

Practitioner Input Form
Submitted: 15/02/2005

Input Record Number	005
Name	Simon Howarth (Study Team Leader/Project Manager, Gladys Nott (Senior Social Scientist
Contact Information	Simon.howarth@mottmac.com , gladys@nott.u-net.com
Organisation(s) Involved	DFID, Mott MacDonald, Department of Water Resources - Kyrgyz Republic, Department of Irrigation – Nepal, Irrigation Department – Andhra Pradesh – India, Water Resources Bureau – Xinjiang, China
Geographic Area	Kyrgyzstan, Nepal, India. China: October 2003 – June 2005 DFID Equity Irrigation and Poverty R8338/ Action research fieldwork has been completed. Data analysis and report preparation in progress.
Dates	October 2003 – June 2005
Communities Involved	Irrigation water users in two irrigation schemes near Osh, Kyrgyzstan (Obu Haet and Jany Aryk), two irrigation schemes in Nepal (Khageri Irrigation Scheme and Sunsari Morang Irrigation Scheme), four WUAs in the Sriramsagar Irrigation Project in Andra Pradesh, India.
Duties and Responsibilities/ Purpose of Project	The purpose of this study is to investigate mechanisms for ensuring fair distribution of irrigation water to all users regardless of socio-economic status or location. This would be achieved by enabling user organisations to share water in an agreed and trusted manner, so that poor farmers receive an improved supply, and their livelihood outcomes are improved.
Context of Intervention	Rural irrigation schemes. The two irrigation schemes in Nepal are both in rural areas of the Terai. One of the two irrigation schemes in Kyrgyzstan is in a rural area, the other is in a peri-urban area near the Osh, the provincial capital. The locations in Andra Pradesh, India are rural.

Practitioner Reflective Case Study

Input Record Number	005 RCS Simon Howarth
<p>1) The mechanisms we used could be categorized as ‘social’, ‘institutional’ and ‘technical’. Our research teams worked with the Water Users Association and water users over two seasons to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Evaluate existing systems of water management, using participatory methods and direct observations. - Identify with water users potential improvements to the system of monitoring water distribution. - Analyse the institutional arrangements needed to introduce those methods. <p>One of the outputs of the evaluation stage of the process was the preparation of a household listing and wellbeing ranking. We used this listing to help us to ensure that members of poor households were recruited as Farmer Observers and participated in our focus group discussions. We formed groups of FOs and WUA representatives to work through the problems of access to water and to develop solutions to these. However, we took care to ensure that all categories of users were represented in these groups as improvements to access by the poor cannot be achieved without reaching a consensus over methods with other water users. These groups met periodically, sometimes as a large group and sometimes broken down into sub-groups in various ways (either well-being, gender, or location).</p> <p>2) These were very promising mechanisms, particularly in Nepal where (in one case) we had the earlier experience with the same WUA to build on and they were thus very receptive. WUAs in Nepal are generally weak and are disillusioned with the progress that they have been able to make, but we had been able to correct this weakness through the water users’ schools.</p> <p>WUAs in Kyrgyzstan are rather newer, so they have not yet become disillusioned, and they are keen to learn and to innovate. However, they are weak in some respects, and there is a lack of awareness or confusion over their role, both amongst the users and the executives of the WUA. This limited the progress that we were able to make, given that our study was limited to one cropping season. Nevertheless, we feel that the mechanisms are sound and useful.</p> <p>We were unable to test the approach in Andhra Pradesh, as the irrigation was cancelled for this season. We anticipate that they would face similar problems to Kyrgyzstan and perhaps to a greater degree as the WUAs have recently been re-elected, while having been given little recent support.</p> <p>3) – The ability to reach a consensus on where water is authorized to be taken from, and rules for sharing water which ensure that poor farmers are equally likely to receive water.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The number of places where water was taken illegally from the canals. - The ability to implement systematic water distribution. <p>Water reaching all fields within the command areas.</p>	

Practitioner Input – Part II

Input Record Number	005II Simon Howarth
9)	I have left the purely consulting field, but built consultation and inclusive decision-making processes into our projects, even though it is more policy-related.
10)	No.
11)	- Site visits, discussions with the communities - Discussion with consultants in rural areas
12)	Interaction with the affected communities from problem identification to needs analyses to construction, implementation and monitoring. Involve the communities!!
13)	- Developing Makeli based mechanism for watershed services (Nieda King, CSIR Environmental +2712 8412842) - CAMP project (catchment Management for Poverty Alleviation) – Graham von Maltiz +2712 8418672 - Deepening Democracy through IWRM – Sustainable relationships for a scarce natural resource. Einita von Wyt +2712 8412672. - Melanie Wiltenson +2712 8413722