.5	49.5	27.3	2.4	100
Goa	179	24	203	1	110	68			179
%	88.2	11.8	100.0	0.6	61.5	38.0			100
Gujarat	434	172	606	4	236	180	12	2	434
%	71.6	28.4	100.0	0.9	54.4	41.5	2.8	0.5	100
Haryana	349	56	405		210	106	31	2	349
%	86.2	13.8	100.0		60.2	30.4	8.9	0.6	100
Himachal Pradesh	143	63	206		6	117	18	2	143
%	69.4	30.6	100.0		4.2	81.8	12.6	1.4	100
Jharkhand	228	168	396	1	108	81	32	6	228
%	57.6	42.4	100.0	0.4	47.4	35.5	14.0	2.6	100
Karnataka	519	69	588		146	297	74	2	519
%	88.3	11.7	100.0		28.1	57.2	14.3	0.4	100
Kerala	194	5	199		19	79	94	2	194
%	97.5	2.5	100.0		9.8	40.7	48.5	1.0	100
Madhya Pradesh	658	225	883	1	340	271	43	3	658
%	74.5	25.5	100.0	0.2	51.7	41.2	6.5	0.5	100
Maharashtra	479	300	779	3	54	176	177	69	479
%	61.5	38.5	100.0	0.6	11.3	36.7	37.0	14.4	100
Orissa	143	79	222		27	82	34		143
%	64.4	35.6	100.0		18.9	57.3	23.8		100
Rajasthan	364	234	598		115	222	25	2	364
%	60.9	39.1	100.0		31.6	61.0	6.9	0.5	100
Sikkim	138	59	197		29	70	38	1	138
%	70.1	29.9	100.0		21.0	50.7	27.5	0.7	100
Uttar Pradesh	1191	691	1882	7	408	586	149	41	1191
%	63.3	36.7	100.0	0.6	34.3	49.2	12.5	3.4	100
Uttrakhand	111	84	195		12	77	13	9	111
%	56.9	43.1	100.0		10.8	69.4	11.7	8.1	100
West Bengal	287	176	463		2	84	194	7	287
%	62.0	38.0	100.0		0.7	29.3	67.6	2.4	100
Total	6286	2759	9045	25	1943	3004	1134	180	6286
%	69.5	30.5	100.0	0.4	30.9	47.8	18.0	2.9	100

Table A 30: Better executions of provisions under State Finance Commission

	Better executions of provisions under State Finance Commission			Useful					
State	Yes	No	Total	Poor	Satis factory	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Total
Andhra Pradesh	183	20	203	2	40	89	27	25	183
%	90.1	9.9	100.0	1.1	21.9	48.6	14.8	13.7	100
Arunachal Pradesh	316	95	411		222	92	2		316
%	76.9	23.1	100.0		70.3	29.1	0.6		100
Assam	370	239	609	14	106	158	86	6	370
%	60.8	39.2	100.0	3.8	28.6	42.7	23.2	1.6	100
Goa	179	24	203	1	178				179
%	88.2	11.8	100.0	0.6	99.4				100
Gujarat	434	172	606	8	330	92	2	2	434
%	71.6	28.4	100.0	1.8	76.0	21.2	0.5	0.5	100
Haryana	349	56	405	4	263	65	14	3	349
%	86.2	13.8	100.0	1.1	75.4	18.6	4.0	0.9	100
Himachal Pradesh	143	63	206		97	31	12	3	143
%	69.4	30.6	100.0		67.8	21.7	8.4	2.1	100
Jharkhand	228	168	396		131	64	27	6	228
%	57.6	42.4	100.0		57.5	28.1	11.8	2.6	100
Karnataka	519	69	588		156	319	42	2	519
%	88.3	11.7	100.0		30.1	61.5	8.1	0.4	100
Kerala	194	5	199		22	157	13	2	194
%	97.5	2.5	100.0		11.3	80.9	6.7	1.0	100
Madhya Pradesh	658	225	883		521	122	11	4	658
%	74.5	25.5	100.0		79.2	18.5	1.7	0.6	100
Maharashtra	479	300	779	3	95	138	155	88	479
%	61.5	38.5	100.0	0.6	19.8	28.8	32.4	18.4	100
Orissa	143	79	222		58	80	5		143
%	64.4	35.6	100.0		40.6	55.9	3.5		100
Rajasthan	364	234	598		291	59	9	5	364
%	60.9	39.1	100.0		79.9	16.2	2.5	1.4	100
Sikkim	138	59	197		43	78	16	1	138
%	70.1	29.9	100.0		31.2	56.5	11.6	0.7	100
Uttar Pradesh	1191	691	1882	24	620	422	92	33	1191
%	63.3	36.7	100.0	2.0	52.1	35.4	7.7	2.8	100
Uttrakhand	111	84	195		73	27	3	8	111
%	56.9	43.1	100.0		65.8	24.3	2.7	7.2	100
West Bengal	287	176	463		36	167	77	7	287
%	62.0	38.0	100.0		12.5	58.2	26.8	2.4	100
Total	6286	2759	9045	56	3282	2160	593	195	6286
%	69.5	30.5	100.0	0.9	52.2	34.4	9.4	3.1	100

Table A 31: Training Organized Covering Various Programmes

	Training organized covering various programmes			Understanding Developed					
State	Yes	No	Total	Poor	Satis factory	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Total
Andhra Pradesh	192	11	203	3	7	49	107	26	192
%	94.6	5.4	100.0	1.6	3.6	25.5	55.7	13.5	100
Arunachal Pradesh	316	95	411		5	240	71		316
%	76.9	23.1	100.0		1.6	75.9	22.5		100
Assam	495	114	609	4	99	245	130	17	495
%	81.3	18.7	100.0	0.8	20.0	49.5	26.3	3.4	100
Goa	198	5	203		194	4			198
%	97.5	2.5	100.0		98.0	2.0			100
Gujarat	434	172	606	3	204	211	15	1	434
%	71.6	28.4	100.0	0.7	47.0	48.6	3.5	0.2	100
Haryana	388	17	405		207	144	35	2	388
%	95.8	4.2	100.0		53.4	37.1	9.0	0.5	100
Himachal Pradesh	176	30	206		5	143	26	2	176
%	85.4	14.6	100.0		2.8	81.3	14.8	1.1	100
Jharkhand	346	50	396	1	176	117	42	10	346
%	87.4	12.6	100.0	0.3	50.9	33.8	12.1	2.9	100
Karnataka	556	32	588		144	320	88	4	556
%	94.6	5.4	100.0		25.9	57.6	15.8	0.7	100
Kerala	195	4	199		18	79	94	4	195
%	98.0	2.0	100.0		9.2	40.5	48.2	2.1	100
Madhya Pradesh	740	143	883	1	360	317	61	1	740
%	83.8	16.2	100.0	0.1	48.6	42.8	8.2	0.1	100
Maharashtra	478	301	779	3	58	170	171	76	478
%	61.4	38.6	100.0	0.6	12.1	35.6	35.8	15.9	100
Orissa	184	38	222		39	102	43		184
%	82.9	17.1	100.0		21.2	55.4	23.4		100
Rajasthan	456	142	598	1	129	278	45	3	456
%	76.3	23.7	100.0	0.2	28.3	61.0	9.9	0.7	100
Sikkim	175	22	197		38	91	43	3	175
%	88.8	11.2	100.0		21.7	52.0	24.6	1.7	100
Uttar Pradesh	1372	510	1882	6	455	668	202	41	1372
%	72.9	27.1	100.0	0.4	33.2	48.7	14.7	3.0	100
Uttrakhand	140	55	195		9	106	14	11	140
%	71.8	28.2	100.0		6.4	75.7	10.0	7.9	100
West Bengal	391	72	463		2	118	244	27	391
%	84.4	15.6	100.0		0.5	30.2	62.4	6.9	100
Total	7232	1813	9045	22	2149	3402	1431	228	7232
%	80.0	20.0	100.0	0.3	29.7	47.0	19.8	3.2	100

Table A 32: Training Organized Covering Various Programmes

	Training organized covering various programmes			Useful					
State	Yes	No	Total	Poor	Satis factory	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Total
Andhra Pradesh	192	11	203	2	19	102	42	27	192
%	94.6	5.4	100.0	1.0	9.9	53.1	21.9	14.1	100
Arunachal Pradesh	316	95	411		103	208	5		316
%	76.9	23.1	100.0		32.6	65.8	1.6		100
Assam	495	114	609	18	150	212	102	13	495
%	81.3	18.7	100.0	3.6	30.3	42.8	20.6	2.6	100
Goa	198	5	203		196	2			198
%	97.5	2.5	100.0		99.0	1.0			100
Gujarat	434	172	606	4	330	95	4	1	434
%	71.6	28.4	100.0	0.9	76.0	21.9	0.9	0.2	100
Haryana	388	17	405	3	284	84	16	1	388
%	95.8	4.2	100.0	0.8	73.2	21.6	4.1	0.3	100
Himachal Pradesh	176	30	206		117	39	17	3	176
%	85.4	14.6	100.0		66.5	22.2	9.7	1.7	100
Jharkhand	346	50	396		208	98	30	10	346
%	87.4	12.6	100.0		60.1	28.3	8.7	2.9	100
Karnataka	556	32	588		158	336	59	3	556
%	94.6	5.4	100.0		28.4	60.4	10.6	0.5	100
Kerala	195	4	199		20	161	10	4	195
%	98.0	2.0	100.0		10.3	82.6	5.1	2.1	100
Madhya Pradesh	740	143	883		578	145	14	3	740
%	83.8	16.2	100.0		78.1	19.6	1.9	0.4	100
Maharashtra	478	301	779	4	100	119	164	91	478
%	61.4	38.6	100.0	0.8	20.9	24.9	34.3	19.0	100
Orissa	184	38	222		82	94	8		184
%	82.9	17.1	100.0		44.6	51.1	4.3		100
Rajasthan	456	142	598		329	107	14	6	456
%	76.3	23.7	100.0		72.1	23.5	3.1	1.3	100
Sikkim	175	22	197		57	91	27		175
%	88.8	11.2	100.0		32.6	52.0	15.4		100
Uttar Pradesh	1372	510	1882	28	740	478	98	28	1372
%	72.9	27.1	100.0	2.0	53.9	34.8	7.1	2.0	100
Uttrakhand	140	55	195		88	40	4	8	140
%	71.8	28.2	100.0		62.9	28.6	2.9	5.7	100
West Bengal	391	72	463		20	192	156	23	391
%	84.4	15.6	100.0		5.1	49.1	39.9	5.9	100
Total	7232	1813	9045	59	3579	2603	770	221	7232
%	80.0	20.0	100.0	0.8	49.5	36.0	10.6	3.1	100

Table A 33: Capacity Building Trainings

	Capacity building trainings			Understanding Developed					
State	Yes	No	Total	Poor	Satis factory	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Total
Andhra Pradesh	181	22	203	4	8	36	113	20	181
%	89.2	10.8	100.0	2.2	4.4	19.9	62.4	11.0	100
Arunachal Pradesh	316	95	411		2	216	98		316
%	76.9	23.1	100.0		0.6	68.4	31.0		100
Assam	483	126	609	5	102	222	144	10	483
%	79.3	20.7	100.0	1.0	21.1	46.0	29.8	2.1	100
Goa	198	5	203		194	4			198
%	97.5	2.5	100.0		98.0	2.0			100
Gujarat	435	171	606	2	205	212	15	1	435
%	71.8	28.2	100.0	0.5	47.1	48.7	3.4	0.2	100
Haryana	365	40	405		199	133	32	1	365
%	90.1	9.9	100.0		54.5	36.4	8.8	0.3	100
Himachal Pradesh	176	30	206		5	145	24	2	176
%	85.4	14.6	100.0		2.8	82.4	13.6	1.1	100
Jharkhand	343	53	396	1	174	120	37	11	343
%	86.6	13.4	100.0	0.3	50.7	35.0	10.8	3.2	100
Karnataka	556	32	588		147	323	82	4	556
%	94.6	5.4	100.0		26.4	58.1	14.7	0.7	100
Kerala	193	6	199		19	74	98	2	193
%	97.0	3.0	100.0		9.8	38.3	50.8	1.0	100
Madhya Pradesh	733	150	883	1	359	309	62	2	733
%	83.0	17.0	100.0	0.1	49.0	42.2	8.5	0.3	100
Maharashtra	474	305	779	3	74	158	169	70	474
%	60.8	39.2	100.0	0.6	15.6	33.3	35.7	14.8	100
Orissa	183	39	222		38	103	42		183
%	82.4	17.6	100.0		20.8	56.3	23.0		100
Rajasthan	370	228	598	3	110	217	38	2	370
%	61.9	38.1	100.0	0.8	29.7	58.6	10.3	0.5	100
Sikkim	175	22	197		39	87	46	3	175
%	88.8	11.2	100.0		22.3	49.7	26.3	1.7	100
Uttar Pradesh	1367	515	1882	3	465	677	179	43	1367
%	72.6	27.4	100.0	0.2	34.0	49.5	13.1	3.1	100
Uttrakhand	140	55	195		11	101	18	10	140
%	71.8	28.2	100.0		7.9	72.1	12.9	7.1	100
West Bengal	367	96	463	1	3	111	236	16	367
%	79.3	20.7	100.0	0.3	0.8	30.2	64.3	4.4	100
Total	7055	1990	9045	23	2154	3248	1433	197	7055
%	78.0	22.0	100.0	0.3	30.5	46.0	20.3	2.8	100

Table A 34: Capacity Building Trainings

	Capacity building trainings			Useful					
State	Yes	No	Total	Poor	Satis factory	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Total
Andhra Pradesh	181	22	203	1	22	96	43	19	181
%	89.2	10.8	100.0	0.6	12.2	53.0	23.8	10.5	100
Arunachal Pradesh	316	95	411		98	214	4		316
%	76.9	23.1	100.0		31.0	67.7	1.3		100
Assam	483	126	609	17	157	186	114	9	483
%	79.3	20.7	100.0	3.5	32.5	38.5	23.6	1.9	100
Goa	198	5	203		196	2			198
%	97.5	2.5	100.0		99.0	1.0			100
Gujarat	435	171	606	3	329	98	5		435
%	71.8	28.2	100.0	0.7	75.6	22.5	1.1		100
Haryana	365	40	405	3	267	80	14	1	365
%	90.1	9.9	100.0	0.8	73.2	21.9	3.8	0.3	100
Himachal Pradesh	176	30	206		119	34	21	2	176
%	85.4	14.6	100.0		67.6	19.3	11.9	1.1	100
Jharkhand	343	53	396		210	96	26	11	343
%	86.6	13.4	100.0		61.2	28.0	7.6	3.2	100
Karnataka	556	32	588		161	337	54	4	556
%	94.6	5.4	100.0		29.0	60.6	9.7	0.7	100
Kerala	193	6	199		23	149	19	2	193
%	97.0	3.0	100.0		11.9	77.2	9.8	1.0	100
Madhya Pradesh	733	150	883		578	138	12	5	733
%	83.0	17.0	100.0		78.9	18.8	1.6	0.7	100
Maharashtra	474	305	779	2	97	137	152	86	474
%	60.8	39.2	100.0	0.4	20.5	28.9	32.1	18.1	100
Orissa	183	39	222	1	82	92	8		183
%	82.4	17.6	100.0	0.5	44.8	50.3	4.4		100
Rajasthan	370	228	598		263	95	9	3	370
%	61.9	38.1	100.0		71.1	25.7	2.4	0.8	100
Sikkim	175	22	197	1	57	85	32		175
%	88.8	11.2	100.0	0.6	32.6	48.6	18.3		100
Uttar Pradesh	1367	515	1882	22	747	471	98	29	1367
%	72.6	27.4	100.0	1.6	54.6	34.5	7.2	2.1	100
Uttrakhand	140	55	195		89	36	6	9	140
%	71.8	28.2	100.0		63.6	25.7	4.3	6.4	100
West Bengal	367	96	463	1	22	175	157	12	367
%	79.3	20.7	100.0	0.3	6.0	47.7	42.8	3.3	100
Total	7055	1990	9045	51	3517	2521	775	191	7055
%	78.0	22.0	100.0	0.7	49.9	35.7	11.0	2.7	100

Table A 35: Training on SBM, Water Quality, Health

	Training on SBM, Water quality,health			Understanding Developed					
State	Yes	No	Total	Poor	Satis factory	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Total
Andhra Pradesh	176	27	203	3	10	45	94	24	176
%	86.7	13.3	100.0	1.7	5.7	25.6	53.4	13.6	100
Arunachal Pradesh	318	93	411		2	224	92		318
%	77.4	22.6	100.0		0.6	70.4	28.9		100
Assam	454	155	609	3	115	219	106	11	454
%	74.5	25.5	100.0	0.7	25.3	48.2	23.3	2.4	100
Goa	181	22	203		178	3			181
%	89.2	10.8	100.0		98.3	1.7			100
Gujarat	366	240	606	2	170	181	12	1	366
%	60.4	39.6	100.0	0.5	46.4	49.5	3.3	0.3	100
Haryana	329	76	405	2	180	117	29	1	329
%	81.2	18.8	100.0	0.6	54.7	35.6	8.8	0.3	100
Himachal Pradesh	143	63	206		5	120	16	2	143
%	69.4	30.6	100.0		3.5	83.9	11.2	1.4	100
Jharkhand	261	135	396	1	133	82	35	10	261
%	65.9	34.1	100.0	0.4	51.0	31.4	13.4	3.8	100
Karnataka	519	69	588		140	302	77		519
%	88.3	11.7	100.0		27.0	58.2	14.8		100
Kerala	189	10	199		19	71	97	2	189
%	95.0	5.0	100.0		10.1	37.6	51.3	1.1	100
Madhya Pradesh	653	230	883	2	345	262	43	1	653
%	74.0	26.0	100.0	0.3	52.8	40.1	6.6	0.2	100
Maharashtra	471	308	779	4	75	157	167	68	471
%	60.5	39.5	100.0	0.8	15.9	33.3	35.5	14.4	100
Orissa	141	81	222		25	81	35		141
%	63.5	36.5	100.0		17.7	57.4	24.8		100
Rajasthan	372	226	598	1	107	220	38	6	372
%	62.2	37.8	100.0	0.3	28.8	59.1	10.2	1.6	100
Sikkim	138	59	197		30	72	32	4	138
%	70.1	29.9	100.0		21.7	52.2	23.2	2.9	100
Uttar Pradesh	1192	690	1882	4	422	577	162	27	1192
%	63.3	36.7	100.0	0.3	35.4	48.4	13.6	2.3	100
Uttrakhand	113	82	195		11	81	11	10	113
%	57.9	42.1	100.0		9.7	71.7	9.7	8.8	100
West Bengal	278	185	463		3	87	176	12	278
%	60.0	40.0	100.0		1.1	31.3	63.3	4.3	100
Total	6294	2751	9045	22	1970	2901	1222	179	6294
%	69.6	30.4	100.0	0.3	31.3	46.1	19.4	2.8	100

Table A 36: Training on SBM, Water Quality, Health

	Training on SBM, Water quality,health			Useful					
State	Yes	No	Total	Poor	Satis factory	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Total
Andhra Pradesh	176	27	203	2	20	98	31	25	176
%	86.7	13.3	100.0	1.1	11.4	55.7	17.6	14.2	100
Arunachal Pradesh	318	93	411		109	208	1		318
%	77.4	22.6	100.0		34.3	65.4	0.3		100
Assam	454	155	609	47	160	157	79	11	454
%	74.5	25.5	100.0	10.4	35.2	34.6	17.4	2.4	100
Goa	181	22	203		180	1			181
%	89.2	10.8	100.0		99.4	0.6			100
Gujarat	366	240	606	2	279	80	4	1	366
%	60.4	39.6	100.0	0.5	76.2	21.9	1.1	0.3	100
Haryana	329	76	405	3	245	66	14	1	329
%	81.2	18.8	100.0	0.9	74.5	20.1	4.3	0.3	100
Himachal Pradesh	143	63	206		100	28	13	2	143
%	69.4	30.6	100.0		69.9	19.6	9.1	1.4	100
Jharkhand	261	135	396		157	67	28	9	261
%	65.9	34.1	100.0		60.2	25.7	10.7	3.4	100
Karnataka	519	69	588		160	306	53		519
%	88.3	11.7	100.0		30.8	59.0	10.2		100
Kerala	189	10	199		23	145	19	2	189
%	95.0	5.0	100.0		12.2	76.7	10.1	1.1	100
Madhya Pradesh	653	230	883		522	116	11	4	653
%	74.0	26.0	100.0		79.9	17.8	1.7	0.6	100
Maharashtra	471	308	779	2	109	131	156	73	471
%	60.5	39.5	100.0	0.4	23.1	27.8	33.1	15.5	100
Orissa	141	81	222	1	59	77	4		141
%	63.5	36.5	100.0	0.7	41.8	54.6	2.8		100
Rajasthan	372	226	598		265	89	11	7	372
%	62.2	37.8	100.0		71.2	23.9	3.0	1.9	100
Sikkim	138	59	197		43	77	17	1	138
%	70.1	29.9	100.0		31.2	55.8	12.3	0.7	100
Uttar Pradesh	1192	690	1882	22	630	433	92	15	1192
%	63.3	36.7	100.0	1.8	52.9	36.3	7.7	1.3	100
Uttrakhand	113	82	195		75	25	5	8	113
%	57.9	42.1	100.0		66.4	22.1	4.4	7.1	100
West Bengal	278	185	463		20	146	108	4	278
%	60.0	40.0	100.0		7.2	52.5	38.8	1.4	100
Total	6294	2751	9045	79	3156	2250	646	163	6294
%	69.6	30.4	100.0	1.3	50.1	35.7	10.3	2.6	100

