

CAC- Phase II Project Completion Report Format

PTF-PAC: CAC- Project Completion Report¹

Name of the CSO:

Consumer Unity & Trust Society (CUTS International)

Address:

277, Sindhi Colony, Bhaskar Marg, Bani Park, Jaipur, 302016, Rajasthan, India;
Telephone: 91-141-5133259/2282821, Email: cart@cuts.org; gc@cuts.org Web:
www.cuts-international.org

Project name & PTF code:

“Reforming the Processes in the Rural Development Department through Policy Dialogue and Civic Engagement, based on RTI Act (2005) in Rajasthan, India”

1. Project Goal:

Contribute towards reduced corruption in processes of National Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme (NREGS), *Swarnajayanti Gram Swarajgar Yojana* (SGSY) and *Indira Aawas Yojana* (IAY) implemented by the Panchayati Raj and Rural Development (PR & RD) Department in Rajasthan, India.

2. Project Objectives:

As specified in the Approved Project proposal	Status of achievement at completion
Reduced incidence of bribery/ corruption experience by the project	<i>Corruption Vulnerability Analysis:</i> In post RGR 21 percent overall beneficiaries have accepted that they have paid bribe (Pre RGR 27 percent) to service providers and the amount of this given bribe was varied from one person to another which come on an average around P285 per beneficiary in whole interventional areas in NREGS which is P18 lesser than the Pre RGR figure of P303.

¹ It is suggested that the Annexes be prepared first.

<p>area citizens for service delivery under the targeted schemes of Rural Development Department.</p>	<p>In IAY, only 34 percent respondents accepted (Pre RGR 52 percent) that they have paid cash bribe for availing the benefits of this scheme at various level of service delivery. In this case as well the amount of bribe demanded from beneficiary was different in most of the cases and after negotiations; the bribe paid to various service providers mainly to Gram Sachiv comes around P960 in each case.</p> <p>In SGSY 13 percent beneficiaries said to pay bribe (Pre RGR 18 percent) mainly to bank officials for doing the long pending grading of their group and than accordingly sanctioning the subsidy loan and transferring it in their account. The bribed amount comes around P417 on an average in cash. One important aspect of this story is that NGOs who are coordinating the ground level activities have to pay a fixed percentage of bribe at <i>Zila Parisad</i> level while getting check of their honorarium for tasks completed and as a result they start to compromise with the field activities therefore they can follow up properly with bank officials and their grading gets delayed and they have to pay bribe to speed up the process.</p>
<p>Transparency and accountability in the target schemes increased through increased use of RTI act.</p>	<p>Under the project around 450 RTI applications were filed by CGCCs and local community/beneficiaries in the selected three scheme of state government with a focus on the corrupt issues came out of survey and experienced by them while availing the services of these schemes.</p> <p>In NREGS total 199 RTI applications were file and out of those 23 were related to registration for job and making job cards. 21 people filed RTI asking about the reasons of giving priority of few people (who were near and dears one of service providers) in providing Jobs ignoring other entitlement holders. Under the scheme 47 RTI applications were filed because service providers were lenient in work measurement and given extra benefits in comparison to other common people.</p> <p>In NREGS adding names of family members and friends of <i>Sarpanch</i> and other PRIs can be seen often so targeting this issue total 38 RTI applications were filed by beneficiaries/ CGCCs asking reasons of adding name without working in must rolls and photocopies. 05 RTI attempted to ask about taking commissions in payment of wages, and 65 were related to the worksite facilities.</p> <p>In SGSY total 89 RTI applications were filed and the issue of grading was targeted most. So majority of RTI Applications (69) were filed related to this issue, which has to be done by the concerned bank. There were some incidences of corruption in the selection of beneficiaries and group formation that was done NGOs so 11 RTI were filed to target that issue. At bank level bribe is demanded for granting loan and disbursement of that grant so such nine issue were identified and filed RTI asking the reasons of delay in disbursement of grants and in one case grant was immediately given, in 03 cases it took months</p>

to get the grant and in case of 05 cases still grants were not given. In few cases the NGOs that are responsible for mobilising and coordinating the SGSY activities at field level are taking money from beneficiaries and making savings from expenses sanctioned for them and compromising with quality.