Table A 37: Training organized for Sector Convergence

	Training for sector convergence			Understanding Developed					
State	Yes	No	Total	Poor	Satis factory	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Total
Andhra Pradesh	181	22	203	4	14	49	87	27	181
%	89.2	10.8	100.0	2.2	7.7	27.1	48.1	14.9	100
Arunachal Pradesh	170	241	411		24	140	6		170
%	41.4	58.6	100.0		14.1	82.4	3.5		100
Assam	355	254	609	4	59	174	107	11	355
%	58.3	41.7	100.0	1.1	16.6	49.0	30.1	3.1	100
Goa	179	24	203		176	3			179
%	88.2	11.8	100.0		98.3	1.7			100
Gujarat	362	244	606	3	201	143	14	1	362
%	59.7	40.3	100.0	0.8	55.5	39.5	3.9	0.3	100
Haryana	335	70	405		209	96	29	1	335
%	82.7	17.3	100.0		62.4	28.7	8.7	0.3	100
Himachal Pradesh	125	81	206		5	110	8	2	125
%	60.7	39.3	100.0		4.0	88.0	6.4	1.6	100
Jharkhand	260	136	396	1	133	84	33	9	260
%	65.7	34.3	100.0	0.4	51.2	32.3	12.7	3.5	100
Karnataka	519	69	588		138	305	75	1	519
%	88.3	11.7	100.0		26.6	58.8	14.5	0.2	100
Kerala	193	6	199		20	70	101	2	193
%	97.0	3.0	100.0		10.4	36.3	52.3	1.0	100
Madhya Pradesh	653	230	883	2	344	263	43	1	653
%	74.0	26.0	100.0	0.3	52.7	40.3	6.6	0.2	100
Maharashtra	358	421	779	3	70	114	124	47	358
%	46.0	54.0	100.0	0.8	19.6	31.8	34.6	13.1	100
Orissa	142	80	222		28	78	36		142
%	64.0	36.0	100.0		19.7	54.9	25.4		100
Rajasthan	221	377	598	1	73	115	26	6	221
%	37.0	63.0	100.0	0.5	33.0	52.0	11.8	2.7	100
Sikkim	138	59	197		33	73	32		138
%	70.1	29.9	100.0		23.9	52.9	23.2		100
Uttar Pradesh	1145	737	1882	9	425	543	142	26	1145
%	60.8	39.2	100.0	0.8	37.1	47.4	12.4	2.3	100
Uttrakhand	111	84	195		14	76	14	7	111
%	56.9	43.1	100.0		12.6	68.5	12.6	6.3	100
West Bengal	243	220	463	1	2	87	147	6	243
%	52.5	47.5	100.0	0.4	0.8	35.8	60.5	2.5	100
Total	5690	3355	9045	28	1968	2523	1024	147	5690
%	62.9	37.1	100.0	0.5	34.6	44.3	18.0	2.6	100

Table A 38: Training organized for Sector Convergence

	Training for sector convergence			Useful					
State	Yes	No	Total	Poor	Satis factory	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Total
Andhra Pradesh	181	22	203	3	28	92	27	31	181
%	89.2	10.8	100.0	1.7	15.5	50.8	14.9	17.1	100
Arunachal Pradesh	170	241	411		131	39			170
%	41.4	58.6	100.0		77.1	22.9			100
Assam	355	254	609	8	97	161	80	9	355
%	58.3	41.7	100.0	2.3	27.3	45.4	22.5	2.5	100
Goa	179	24	203		178	1			179
%	88.2	11.8	100.0		99.4	0.6			100
Gujarat	362	244	606	6	281	70	5		362
%	59.7	40.3	100.0	1.7	77.6	19.3	1.4		100
Haryana	335	70	405	2	261	58	13	1	335
%	82.7	17.3	100.0	0.6	77.9	17.3	3.9	0.3	100
Himachal Pradesh	125	81	206		97	20	6	2	125
%	60.7	39.3	100.0		77.6	16.0	4.8	1.6	100
Jharkhand	260	136	396		157	67	26	10	260
%	65.7	34.3	100.0		60.4	25.8	10.0	3.8	100
Karnataka	519	69	588		156	319	43	1	519
%	88.3	11.7	100.0		30.1	61.5	8.3	0.2	100
Kerala	193	6	199		24	147	20	2	193
%	97.0	3.0	100.0		12.4	76.2	10.4	1.0	100
Madhya Pradesh	653	230	883		522	117	11	3	653
%	74.0	26.0	100.0		79.9	17.9	1.7	0.5	100
Maharashtra	358	421	779	4	84	105	108	57	358
%	46.0	54.0	100.0	1.1	23.5	29.3	30.2	15.9	100
Orissa	142	80	222		64	75	3		142
%	64.0	36.0	100.0		45.1	52.8	2.1		100
Rajasthan	221	377	598		163	48	5	5	221
%	37.0	63.0	100.0		73.8	21.7	2.3	2.3	100
Sikkim	138	59	197	1	46	75	16		138
%	70.1	29.9	100.0	0.7	33.3	54.3	11.6		100
Uttar Pradesh	1145	737	1882	28	605	417	81	14	1145
%	60.8	39.2	100.0	2.4	52.8	36.4	7.1	1.2	100
Uttrakhand	111	84	195		74	26	6	5	111
%	56.9	43.1	100.0		66.7	23.4	5.4	4.5	100
West Bengal	243	220	463		43	133	59	8	243
%	52.5	47.5	100.0		17.7	54.7	24.3	3.3	100
Total	5690	3355	9045	52	3011	1970	509	148	5690
%	62.9	37.1	100.0	0.9	52.9	34.6	8.9	2.6	100

Table A 39: Commmunity Organizations & Related Issues

	Comm. Organizations & related issues			Understanding Developed					
State	Yes	No	Total	Poor	Satis factory	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Total
Andhra Pradesh	168	35	203	5	15	51	74	23	168
%	82.8	17.2	100.0	3.0	8.9	30.4	44.0	13.7	100
Arunachal Pradesh	318	93	411		61	248	9		318
%	77.4	22.6	100.0		19.2	78.0	2.8		100
Assam	438	171	609	5	118	195	108	12	438
%	71.9	28.1	100.0	1.1	26.9	44.5	24.7	2.7	100
Goa	146	57	203		142	4			146
%	71.9	28.1	100.0		97.3	2.7			100
Gujarat	398	208	606	3	230	150	14	1	398
%	65.7	34.3	100.0	0.8	57.8	37.7	3.5	0.3	100
Haryana	301	104	405		176	96	28	1	301
%	74.3	25.7	100.0		58.5	31.9	9.3	0.3	100
Himachal Pradesh	143	63	206		7	119	15	2	143
%	69.4	30.6	100.0		4.9	83.2	10.5	1.4	100
Jharkhand	264	132	396	1	134	86	33	10	264
%	66.7	33.3	100.0	0.4	50.8	32.6	12.5	3.8	100
Karnataka	505	83	588		138	291	73	3	505
%	85.9	14.1	100.0		27.3	57.6	14.5	0.6	100
Kerala	174	25	199		19	67	86	2	174
%	87.4	12.6	100.0		10.9	38.5	49.4	1.1	100
Madhya Pradesh	626	257	883	3	337	248	36	2	626
%	70.9	29.1	100.0	0.5	53.8	39.6	5.8	0.3	100
Maharashtra	548	231	779	3	81	164	224	76	548
%	70.3	29.7	100.0	0.5	14.8	29.9	40.9	13.9	100
Orissa	142	80	222		27	75	40		142
%	64.0	36.0	100.0		19.0	52.8	28.2		100
Rajasthan	373	225	598	2	131	205	31	4	373
%	62.4	37.6	100.0	0.5	35.1	55.0	8.3	1.1	100
Sikkim	138	59	197		31	72	34	1	138
%	70.1	29.9	100.0		22.5	52.2	24.6	0.7	100
Uttar Pradesh	1184	698	1882	17	425	565	155	22	1184
%	62.9	37.1	100.0	1.4	35.9	47.7	13.1	1.9	100
Uttrakhand	115	80	195		15	78	15	7	115
%	59.0	41.0	100.0		13.0	67.8	13.0	6.1	100
West Bengal	386	77	463	1	6	134	227	18	386
%	83.4	16.6	100.0	0.3	1.6	34.7	58.8	4.7	100
Total	6367	2678	9045	40	2093	2848	1202	184	6367
%	70.4	29.6	100.0	0.6	32.9	44.7	18.9	2.9	100

Table A 40: Community Organizations & Related Issues

	Comm. Organizations & related issues			Useful					
State	Yes	No	Total	Poor	Satis factory	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Total
Andhra Pradesh	168	35	203	3	35	79	28	23	168
%	82.8	17.2	100.0	1.8	20.8	47.0	16.7	13.7	100
Arunachal Pradesh	318	93	411		256	62			318
%	77.4	22.6	100.0		80.5	19.5			100
Assam	438	171	609	45	149	152	82	10	438
%	71.9	28.1	100.0	10.3	34.0	34.7	18.7	2.3	100
Goa	146	57	203		145	1			146
%	71.9	28.1	100.0		99.3	0.7			100
Gujarat	398	208	606	10	306	77	4	1	398
%	65.7	34.3	100.0	2.5	76.9	19.3	1.0	0.3	100
Haryana	301	104	405		224	64	12	1	301
%	74.3	25.7	100.0		74.4	21.3	4.0	0.3	100
Himachal Pradesh	143	63	206		100	30	11	2	143
%	69.4	30.6	100.0		69.9	21.0	7.7	1.4	100
Jharkhand	264	132	396		158	72	23	11	264
%	66.7	33.3	100.0		59.8	27.3	8.7	4.2	100
Karnataka	505	83	588		151	309	42	3	505
%	85.9	14.1	100.0		29.9	61.2	8.3	0.6	100
Kerala	174	25	199		24	132	16	2	174
%	87.4	12.6	100.0		13.8	75.9	9.2	1.1	100
Madhya Pradesh	626	257	883	1	502	112	8	3	626
%	70.9	29.1	100.0	0.2	80.2	17.9	1.3	0.5	100
Maharashtra	548	231	779	2	121	131	186	108	548
%	70.3	29.7	100.0	0.4	22.1	23.9	33.9	19.7	100
Orissa	142	80	222		65	72	5		142
%	64.0	36.0	100.0		45.8	50.7	3.5		100
Rajasthan	373	225	598		300	62	6	5	373
%	62.4	37.6	100.0		80.4	16.6	1.6	1.3	100
Sikkim	138	59	197	1	45	73	19		138
%	70.1	29.9	100.0	0.7	32.6	52.9	13.8		100
Uttar Pradesh	1184	698	1882	36	609	436	93	10	1184
%	62.9	37.1	100.0	3.0	51.4	36.8	7.9	0.8	100
Uttrakhand	115	80	195		78	24	7	6	115
%	59.0	41.0	100.0		67.8	20.9	6.1	5.2	100
West Bengal	386	77	463		56	193	117	20	386
%	83.4	16.6	100.0		14.5	50.0	30.3	5.2	100
Total	6367	2678	9045	98	3324	2081	659	205	6367
%	70.4	29.6	100.0	1.5	52.2	32.7	10.4	3.2	100

Table A 41: Understanding Rural Poverty

	Understanding rural poverty			Understanding Developed					
State	Yes	No	Total	Poor	Satis factory	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Total
Andhra Pradesh	173	30	203	3	19	51	73	27	173
%	85.2	14.8	100.0	1.7	11.0	29.5	42.2	15.6	100
Arunachal Pradesh	318	93	411		103	209	6		318
%	77.4	22.6	100.0		32.4	65.7	1.9		100
Assam	436	173	609	4	126	192	101	13	436
%	71.6	28.4	100.0	0.9	28.9	44.0	23.2	3.0	100
Goa	165	38	203		160	5			165
%	81.3	18.7	100.0		97.0	3.0			100
Gujarat	396	210	606	2	241	138	14	1	396
%	65.3	34.7	100.0	0.5	60.9	34.8	3.5	0.3	100
Haryana	301	104	405		178	95	27	1	301
%	74.3	25.7	100.0		59.1	31.6	9.0	0.3	100
Himachal Pradesh	142	64	206		10	116	14	2	142
%	68.9	31.1	100.0		7.0	81.7	9.9	1.4	100
Jharkhand	264	132	396	1	131	82	41	9	264
%	66.7	33.3	100.0	0.4	49.6	31.1	15.5	3.4	100
Karnataka	439	149	588		113	282	42	2	439
%	74.7	25.3	100.0		25.7	64.2	9.6	0.5	100
Kerala	177	22	199		17	69	88	3	177
%	88.9	11.1	100.0		9.6	39.0	49.7	1.7	100
Madhya Pradesh	624	259	883	1	336	246	40	1	624
%	70.7	29.3	100.0	0.2	53.8	39.4	6.4	0.2	100
Maharashtra	564	215	779	3	79	180	219	83	564
%	72.4	27.6	100.0	0.5	14.0	31.9	38.8	14.7	100
Orissa	143	79	222		28	75	40		143
%	64.4	35.6	100.0		19.6	52.4	28.0		100
Rajasthan	373	225	598	1	114	225	29	4	373
%	62.4	37.6	100.0	0.3	30.6	60.3	7.8	1.1	100
Sikkim	143	54	197		30	79	32	2	143
%	72.6	27.4	100.0		21.0	55.2	22.4	1.4	100
Uttar Pradesh	1182	700	1882	13	433	563	150	23	1182
%	62.8	37.2	100.0	1.1	36.6	47.6	12.7	1.9	100
Uttrakhand	115	80	195		14	76	13	12	115
%	59.0	41.0	100.0		12.2	66.1	11.3	10.4	100
West Bengal	402	61	463	1	6	150	231	14	402
%	86.8	13.2	100.0	0.2	1.5	37.3	57.5	3.5	100
Total	6357	2688	9045	29	2138	2833	1160	197	6357
%	70.3	29.7	100.0	0.5	33.6	44.6	18.2	3.1	100

Table A 42: Understanding Rural Poverty

	Understanding rural poverty			Useful					
State	Yes	No	Total	Poor	Satis factory	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Total
Andhra Pradesh	173	30	203	2	39	75	29	28	173
%	85.2	14.8	100.0	1.2	22.5	43.4	16.8	16.2	100
Arunachal Pradesh	318	93	411		262	56			318
%	77.4	22.6	100.0		82.4	17.6			100
Assam	436	173	609	59	146	139	79	13	436
%	71.6	28.4	100.0	13.5	33.5	31.9	18.1	3.0	100
Goa	165	38	203		161	4			165
%	81.3	18.7	100.0		97.6	2.4			100
Gujarat	396	210	606	15	300	76	5		396
%	65.3	34.7	100.0	3.8	75.8	19.2	1.3		100
Haryana	301	104	405	2	224	62	12	1	301
%	74.3	25.7	100.0	0.7	74.4	20.6	4.0	0.3	100
Himachal Pradesh	142	64	206		99	29	12	2	142
%	68.9	31.1	100.0		69.7	20.4	8.5	1.4	100
Jharkhand	264	132	396		155	69	31	9	264
%	66.7	33.3	100.0		58.7	26.1	11.7	3.4	100
Karnataka	439	149	588		124	292	21	2	439
%	74.7	25.3	100.0		28.2	66.5	4.8	0.5	100
Kerala	177	22	199		21	132	21	3	177
%	88.9	11.1	100.0		11.9	74.6	11.9	1.7	100
Madhya Pradesh	624	259	883		501	107	13	3	624
%	70.7	29.3	100.0		80.3	17.1	2.1	0.5	100
Maharashtra	564	215	779	2	122	156	172	112	564
%	72.4	27.6	100.0	0.4	21.6	27.7	30.5	19.9	100
Orissa	143	79	222		66	70	7		143
%	64.4	35.6	100.0		46.2	49.0	4.9		100
Rajasthan	373	225	598		298	64	7	4	373
%	62.4	37.6	100.0		79.9	17.2	1.9	1.1	100
Sikkim	143	54	197	1	47	76	19		143
%	72.6	27.4	100.0	0.7	32.9	53.1	13.3		100
Uttar Pradesh	1182	700	1882	35	615	437	81	14	1182
%	62.8	37.2	100.0	3.0	52.0	37.0	6.9	1.2	100
Uttrakhand	115	80	195		75	24	7	9	115
%	59.0	41.0	100.0		65.2	20.9	6.1	7.8	100
West Bengal	402	61	463		56	217	113	16	402
%	86.8	13.2	100.0		13.9	54.0	28.1	4.0	100
Total	6357	2688	9045	116	3311	2085	629	216	6357
%	70.3	29.7	100.0	1.8	52.1	32.8	9.9	3.4	100

Table A 43: Understanding Inequality

	Understanding inequality			Understanding Developed					
State	Yes	No	Total	Poor	Satis factory	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Total
Andhra Pradesh	170	33	203	4	24	48	70	24	170
%	83.7	16.3	100.0	2.4	14.1	28.2	41.2	14.1	100
Arunachal Pradesh	333	78	411		144	178	11		333
%	81.0	19.0	100.0		43.2	53.5	3.3		100
Assam	458	151	609	4	134	199	108	13	458
%	75.2	24.8	100.0	0.9	29.3	43.4	23.6	2.8	100
Goa	148	55	203		141	7			148
%	72.9	27.1	100.0		95.3	4.7			100
Gujarat	424	182	606	2	261	149	11	1	424
%	70.0	30.0	100.0	0.5	61.6	35.1	2.6	0.2	100
Haryana	262	143	405		155	80	26	1	262
%	64.7	35.3	100.0		59.2	30.5	9.9	0.4	100
Himachal Pradesh	141	65	206	1	8	116	14	2	141
%	68.4	31.6	100.0	0.7	5.7	82.3	9.9	1.4	100
Jharkhand	261	135	396	1	137	81	31	11	261
%	65.9	34.1	100.0	0.4	52.5	31.0	11.9	4.2	100
Karnataka	440	148	588		130	269	39	2	440
%	74.8	25.2	100.0		29.5	61.1	8.9	0.5	100
Kerala	177	22	199		17	73	85	2	177
%	88.9	11.1	100.0		9.6	41.2	48.0	1.1	100
Madhya Pradesh	621	262	883	1	335	248	36	1	621
%	70.3	29.7	100.0	0.2	53.9	39.9	5.8	0.2	100
Maharashtra	557	222	779	4	87	158	236	72	557
%	71.5	28.5	100.0	0.7	15.6	28.4	42.4	12.9	100
Orissa	140	82	222		24	77	39		140
%	63.1	36.9	100.0		17.1	55.0	27.9		100
Rajasthan	380	218	598	1	118	229	29	3	380
%	63.5	36.5	100.0	0.3	31.1	60.3	7.6	0.8	100
Sikkim	138	59	197		29	75	32	2	138
%	70.1	29.9	100.0		21.0	54.3	23.2	1.4	100
Uttar Pradesh	1160	722	1882	18	414	548	154	26	1160
%	61.6	38.4	100.0	1.6	35.7	47.2	13.3	2.2	100
Uttrakhand	140	55	195		16	101	14	9	140
%	71.8	28.2	100.0		11.4	72.1	10.0	6.4	100
West Bengal	347	116	463	1	4	141	198	3	347
%	74.9	25.1	100.0	0.3	1.2	40.6	57.1	0.9	100
Total	6297	2748	9045	37	2178	2777	1133	172	6297
%	69.6	30.4	100.0	0.6	34.6	44.1	18.0	2.7	100

Table A 44: Understanding Inequality

	Understanding inequality			Useful					
State	Yes	No	Total	Poor	Satis factory	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Total
Andhra Pradesh	170	33	203	3	39	69	32	27	170
%	83.7	16.3	100.0	1.8	22.9	40.6	18.8	15.9	100
Arunachal Pradesh	333	78	411		265	68			333
%	81.0	19.0	100.0		79.6	20.4			100
Assam	458	151	609	61	149	155	76	17	458
%	75.2	24.8	100.0	13.3	32.5	33.8	16.6	3.7	100
Goa	148	55	203		143	5			148
%	72.9	27.1	100.0		96.6	3.4			100
Gujarat	424	182	606	19	317	83	5		424
%	70.0	30.0	100.0	4.5	74.8	19.6	1.2		100
Haryana	262	143	405	1	192	56	12	1	262
%	64.7	35.3	100.0	0.4	73.3	21.4	4.6	0.4	100
Himachal Pradesh	141	65	206		100	28	11	2	141
%	68.4	31.6	100.0		70.9	19.9	7.8	1.4	100
Jharkhand	261	135	396		159	66	24	12	261
%	65.9	34.1	100.0		60.9	25.3	9.2	4.6	100
Karnataka	440	148	588		141	276	21	2	440
%	74.8	25.2	100.0		32.0	62.7	4.8	0.5	100
Kerala	177	22	199		21	140	14	2	177
%	88.9	11.1	100.0		11.9	79.1	7.9	1.1	100
Madhya Pradesh	621	262	883		501	107	9	4	621
%	70.3	29.7	100.0		80.7	17.2	1.4	0.6	100
Maharashtra	557	222	779	7	120	129	199	102	557
%	71.5	28.5	100.0	1.3	21.5	23.2	35.7	18.3	100
Orissa	140	82	222		61	73	6		140
%	63.1	36.9	100.0		43.6	52.1	4.3		100
Rajasthan	380	218	598		306	63	8	3	380
%	63.5	36.5	100.0		80.5	16.6	2.1	0.8	100
Sikkim	138	59	197	1	45	72	20		138
%	70.1	29.9	100.0	0.7	32.6	52.2	14.5		100
Uttar Pradesh	1160	722	1882	28	617	410	92	13	1160
%	61.6	38.4	100.0	2.4	53.2	35.3	7.9	1.1	100
Uttrakhand	140	55	195		92	36	7	5	140
%	71.8	28.2	100.0		65.7	25.7	5.0	3.6	100
West Bengal	347	116	463		42	214	83	8	347
%	74.9	25.1	100.0		12.1	61.7	23.9	2.3	100
Total	6297	2748	9045	120	3310	2050	619	198	6297
%	69.6	30.4	100.0	1.9	52.6	32.6	9.8	3.1	100

Table A 45: Understanding Poor Human Indices

	Understanding poor human indices			Understanding Developed					
State	Yes	No	Total	Poor	Satis factory	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Total
Andhra Pradesh	171	32	203	3	13	51	78	26	171
%	84.2	15.8	100.0	1.8	7.6	29.8	45.6	15.2	100
Arunachal Pradesh	332	79	411		124	177	31		332
%	80.8	19.2	100.0		37.3	53.3	9.3		100
Assam	443	166	609	1	134	206	90	12	443
%	72.7	27.3	100.0	0.2	30.2	46.5	20.3	2.7	100
Goa	146	57	203		143	3			146
%	71.9	28.1	100.0		97.9	2.1			100
Gujarat	426	180	606	3	238	176	8	1	426
%	70.3	29.7	100.0	0.7	55.9	41.3	1.9	0.2	100
Haryana	266	139	405		177	60	27	2	266
%	65.7	34.3	100.0		66.5	22.6	10.2	0.8	100
Himachal Pradesh	140	66	206		5	123	10	2	140
%	68.0	32.0	100.0		3.6	87.9	7.1	1.4	100
Jharkhand	262	134	396	2	141	86	31	2	262
%	66.2	33.8	100.0	0.8	53.8	32.8	11.8	0.8	100
Karnataka	451	137	588		131	268	51	1	451
%	76.7	23.3	100.0		29.0	59.4	11.3	0.2	100
Kerala	177	22	199		27	62	86	2	177
%	88.9	11.1	100.0		15.3	35.0	48.6	1.1	100
Madhya Pradesh	611	272	883	4	333	230	43	1	611
%	69.2	30.8	100.0	0.7	54.5	37.6	7.0	0.2	100
Maharashtra	586	193	779	6	80	188	272	40	586
%	75.2	24.8	100.0	1.0	13.7	32.1	46.4	6.8	100
Orissa	135	87	222		23	78	34		135
%	60.8	39.2	100.0		17.0	57.8	25.2		100
Rajasthan	373	225	598	1	131	199	41	1	373
%	62.4	37.6	100.0	0.3	35.1	53.4	11.0	0.3	100
Sikkim	137	60	197		25	85	27		137
%	69.5	30.5	100.0		18.2	62.0	19.7		100
Uttar Pradesh	1142	740	1882	14	457	513	136	22	1142
%	60.7	39.3	100.0	1.2	40.0	44.9	11.9	1.9	100
Uttrakhand	121	74	195		12	74	29	6	121
%	62.1	37.9	100.0		9.9	61.2	24.0	5.0	100
West Bengal	350	113	463		4	117	226	3	350
%	75.6	24.4	100.0		1.1	33.4	64.6	0.9	100
Total	6269	2776	9045	34	2198	2696	1220	121	6269
%	69.3	30.7	100.0	0.5	35.1	43.0	19.5	1.9	100

Table A 46: Understanding Poor Human Indices

	Understanding poor human indices			Useful					
State	Yes	No	Total	Poor	Satis factory	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Total
Andhra Pradesh	171	32	203	4	12	89	45	21	171
%	84.2	15.8	100.0	2.3	7.0	52.0	26.3	12.3	100
Arunachal Pradesh	332	79	411		215	117			332
%	80.8	19.2	100.0		64.8	35.2			100
Assam	443	166	609	59	136	173	63	12	443
%	72.7	27.3	100.0	13.3	30.7	39.1	14.2	2.7	100
Goa	146	57	203		144	2			146
%	71.9	28.1	100.0		98.6	1.4			100
Gujarat	426	180	606	4	334	86	1	1	426
%	70.3	29.7	100.0	0.9	78.4	20.2	0.2	0.2	100
Haryana	266	139	405		209	42	14	1	266
%	65.7	34.3	100.0		78.6	15.8	5.3	0.4	100
Himachal Pradesh	140	66	206		97	32	9	2	140
%	68.0	32.0	100.0		69.3	22.9	6.4	1.4	100
Jharkhand	262	134	396	1	165	68	26	2	262
%	66.2	33.8	100.0	0.4	63.0	26.0	9.9	0.8	100
Karnataka	451	137	588		138	285	27	1	451
%	76.7	23.3	100.0		30.6	63.2	6.0	0.2	100
Kerala	177	22	199		31	127	17	2	177
%	88.9	11.1	100.0		17.5	71.8	9.6	1.1	100
Madhya Pradesh	611	272	883	2	491	100	17	1	611
%	69.2	30.8	100.0	0.3	80.4	16.4	2.8	0.2	100
Maharashtra	586	193	779	5	85	183	251	62	586
%	75.2	24.8	100.0	0.9	14.5	31.2	42.8	10.6	100
Orissa	135	87	222		57	74	4		135
%	60.8	39.2	100.0		42.2	54.8	3.0		100
Rajasthan	373	225	598		293	69	9	2	373
%	62.4	37.6	100.0		78.6	18.5	2.4	0.5	100
Sikkim	137	60	197	1	40	91	5		137
%	69.5	30.5	100.0	0.7	29.2	66.4	3.6		100
Uttar Pradesh	1142	740	1882	33	633	385	81	10	1142
%	60.7	39.3	100.0	2.9	55.4	33.7	7.1	0.9	100
Uttrakhand	121	74	195		74	36	5	6	121
%	62.1	37.9	100.0		61.2	29.8	4.1	5.0	100
West Bengal	350	113	463		15	209	123	3	350
%	75.6	24.4	100.0		4.3	59.7	35.1	0.9	100
Total	6269	2776	9045	109	3169	2168	697	126	6269
%	69.3	30.7	100.0	1.7	50.6	34.6	11.1	2.0	100

Table A 47: Understanding Unemployment Issues

	Understanding unemployment issues			Understanding Developed					
State	Yes	No	Total	Poor	Satis factory	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Total
Andhra Pradesh	169	34	203	2	15	60	68	24	169
%	83.3	16.7	100.0	1.2	8.9	35.5	40.2	14.2	100
Arunachal Pradesh	321	90	411		37	263	21		321
%	78.1	21.9	100.0		11.5	81.9	6.5		100
Assam	454	155	609	3	123	212	106	10	454
%	74.5	25.5	100.0	0.7	27.1	46.7	23.3	2.2	100
Goa	155	48	203		151	3	1		155
%	76.4	23.6	100.0		97.4	1.9	0.6		100
Gujarat	430	176	606	1	224	201	4		430
%	71.0	29.0	100.0	0.2	52.1	46.7	0.9		100
Haryana	273	132	405		185	60	25	3	273
%	67.4	32.6	100.0		67.8	22.0	9.2	1.1	100
Himachal Pradesh	143	63	206		7	122	12	2	143
%	69.4	30.6	100.0		4.9	85.3	8.4	1.4	100
Jharkhand	266	130	396	1	151	80	32	2	266
%	67.2	32.8	100.0	0.4	56.8	30.1	12.0	0.8	100
Karnataka	455	133	588		156	245	52	2	455
%	77.4	22.6	100.0		34.3	53.8	11.4	0.4	100
Kerala	177	22	199		29	68	78	2	177
%	88.9	11.1	100.0		16.4	38.4	44.1	1.1	100
Madhya Pradesh	606	277	883	3	332	229	41	1	606
%	68.6	31.4	100.0	0.5	54.8	37.8	6.8	0.2	100
Maharashtra	581	198	779	2	76	215	200	88	581
%	74.6	25.4	100.0	0.3	13.1	37.0	34.4	15.1	100
Orissa	144	78	222		21	115	8		144
%	64.9	35.1	100.0		14.6	79.9	5.6		100
Rajasthan	376	222	598		115	218	38	5	376
%	62.9	37.1	100.0		30.6	58.0	10.1	1.3	100
Sikkim	147	50	197		31	82	33	1	147
%	74.6	25.4	100.0		21.1	55.8	22.4	0.7	100
Uttar Pradesh	1199	683	1882	12	489	543	117	38	1199
%	63.7	36.3	100.0	1.0	40.8	45.3	9.8	3.2	100
Uttrakhand	138	57	195		11	91	30	6	138
%	70.8	29.2	100.0		8.0	65.9	21.7	4.3	100
West Bengal	363	100	463		5	131	207	20	363
%	78.4	21.6	100.0		1.4	36.1	57.0	5.5	100
Total	6397	2648	9045	24	2158	2938	1073	204	6397
%	70.7	29.3	100.0	0.4	33.7	45.9	16.8	3.2	100

Table A 48: Understanding Unemployment Issues

	Understanding unemployment issues			Useful					
State	Yes	No	Total	Poor	Satis factory	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Total
Andhra Pradesh	169	34	203	2	18	91	32	26	169
%	83.3	16.7	100.0	1.2	10.7	53.8	18.9	15.4	100
Arunachal Pradesh	321	90	411		216	104	1		321
%	78.1	21.9	100.0		67.3	32.4	0.3		100
Assam	454	155	609	50	155	150	82	17	454
%	74.5	25.5	100.0	11.0	34.1	33.0	18.1	3.7	100
Goa	155	48	203		152	2	1		155
%	76.4	23.6	100.0		98.1	1.3	0.6		100
Gujarat	430	176	606	1	313	116			430
%	71.0	29.0	100.0	0.2	72.8	27.0			100
Haryana	273	132	405	1	215	43	13	1	273
%	67.4	32.6	100.0	0.4	78.8	15.8	4.8	0.4	100
Himachal Pradesh	143	63	206		101	31	9	2	143
%	69.4	30.6	100.0		70.6	21.7	6.3	1.4	100
Jharkhand	266	130	396		177	63	24	2	266
%	67.2	32.8	100.0		66.5	23.7	9.0	0.8	100
Karnataka	455	133	588		162	263	28	2	455
%	77.4	22.6	100.0		35.6	57.8	6.2	0.4	100
Kerala	177	22	199		33	129	13	2	177
%	88.9	11.1	100.0		18.6	72.9	7.3	1.1	100
Madhya Pradesh	606	277	883	2	482	108	12	2	606
%	68.6	31.4	100.0	0.3	79.5	17.8	2.0	0.3	100
Maharashtra	581	198	779	5	119	172	179	106	581
%	74.6	25.4	100.0	0.9	20.5	29.6	30.8	18.2	100
Orissa	144	78	222		59	83	2		144
%	64.9	35.1	100.0		41.0	57.6	1.4		100
Rajasthan	376	222	598		280	84	8	4	376
%	62.9	37.1	100.0		74.5	22.3	2.1	1.1	100
Sikkim	147	50	197		54	79	13	1	147
%	74.6	25.4	100.0		36.7	53.7	8.8	0.7	100
Uttar Pradesh	1199	683	1882	33	677	394	72	23	1199
%	63.7	36.3	100.0	2.8	56.5	32.9	6.0	1.9	100
Uttrakhand	138	57	195		90	34	8	6	138
%	70.8	29.2	100.0		65.2	24.6	5.8	4.3	100
West Bengal	363	100	463		22	220	106	15	363
%	78.4	21.6	100.0		6.1	60.6	29.2	4.1	100
Total	6397	2648	9045	94	3325	2166	603	209	6397
%	70.7	29.3	100.0	1.5	52.0	33.9	9.4	3.3	100

Table A 49: GP Fund & its Importance

	GP fund & its importance			Understanding Developed					
State	Yes	No	Total	Poor	Satis factory	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Total
Andhra Pradesh	174	29	203	2	12	72	60	28	174
%	85.7	14.3	100.0	1.1	6.9	41.4	34.5	16.1	100
Arunachal Pradesh	303	108	411		55	234	14		303
%	73.7	26.3	100.0		18.2	77.2	4.6		100
Assam	453	156	609	2	117	212	112	10	453
%	74.4	25.6	100.0	0.4	25.8	46.8	24.7	2.2	100
Goa	153	50	203		148	5			153
%	75.4	24.6	100.0		96.7	3.3			100
Gujarat	419	187	606	3	213	193	8	2	419
%	69.1	30.9	100.0	0.7	50.8	46.1	1.9	0.5	100
Haryana	273	132	405		178	66	27	2	273
%	67.4	32.6	100.0		65.2	24.2	9.9	0.7	100
Himachal Pradesh	142	64	206		4	123	13	2	142
%	68.9	31.1	100.0		2.8	86.6	9.2	1.4	100
Jharkhand	266	130	396	1	149	76	33	7	266
%	67.2	32.8	100.0	0.4	56.0	28.6	12.4	2.6	100
Karnataka	448	140	588		125	268	50	5	448
%	76.2	23.8	100.0		27.9	59.8	11.2	1.1	100
Kerala	175	24	199		28	67	77	3	175
%	87.9	12.1	100.0		16.0	38.3	44.0	1.7	100
Madhya Pradesh	607	276	883	4	322	233	45	3	607
%	68.7	31.3	100.0	0.7	53.0	38.4	7.4	0.5	100
Maharashtra	582	197	779	3	73	206	217	83	582
%	74.7	25.3	100.0	0.5	12.5	35.4	37.3	14.3	100
Orissa	143	79	222		19	111	13		143
%	64.4	35.6	100.0		13.3	77.6	9.1		100
Rajasthan	388	210	598		118	223	38	9	388
%	64.9	35.1	100.0		30.4	57.5	9.8	2.3	100
Sikkim	143	54	197		30	77	33	3	143
%	72.6	27.4	100.0		21.0	53.8	23.1	2.1	100
Uttar Pradesh	1197	685	1882	5	462	567	121	42	1197
%	63.6	36.4	100.0	0.4	38.6	47.4	10.1	3.5	100
Uttrakhand	140	55	195		13	91	26	10	140
%	71.8	28.2	100.0		9.3	65.0	18.6	7.1	100
West Bengal	350	113	463		4	126	197	23	350
%	75.6	24.4	100.0		1.1	36.0	56.3	6.6	100
Total	6356	2689	9045	20	2070	2950	1084	232	6356
%	70.3	29.7	100.0	0.3	32.6	46.4	17.1	3.7	100

Table A 50: GP Fund & its Importance

	GP fund & its importance			Useful					
State	Yes	No	Total	Poor	Satis factory	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Total
Andhra Pradesh	174	29	203	3	17	102	24	28	174
%	85.7	14.3	100.0	1.7	9.8	58.6	13.8	16.1	100
Arunachal Pradesh	303	108	411		218	85			303
%	73.7	26.3	100.0		71.9	28.1			100
Assam	453	156	609	50	138	165	87	13	453
%	74.4	25.6	100.0	11.0	30.5	36.4	19.2	2.9	100
Goa	153	50	203		149	4			153
%	75.4	24.6	100.0		97.4	2.6			100
Gujarat	419	187	606	3	336	76	2	2	419
%	69.1	30.9	100.0	0.7	80.2	18.1	0.5	0.5	100
Haryana	273	132	405		216	42	14	1	273
%	67.4	32.6	100.0		79.1	15.4	5.1	0.4	100
Himachal Pradesh	142	64	206		96	33	10	3	142
%	68.9	31.1	100.0		67.6	23.2	7.0	2.1	100
Jharkhand	266	130	396		175	61	23	7	266
%	67.2	32.8	100.0		65.8	22.9	8.6	2.6	100
Karnataka	448	140	588		133	288	22	5	448
%	76.2	23.8	100.0		29.7	64.3	4.9	1.1	100
Kerala	175	24	199		31	129	12	3	175
%	87.9	12.1	100.0		17.7	73.7	6.9	1.7	100
Madhya Pradesh	607	276	883	2	483	102	17	3	607
%	68.7	31.3	100.0	0.3	79.6	16.8	2.8	0.5	100
Maharashtra	582	197	779	4	124	153	203	98	582
%	74.7	25.3	100.0	0.7	21.3	26.3	34.9	16.8	100
Orissa	143	79	222		61	80	2		143
%	64.4	35.6	100.0		42.7	55.9	1.4		100
Rajasthan	388	210	598		290	83	7	8	388
%	64.9	35.1	100.0		74.7	21.4	1.8	2.1	100
Sikkim	143	54	197		52	73	17	1	143
%	72.6	27.4	100.0		36.4	51.0	11.9	0.7	100
Uttar Pradesh	1197	685	1882	36	685	373	76	27	1197
%	63.6	36.4	100.0	3.0	57.2	31.2	6.3	2.3	100
Uttrakhand	140	55	195		91	36	4	9	140
%	71.8	28.2	100.0		65.0	25.7	2.9	6.4	100
West Bengal	350	113	463		26	221	86	17	350
%	75.6	24.4	100.0		7.4	63.1	24.6	4.9	100
Total	6356	2689	9045	98	3321	2106	606	225	6356
%	70.3	29.7	100.0	1.5	52.2	33.1	9.5	3.5	100

Table A 51: Importance of Participatory Development

	Importance of part			Understanding Developed					
State	Yes	No	Total	Poor	Satis factory	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Total
Andhra Pradesh	173	30	203	2	7	71	61	32	173
%	85.2	14.8	100.0	1.2	4.0	41.0	35.3	18.5	100
Arunachal Pradesh	297	114	411		111	181	5		297
%	72.3	27.7	100.0		37.4	60.9	1.7		100
Assam	452	157	609	2	109	226	106	9	452
%	74.2	25.8	100.0	0.4	24.1	50.0	23.5	2.0	100
Goa	147	56	203		143	4			147
%	72.4	27.6	100.0		97.3	2.7			100
Gujarat	407	199	606	2	225	171	8	1	407
%	67.2	32.8	100.0	0.5	55.3	42.0	2.0	0.2	100
Haryana	262	143	405		169	66	25	2	262
%	64.7	35.3	100.0		64.5	25.2	9.5	0.8	100
Himachal Pradesh	142	64	206		7	121	12	2	142
%	68.9	31.1	100.0		4.9	85.2	8.5	1.4	100
Jharkhand	263	133	396	1	150	78	32	2	263
%	66.4	33.6	100.0	0.4	57.0	29.7	12.2	0.8	100
Karnataka	447	141	588		122	271	51	3	447
%	76.0	24.0	100.0		27.3	60.6	11.4	0.7	100
Kerala	171	28	199		28	68	73	2	171
%	85.9	14.1	100.0		16.4	39.8	42.7	1.2	100
Madhya Pradesh	602	281	883	3	322	225	48	4	602
%	68.2	31.8	100.0	0.5	53.5	37.4	8.0	0.7	100
Maharashtra	569	210	779	3	68	199	210	89	569
%	73.0	27.0	100.0	0.5	12.0	35.0	36.9	15.6	100
Orissa	143	79	222		15	114	14		143
%	64.4	35.6	100.0		10.5	79.7	9.8		100
Rajasthan	376	222	598		117	215	40	4	376
%	62.9	37.1	100.0		31.1	57.2	10.6	1.1	100
Sikkim	156	41	197		36	82	37	1	156
%	79.2	20.8	100.0		23.1	52.6	23.7	0.6	100
Uttar Pradesh	1158	724	1882	12	426	572	109	39	1158
%	61.5	38.5	100.0	1.0	36.8	49.4	9.4	3.4	100
Uttrakhand	123	72	195		10	79	25	9	123
%	63.1	36.9	100.0		8.1	64.2	20.3	7.3	100
West Bengal	352	111	463		3	127	202	20	352
%	76.0	24.0	100.0		0.9	36.1	57.4	5.7	100
Total	6240	2805	9045	25	2068	2870	1058	219	6240
%	69.0	31.0	100.0	0.4	33.1	46.0	17.0	3.5	100