In IAY total 150 RTI applications were filed by raising the issues of corruption in the selection process and for that 38 applications were filed. Second issue was changing the orders of beneficiary in the list and for that 26 applications were file for enquiring about the reasons. While giving sanctioned check by *Gram Sachiv* (16), During inspection of under construction house (05), during encashment of check by bank officials (06). Under the project painting the list of beneficiaries was given prime focus and for that total 74 applications were filed to know about the current status of this and actions taken in future to write this. In case of 33 applications demanded information was received mentioning that this list is not written at GP level and appeal has been done in 26 cases before *Sarpanch*, who is first appellate authority.

Details of RTI Applications in various schemes:

S. No.	Name of Scheme	Subject of RTI application	No. Of RTI	Info. Received	Cases in Appeal
1.	NREGS	Registration and making job cards	23		
2.	„	Priority in providing jobs	21		
3.	„	Payment of higher wages	47		
4.	„	Fake names in must rolls	38		
5.	„	Commissions in payment	16		
6.	„	Worksite facilities	65		
		Total	209	124	26
1.	SGSY	Selection of beneficiaries and group formation	11		
2.	„	Grading of the group	69		
3.	„	Disbursement of grant and granting loan	09		
		Total	89	66	13
1.	IAY	Selection of beneficiaries	26		
2.	„	Changing the order up in the list o	23		
3.	„	Giving sanctioned check by GS	16		
4.	„	Inspection of constructing house	05		
5.	„	Check Encashment at Bank	09		
6.	„	Proactive disclosure of list of beneficiaries	74		
		Total	153	98	21

	<p>In most of the RTI applications, the information demanded was related to some act of corruption, and can be called an attempt to hit the corrupt service providers. Through strategic RTI filing by common man, these corrupt processes were targeted so that systemic issues of corruption are fixed and change can be initiated and service providers are made accountable. These RTI applications were need based and represent most burning issues among beneficiaries. These applications were filed individually but were supported collectively. Satisfactory resolution of these RTI applications resulted in to simplifying the processes, resolving the problems, enhancing responsiveness of services providers and reducing corruption experience of common people in interventional areas.</p>
<p>Citizens in the project area are able to obtain corruption free services through empowered network of CGCCs that act as 'watchdogs'</p>	<p>Though there is no exact data in answer of the question that how many people got corruption free service delivery through using RTI but there is a scientific estimation that most of the beneficiaries who filed RTI as mentioned above and many of the callers on RAIC who filed RTI also got corruption free service delivery of the selected schemes. As came out during the impact assessment exercise through FGDs that during the public interface meetings, RTI evening classes, Block RTI Chaupals, advocacy meetings and relentless work of CGCCs among community made aware to hundreds of common people (who are victims of corruption) about the RTI filing process and some of them also had used the RTI for getting corruption free services of the selected scheme as few success stories were reported.</p>

3. Project Area location:

The project was implemented in two districts namely, Tonk under Ajmer division and Jaipur under Jaipur division.

4. Project period:

a) **Original:** The duration of the project was of one year, i.e. from May 01, 2009 to April 30, 2010. The project was extended for five more months from May 01, 2010 to September 30, 2010.

b) **Actual:** Despite the extended time period, the one project activity of developing RTI Toolkit or Model Framework for Replication went on up to February, 2011.

5. Project Budget

P17,58,000

6. Budget utilised as on February, 2011

P16,71,968

7. Project Completion Summary (maximum five pages)

CUTS Centre for Consumer Action, Research & Training (CUTS CART), one of the programme centers of Consumer Unity & Trust Society (CUTS), in partnership with the Partnership for Transparency Fund (PTF), Washington DC, implemented a project, entitled 'Reforming the Processes in the Rural Development Department through Policy and Civic Engagement, Based on RTI Act (2005) in Rajasthan, India', from May 2009 to September 2010. The activities under the project had been confined to two districts of Rajasthan, Jaipur and Tonk, and had been conceived to make the attempts more rigorous and deeper in defeating corruption.