Table A 52: Importance of Participatory development

	Importance of part			Useful					
State	Yes	No	Total	Poor	Satis factory	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Total
Andhra Pradesh	173	30	203	1	12	104	24	32	173
%	85.2	14.8	100.0	0.6	6.9	60.1	13.9	18.5	100
Arunachal Pradesh	297	114	411		236	61			297
%	72.3	27.7	100.0		79.5	20.5			100
Assam	452	157	609	52	129	175	80	16	452
%	74.2	25.8	100.0	11.5	28.5	38.7	17.7	3.5	100
Goa	147	56	203		144	3			147
%	72.4	27.6	100.0		98.0	2.0			100
Gujarat	407	199	606	2	322	80	2	1	407
%	67.2	32.8	100.0	0.5	79.1	19.7	0.5	0.2	100
Haryana	262	143	405	1	200	47	13	1	262
%	64.7	35.3	100.0	0.4	76.3	17.9	5.0	0.4	100
Himachal Pradesh	142	64	206		96	33	11	2	142
%	68.9	31.1	100.0		67.6	23.2	7.7	1.4	100
Jharkhand	263	133	396		175	62	24	2	263
%	66.4	33.6	100.0		66.5	23.6	9.1	0.8	100
Karnataka	447	141	588		133	285	26	3	447
%	76.0	24.0	100.0		29.8	63.8	5.8	0.7	100
Kerala	171	28	199		33	129	7	2	171
%	85.9	14.1	100.0		19.3	75.4	4.1	1.2	100
Madhya Pradesh	602	281	883	3	478	100	19	2	602
%	68.2	31.8	100.0	0.5	79.4	16.6	3.2	0.3	100
Maharashtra	569	210	779	4	124	140	201	100	569
%	73.0	27.0	100.0	0.7	21.8	24.6	35.3	17.6	100
Orissa	143	79	222		56	85	2		143
%	64.4	35.6	100.0		39.2	59.4	1.4		100
Rajasthan	376	222	598		282	80	9	5	376
%	62.9	37.1	100.0		75.0	21.3	2.4	1.3	100
Sikkim	156	41	197	1	57	80	18		156
%	79.2	20.8	100.0	0.6	36.5	51.3	11.5		100
Uttar Pradesh	1158	724	1882	36	674	352	69	27	1158
%	61.5	38.5	100.0	3.1	58.2	30.4	6.0	2.3	100
Uttrakhand	123	72	195		76	35	3	9	123
%	63.1	36.9	100.0		61.8	28.5	2.4	7.3	100
West Bengal	352	111	463		30	217	88	17	352
%	76.0	24.0	100.0		8.5	61.6	25.0	4.8	100
Total	6240	2805	9045	100	3257	2068	596	219	6240
%	69.0	31.0	100.0	1.6	52.2	33.1	9.6	3.5	100

Table A 53: Developing Understanding about Gender

	Developing understanding about gender			Understanding Developed					
State	Yes	No	Total	Poor	Satis factory	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Total
Andhra Pradesh	170	33	203	2	5	68	65	30	170
%	83.7	16.3	100.0	1.2	2.9	40.0	38.2	17.6	100
Arunachal Pradesh	316	95	411		140	170	6		316
%	76.9	23.1	100.0		44.3	53.8	1.9		100
Assam	456	153	609	1	116	219	111	9	456
%	74.9	25.1	100.0	0.2	25.4	48.0	24.3	2.0	100
Goa	148	55	203		144	3	1		148
%	72.9	27.1	100.0		97.3	2.0	0.7		100
Gujarat	409	197	606	3	231	166	8	1	409
%	67.5	32.5	100.0	0.7	56.5	40.6	2.0	0.2	100
Haryana	269	136	405		177	66	24	2	269
%	66.4	33.6	100.0		65.8	24.5	8.9	0.7	100
Himachal Pradesh	142	64	206		7	120	13	2	142
%	68.9	31.1	100.0		4.9	84.5	9.2	1.4	100
Jharkhand	265	131	396	1	151	79	30	4	265
%	66.9	33.1	100.0	0.4	57.0	29.8	11.3	1.5	100
Karnataka	447	141	588		112	278	56	1	447
%	76.0	24.0	100.0		25.1	62.2	12.5	0.2	100
Kerala	173	26	199		28	66	77	2	173
%	86.9	13.1	100.0		16.2	38.2	44.5	1.2	100
Madhya Pradesh	589	294	883	2	320	212	53	2	589
%	66.7	33.3	100.0	0.3	54.3	36.0	9.0	0.3	100
Maharashtra	578	201	779	1	45	107	237	188	578
%	74.2	25.8	100.0	0.2	7.8	18.5	41.0	32.5	100
Orissa	144	78	222		15	110	19		144
%	64.9	35.1	100.0		10.4	76.4	13.2		100
Rajasthan	386	212	598	1	108	230	44	3	386
%	64.5	35.5	100.0	0.3	28.0	59.6	11.4	0.8	100
Sikkim	141	56	197		35	71	32	3	141
%	71.6	28.4	100.0		24.8	50.4	22.7	2.1	100
Uttar Pradesh	1142	740	1882	9	422	554	120	37	1142
%	60.7	39.3	100.0	0.8	37.0	48.5	10.5	3.2	100
Uttrakhand	122	73	195		11	76	25	10	122
%	62.6	37.4	100.0		9.0	62.3	20.5	8.2	100
West Bengal	348	115	463		3	127	193	25	348
%	75.2	24.8	100.0		0.9	36.5	55.5	7.2	100
Total	6245	2800	9045	20	2070	2722	1114	319	6245
%	69.0	31.0	100.0	0.3	33.1	43.6	17.8	5.1	100

Table A 54: Developing Understanding about Gender

	Developing understanding about gender			Useful					
State	Yes	No	Total	Poor	Satis factory	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Total
Andhra Pradesh	170	33	203	2	11	98	33	26	170
%	83.7	16.3	100.0	1.2	6.5	57.6	19.4	15.3	100
Arunachal Pradesh	316	95	411		260	55	1		316
%	76.9	23.1	100.0		82.3	17.4	0.3		100
Assam	456	153	609	56.0	135.0	170.0	82.0	13.0	456
%	74.9	25.1	100.0	12.3	29.6	37.3	18.0	2.9	100
Goa	148	55	203		146	1	1		148
%	72.9	27.1	100.0		98.6	0.7	0.7		100
Gujarat	409	197	606	3	318	87		1	409
%	67.5	32.5	100.0	0.7	77.8	21.3		0.2	100
Haryana	269	136	405		209	47	12	1	269
%	66.4	33.6	100.0		77.7	17.5	4.5	0.4	100
Himachal Pradesh	142	64	206		98	35	7	2	142
%	68.9	31.1	100.0		69.0	24.6	4.9	1.4	100
Jharkhand	265	131	396		176	62	20	7	265
%	66.9	33.1	100.0		66.4	23.4	7.5	2.6	100
Karnataka	447	141	588		126	287	33	1	447
%	76.0	24.0	100.0		28.2	64.2	7.4	0.2	100
Kerala	173	26	199		35	125	11	2	173
%	86.9	13.1	100.0		20.2	72.3	6.4	1.2	100
Madhya Pradesh	589	294	883	1	468	96	21	3	589
%	66.7	33.3	100.0	0.2	79.5	16.3	3.6	0.5	100
Maharashtra	578	201	779	2	69	140	251	116	578
%	74.2	25.8	100.0	0.3	11.9	24.2	43.4	20.1	100
Orissa	144	78	222		56	83	5		144
%	64.9	35.1	100.0		38.9	57.6	3.5		100
Rajasthan	386	212	598	1	283	93	5	4	386
%	64.5	35.5	100.0	0.3	73.3	24.1	1.3	1.0	100
Sikkim	141	56	197		53	69	19		141
%	71.6	28.4	100.0		37.6	48.9	13.5		100
Uttar Pradesh	1142	740	1882	29	640	371	78	24	1142
%	60.7	39.3	100.0	2.5	56.0	32.5	6.8	2.1	100
Uttrakhand	122	73	195		75	33	4	10	122
%	62.6	37.4	100.0		61.5	27.0	3.3	8.2	100
West Bengal	348	115	463		42	203	81	22	348
%	75.2	24.8	100.0		12.1	58.3	23.3	6.3	100
Total	6245	2800	9045	94	3200	2055	664	232	6245
%	69.0	31.0	100.0	1.5	51.2	32.9	10.6	3.7	100

Table A 55: Gender & its Relation with Development

	Gender & its relation with development			Understanding Developed					
State	Yes	No	Total	Poor	Satis factory	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Total
Andhra Pradesh	169	34	203		11	61	71	26	169
%	83.3	16.7	100.0		6.5	36.1	42.0	15.4	100
Arunachal Pradesh	304	107	411		137	161	6		304
%	74.0	26.0	100.0		45.1	53.0	2.0		100
Assam	446	163	609		126	201	111	8	446
%	73.2	26.8	100.0		28.3	45.1	24.9	1.8	100
Goa	146	57	203		142	4			146
%	71.9	28.1	100.0		97.3	2.7			100
Gujarat	401	205	606	4	219	169	8	1	401
%	66.2	33.8	100.0	1.0	54.6	42.1	2.0	0.2	100
Haryana	265	140	405		174	62	27	2	265
%	65.4	34.6	100.0		65.7	23.4	10.2	0.8	100
Himachal Pradesh	140	66	206		2	124	13	1	140
%	68.0	32.0	100.0		1.4	88.6	9.3	0.7	100
Jharkhand	264	132	396	1	148	79	30	6	264
%	66.7	33.3	100.0	0.4	56.1	29.9	11.4	2.3	100
Karnataka	440	148	588		114	281	44	1	440
%	74.8	25.2	100.0		25.9	63.9	10.0	0.2	100
Kerala	173	26	199		28	64	79	2	173
%	86.9	13.1	100.0		16.2	37.0	45.7	1.2	100
Madhya Pradesh	595	288	883	1	322	221	50	1	595
%	67.4	32.6	100.0	0.2	54.1	37.1	8.4	0.2	100
Maharashtra	579	200	779	4	55	166	230	124	579
%	74.3	25.7	100.0	0.7	9.5	28.7	39.7	21.4	100
Orissa	144	78	222		15	106	23		144
%	64.9	35.1	100.0		10.4	73.6	16.0		100
Rajasthan	375	223	598	1	120	216	35	3	375
%	62.7	37.3	100.0	0.3	32.0	57.6	9.3	0.8	100
Sikkim	142	55	197		28	81	30	3	142
%	72.1	27.9	100.0		19.7	57.0	21.1	2.1	100
Uttar Pradesh	1191	691	1882	9	465	550	123	44	1191
%	63.3	36.7	100.0	0.8	39.0	46.2	10.3	3.7	100
Uttrakhand	129	66	195		12	79	31	7	129
%	66.2	33.8	100.0		9.3	61.2	24.0	5.4	100
West Bengal	351	112	463	1	2	132	199	17	351
%	75.8	24.2	100.0	0.3	0.6	37.6	56.7	4.8	100
Total	6254	2791	9045	21	2120	2757	1110	246	6254
%	69.1	30.9	100.0	0.3	33.9	44.1	17.7	3.9	100

Table A 56: Gender & its Relation with Development

	Gender & its relation with development			Useful					
State	Yes	No	Total	Poor	Satis factory	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Total
Andhra Pradesh	169	34	203		15	93	37	24	169
%	83.3	16.7	100.0		8.9	55.0	21.9	14.2	100
Arunachal Pradesh	304	107	411		256	48			304
%	74.0	26.0	100.0		84.2	15.8			100
Assam	446	163	609	54	137	153	87	15	446
%	73.2	26.8	100.0	12.1	30.7	34.3	19.5	3.4	100
Goa	146	57	203		144	2			146
%	71.9	28.1	100.0		98.6	1.4			100
Gujarat	401	205	606	5	308	85	2	1	401
%	66.2	33.8	100.0	1.2	76.8	21.2	0.5	0.2	100
Haryana	265	140	405		207	44	13	1	265
%	65.4	34.6	100.0		78.1	16.6	4.9	0.4	100
Himachal Pradesh	140	66	206		96	34	9	1	140
%	68.0	32.0	100.0		68.6	24.3	6.4	0.7	100
Jharkhand	264	132	396		175	61	23	5	264
%	66.7	33.3	100.0		66.3	23.1	8.7	1.9	100
Karnataka	440	148	588		129	290	20	1	440
%	74.8	25.2	100.0		29.3	65.9	4.5	0.2	100
Kerala	173	26	199		35	121	15	2	173
%	86.9	13.1	100.0		20.2	69.9	8.7	1.2	100
Madhya Pradesh	595	288	883	1	469	101	21	3	595
%	67.4	32.6	100.0	0.2	78.8	17.0	3.5	0.5	100
Maharashtra	579	200	779	2	106	148	248	75	579
%	74.3	25.7	100.0	0.3	18.3	25.6	42.8	13.0	100
Orissa	144	78	222		56	84	4		144
%	64.9	35.1	100.0		38.9	58.3	2.8		100
Rajasthan	375	223	598	1	289	76	6	3	375
%	62.7	37.3	100.0	0.3	77.1	20.3	1.6	0.8	100
Sikkim	142	55	197	1	49	75	17		142
%	72.1	27.9	100.0	0.7	34.5	52.8	12.0		100
Uttar Pradesh	1191	691	1882	27	665	388	80	31	1191
%	63.3	36.7	100.0	2.3	55.8	32.6	6.7	2.6	100
Uttrakhand	129	66	195		77	41	4	7	129
%	66.2	33.8	100.0		59.7	31.8	3.1	5.4	100
West Bengal	351	112	463		43	211	78	19	351
%	75.8	24.2	100.0		12.3	60.1	22.2	5.4	100
Total	6254	2791	9045	91	3256	2055	664	188	6254
%	69.1	30.9	100.0	1.5	52.1	32.9	10.6	3.0	100

Table A 57: Planning through Justice

	Planning through justice			Understanding Developed					
State	Yes	No	Total	Poor	Satis factory	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Total
Andhra Pradesh	169	34	203	1	9	51	74	34	169
%	83.3	16.7	100.0	0.6	5.3	30.2	43.8	20.1	100
Arunachal Pradesh	311	100	411		106	199	6		311
%	75.7	24.3	100.0		34.1	64.0	1.9		100
Assam	446	163	609	1	118	208	112	7	446
%	73.2	26.8	100.0	0.2	26.5	46.6	25.1	1.6	100
Goa	147	56	203		142	5			147
%	72.4	27.6	100.0		96.6	3.4			100
Gujarat	401	205	606	2	218	173	7	1	401
%	66.2	33.8	100.0	0.5	54.4	43.1	1.7	0.2	100
Haryana	266	139	405		173	65	26	2	266
%	65.7	34.3	100.0		65.0	24.4	9.8	0.8	100
Himachal Pradesh	139	67	206		3	122	13	1	139
%	67.5	32.5	100.0		2.2	87.8	9.4	0.7	100
Jharkhand	264	132	396	1	151	75	30	7	264
%	66.7	33.3	100.0	0.4	57.2	28.4	11.4	2.7	100
Karnataka	444	144	588		115	274	53	2	444
%	75.5	24.5	100.0		25.9	61.7	11.9	0.5	100
Kerala	159	40	199		28	58	71	2	159
%	79.9	20.1	100.0		17.6	36.5	44.7	1.3	100
Madhya Pradesh	599	284	883	1	322	223	50	3	599
%	67.8	32.2	100.0	0.2	53.8	37.2	8.3	0.5	100
Maharashtra	574	205	779	2	67	134	234	137	574
%	73.7	26.3	100.0	0.3	11.7	23.3	40.8	23.9	100
Orissa	144	78	222		17	105	22		144
%	64.9	35.1	100.0		11.8	72.9	15.3		100
Rajasthan	386	212	598		127	223	31	5	386
%	64.5	35.5	100.0		32.9	57.8	8.0	1.3	100
Sikkim	142	55	197		27	78	35	2	142
%	72.1	27.9	100.0		19.0	54.9	24.6	1.4	100
Uttar Pradesh	1170	712	1882	13	442	545	128	42	1170
%	62.2	37.8	100.0	1.1	37.8	46.6	10.9	3.6	100
Uttrakhand	125	70	195		8	82	27	8	125
%	64.1	35.9	100.0		6.4	65.6	21.6	6.4	100
West Bengal	348	115	463		3	127	192	26	348
%	75.2	24.8	100.0		0.9	36.5	55.2	7.5	100
Total	6234	2811	9045	21	2076	2747	1111	279	6234
%	68.9	31.1	100.0	0.3	33.3	44.1	17.8	4.5	100

Table A 58: Planning through Justice

	Planning through justice			Useful					
State	Yes	No	Total	Poor	Satis factory	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Total
Andhra Pradesh	169	34	203		12	97	32	28	169
%	83.3	16.7	100.0		7.1	57.4	18.9	16.6	100
Arunachal Pradesh	311	100	411		254	57			311
%	75.7	24.3	100.0		81.7	18.3			100
Assam	446	163	609	53	138	158	85	12	446
%	73.2	26.8	100.0	11.9	30.9	35.4	19.1	2.7	100
Goa	147	56	203		144	3			147
%	72.4	27.6	100.0		98.0	2.0			100
Gujarat	401	205	606	3	308	89		1	401
%	66.2	33.8	100.0	0.7	76.8	22.2		0.2	100
Haryana	266	139	405	1	205	45	14	1	266
%	65.7	34.3	100.0	0.4	77.1	16.9	5.3	0.4	100
Himachal Pradesh	139	67	206		96	34	7	2	139
%	67.5	32.5	100.0		69.1	24.5	5.0	1.4	100
Jharkhand	264	132	396		176	60	22	6	264
%	66.7	33.3	100.0		66.7	22.7	8.3	2.3	100
Karnataka	444	144	588	1	126	288	27	2	444
%	75.5	24.5	100.0	0.2	28.4	64.9	6.1	0.5	100
Kerala	159	40	199		36	104	17	2	159
%	79.9	20.1	100.0		22.6	65.4	10.7	1.3	100
Madhya Pradesh	599	284	883	1	477	97	21	3	599
%	67.8	32.2	100.0	0.2	79.6	16.2	3.5	0.5	100
Maharashtra	574	205	779	2	96	141	263	72	574
%	73.7	26.3	100.0	0.3	16.7	24.6	45.8	12.5	100
Orissa	144	78	222		59	80	5		144
%	64.9	35.1	100.0		41.0	55.6	3.5		100
Rajasthan	386	212	598		300	79	2	5	386
%	64.5	35.5	100.0		77.7	20.5	0.5	1.3	100
Sikkim	142	55	197		48	75	19		142
%	72.1	27.9	100.0		33.8	52.8	13.4		100
Uttar Pradesh	1170	712	1882	25	648	388	81	28	1170
%	62.2	37.8	100.0	2.1	55.4	33.2	6.9	2.4	100
Uttrakhand	125	70	195		77	35	5	8	125
%	64.1	35.9	100.0		61.6	28.0	4.0	6.4	100
West Bengal	348	115	463		49	195	92	12	348
%	75.2	24.8	100.0		14.1	56.0	26.4	3.4	100
Total	6234	2811	9045	86	3249	2025	692	182	6234
%	68.9	31.1	100.0	1.4	52.1	32.5	11.1	2.9	100

Table A 59: Better Understanding of Village Level Institutions

	Better understanding			Understanding Developed					
State	Yes	No	Total	Poor	Satis factory	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Total
Andhra Pradesh	162	41	203		12	52	74	24	162
%	79.8	20.2	100.0		7.4	32.1	45.7	14.8	100
Arunachal Pradesh	306	105	411		32	258	16		306
%	74.5	25.5	100.0		10.5	84.3	5.2		100
Assam	442	167	609	2	116	204	109	11	442
%	72.6	27.4	100.0	0.5	26.2	46.2	24.7	2.5	100
Goa	144	59	203		137	6	1		144
%	70.9	29.1	100.0		95.1	4.2	0.7		100
Gujarat	421	185	606	3	205	201	11	1	421
%	69.5	30.5	100.0	0.7	48.7	47.7	2.6	0.2	100
Haryana	271	134	405		179	65	25	2	271
%	66.9	33.1	100.0		66.1	24.0	9.2	0.7	100
Himachal Pradesh	142	64	206		1	123	16	2	142
%	68.9	31.1	100.0		0.7	86.6	11.3	1.4	100
Jharkhand	263	133	396	1	146	77	35	4	263
%	66.4	33.6	100.0	0.4	55.5	29.3	13.3	1.5	100
Karnataka	443	145	588		130	259	50	4	443
%	75.3	24.7	100.0		29.3	58.5	11.3	0.9	100
Kerala	164	35	199		29	62	71	2	164
%	82.4	17.6	100.0		17.7	37.8	43.3	1.2	100
Madhya Pradesh	586	297	883	2	326	211	45	2	586
%	66.4	33.6	100.0	0.3	55.6	36.0	7.7	0.3	100
Maharashtra	567	212	779	4	60	150	240	113	567
%	72.8	27.2	100.0	0.7	10.6	26.5	42.3	19.9	100
Orissa	144	78	222		16	106	22		144
%	64.9	35.1	100.0		11.1	73.6	15.3		100
Rajasthan	384	214	598		115	219	43	7	384
%	64.2	35.8	100.0		29.9	57.0	11.2	1.8	100
Sikkim	142	55	197		25	77	36	4	142
%	72.1	27.9	100.0		17.6	54.2	25.4	2.8	100
Uttar Pradesh	1153	729	1882	4	392	586	140	31	1153
%	61.3	38.7	100.0	0.3	34.0	50.8	12.1	2.7	100
Uttrakhand	125	70	195		8	82	29	6	125
%	64.1	35.9	100.0		6.4	65.6	23.2	4.8	100
West Bengal	360	103	463		2	124	208	26	360
%	77.8	22.2	100.0		0.6	34.4	57.8	7.2	100
Total	6219	2826	9045	16	1931	2862	1171	239	6219
%	68.8	31.2	100.0	0.3	31.1	46.0	18.8	3.8	100

Table A 60: Better Understanding of Village Level Institutions

	Better understanding			Useful					
State	Yes	No	Total	Poor	Satis factory	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Total
Andhra Pradesh	162	41	203		18	90	29	25	162
%	79.8	20.2	100.0		11.1	55.6	17.9	15.4	100
Arunachal Pradesh	306	105	411		191	115			306
%	74.5	25.5	100.0		62.4	37.6			100
Assam	442	167	609	58	130	161	83	10	442
%	72.6	27.4	100.0	13.1	29.4	36.4	18.8	2.3	100
Goa	144	59	203		138	6			144
%	70.9	29.1	100.0		95.8	4.2			100
Gujarat	421	185	606	3	329	84	4	1	421
%	69.5	30.5	100.0	0.7	78.1	20.0	1.0	0.2	100
Haryana	271	134	405	1	212	44	13	1	271
%	66.9	33.1	100.0	0.4	78.2	16.2	4.8	0.4	100
Himachal Pradesh	142	64	206		97	33	9	3	142
%	68.9	31.1	100.0		68.3	23.2	6.3	2.1	100
Jharkhand	263	133	396		174	59	27	3	263
%	66.4	33.6	100.0		66.2	22.4	10.3	1.1	100
Karnataka	443	145	588		143	269	27	4	443
%	75.3	24.7	100.0		32.3	60.7	6.1	0.9	100
Kerala	164	35	199		36	108	18	2	164
%	82.4	17.6	100.0		22.0	65.9	11.0	1.2	100
Madhya Pradesh	586	297	883	1	475	89	18	3	586
%	66.4	33.6	100.0	0.2	81.1	15.2	3.1	0.5	100
Maharashtra	567	212	779	4	102	130	216	115	567
%	72.8	27.2	100.0	0.7	18.0	22.9	38.1	20.3	100
Orissa	144	78	222		59	80	5		144
%	64.9	35.1	100.0		41.0	55.6	3.5		100
Rajasthan	384	214	598		282	87	8	7	384
%	64.2	35.8	100.0		73.4	22.7	2.1	1.8	100
Sikkim	142	55	197	1	47	75	18	1	142
%	72.1	27.9	100.0	0.7	33.1	52.8	12.7	0.7	100
Uttar Pradesh	1153	729	1882	18	626	399	91	19	1153
%	61.3	38.7	100.0	1.6	54.3	34.6	7.9	1.6	100
Uttrakhand	125	70	195		74	39	6	6	125
%	64.1	35.9	100.0		59.2	31.2	4.8	4.8	100
West Bengal	360	103	463		28	194	122	16	360
%	77.8	22.2	100.0		7.8	53.9	33.9	4.4	100
Total	6219	2826	9045	86	3161	2062	694	216	6219
%	68.8	31.2	100.0	1.4	50.8	33.2	11.2	3.5	100

Table A 61: Social Work, Social Issues & Responsible Factors

	Social work, social issues			Understanding Developed					
State	Yes	No	Total	Poor	Satis factory	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Total
Andhra Pradesh	170	33	203		7	52	81	30	170
%	83.7	16.3	100.0		4.1	30.6	47.6	17.6	100
Arunachal Pradesh	299	112	411		5	247	47		299
%	72.7	27.3	100.0		1.7	82.6	15.7		100
Assam	454	155	609	1	129	207	108	9	454
%	74.5	25.5	100.0	0.2	28.4	45.6	23.8	2.0	100
Goa	152	51	203		147	3	2		152
%	74.9	25.1	100.0		96.7	2.0	1.3		100
Gujarat	419	187	606	2	215	193	8	1	419
%	69.1	30.9	100.0	0.5	51.3	46.1	1.9	0.2	100
Haryana	270	135	405		176	67	25	2	270
%	66.7	33.3	100.0		65.2	24.8	9.3	0.7	100
Himachal Pradesh	138	68	206		1	121	15	1	138
%	67.0	33.0	100.0		0.7	87.7	10.9	0.7	100
Jharkhand	264	132	396	1	146	80	33	4	264
%	66.7	33.3	100.0	0.4	55.3	30.3	12.5	1.5	100
Karnataka	448	140	588		142	251	52	3	448
%	76.2	23.8	100.0		31.7	56.0	11.6	0.7	100
Kerala	161	38	199		28	62	69	2	161
%	80.9	19.1	100.0		17.4	38.5	42.9	1.2	100
Madhya Pradesh	615	268	883	1	348	219	47		615
%	69.6	30.4	100.0	0.2	56.6	35.6	7.6		100
Maharashtra	571	208	779	3	56	137	283	92	571
%	73.3	26.7	100.0	0.5	9.8	24.0	49.6	16.1	100
Orissa	145	77	222		18	102	25		145
%	65.3	34.7	100.0		12.4	70.3	17.2		100
Rajasthan	373	225	598		112	219	37	5	373
%	62.4	37.6	100.0		30.0	58.7	9.9	1.3	100
Sikkim	154	43	197		37	77	37	3	154
%	78.2	21.8	100.0		24.0	50.0	24.0	1.9	100
Uttar Pradesh	1198	684	1882	6	428	592	129	43	1198
%	63.7	36.3	100.0	0.5	35.7	49.4	10.8	3.6	100
Uttrakhand	125	70	195		9	81	26	9	125
%	64.1	35.9	100.0		7.2	64.8	20.8	7.2	100
West Bengal	361	102	463		4	123	209	25	361
%	78.0	22.0	100.0		1.1	34.1	57.9	6.9	100
Total	6317	2728	9045	14	2008	2833	1233	229	6317
%	69.8	30.2	100.0	0.2	31.8	44.8	19.5	3.6	100

Table A 62: Social Work, Social Issues & Responsible Factors

	Social work, social issues			Useful					
State	Yes	No	Total	Poor	Satis factory	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Total
Andhra Pradesh	170	33	203		13	87	42	28	170
%	83.7	16.3	100.0		7.6	51.2	24.7	16.5	100
Arunachal Pradesh	299	112	411		141	158			299
%	72.7	27.3	100.0		47.2	52.8			100
Assam	454	155	609	54	141	168	76	15	454
%	74.5	25.5	100.0	11.9	31.1	37.0	16.7	3.3	100
Goa	152	51	203		149	2	1		152
%	74.9	25.1	100.0		98.0	1.3	0.7		100
Gujarat	419	187	606	2	326	89	1	1	419
%	69.1	30.9	100.0	0.5	77.8	21.2	0.2	0.2	100
Haryana	270	135	405	1	213	42	13	1	270
%	66.7	33.3	100.0	0.4	78.9	15.6	4.8	0.4	100
Himachal Pradesh	138	68	206		100	27	10	1	138
%	67.0	33.0	100.0		72.5	19.6	7.2	0.7	100
Jharkhand	264	132	396		175	61	24	4	264
%	66.7	33.3	100.0		66.3	23.1	9.1	1.5	100
Karnataka	448	140	588		157	257	31	3	448
%	76.2	23.8	100.0		35.0	57.4	6.9	0.7	100
Kerala	161	38	199		34	110	15	2	161
%	80.9	19.1	100.0		21.1	68.3	9.3	1.2	100
Madhya Pradesh	615	268	883	2	502	93	17	1	615
%	69.6	30.4	100.0	0.3	81.6	15.1	2.8	0.2	100
Maharashtra	571	208	779	2	92	138	176	163	571
%	73.3	26.7	100.0	0.4	16.1	24.2	30.8	28.5	100
Orissa	145	77	222		60	81	4		145
%	65.3	34.7	100.0		41.4	55.9	2.8		100
Rajasthan	373	225	598		281	84	3	5	373
%	62.4	37.6	100.0		75.3	22.5	0.8	1.3	100
Sikkim	154	43	197	1	56	79	17	1	154
%	78.2	21.8	100.0	0.6	36.4	51.3	11.0	0.6	100
Uttar Pradesh	1198	684	1882	28	639	418	83	30	1198
%	63.7	36.3	100.0	2.3	53.3	34.9	6.9	2.5	100
Uttrakhand	125	70	195		75	40	1	9	125
%	64.1	35.9	100.0		60.0	32.0	0.8	7.2	100
West Bengal	361	102	463		18	209	116	18	361
%	78.0	22.0	100.0		5.0	57.9	32.1	5.0	100
Total	6317	2728	9045	90	3172	2143	630	282	6317
%	69.8	30.2	100.0	1.4	50.2	33.9	10.0	4.5	100

Table A 63: Social Development, Method, Nature & Concept

	Social development, method, nature & concept			Understanding Developed					
State	Yes	No	Total	Poor	Satis factory	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Total
Andhra Pradesh	170	33	203		6	50	81	33	170
%	83.7	16.3	100.0		3.5	29.4	47.6	19.4	100
Arunachal Pradesh	303	108	411		3	221	79		303
%	73.7	26.3	100.0		1.0	72.9	26.1		100
Assam	440	169	609		116	204	112	8	440
%	72.2	27.8	100.0		26.4	46.4	25.5	1.8	100
Goa	147	56	203		141	4	2		147
%	72.4	27.6	100.0		95.9	2.7	1.4		100
Gujarat	410	196	606		225	178	7		410
%	67.7	32.3	100.0		54.9	43.4	1.7		100
Haryana	271	134	405		175	69	25	2	271
%	66.9	33.1	100.0		64.6	25.5	9.2	0.7	100
Himachal Pradesh	135	71	206		2	117	14	2	135
%	65.5	34.5	100.0		1.5	86.7	10.4	1.5	100
Jharkhand	262	134	396	1	145	83	31	2	262
%	66.2	33.8	100.0	0.4	55.3	31.7	11.8	0.8	100
Karnataka	439	149	588		138	255	45	1	439
%	74.7	25.3	100.0		31.4	58.1	10.3	0.2	100
Kerala	163	36	199		28	61	72	2	163
%	81.9	18.1	100.0		17.2	37.4	44.2	1.2	100
Madhya Pradesh	601	282	883	1	338	219	43		601
%	68.1	31.9	100.0	0.2	56.2	36.4	7.2		100
Maharashtra	568	211	779	3	76	132	270	87	568
%	72.9	27.1	100.0	0.5	13.4	23.2	47.5	15.3	100
Orissa	141	81	222		18	94	29		141
%	63.5	36.5	100.0		12.8	66.7	20.6		100
Rajasthan	373	225	598		116	216	35	6	373
%	62.4	37.6	100.0		31.1	57.9	9.4	1.6	100
Sikkim	137	60	197		29	70	36	2	137
%	69.5	30.5	100.0		21.2	51.1	26.3	1.5	100
Uttar Pradesh	1141	741	1882	8	407	578	123	25	1141
%	60.6	39.4	100.0	0.7	35.7	50.7	10.8	2.2	100
Uttrakhand	116	79	195		7	74	27	8	116
%	59.5	40.5	100.0		6.0	63.8	23.3	6.9	100
West Bengal	354	109	463		2	118	203	31	354
%	76.5	23.5	100.0		0.6	33.3	57.3	8.8	100
Total	6171	2874	9045	13	1972	2743	1234	209	6171
%	68.2	31.8	100.0	0.2	32.0	44.4	20.0	3.4	100

Table A 64: Social Development, Method, Nature & Concept

	Social development, method, nature & concept			Useful					
State	Yes	No	Total	Poor	Satis factory	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Total
Andhra Pradesh	170	33	203	1	18	85	36	30	170
%	83.7	16.3	100.0	0.6	10.6	50.0	21.2	17.6	100
Arunachal Pradesh	303	108	411		105	197	1		303
%	73.7	26.3	100.0		34.7	65.0	0.3		100
Assam	440	169	609	58	117	168	85	12	440
%	72.2	27.8	100.0	13.2	26.6	38.2	19.3	2.7	100
Goa	147	56	203		144	2	1		147
%	72.4	27.6	100.0		98.0	1.4	0.7		100
Gujarat	410	196	606		334	75	1		410
%	67.7	32.3	100.0		81.5	18.3	0.2		100
Haryana	271	134	405	1	211	46	12	1	271
%	66.9	33.1	100.0	0.4	77.9	17.0	4.4	0.4	100
Himachal Pradesh	135	71	206		95	30	8	2	135
%	65.5	34.5	100.0		70.4	22.2	5.9	1.5	100
Jharkhand	262	134	396	1	173	62	22	4	262
%	66.2	33.8	100.0	0.4	66.0	23.7	8.4	1.5	100
Karnataka	439	149	588		152	263	23	1	439
%	74.7	25.3	100.0		34.6	59.9	5.2	0.2	100
Kerala	163	36	199		33	112	16	2	163
%	81.9	18.1	100.0		20.2	68.7	9.8	1.2	100
Madhya Pradesh	601	282	883	1	492	88	19	1	601
%	68.1	31.9	100.0	0.2	81.9	14.6	3.2	0.2	100
Maharashtra	568	211	779	5	104	127	173	159	568
%	72.9	27.1	100.0	0.9	18.3	22.4	30.5	28.0	100
Orissa	141	81	222		61	72	8		141
%	63.5	36.5	100.0		43.3	51.1	5.7		100
Rajasthan	373	225	598		287	76	3	7	373
%	62.4	37.6	100.0		76.9	20.4	0.8	1.9	100
Sikkim	137	60	197	1	47	71	18		137
%	69.5	30.5	100.0	0.7	34.3	51.8	13.1		100
Uttar Pradesh	1141	741	1882	32	605	424	68	12	1141
%	60.6	39.4	100.0	2.8	53.0	37.2	6.0	1.1	100
Uttrakhand	116	79	195		66	39	4	7	116
%	59.5	40.5	100.0		56.9	33.6	3.4	6.0	100
West Bengal	354	109	463		14	205	109	26	354
%	76.5	23.5	100.0		4.0	57.9	30.8	7.3	100
Total	6171	2874	9045	100	3058	2142	607	264	6171
%	68.2	31.8	100.0	1.6	49.6	34.7	9.8	4.3	100

Table A 65: Skill to Work with Different Social Groups

	Skill to work with different social groups			Understanding Developed					
State	Yes	No	Total	Poor	Satis factory	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Total
Andhra Pradesh	158	45	203		1	40	84	33	158
%	77.8	22.2	100.0		0.6	25.3	53.2	20.9	100
Arunachal Pradesh	289	122	411		2	182	105		289
%	70.3	29.7	100.0		0.7	63.0	36.3		100
Assam	423	186	609	1	97	185	133	7	423
%	69.5	30.5	100.0	0.2	22.9	43.7	31.4	1.7	100
Goa	146	57	203		141	4	1		146
%	71.9	28.1	100.0		96.6	2.7	0.7		100
Gujarat	403	203	606		199	193	10	1	403
%	66.5	33.5	100.0		49.4	47.9	2.5	0.2	100
Haryana	269	136	405		176	67	24	2	269
%	66.4	33.6	100.0		65.4	24.9	8.9	0.7	100
Himachal Pradesh	138	68	206	1	1	125	10	1	138
%	67.0	33.0	100.0	0.7	0.7	90.6	7.2	0.7	100
Jharkhand	262	134	396	1	149	80	29	3	262
%	66.2	33.8	100.0	0.4	56.9	30.5	11.1	1.1	100
Karnataka	435	153	588		129	264	40	2	435
%	74.0	26.0	100.0		29.7	60.7	9.2	0.5	100
Kerala	161	38	199		28	60	71	2	161
%	80.9	19.1	100.0		17.4	37.3	44.1	1.2	100
Madhya Pradesh	607	276	883	1	343	221	42		607
%	68.7	31.3	100.0	0.2	56.5	36.4	6.9		100
Maharashtra	585	194	779	4	70	127	300	84	585
%	75.1	24.9	100.0	0.7	12.0	21.7	51.3	14.4	100
Orissa	135	87	222		19	89	27		135
%	60.8	39.2	100.0		14.1	65.9	20.0		100
Rajasthan	373	225	598		114	219	35	5	373
%	62.4	37.6	100.0		30.6	58.7	9.4	1.3	100
Sikkim	143	54	197		26	79	38		143
%	72.6	27.4	100.0		18.2	55.2	26.6		100
Uttar Pradesh	1142	740	1882	9	426	558	111	38	1142
%	60.7	39.3	100.0	0.8	37.3	48.9	9.7	3.3	100
Uttrakhand	116	79	195		8	73	27	8	116
%	59.5	40.5	100.0		6.9	62.9	23.3	6.9	100
West Bengal	343	120	463		2	117	208	16	343
%	74.1	25.9	100.0		0.6	34.1	60.6	4.7	100
Total	6128	2917	9045	17	1931	2683	1295	202	6128
%	67.8	32.2	100.0	0.3	31.5	43.8	21.1	3.3	100

Table A 66: Skill to Work with Different Social Groups

	Skill to work with different social groups			Useful					
State	Yes	No	Total	Poor	Satis factory	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Total
Andhra Pradesh	158	45	203		19	75	35	29	158
%	77.8	22.2	100.0		12.0	47.5	22.2	18.4	100
Arunachal Pradesh	289	122	411		76	212	1		289
%	70.3	29.7	100.0		26.3	73.4	0.3		100
Assam	423	186	609	56	127	145	81	14	423
%	69.5	30.5	100.0	13.2	30.0	34.3	19.1	3.3	100
Goa	146	57	203		145		1		146
%	71.9	28.1	100.0		99.3		0.7		100
Gujarat	403	203	606		311	88	3	1	403
%	66.5	33.5	100.0		77.2	21.8	0.7	0.2	100
Haryana	269	136	405	1	211	44	12	1	269
%	66.4	33.6	100.0	0.4	78.4	16.4	4.5	0.4	100
Himachal Pradesh	138	68	206		99	27	11	1	138
%	67.0	33.0	100.0		71.7	19.6	8.0	0.7	100
Jharkhand	262	134	396		175	61	22	4	262
%	66.2	33.8	100.0		66.8	23.3	8.4	1.5	100
Karnataka	435	153	588		141	270	23	1	435
%	74.0	26.0	100.0		32.4	62.1	5.3	0.2	100
Kerala	161	38	199		33	112	14	2	161
%	80.9	19.1	100.0		20.5	69.6	8.7	1.2	100
Madhya Pradesh	607	276	883	3	495	93	15	1	607
%	68.7	31.3	100.0	0.5	81.5	15.3	2.5	0.2	100
Maharashtra	585	194	779	4	91	165	149	176	585
%	75.1	24.9	100.0	0.7	15.6	28.2	25.5	30.1	100
Orissa	135	87	222		60	68	7		135
%	60.8	39.2	100.0		44.4	50.4	5.2		100
Rajasthan	373	225	598		288	74	5	6	373
%	62.4	37.6	100.0		77.2	19.8	1.3	1.6	100
Sikkim	143	54	197	1	50	77	14	1	143
%	72.6	27.4	100.0	0.7	35.0	53.8	9.8	0.7	100
Uttar Pradesh	1142	740	1882	32	633	382	69	26	1142
%	60.7	39.3	100.0	2.8	55.4	33.5	6.0	2.3	100
Uttrakhand	116	79	195		65	40	4	7	116
%	59.5	40.5	100.0		56.0	34.5	3.4	6.0	100
West Bengal	343	120	463		17	197	122	7	343
%	74.1	25.9	100.0		5.0	57.4	35.6	2.0	100
Total	6128	2917	9045	97	3036	2130	588	277	6128
%	67.8	32.2	100.0	1.6	49.5	34.8	9.6	4.5	100