It was done through diagnosing systemic causes of various facets of corruption and adopting measures to address them through simplifying the service delivery process, re-institutionalising agency processes and enhancing transparency and people's participation. These efforts ultimately contributed to improving RTI response capacity of service providers by using RTI Act as a tool in the NREGS, SGSY and IAY implemented by the *Panchayati Raj* and Rural Development Department, Rajasthan Government.

A network of trained & resourceful CGCCs, CSOs and other interested individuals working together for transparency and accountability in all 17 blocks of Jaipur and Tonk districts was formed and started to work in a focused manner, which resulted in the emergence of trained critical mass within the community, increased use of RTI for targeting corruption issues and denial of benefits meant for common man in case of not paying bribe in turn.

An RTI Advisory and Information Cell was started to advice and educate the masses, proactive citizenries and victims of corruption about the RTI Act and its usages in government departments and targeting the areas of corruption to get corruption-free service delivery meant for them. An orientation the concerned staff was conducted for handling it effectively. A total 210 phone calls were received and most of the callers were facing a situation in which service providers were demanding bribes in lieu of rendering the entitled services. More than 43 callers/visitors filed RTI applications in various departments (26 of them received demanded information) and used it as a tool which helped these 41 people to avail those services without paying any bribe, denied earlier.

The 'RTI Ground Realities and Corruption Vulnerability Survey' was conducted with 600 scheme beneficiaries, engaging the consortium of CGCCs. This survey revealed that every beneficiary of NREGS (average P303), IAY (P1268) and SGSY (P660) were paying bribes to avail the benefits. In Jaipur and Tonk districts, total bribes paid were: in NREGS (P14.9 crores), IAY (P48 lakh) and SGSY (P37 lakh). These findings

formed the basis for evidence-based advocacy and constructive and continued dialogue with high officials of the concerned Rural Development Department.

This constructive dialogue with the government resulted in passing office orders related to transparency and accountability. This data of RTI Ground Realities and Corruption Vulnerability Analysis (RGR & CVA) survey was disseminated widely to the common masses and service providers by organising 'RTI Block Level RTI *Chaupals*' (BLRCs) in all the 17 blocks of both the districts and their views and suggestions were invited. '*Chaupal*' means a meeting place of local villagers to discuss day-to-day issues with each other. In these BLRCs, strategies were also discussed to make the service delivery system free from corruption by using RTI as a tool.

A 10-member delegation visited Kozhikode and Wynadu districts of Kerala during November 13-18, 2009. The delegates included *Sarpanch* and *Gram Sachiv*, Mundia and Harsulia *Gram Panchayats* and Sub-divisional Officer, Niwai, Tonk. Two NGO partners from SAJAG and NEH Sansthan and three staff members from CUTS were part of the delegation. The visit was very educative, eye opener and full of learning for all the visitors which helped them in understanding the best practices related to people's planning process at ward and *Gram Panchayat* level out there and imbibing these to implement in their working areas in selected districts. It is significant to mention that, in India, it is the state of Kerala where 40 percent of the total plan outlay of the Rural Development and *Panchayati Raj* Department goes directly to the *Gram Panchayats*.

As an outcome, one visiting official passed an order down the line in all *Gram Panchayats* and Block Development Offices to have a complaint-cum-suggestion box, fixed at some prominent place of their office so that common citizens could drop their complaints and later actions can be taken by concerned officials. The order was followed in some of the *Gram Panchayats* and the visiting official also placed a complaint cum suggestion box in his office just after returning from this visit. This exposure visit was extremely helpful in ensuring the participation of these key stakeholders throughout the project period.

Efforts were made to develop a Model RTI *Gram Panchayat* (MRGP) in each district to ensure transparency, accountability and corruption-free service delivery system in selected schemes. In these MRGPs, community mobilisation programmes were organised in villages regarding RTI awareness, filing process, identified areas of corruption and using RTI as a tool so that they all avail services without paying bribes.