Table A 67: Attitude & Behavior Change

	Attitude & behavior change			Understanding Developed					
State	Yes	No	Total	Poor	Satis factory	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Total
Andhra Pradesh	167	36	203	2	4	40	84	37	167
%	82.3	17.7	100.0	1.2	2.4	24.0	50.3	22.2	100
Arunachal Pradesh	317	94	411		3	204	110		317
%	77.1	22.9	100.0		0.9	64.4	34.7		100
Assam	419	190	609	1	117	170	121	10	419
%	68.8	31.2	100.0	0.2	27.9	40.6	28.9	2.4	100
Goa	146	57	203		140	6			146
%	71.9	28.1	100.0		95.9	4.1			100
Gujarat	402	204	606	2	189	193	17	1	402
%	66.3	33.7	100.0	0.5	47.0	48.0	4.2	0.2	100
Haryana	266	139	405		170	72	22	2	266
%	65.7	34.3	100.0		63.9	27.1	8.3	0.8	100
Himachal Pradesh	135	71	206	1	1	119	12	2	135
%	65.5	34.5	100.0	0.7	0.7	88.1	8.9	1.5	100
Jharkhand	262	134	396	1	149	78	30	4	262
%	66.2	33.8	100.0	0.4	56.9	29.8	11.5	1.5	100
Karnataka	439	149	588		130	265	41	3	439
%	74.7	25.3	100.0		29.6	60.4	9.3	0.7	100
Kerala	157	42	199		28	58	69	2	157
%	78.9	21.1	100.0		17.8	36.9	43.9	1.3	100
Madhya Pradesh	611	272	883	1	341	226	42	1	611
%	69.2	30.8	100.0	0.2	55.8	37.0	6.9	0.2	100
Maharashtra	574	205	779	2	74	169	251	78	574
%	73.7	26.3	100.0	0.3	12.9	29.4	43.7	13.6	100
Orissa	137	85	222		19	90	28		137
%	61.7	38.3	100.0		13.9	65.7	20.4		100
Rajasthan	372	226	598		114	218	38	2	372
%	62.2	37.8	100.0		30.6	58.6	10.2	0.5	100
Sikkim	138	59	197		29	73	35	1	138
%	70.1	29.9	100.0		21.0	52.9	25.4	0.7	100
Uttar Pradesh	1180	702	1882	6	459	560	131	24	1180
%	62.7	37.3	100.0	0.5	38.9	47.5	11.1	2.0	100
Uttrakhand	120	75	195		8	77	30	5	120
%	61.5	38.5	100.0		6.7	64.2	25.0	4.2	100
West Bengal	350	113	463		7	116	197	30	350
%	75.6	24.4	100.0		2.0	33.1	56.3	8.6	100
Total	6192	2853	9045	16	1982	2734	1258	202	6192
%	68.5	31.5	100.0	0.3	32.0	44.2	20.3	3.3	100

Table A 68: Attitude & Behavior Change

	Attitude & behavior change			Useful					
State	Yes	No	Total	Poor	Satis factory	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Total
Andhra Pradesh	167	36	203	1	12	84	37	33	167
%	82.3	17.7	100.0	0.6	7.2	50.3	22.2	19.8	100
Arunachal Pradesh	317	94	411		78	238	1		317
%	77.1	22.9	100.0		24.6	75.1	0.3		100
Assam	419	190	609	56	138	137	75	13	419
%	68.8	31.2	100.0	13.4	32.9	32.7	17.9	3.1	100
Goa	146	57	203		145	1			146
%	71.9	28.1	100.0		99.3	0.7			100
Gujarat	402	204	606	2	290	107	2	1	402
%	66.3	33.7	100.0	0.5	72.1	26.6	0.5	0.2	100
Haryana	266	139	405		205	49	11	1	266
%	65.7	34.3	100.0		77.1	18.4	4.1	0.4	100
Himachal Pradesh	135	71	206		97	30	5	3	135
%	65.5	34.5	100.0		71.9	22.2	3.7	2.2	100
Jharkhand	262	134	396		178	55	21	8	262
%	66.2	33.8	100.0		67.9	21.0	8.0	3.1	100
Karnataka	439	149	588		143	274	19	3	439
%	74.7	25.3	100.0		32.6	62.4	4.3	0.7	100
Kerala	157	42	199		32	108	15	2	157
%	78.9	21.1	100.0		20.4	68.8	9.6	1.3	100
Madhya Pradesh	611	272	883	1	501	94	13	2	611
%	69.2	30.8	100.0	0.2	82.0	15.4	2.1	0.3	100
Maharashtra	574	205	779	2	116	170	166	120	574
%	73.7	26.3	100.0	0.3	20.2	29.6	28.9	20.9	100
Orissa	137	85	222		59	73	5		137
%	61.7	38.3	100.0		43.1	53.3	3.6		100
Rajasthan	372	226	598		286	80	4	2	372
%	62.2	37.8	100.0		76.9	21.5	1.1	0.5	100
Sikkim	138	59	197		48	75	14	1	138
%	70.1	29.9	100.0		34.8	54.3	10.1	0.7	100
Uttar Pradesh	1180	702	1882	22	689	369	86	14	1180
%	62.7	37.3	100.0	1.9	58.4	31.3	7.3	1.2	100
Uttrakhand	120	75	195	1	68	40	6	5	120
%	61.5	38.5	100.0	0.8	56.7	33.3	5.0	4.2	100
West Bengal	350	113	463	1	26	163	140	20	350
%	75.6	24.4	100.0	0.3	7.4	46.6	40.0	5.7	100
Total	6192	2853	9045	86	3111	2147	620	228	6192
%	68.5	31.5	100.0	1.4	50.2	34.7	10.0	3.7	100

Table A 69: Develop Better Communication Skill & Leadership Qualities

	Develop better communication skill & leadership qualities			Understanding Developed					
State	Yes	No	Total	Poor	Satis factory	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Total
Andhra Pradesh	152	51	203	1	4	31	79	37	152
%	74.9	25.1	100.0	0.7	2.6	20.4	52.0	24.3	100
Arunachal Pradesh	296	115	411		2	185	109		296
%	72.0	28.0	100.0		0.7	62.5	36.8		100
Assam	423	186	609	1	124	179	109	10	423
%	69.5	30.5	100.0	0.2	29.3	42.3	25.8	2.4	100
Goa	146	57	203		140	5	1		146
%	71.9	28.1	100.0		95.9	3.4	0.7		100
Gujarat	422	184	606	2	202	200	17	1	422
%	69.6	30.4	100.0	0.5	47.9	47.4	4.0	0.2	100
Haryana	270	135	405		174	72	22	2	270
%	66.7	33.3	100.0		64.4	26.7	8.1	0.7	100
Himachal Pradesh	135	71	206	1	2	118	12	2	135
%	65.5	34.5	100.0	0.7	1.5	87.4	8.9	1.5	100
Jharkhand	264	132	396	1	149	81	27	6	264
%	66.7	33.3	100.0	0.4	56.4	30.7	10.2	2.3	100
Karnataka	437	151	588		141	255	39	2	437
%	74.3	25.7	100.0		32.3	58.4	8.9	0.5	100
Kerala	156	43	199		29	60	65	2	156
%	78.4	21.6	100.0		18.6	38.5	41.7	1.3	100
Madhya Pradesh	613	270	883	2	343	221	47		613
%	69.4	30.6	100.0	0.3	56.0	36.1	7.6672		100
Maharashtra	573	206	779	1	60	151	282	79	573
%	73.6	26.4	100.0	0.2	10.5	26.4	49.2	13.8	100
Orissa	139	83	222		19	86	34		139
%	62.6	37.4	100.0		13.7	61.9	24.5		100
Rajasthan	372	226	598	1	121	211	35	4	372
%	62.2	37.8	100.0	0.3	32.5	56.7	9.4	1.1	100
Sikkim	137	60	197		29	73	34	1	137
%	69.5	30.5	100.0		21.2	53.3	24.8	0.7	100
Uttar Pradesh	1138	744	1882	11	432	535	121	39	1138
%	60.5	39.5	100.0	1.0	38.0	47.0	10.6	3.4	100
Uttrakhand	112	83	195		9	68	28	7	112
%	57.4	42.6	100.0		8.0	60.7	25.0	6.3	100
West Bengal	359	104	463		1	112	211	35	359
%	77.5	22.5	100.0		0.3	31.2	58.8	9.7	100
Total	6144	2901	9045	21	1981	2643	1272	227	6144
%	67.9	32.1	100.0	0.3	32.2	43.0	20.7	3.7	100

Table A 70: Develop Better Communication Skill & Leadership Qualities

	Develop better communication skill & leadership qualities			Useful					
State	Yes	No	Total	Poor	Satis factory	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Total
Andhra Pradesh	152	51	203	1	10	72	34	35	152
%	74.9	25.1	100.0	0.7	6.6	47.4	22.4	23.0	100
Arunachal Pradesh	296	115	411		78	216	2		296
%	72.0	28.0	100.0		26.4	73.0	0.7		100
Assam	423	186	609	56	128	150	84	5	423
%	69.5	30.5	100.0	13.2	30.3	35.5	19.9	1.2	100
Goa	146	57	203		145		1		146
%	71.9	28.1	100.0		99.3		0.7		100
Gujarat	422	184	606	2	298	120	1	1	422
%	69.6	30.4	100.0	0.5	70.6	28.4	0.2	0.2	100
Haryana	270	135	405	1	208	48	12	1	270
%	66.7	33.3	100.0	0.4	77.0	17.8	4.4	0.4	100
Himachal Pradesh	135	71	206		96	29	8	2	135
%	65.5	34.5	100.0		71.1	21.5	5.9	1.5	100
Jharkhand	264	132	396		180	61	18	5	264
%	66.7	33.3	100.0		68.2	23.1	6.8	1.9	100
Karnataka	437	151	588		155	262	18	2	437
%	74.3	25.7	100.0		35.5	60.0	4.1	0.5	100
Kerala	156	43	199		34	108	12	2	156
%	78.4	21.6	100.0		21.8	69.2	7.7	1.3	100
Madhya Pradesh	613	270	883	1	507	87	16	2	613
%	69.4	30.6	100.0	0.2	82.7	14.2	2.6	0.3	100
Maharashtra	573	206	779	2	99	135	194	143	573
%	73.6	26.4	100.0	0.3	17.3	23.6	33.9	25.0	100
Orissa	139	83	222		59	74	6		139
%	62.6	37.4	100.0		42.4	53.2	4.3		100
Rajasthan	372	226	598	1	287	73	7	4	372
%	62.2	37.8	100.0	0.3	77.2	19.6	1.9	1.1	100
Sikkim	137	60	197		48	76	12	1	137
%	69.5	30.5	100.0		35.0	55.5	8.8	0.7	100
Uttar Pradesh	1138	744	1882	29	622	392	70	25	1138
%	60.5	39.5	100.0	2.5	54.7	34.4	6.2	2.2	100
Uttrakhand	112	83	195		63	38	4	7	112
%	57.4	42.6	100.0		56.3	33.9	3.6	6.3	100
West Bengal	359	104	463		23	173	145	18	359
%	77.5	22.5	100.0		6.4	48.2	40.4	5.0	100
Total	6144	2901	9045	93	3040	2114	644	253	6144
%	67.9	32.1	100.0	1.5	49.5	34.4	10.5	4.1	100

Table A 71: Preparing Detailed Project Report

	Preparing Detailed Project Report			Understanding Developed					
State	Yes	No	Total	Poor	Satis factory	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Total
Andhra Pradesh	156	47	203		5	38	82	31	156
%	76.8	23.2	100.0		3.2	24.4	52.6	19.9	100
Arunachal Pradesh	289	122	411		2	206	81		289
%	70.3	29.7	100.0		0.7	71.3	28.0		100
Assam	429	180	609		126	196	100	7	429
%	70.4	29.6	100.0		29.4	45.7	23.3	1.6	100
Goa	147	56	203		141	5	1		147
%	72.4	27.6	100.0		95.9	3.4	0.7		100
Gujarat	403	203	606	2	197	184	18	2	403
%	66.5	33.5	100.0	0.5	48.9	45.7	4.5	0.5	100
Haryana	262	143	405		149	82	29	2	262
%	64.7	35.3	100.0		56.9	31.3	11.1	0.8	100
Himachal Pradesh	137	69	206	1	1	118	15	2	137
%	66.5	33.5	100.0	0.7	0.7	86.1	10.9	1.5	100
Jharkhand	262	134	396	2	144	75	33	8	262
%	66.2	33.8	100.0	0.8	55.0	28.6	12.6	3.1	100
Karnataka	426	162	588	1	150	236	37	2	426
%	72.4	27.6	100.0	0.2	35.2	55.4	8.7	0.5	100
Kerala	152	47	199		28	61	61	2	152
%	76.4	23.6	100.0		18.4	40.1	40.1	1.3	100
Madhya Pradesh	599	284	883	1	338	219	40	1	599
%	67.8	32.2	100.0	0.2	56.4	36.6	6.7	0.2	100
Maharashtra	573	206	779	2	58	178	268	67	573
%	73.6	26.4	100.0	0.3	10.1	31.1	46.8	11.7	100
Orissa	140	82	222		18	94	28		140
%	63.1	36.9	100.0		12.9	67.1	20.0		100
Rajasthan	370	228	598		116	211	36	7	370
%	61.9	38.1	100.0		31.4	57.0	9.7	1.8919	100
Sikkim	138	59	197	1	35	68	34		138
%	70.1	29.9	100.0	0.7	25.4	49.3	24.6		100
Uttar Pradesh	1131	751	1882	7	418	534	133	39	1131
%	60.1	39.9	100.0	0.6	37.0	47.2	11.8	3.4	100
Uttrakhand	124	71	195		7	82	27	8	124
%	63.6	36.4	100.0		5.6	66.1	21.8	6.5	100
West Bengal	354	109	463	1	6	132	200	15	354
%	76.5	23.5	100.0	0.3	1.7	37.3	56.5	4.2	100
Total	6092	2953	9045	18	1939	2719	1223	193	6092
%	67.4	32.6	100.0	0.3	31.8	44.6	20.1	3.2	100

Table A 72: Preparing Detailed Project Report

	Preparing Detailed Project Report			Useful					
State	Yes	No	Total	Poor	Satis factory	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Total
Andhra Pradesh	156	47	203	1	17	76	33	29	156
%	76.8	23.2	100.0	0.6	10.9	48.7	21.2	18.6	100
Arunachal Pradesh	289	122	411		77	212			289
%	70.3	29.7	100.0		26.6	73.4			100
Assam	429	180	609	49	149	152	66	13	429
%	70.4	29.6	100.0	11.4	34.7	35.4	15.4	3.0	100
Goa	147	56	203		143	3	1		147
%	72.4	27.6	100.0		97.3	2.0	0.7		100
Gujarat	403	203	606	2	285	112	2	2	403
%	66.5	33.5	100.0	0.5	70.7	27.8	0.5	0.5	100
Haryana	262	143	405		193	53	15	1	262
%	64.7	35.3	100.0		73.7	20.2	5.7	0.4	100
Himachal Pradesh	137	69	206		96	28	10	3	137
%	66.5	33.5	100.0		70.1	20.4	7.3	2.2	100
Jharkhand	262	134	396		175	57	21	9	262
%	66.2	33.8	100.0		66.8	21.8	8.0	3.4	100
Karnataka	426	162	588		165	244	15	2	426
%	72.4	27.6	100.0		38.7	57.3	3.5	0.5	100
Kerala	152	47	199		37	99	14	2	152
%	76.4	23.6	100.0		24.3	65.1	9.2	1.3	100
Madhya Pradesh	599	284	883	1	495	85	15	3	599
%	67.8	32.2	100.0	0.2	82.6	14.2	2.5	0.5	100
Maharashtra	573	206	779	1	101	110	179	182	573
%	73.6	26.4	100.0	0.2	17.6	19.2	31.2	31.8	100
Orissa	140	82	222		64	74	2		140
%	63.1	36.9	100.0		45.7	52.9	1.4		100
Rajasthan	370	228	598		283	73	6	8	370
%	61.9	38.1	100.0		76.5	19.7	1.6	2.2	100
Sikkim	138	59	197	1	54	70	13		138
%	70.1	29.9	100.0	0.7	39.1	50.7	9.4		100
Uttar Pradesh	1131	751	1882	23	591	409	82	26	1131
%	60.1	39.9	100.0	2.0	52.3	36.2	7.3	2.3	100
Uttrakhand	124	71	195		72	39	5	8	124
%	63.6	36.4	100.0		58.1	31.5	4.0	6.5	100
West Bengal	354	109	463		28	200	121	5	354
%	76.5	23.5	100.0		7.9	56.5	34.2	1.4	100
Total	6092	2953	9045	78	3025	2096	600	293	6092
%	67.4	32.6	100.0	1.3	49.7	34.4	9.8	4.8	100

Table A 73: Help in Getting Acquainted with Digital Inclusiveness

				Understanding Developed					
State	Yes	No	Total	Poor	Satis factory	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Total
Andhra Pradesh	95	108	203		8	21	35	31	95
%	46.8	53.2	100.0		8.4	22.1	36.8	32.6	100
Arunachal Pradesh	25	386	411		7	18			25
%	6.1	93.9	100.0		28.0	72.0			100
Assam	47	562	609	1	7	17	10	12	47
%	7.7	92.3	100.0	2.1	14.9	36.2	21.3	25.5	100
Goa	12	191	203		12				12
%	5.9	94.1	100.0		100.0				100
Gujarat	3	603	606		2	1			3
%	0.5	99.5	100.0		66.7	33.3			100
Haryana	57	348	405	1	25	21	10		57
%	14.1	85.9	100.0	1.8	43.9	36.8	17.5		100
Himachal Pradesh	24	182	206			21		3	24
%	11.7	88.3	100.0			87.5		12.5	100
Jharkhand	110	286	396		24	57	25	4	110
%	27.8	72.2	100.0		21.8	51.8	22.7	3.6	100
Karnataka	121	467	588		6	104	11		121
%	20.6	79.4	100.0		5.0	86.0	9.1		100
Kerala	58	141	199		24	29	5		58
%	29.1	70.9	100.0		41.4	50.0	8.6		100
Madhya Pradesh	69	814	883	2	29	26	11	1	69
%	7.8	92.2	100.0	2.9	42.0	37.7	15.9	1.4	100
Maharashtra	204	575	779	1	55	68	50	30	204
%	26.2	73.8	100.0	0.5	27.0	33.3	24.5	14.7	100
Orissa	10	212	222		4	6			10
%	4.5	95.5	100.0		40.0	60.0			100
Rajasthan	94	504	598		31	50	12	1	94
%	15.7	84.3	100.0		33.0	53.2	12.8	1.1	100
Sikkim	23	174	197		2	9	11	1	23
%	11.7	88.3	100.0		8.7	39.1	47.8	4.3	100
Uttar Pradesh	335	1547	1882	8	133	136	45	13	335
%	17.8	82.2	100.0	2.4	39.7	40.6	13.4	3.9	100
Uttrakhand	5	190	195		1	1		3	5
%	2.6	97.4	100.0		20.0	20.0		60.0	100
West Bengal	46	417	463		21	12	9	4	46
%	9.9	90.1	100.0		45.7	26.1	19.6	8.7	100
Total	1338	7707	9045	13	391	597	234	103	1338
%	14.8	85.2	100.0	1.0	29.2	44.6	17.5	7.7	100

Table A 74: Help in Getting Acquainted with Digital Inclusiveness

				Useful					
State	Yes	No	Total	Poor	Satis factory	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Total
Andhra Pradesh	95	108	203		9	26	31	29	95
%	46.8	53.2	100.0		9.5	27.4	32.6	30.5	100
Arunachal Pradesh	25	386	411		23	2			25
%	6.1	93.9	100.0		92.0	8.0			100
Assam	47	562	609	2	14	7	17	7	47
%	7.7	92.3	100.0	4.3	29.8	14.9	36.2	14.9	100
Goa	12	191	203		12				12
%	5.9	94.1	100.0		100.0				100
Gujarat	3	603	606	1	1	1			3
%	0.5	99.5	100.0	33.3	33.3	33.3			100
Haryana	57	348	405	2	38	14	3		57
%	14.1	85.9	100.0	3.5	66.7	24.6	5.3		100
Himachal Pradesh	24	182	206		4	17	1	2	24
%	11.7	88.3	100.0		16.7	70.8	4.2	8.3	100
Jharkhand	110	286	396		50	45	12	3	110
%	27.8	72.2	100.0		45.5	40.9	10.9	2.7	100
Karnataka	121	467	588		6	109	6		121
%	20.6	79.4	100.0		5.0	90.1	5.0		100
Kerala	58	141	199		25	29	4		58
%	29.1	70.9	100.0		43.1	50.0	6.9		100
Madhya Pradesh	69	814	883	1	33	20	12	3	69
%	7.8	92.2	100.0	1.4	47.8	29.0	17.4	4.3	100
Maharashtra	204	575	779	1	51	66	49	37	204
%	26.2	73.8	100.0	0.5	25.0	32.4	24.0	18.1	100
Orissa	10	212	222		7	3			10
%	4.5	95.5	100.0		70.0	30.0			100
Rajasthan	94	504	598	3	58	28	4	1	94
%	15.7	84.3	100.0	3.2	61.7	29.8	4.3	1.1	100
Sikkim	23	174	197	1	4	15	3		23
%	11.7	88.3	100.0	4.3	17.4	65.2	13.0		100
Uttar Pradesh	335	1547	1882	24	158	110	34	9	335
%	17.8	82.2	100.0	7.2	47.2	32.8	10.1	2.7	100
Uttrakhand	5	190	195		1	1		3	5
%	2.6	97.4	100.0		20.0	20.0		60.0	100
West Bengal	46	417	463	6	21	11	4	4	46
%	9.9	90.1	100.0	13.0	45.7	23.9	8.7	8.7	100
Total	1338	7707	9045	41	515	504	180	98	1338
%	14.8	85.2	100.0	3.1	38.5	37.7	13.5	7.3	100

Table A 75: Understanding Importance of e-Governance, Online (ICT) or e-enablement of Panchayats

State				Understanding Developed					
	Yes	No	Total	Poor	Satis factory	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Total
Andhra Pradesh	95	108	203		4	19	34	38	95
%	46.8	53.2	100.0		4.2	20.0	35.8	40.0	100
Arunachal Pradesh	25	386	411		15	10			25
%	6.1	93.9	100.0		60.0	40.0			100
Assam	43	566	609	1	11	8	7	16	43
%	7.1	92.9	100.0	2.3	25.6	18.6	16.3	37.2	100
Goa	12	191	203		12				12
%	5.9	94.1	100.0		100.0				100
Gujarat	1	605	606		1				1
%	0.2	99.8	100.0		100.0				100
Haryana	35	370	405		11	15	9		35
%	8.6	91.4	100.0		31.4	42.9	25.7		100
Himachal Pradesh	14	192	206			11	1	2	14
%	6.8	93.2	100.0			78.6	7.1	14.3	100
Jharkhand	9	387	396		1	2	4	2	9
%	2.3	97.7	100.0		11.1	22.2	44.4	22.2	100
Karnataka	121	467	588		5	105	11		121
%	20.6	79.4	100.0		4.1	86.8	9.1		100
Kerala	57	142	199		21	28	8		57
%	28.6	71.4	100.0		36.8	49.1	14.0		100
Madhya Pradesh	69	814	883	2	28	28	9	2	69
%	7.8	92.2	100.0	2.9	40.6	40.6	13.0	2.9	100
Maharashtra	200	579	779	2	51	55	64	28	200
%	25.7	74.3	100.0	1.0	25.5	27.5	32.0	14.0	100
Orissa	9	213	222		3	6			9
%	4.1	95.9	100.0		33.3	66.7			100
Rajasthan	82	516	598	1	28	44	8	1	82
%	13.7	86.3	100.0	1.2	34.1	53.7	9.8	1.2	100
Sikkim	12	185	197		1	5	5	1	12
%	6.1	93.9	100.0		8.3	41.7	41.7	8.3	100
Uttar Pradesh	286	1596	1882	15	108	113	39	11	286
%	15.2	84.8	100.0	5.2	37.8	39.5	13.6	3.8	100
Uttrakhand	5	190	195		1	2		2	5
%	2.6	97.4	100.0		20.0	40.0		40.0	100
West Bengal	71	392	463		20	17	20	14	71
%	15.3	84.7	100.0		28.2	23.9	28.2	19.7	100
Total	1146	7899	9045	21	321	468	219	117	1146
%	12.7	87.3	100.0	1.8	28.0	40.8	19.1	10.2	100

Table A 76: Understanding Importance of e-Governance, Online (ICT) or e-enablement of Panchayats

				Useful					
State	Yes	No	Total	Poor	Satis factory	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Total
Andhra Pradesh	95	108	203		8	21	29	37	95
%	46.8	53.2	100.0		8.4	22.1	30.5	38.9	100
Arunachal Pradesh	25	386	411		24	1			25
%	6.1	93.9	100.0		96.0	4.0			100
Assam	43	566	609	4	8	6	16	9	43
%	7.1	92.9	100.0	9.3	18.6	14.0	37.2	20.9	100
Goa	12	191	203		12				12
%	5.9	94.1	100.0		100.0				100
Gujarat	1	605	606	1					1
%	0.2	99.8	100.0	100.0					100
Haryana	35	370	405	1	24	7	3		35
%	8.6	91.4	100.0	2.9	68.6	20.0	8.6		100
Himachal Pradesh	14	192	206		2	9		3	14
%	6.8	93.2	100.0		14.3	64.3		21.4	100
Jharkhand	9	387	396		1	3	3	2	9
%	2.3	97.7	100.0		11.1	33.3	33.3	22.2	100
Karnataka	121	467	588		6	109	6		121
%	20.6	79.4	100.0		5.0	90.1	5.0		100
Kerala	57	142	199		25	31	1		57
%	28.6	71.4	100.0		43.9	54.4	1.8		100
Madhya Pradesh	69	814	883	2	29	22	12	4	69
%	7.8	92.2	100.0	2.9	42.0	31.9	17.4	5.8	100
Maharashtra	200	579	779	1	46	66	51	36	200
%	25.7	74.3	100.0	0.5	23.0	33.0	25.5	18.0	100
Orissa	9	213	222		6	3			9
%	4.1	95.9	100.0		66.7	33.3			100
Rajasthan	82	516	598	3	51	24	3	1	82
%	13.7	86.3	100.0	3.7	62.2	29.3	3.7	1.2	100
Sikkim	12	185	197	1	1	8	1	1	12
%	6.1	93.9	100.0	8.3	8.3	66.7	8.3	8.3	100
Uttar Pradesh	286	1596	1882	27	132	90	32	5	286
%	15.2	84.8	100.0	9.4	46.2	31.5	11.2	1.7	100
Uttrakhand	5	190	195		1	3		1	5
%	2.6	97.4	100.0		20.0	60.0		20.0	100
West Bengal	71	392	463	6	20	13	14	18	71
%	15.3	84.7	100.0	8.5	28.2	18.3	19.7	25.4	100
Total	1146	7899	9045	46	396	416	171	117	1146
%	12.7	87.3	100.0	4.0	34.6	36.3	14.9	10.2	100

Table A 77: Develop Confidence and Increased Sense of Responsibility

	Develop Confidence			Extent Beneficial					
State	Yes	No	Total	Poor	Satis factory	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Total
Andhra Pradesh	163	40	203		9	64	64	26	163
%	80.3	19.7	100.0		5.5	39.3	39.3	16.0	100
Arunachal Pradesh	265	146	411	1	8	222	34		265
%	64.5	35.5	100.0	0.4	3.0	83.8	12.8		100
Assam	354	255	609	1	80	200	66	7	354
%	58.1	41.9	100.0	0.3	22.6	56.5	18.6	2.0	100
Goa	147	56	203		142	5			147
%	72.4	27.6	100.0		96.6	3.4			100
Gujarat	364	242	606		252	106	5	1	364
%	60.1	39.9	100.0		69.2	29.1	1.4	0.3	100
Haryana	256	149	405		161	70	25		256
%	63.2	36.8	100.0		62.9	27.3	9.8		100
Himachal Pradesh	143	63	206	1	72	59	10	1	143
%	69.4	30.6	100.0	0.7	50.3	41.3	7.0	0.7	100
Jharkhand	264	132	396		165	68	27	4	264
%	66.7	33.3	100.0		62.5	25.8	10.2	1.5	100
Karnataka	439	149	588	1	162	241	33	2	439
%	74.7	25.3	100.0	0.2	36.9	54.9	7.5	0.5	100
Kerala	178	21	199		27	94	56	1	178
%	89.4	10.6	100.0		15.2	52.8	31.5	0.6	100
Madhya Pradesh	623	260	883	1	360	175	80	7	623
%	70.6	29.4	100.0	0.2	57.8	28.1	12.8	1.1	100
Maharashtra	530	249	779	3	59	168	230	70	530
%	68.0	32.0	100.0	0.6	11.1	31.7	43.4	13.2	100
Orissa	141	81	222		37	96	8		141
%	63.5	36.5	100.0		26.2	68.1	5.7		100
Rajasthan	369	229	598		175	161	26	7	369
%	61.7	38.3	100.0		47.4	43.6	7.0	1.9	100
Sikkim	138	59	197		38	83	17		138
%	70.1	29.9	100.0		27.5	60.1	12.3		100
Uttar Pradesh	1121	761	1882	1	418	536	136	30	1121
%	59.6	40.4	100.0	0.1	37.3	47.8	12.1	2.7	100
Uttrakhand	140	55	195		14	78	42	6	140
%	71.8	28.2	100.0		10.0	55.7	30.0	4.3	100
West Bengal	359	104	463		12	154	177	16	359
%	77.5	22.5	100.0		3.3	42.9	49.3	4.5	100
Total	5994	3051	9045	9	2191	2580	1036	178	5994
%	66.3	33.7	100.0	0.2	36.6	43.0	17.3	3.0	100

Table A 78: Better approach and working for Planning

	Better approach and working for Planning			Extent Beneficial					
State	Yes	No	Total	Poor	Satis factory	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Total
Andhra Pradesh	157	46	203		3	55	70	29	157
%	77.3	22.7	100.0		1.9	35.0	44.6	18.5	100
Arunachal Pradesh	287	124	411		10	258	19		287
%	69.8	30.2	100.0		3.5	89.9	6.6		100
Assam	374	235	609	1	136	171	57	9	374
%	61.4	38.6	100.0	0.3	36.4	45.7	15.2	2.4	100
Goa	146	57	203		143	3			146
%	71.9	28.1	100.0		97.9	2.1			100
Gujarat	365	241	606		247	114	3	1	365
%	60.2	39.8	100.0		67.7	31.2	0.8	0.3	100
Haryana	269	136	405		161	82	26		269
%	66.4	33.6	100.0		59.9	30.5	9.7		100
Himachal Pradesh	141	65	206		58	72	9	2	141
%	68.4	31.6	100.0		41.1	51.1	6.4	1.4	100
Jharkhand	263	133	396	1	162	69	26	5	263
%	66.4	33.6	100.0	0.4	61.6	26.2	9.9	1.9	100
Karnataka	443	145	588	1	162	243	35	2	443
%	75.3	24.7	100.0	0.2	36.6	54.9	7.9	0.5	100
Kerala	177	22	199		27	92	57	1	177
%	88.9	11.1	100.0		15.3	52.0	32.2	0.6	100
Madhya Pradesh	622	261	883	1	325	202	86	8	622
%	70.4	29.6	100.0	0.2	52.3	32.5	13.8	1.3	100
Maharashtra	531	248	779	2	61	210	163	95	531
%	68.2	31.8	100.0	0.4	11.5	39.5	30.7	17.9	100
Orissa	140	82	222		37	88	15		140
%	63.1	36.9	100.0		26.4	62.9	10.7		100
Rajasthan	373	225	598	2	163	166	38	4	373
%	62.4	37.6	100.0	0.5	43.7	44.5	10.2	1.1	100
Sikkim	137	60	197		38	72	27		137
%	69.5	30.5	100.0		27.7	52.6	19.7		100
Uttar Pradesh	1118	764	1882	2	418	522	155	21	1118
%	59.4	40.6	100.0	0.2	37.4	46.7	13.9	1.9	100
Uttrakhand	122	73	195	1	14	62	41	4	122
%	62.6	37.4	100.0	0.8	11.5	50.8	33.6	3.3	100
West Bengal	351	112	463		5	136	188	22	351
%	75.8	24.2	100.0		1.4	38.7	53.6	6.3	100
Total	6016	3029	9045	11	2170	2617	1015	203	6016
%	66.5	33.5	100.0	0.2	36.1	43.5	16.9	3.4	100

Table A 79: Undertake Baseline Data Collection

	Baseline Data Collection			Extent Beneficial					
State	Yes	No	Total	Poor	Satis factory	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Total
Andhra Pradesh	162	41	203		7	56	64	35	162
%	79.8	20.2	100.0		4.3	34.6	39.5	21.6	100
Arunachal Pradesh	265	146	411	1	23	198	43		265
%	64.5	35.5	100.0	0.4	8.7	74.7	16.2		100
Assam	358	251	609		70	177	104	7	358
%	58.8	41.2	100.0		19.6	49.4	29.1	2.0	100
Goa	146	57	203		142	3	1		146
%	71.9	28.1	100.0		97.3	2.1	0.7		100
Gujarat	363	243	606		247	109	5	2	363
%	59.9	40.1	100.0		68.0	30.0	1.4	0.6	100
Haryana	277	128	405		168	85	24		277
%	68.4	31.6	100.0		60.6	30.7	8.7		100
Himachal Pradesh	122	84	206		72	44	3	3	122
%	59.2	40.8	100.0		59.0	36.1	2.5	2.5	100
Jharkhand	263	133	396		166	66	27	4	263
%	66.4	33.6	100.0		63.1	25.1	10.3	1.5	100
Karnataka	439	149	588	1	152	249	36	1	439
%	74.7	25.3	100.0	0.2	34.6	56.7	8.2	0.2	100
Kerala	178	21	199		27	90	60	1	178
%	89.4	10.6	100.0		15.2	50.6	33.7	0.6	100
Madhya Pradesh	566	317	883	1	310	166	82	7	566
%	64.1	35.9	100.0	0.2	54.8	29.3	14.5	1.2	100
Maharashtra	514	265	779	1	68	183	162	100	514
%	66.0	34.0	100.0	0.2	13.2	35.6	31.5	19.5	100
Orissa	113	109	222		23	74	16		113
%	50.9	49.1	100.0		20.4	65.5	14.2		100
Rajasthan	368	230	598		170	158	32	8	368
%	61.5	38.5	100.0		46.2	42.9	8.7	2.2	100
Sikkim	138	59	197		34	76	28		138
%	70.1	29.9	100.0		24.6	55.1	20.3		100
Uttar Pradesh	1096	786	1882	3	435	488	141	29	1096
%	58.2	41.8	100.0	0.3	39.7	44.5	12.9	2.6	100
Uttrakhand	111	84	195	1	15	57	32	6	111
%	56.9	43.1	100.0	0.9	13.5	51.4	28.8	5.4	100
West Bengal	332	131	463		15	137	168	12	332
%	71.7	28.3	100.0		4.5	41.3	50.6	3.6	100
Total	5811	3234	9045	8	2144	2416	1028	215	5811
%	64.2	35.8	100.0	0.1	36.9	41.6	17.7	3.7	100

Table A 80: Better Understanding of Village Issues and Required Action

	Better understanding			Extent Beneficial					
State	Yes	No	Total	Poor	Satis factory	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Total
Andhra Pradesh	152	51	203		3	62	45	42	152
%	74.9	25.1	100.0		2.0	40.8	29.6	27.6	100
Arunachal Pradesh	274	137	411	1	34	191	48		274
%	66.7	33.3	100.0	0.4	12.4	69.7	17.5		100
Assam	373	236	609		108	180	77	8	373
%	61.2	38.8	100.0		29.0	48.3	20.6	2.1	100
Goa	145	58	203		142	3			145
%	71.4	28.6	100.0		97.9	2.1			100
Gujarat	365	241	606		229	131	3	2	365
%	60.2	39.8	100.0		62.7	35.9	0.8	0.5	100
Haryana	268	137	405		156	86	26		268
%	66.2	33.8	100.0		58.2	32.1	9.7		100
Himachal Pradesh	141	65	206		71	59	8	3	141
%	68.4	31.6	100.0		50.4	41.8	5.7	2.1	100
Jharkhand	264	132	396		165	68	21	10	264
%	66.7	33.3	100.0		62.5	25.8	8.0	3.8	100
Karnataka	443	145	588	1	147	258	34	3	443
%	75.3	24.7	100.0	0.2	33.2	58.2	7.7	0.7	100
Kerala	177	22	199		27	96	53	1	177
%	88.9	11.1	100.0		15.3	54.2	29.9	0.6	100
Madhya Pradesh	616	267	883	1	345	176	88	6	616
%	69.8	30.2	100.0	0.2	56.0	28.6	14.3	1.0	100
Maharashtra	531	248	779	2	66	171	187	105	531
%	68.2	31.8	100.0	0.4	12.4	32.2	35.2	19.8	100
Orissa	141	81	222		30	97	14		141
%	63.5	36.5	100.0		21.3	68.8	9.9		100
Rajasthan	373	225	598		166	161	37	9	373
%	62.4	37.6	100.0		44.5	43.2	9.9	2.4	100
Sikkim	139	58	197		39	68	31	1	139
%	70.6	29.4	100.0		28.1	48.9	22.3	0.7	100
Uttar Pradesh	1090	792	1882	4	418	474	164	30	1090
%	57.9	42.1	100.0	0.4	38.3	43.5	15.0	2.8	100
Uttrakhand	112	83	195	1	19	53	33	6	112
%	57.4	42.6	100.0	0.9	17.0	47.3	29.5	5.4	100
West Bengal	345	118	463	1	10	130	187	17	345
%	74.5	25.5	100.0	0.3	2.9	37.7	54.2	4.9	100
Total	5949	3096	9045	11	2175	2464	1056	243	5949
%	65.8	34.2	100.0	0.2	36.6	41.4	17.8	4.1	100

Table A 81: Help in Understanding Sustainable Development Goals

	Understanding Sustainable Development Goals			Extent Beneficial					
State	Yes	No	Total	Poor	Satis factory	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Total
Andhra Pradesh	160	43	203	1	12	66	54	27	160
%	78.8	21.2	100.0	0.6	7.5	41.3	33.8	16.9	100
Arunachal Pradesh	265	146	411	1	64	166	34		265
%	64.5	35.5	100.0	0.4	24.2	62.6	12.8		100
Assam	356	253	609	2	71	174	102	7	356
%	58.5	41.5	100.0	0.6	19.9	48.9	28.7	2.0	100
Goa	146	57	203		143	3			146
%	71.9	28.1	100.0		97.9	2.1			100
Gujarat	363	243	606		240	116	5	2	363
%	59.9	40.1	100.0		66.1	32.0	1.4	0.6	100
Haryana	276	129	405		166	86	24		276
%	68.1	31.9	100.0		60.1	31.2	8.7		100
Himachal Pradesh	143	63	206		77	53	11	2	143
%	69.4	30.6	100.0		53.8	37.1	7.7	1.4	100
Jharkhand	265	131	396	1	166	67	24	7	265
%	66.9	33.1	100.0	0.4	62.6	25.3	9.1	2.6	100
Karnataka	439	149	588	1	145	254	37	2	439
%	74.7	25.3	100.0	0.2	33.0	57.9	8.4	0.5	100
Kerala	178	21	199		28	98	51	1	178
%	89.4	10.6	100.0		15.7	55.1	28.7	0.6	100
Madhya Pradesh	622	261	883	1	363	171	81	6	622
%	70.4	29.6	100.0	0.2	58.4	27.5	13.0	1.0	100
Maharashtra	521	258	779	1	78	147	210	85	521
%	66.9	33.1	100.0	0.2	15.0	28.2	40.3	16.3	100
Orissa	143	79	222		32	98	13		143
%	64.4	35.6	100.0		22.4	68.5	9.1		100
Rajasthan	369	229	598	1	166	160	36	6	369
%	61.7	38.3	100.0	0.3	45.0	43.4	9.8	1.6	100
Sikkim	138	59	197	1	35	79	22	1	138
%	70.1	29.9	100.0	0.7	25.4	57.2	15.9	0.7	100
Uttar Pradesh	1114	768	1882	6	445	502	142	19	1114
%	59.2	40.8	100.0	0.5	39.9	45.1	12.7	1.7	100
Uttrakhand	111	84	195	1	17	52	35	6	111
%	56.9	43.1	100.0	0.9	15.3	46.8	31.5	5.4	100
West Bengal	331	132	463		20	168	126	17	331
%	71.5	28.5	100.0		6.0	50.8	38.1	5.1	100
Total	5940	3105	9045	17	2268	2460	1007	188	5940
%	65.7	34.3	100.0	0.3	38.2	41.4	17.0	3.2	100

Table A 82: Able to Manage Community Organization & Related Issues, & Conflict in Better Way

	Able to manage			Extent Beneficial					
State	Yes	No	Total	Poor	Satis factory	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Total
Andhra Pradesh	162	41	203	2	21	56	59	24	162
%	79.8	20.2	100.0	1.2	13.0	34.6	36.4	14.8	100
Arunachal Pradesh	271	140	411	1	71	162	37		271
%	65.9	34.1	100.0	0.4	26.2	59.8	13.7		100
Assam	372	237	609	2	136	156	72	6	372
%	61.1	38.9	100.0	0.5	36.6	41.9	19.4	1.6	100
Goa	145	58	203		143	2			145
%	71.4	28.6	100.0		98.6	1.4			100
Gujarat	362	244	606		248	111	2	1	362
%	59.7	40.3	100.0		68.5	30.7	0.6	0.3	100
Haryana	261	144	405	1	160	76	24		261
%	64.4	35.6	100.0	0.4	61.3	29.1	9.2		100
Himachal Pradesh	141	65	206		78	53	7	3	141
%	68.4	31.6	100.0		55.3	37.6	5.0	2.1	100
Jharkhand	264	132	396	1	164	73	22	4	264
%	66.7	33.3	100.0	0.4	62.1	27.7	8.3	1.5	100
Karnataka	442	146	588	1	148	258	34	1	442
%	75.2	24.8	100.0	0.2	33.5	58.4	7.7	0.2	100
Kerala	177	22	199		28	92	56	1	177
%	88.9	11.1	100.0		15.8	52.0	31.6	0.6	100
Madhya Pradesh	617	266	883	2	346	181	82	6	617
%	69.9	30.1	100.0	0.3	56.1	29.3	13.3	1.0	100
Maharashtra	529	250	779	2	66	192	159	110	529
%	67.9	32.1	100.0	0.4	12.5	36.3	30.1	20.8	100
Orissa	140	82	222		30	93	17		140
%	63.1	36.9	100.0		21.4	66.4	12.1		100
Rajasthan	371	227	598		178	154	35	4	371
%	62.0	38.0	100.0		48.0	41.5	9.4	1.1	100
Sikkim	138	59	197		39	77	21	1	138
%	70.1	29.9	100.0		28.3	55.8	15.2	0.7	100
Uttar Pradesh	1105	777	1882	10	452	476	148	19	1105
%	58.7	41.3	100.0	0.9	40.9	43.1	13.4	1.7	100
Uttrakhand	115	80	195	2	21	52	36	4	115
%	59.0	41.0	100.0	1.7	18.3	45.2	31.3	3.5	100
West Bengal	347	116	463		13	125	186	23	347
%	74.9	25.1	100.0		3.7	36.0	53.6	6.6	100
Total	5959	3086	9045	24	2342	2389	997	207	5959
%	65.9	34.1	100.0	0.4	39.3	40.1	16.7	3.5	100

Table A 83: Better Understanding of the Core Issues of Rural Poverty

	Better understanding			Extent Beneficial					
State	Yes	No	Total	Poor	Satis factory	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Total
Andhra Pradesh	153	50	203	3	22	50	46	32	153
%	75.4	24.6	100.0	2.0	14.4	32.7	30.1	20.9	100
Arunachal Pradesh	271	140	411	1	88	144	38		271
%	65.9	34.1	100.0	0.4	32.5	53.1	14.0		100
Assam	386	223	609	1	93	188	96	8	386
%	63.4	36.6	100.0	0.3	24.1	48.7	24.9	2.1	100
Goa	147	56	203		144	3			147
%	72.4	27.6	100.0		98.0	2.0			100
Gujarat	361	245	606		249	107	4	1	361
%	59.6	40.4	100.0		69.0	29.6	1.1	0.3	100
Haryana	270	135	405		169	77	24		270
%	66.7	33.3	100.0		62.6	28.5	8.9		100
Himachal Pradesh	141	65	206		78	52	9	2	141
%	68.4	31.6	100.0		55.3	36.9	6.4	1.4	100
Jharkhand	264	132	396		167	68	24	5	264
%	66.7	33.3	100.0		63.3	25.8	9.1	1.9	100
Karnataka	435	153	588	1	144	256	33	1	435
%	74.0	26.0	100.0	0.2	33.1	58.9	7.6	0.2	100
Kerala	178	21	199		28	92	57	1	178
%	89.4	10.6	100.0		15.7	51.7	32.0	0.6	100
Madhya Pradesh	604	279	883	1	351	165	82	5	604
%	68.4	31.6	100.0	0.2	58.1	27.3	13.6	0.8	100
Maharashtra	530	249	779		86	155	202	87	530
%	68.0	32.0	100.0		16.2	29.2	38.1	16.4	100
Orissa	139	83	222		31	90	18		139
%	62.6	37.4	100.0		22.3	64.7	12.9		100
Rajasthan	373	225	598		178	160	30	5	373
%	62.4	37.6	100.0		47.7	42.9	8.0	1.3	100
Sikkim	137	60	197		38	74	24	1	137
%	69.5	30.5	100.0		27.7	54.0	17.5	0.7	100
Uttar Pradesh	1104	778	1882	16	445	470	142	31	1104
%	58.7	41.3	100.0	1.4	40.3	42.6	12.9	2.8	100
Uttrakhand	112	83	195	2	16	53	34	7	112
%	57.4	42.6	100.0	1.8	14.3	47.3	30.4	6.3	100
West Bengal	345	118	463		15	124	181	25	345
%	74.5	25.5	100.0		4.3	35.9	52.5	7.2	100
Total	5950	3095	9045	25	2342	2328	1044	211	5950
%	65.8	34.2	100.0	0.4	39.4	39.1	17.5	3.5	100

Table A 84: Training Organized Covering Various Programmes/schemes

				Extent Beneficial					
State	Yes	No	Total	Poor	Satis factory	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Total
Andhra Pradesh	169	34	203	1	15	56	66	31	169
%	83.3	16.7	100.0	0.6	8.9	33.1	39.1	18.343	100
Arunachal Pradesh	316	95	411		32	217	67		316
%	76.9	23.1	100.0		10.1	68.7	21.2		100
Assam	391	218	609	1	90	180	112	8	391
%	64.2	35.8	100.0	0.3	23.0	46.0	28.6	2.0	100
Goa	147	56	203		144	3			147
%	72.4	27.6	100.0		98.0	2.0			100
Gujarat	364	242	606		215	143	5	1	364
%	60.1	39.9	100.0		59.1	39.3	1.4	0.3	100
Haryana	275	130	405		157	93	24	1	275
%	67.9	32.1	100.0		57.1	33.8	8.7	0.4	100
Himachal Pradesh	143	63	206		76	53	12	2	143
%	69.4	30.6	100.0		53.1	37.1	8.4	1.4	100
Jharkhand	265	131	396		166	68	27	4	265
%	66.9	33.1	100.0		62.6	25.7	10.2	1.5	100
Karnataka	424	164	588	1	144	243	35	1	424
%	72.1	27.9	100.0	0.2	34.0	57.3	8.3	0.2	100
Kerala	157	42	199		27	73	56	1	157
%	78.9	21.1	100.0		17.2	46.5	35.7	0.6	100
Madhya Pradesh	651	232	883	1	374	184	85	7	651
%	73.7	26.3	100.0	0.2	57.5	28.3	13.1	1.1	100
Maharashtra	532	247	779		71	164	206	91	532
%	68.3	31.7	100.0		13.3	30.8	38.7	17.1	100
Orissa	141	81	222		31	94	16		141
%	63.5	36.5	100.0		22.0	66.7	11.3		100
Rajasthan	372	226	598		176	151	36	9	372
%	62.2	37.8	100.0		47.3	40.6	9.7	2.4	100
Sikkim	138	59	197		32	81	24	1	138
%	70.1	29.9	100.0		23.2	58.7	17.4	0.7	100
Uttar Pradesh	1117	765	1882	3	426	459	191	38	1117
%	59.4	40.6	100.0	0.3	38.1	41.1	17.1	3.4	100
Uttrakhand	138	57	195		15	72	42	9	138
%	70.8	29.2	100.0		10.9	52.2	30.4	6.5	100
West Bengal	338	125	463	1	11	141	152	33	338
%	73.0	27.0	100.0	0.3	3.3	41.7	45.0	9.8	100
Total	6078	2967	9045	8	2202	2475	1156	237	6078
%	67.2	32.8	100.0	0.1	36.2	40.7	19.0	3.9	100

Table A 85: Training in Addition to RGSA

				Extent Beneficial					
State	Yes	No	Total	Poor	Satis factory	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Total
Andhra Pradesh	181	22	203		6	71	67	37	181
%	89.2	10.8	100.0		3.3	39.2	37.0	20.4	100
Arunachal Pradesh	316	95	411		53	206	57		316
%	76.9	23.1	100.0		16.8	65.2	18.0		100
Assam	388	221	609		100	171	113	4	388
%	63.7	36.3	100.0		25.8	44.1	29.1	1.0	100
Goa	147	56	203		144	3			147
%	72.4	27.6	100.0		98.0	2.0			100
Gujarat	364	242	606		221	139	3	1	364
%	60.1	39.9	100.0		60.7	38.2	0.8	0.3	100
Haryana	276	129	405		160	92	23	1	276
%	68.1	31.9	100.0		58.0	33.3	8.3	0.4	100
Himachal Pradesh	143	63	206		76	54	11	2	143
%	69.4	30.6	100.0		53.1	37.8	7.7	1.4	100
Jharkhand	264	132	396		166	69	25	4	264
%	66.7	33.3	100.0		62.9	26.1	9.5	1.5	100
Karnataka	424	164	588	1	144	249	28	2	424
%	72.1	27.9	100.0	0.2	34.0	58.7	6.6	0.5	100
Kerala	157	42	199		27	72	57	1	157
%	78.9	21.1	100.0		17.2	45.9	36.3	0.6	100
Madhya Pradesh	651	232	883	1	369	194	82	5	651
%	73.7	26.3	100.0	0.2	56.7	29.8	12.6	0.8	100
Maharashtra	530	249	779		71	172	192	95	530
%	68.0	32.0	100.0		13.4	32.5	36.2	17.9	100
Orissa	141	81	222		30	95	16		141
%	63.5	36.5	100.0		21.3	67.4	11.3		100
Rajasthan	371	227	598		172	161	33	5	371
%	62.0	38.0	100.0		46.4	43.4	8.9	1.3	100
Sikkim	137	60	197	1	33	76	27		137
%	69.5	30.5	100.0	0.7	24.1	55.5	19.7		100
Uttar Pradesh	1117	765	1882	2	439	460	196	20	1117
%	59.4	40.6	100.0	0.2	39.3	41.2	17.5	1.8	100
Uttrakhand	137	58	195	1	16	70	44	6	137
%	70.3	29.7	100.0	0.7	11.7	51.1	32.1	4.4	100
West Bengal	348	115	463	1	13	150	152	32	348
%	75.2	24.8	100.0	0.3	3.7	43.1	43.7	9.2	100
Total	6092	2953	9045	7	2240	2504	1126	215	6092
%	67.4	32.6	100.0	0.1	36.8	41.1	18.5	3.5	100

Table A 86: Developed Better Understanding Importance of e-Governance,

				Extent Beneficial					
State	Yes	No	Total	Poor	Satis factory	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Total
Andhra Pradesh	181	22	203		21	74	64	22	181
%	89.2	10.8	100.0		11.6	40.9	35.4	12.2	100
Arunachal Pradesh	298	113	411		101	179	18		298
%	72.5	27.5	100.0		33.9	60.1	6.0		100
Assam	436	173	609		86	219	128	3	436
%	71.6	28.4	100.0		19.7	50.2	29.4	0.7	100
Goa	146	57	203		134	11	1		146
%	71.9	28.1	100.0		91.8	7.5	0.7		100
Gujarat	364	242	606		64	203	97		364
%	60.1	39.9	100.0		17.6	55.8	26.6		100
Haryana	240	165	405	2	128	85	25		240
%	59.3	40.7	100.0	0.8	53.3	35.4	10.4		100
Himachal Pradesh	139	67	206		76	51	10	2	139
%	67.5	32.5	100.0		54.7	36.7	7.2	1.4	100
Jharkhand	265	131	396		68	142	55		265
%	66.9	33.1	100.0		25.7	53.6	20.8		100
Karnataka	420	168	588		70	244	106		420
%	71.4	28.6	100.0		16.7	58.1	25.2		100
Kerala	157	42	199		22	88	47		157
%	78.9	21.1	100.0		14.0	56.1	29.9		100
Madhya Pradesh	630	253	883		131	365	132	2	630
%	71.4	28.6	100.0		20.8	57.9	21.0	0.3	100
Maharashtra	524	255	779	3	61	189	192	79	524
%	67.3	32.7	100.0	0.6	11.6	36.1	36.6	15.1	100
Orissa	142	80	222		27	85	30		142
%	64.0	36.0	100.0		19.0	59.9	21.1		100
Rajasthan	361	237	598		89	203	69		361
%	60.4	39.6	100.0		24.7	56.2	19.1		100
Sikkim	138	59	197	1	24	79	34		138
%	70.1	29.9	100.0	0.7	17.4	57.2	24.6		100
Uttar Pradesh	1106	776	1882	6	397	535	153	15	1106
%	58.8	41.2	100.0	0.5	35.9	48.4	13.8	1.4	100
Uttrakhand	137	58	195		24	80	33		137
%	70.3	29.7	100.0		17.5	58.4	24.1		100
West Bengal	373	90	463	6	51	191	107	18	373
%	80.6	19.4	100.0	1.6	13.7	51.2	28.7	4.8	100
Total	6057	2988	9045	18	1576	3024	1301	141	6060
%	67.0	33.0	100.0	0.3	26.0	49.9	21.5	2.3	100

Table A 87: Able to Undertake Gram Panchayat Development Work

	Able to undertake			Extent Beneficial					
State	Yes	No	Total	Poor	Satis factory	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Total
Andhra Pradesh	169	34	203		25	53	58	33	169
%	83.3	16.7	100.0		14.8	31.4	34.3	19.5	100
Arunachal Pradesh	315	96	411		46	227	42		315
%	76.6	23.4	100.0		14.6	72.1	13.3		100
Assam	383	226	609	2	105	186	83	7	383
%	62.9	37.1	100.0	0.5	27.4	48.6	21.7	1.8	100
Goa	147	56	203		142	5			147
%	72.4	27.6	100.0		96.6	3.4			100
Gujarat	366	240	606		243	117	5	1	366
%	60.4	39.6	100.0		66.4	32.0	1.4	0.3	100
Haryana	273	132	405		121	130	22		273
%	67.4	32.6	100.0		44.3	47.6	8.1		100
Himachal Pradesh	143	63	206		76	55	10	2	143
%	69.4	30.6	100.0		53.1	38.5	7.0	1.4	100
Jharkhand	265	131	396		171	64	27	3	265
%	66.9	33.1	100.0		64.5	24.2	10.2	1.1	100
Karnataka	423	165	588	1	170	222	29	1	423
%	71.9	28.1	100.0	0.2	40.2	52.5	6.9	0.2	100
Kerala	156	43	199		45	57	53	1	156
%	78.4	21.6	100.0		28.8	36.5	34.0	0.6	100
Madhya Pradesh	617	266	883	2	357	230	23	5	617
%	69.9	30.1	100.0	0.3	57.9	37.3	3.7	0.8	100
Maharashtra	526	253	779	2	87	174	173	90	526
%	67.5	32.5	100.0	0.4	16.5	33.1	32.9	17.1	100
Orissa	139	83	222		27	96	16		139
%	62.6	37.4	100.0		19.4	69.1	11.5		100
Rajasthan	373	225	598		82	264	22	5	373
%	62.4	37.6	100.0		22.0	70.8	5.9	1.3	100
Sikkim	137	60	197		32	87	18		137
%	69.5	30.5	100.0		23.4	63.5	13.1		100
Uttar Pradesh	1126	756	1882	5	463	499	131	28	1126
%	59.8	40.2	100.0	0.4	41.1	44.3	11.6	2.5	100
Uttrakhand	129	66	195	1	10	104	9	5	129
%	66.2	33.8	100.0	0.8	7.8	80.6	7.0	3.9	100
West Bengal	337	126	463		11	136	163	27	337
%	72.8	27.2	100.0		3.3	40.4	48.4	8.0	100
Total	6024	3021	9045	13	2213	2706	884	208	6024
%	66.6	33.4	100.0	0.2	36.7	44.9	14.7	3.5	100

Table A 88: Able to Manage Development Work

	Able to manage development work			Extent Beneficial					
State	Yes	No	Total	Poor	Satis factory	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Total
Andhra Pradesh	165	38	203		27	58	55	25	165
%	81.3	18.7	100.0		16.4	35.2	33.3	15.2	100
Arunachal Pradesh	298	113	411		46	204	48		298
%	72.5	27.5	100.0		15.4	68.5	16.1		100
Assam	423	186	609		116	214	86	7	423
%	69.5	30.5	100.0		27.4	50.6	20.3	1.7	100
Goa	147	56	203		144	2	1		147
%	72.4	27.6	100.0		98.0	1.4	0.7		100
Gujarat	367	239	606		265	93	8	1	367
%	60.6	39.4	100.0		72.2	25.3	2.2	0.3	100
Haryana	255	150	405		155	75	25		255
%	63.0	37.0	100.0		60.8	29.4	9.8		100
Himachal Pradesh	142	64	206		76	54	10	2	142
%	68.9	31.1	100.0		53.5	38.0	7.0	1.4	100
Jharkhand	264	132	396		173	63	23	5	264
%	66.7	33.3	100.0		65.5	23.9	8.7	1.9	100
Karnataka	421	167	588	1	151	213	54	2	421
%	71.6	28.4	100.0	0.2	35.9	50.6	12.8	0.5	100
Kerala	158	41	199		42	67	48	1	158
%	79.4	20.6	100.0		26.6	42.4	30.4	0.6	100
Madhya Pradesh	607	276	883	4	426	125	47	5	607
%	68.7	31.3	100.0	0.7	70.2	20.6	7.7	0.8	100
Maharashtra	532	247	779	4	81	160	194	93	532
%	68.3	31.7	100.0	0.8	15.2	30.1	36.5	17.5	100
Orissa	141	81	222		35	84	22		141
%	63.5	36.5	100.0		24.8	59.6	15.6		100
Rajasthan	371	227	598		150	170	46	5	371
%	62.0	38.0	100.0		40.4	45.8	12.4	1.3	100
Sikkim	148	49	197		40	89	19		148
%	75.1	24.9	100.0		27.0	60.1	12.8		100
Uttar Pradesh	1123	759	1882	11	491	474	114	33	1123
%	59.7	40.3	100.0	1.0	43.7	42.2	10.2	2.9	100
Uttrakhand	115	80	195	1	45	50	13	6	115
%	59.0	41.0	100.0	0.9	39.1	43.5	11.3	5.2	100
West Bengal	358	105	463		8	123	192	35	358
%	77.3	22.7	100.0		2.2	34.4	53.6	9.8	100
Total	6035	3010	9045	21	2471	2318	1005	220	6035
%	66.7	33.3	100.0	0.3	40.9	38.4	16.7	3.6	100

Table A 89: Plans developed in the Gram Panchayat

				Extent Beneficial			
State	Yes	No	Total	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Total
Andhra Pradesh	168	35	203	25	50	93	168
%	82.8	17.2	100.0	14.9	29.8	55.4	100.0
Arunachal Pradesh	318	93	411	62	223	33	318
%	77.4	22.6	100.0	19.5	70.1	10.4	100.0
Assam	495	114	609	124	261	110	495
%	81.3	18.7	100.0	25.1	52.7	22.2	100.0
Goa	147	56	203	145	1	1	147
%	72.4	27.6	100.0	98.6	0.7	0.7	100.0
Gujarat	396	210	606	291	95	10	396
%	65.3	34.7	100.0	73.5	24.0	2.5	100.0
Haryana	272	133	405	161	82	29	272
%	67.2	32.8	100.0	59.2	30.1	10.7	100.0
Himachal Pradesh	143	63	206	81	52	10	143
%	69.4	30.6	100.0	56.6	36.4	7.0	100.0
Jharkhand	258	138	396	164	58	36	258
%	65.2	34.8	100.0	63.6	22.5	14.0	100.0
Karnataka	481	107	588	166	250	65	481
%	81.8	18.2	100.0	34.5	52.0	13.5	100.0
Kerala	175	24	199	44	84	47	175
%	87.9	12.1	100.0	25.1	48.0	26.9	100.0
Madhya Pradesh	620	263	883	447	140	33	620
%	70.2	29.8	100.0	72.1	22.6	5.3	100.0
Maharashtra	542	237	779	85	162	295	542
%	69.6	30.4	100.0	15.7	29.9	54.4	100.0
Orissa	142	80	222	41	88	13	142
%	64.0	36.0	100.0	28.9	62.0	9.2	100.0
Rajasthan	372	226	598	174	172	26	372
%	62.2	37.8	100.0	46.8	46.2	7.0	100.0
Sikkim	138	59	197	35	79	24	138
%	70.1	29.9	100.0	25.4	57.2	17.4	100.0
Uttar Pradesh	1116	766	1882	504	450	162	1116
%	59.3	40.7	100.0	45.2	40.3	14.5	100.0
Uttarakhand	138	57	195	75	47	16	138
%	70.8	29.2	100.0	54.3	34.1	11.6	100.0
West Bengal	383	80	463	17	144	222	383
%	82.7	17.3	100.0	4.4	37.6	58.0	100.0
Total	6304	2741	9045	2641	2438	1225	6304
%	69.7	30.3	100.0	41.9	38.7	19.4	100.0