As a result of these mass mobilisation efforts, slogan writings and frequent visits, more than 90 people came forward to file RTI applications on corruption issues prevalent in the three selected schemes. In both the districts, 450 RTI applications were filed. These applications were based on issues of corruption that cropped up during the RGR and CVA survey: The information demanded in most of the RTI applications was related to acts of corruption. These RTI applications were need-based, represented burning issues among beneficiaries and were filed individually, but supported collectively. These also contributed to simplifying the processes, use of RTI

by common people, satisfactory resolution of problems, enhancing responsiveness of services providers and reducing corruption experienced by common people.

Two advocacy meetings were organised at the state level and participation of policy makers and media was ensured. These meetings were extremely useful and fruitful in terms of putting the ground realities and corruption vulnerability survey findings before the policy makers. As an outcome of these meetings, official orders were given to ensure transparency and accountability measures in governmental schemes.

A set of recommendations for simplified and transparent service delivery processes of the selected schemes was submitted to the government and policy makers to take appropriate actions.

A model framework for replication or RTI Toolkit has been published in which entire project-related experiences, tools, methodology, community participation model, success stories and best practices have been incorporated so that similar intervention can be replicated elsewhere as well. To develop the model framework for replication, a concept note was prepared and shared with key stakeholders mentioning the target audience, objectives/ purpose, content/structure/usage/ dissemination/replication.

The project team was experienced and in terms of the subject knowledge, communication skills, rapport building, extensive field visits and networking with the proactive citizens against corruption or CGCCs was good which contributed towards achieving the project outcomes and goal. The involvement of the Community especially people who were victims of corruption was good during the project period in terms of participating in the activities, using RTI as tool, raising the issue in front of service providers; motivating others for filing RTI applications on areas of corruption in selected schemes.

Attitude of the policy makers and bureaucrats in general towards initiatives against corruption was not that much encouraging. Most of the service providers either stay away from the discussions on public platforms or spoke very carefully on the issue. But few officials were cooperative in nature so such cooperative officials and public representatives were pursued and motivated through inviting in some other programmes of their interest where they can get an opportunity to meet with ministers or international experts/professionals.

The problem of frequent transfer of bureaucrats and other service providers break the rhythm of project progress but provide opportunity to replicate the model at new place where the official has to be transferred but it was a bit difficult for the team to orient the new officials towards the project activities and things has to started from scratch with them.

If we see, most of the NGOs are having small budget turnover and heavily depend on government's small grants so it is difficult to talk against corrupt officials whom they are dealing with. As an impact of this project, one CGCC member (Deepak Mishra)

refused to pay bribe to service providers from the received remuneration for implementing SGSY scheme in a block of Jaipur district and surrendered the scheme to government back by opposing the corruption prevailed in the concerned department, which encouraged other CGCCs as well to fight against corruption.

Advocacy with government regarding reforming the corrupt process was very difficult but the top-down approach of advocacy and involvement of state Rural Development minister also motivated down the line officials to take some actions and behave responsibly. In the advocacy efforts CGCCs were also made part wherever it was necessary. So in total this intervention made a sincere effort with the help of a critical mass of people to combat the corruption using RTI and reforming the corrupt process so that systemic forms of corruption are eliminated.

7.1 Strategies used to achieve project goal and objectives

The main strategies which were used to achieve the project goal were to create a pool of CGCCs among community and building their capacity to combat corruption with the usage of RTI and engaging community. Rigorous effort was made to mobilized community against the corruption and using RTI as tool on one hand and engaging in constructive dialogue with service providers from state level up to Block and Panchayat level and raising the areas and issues of corruption before them to reform the corrupt service delivery processes on the other hand. So it was not other than a research based advocacy to policy makers. There was direct intervention with the scheme beneficiaries for identifying their corruption vulnerability and empowering them to get corruption free services through using RTI as a tool.

7.2. Project activities (Details in Annex 1)

1.1 Identification of potential, enthusiastic, proactive and grassroots based community members and CSOs for CGCCs and CSOs network.

1.2 Orientation of selected CGCCs and CSOs representatives. Strategy formulation, Task assignment, Target setting as per project objectives.

1.3 Supportive monitoring and periodic evaluation of activities, targets and tasks Assigned to CGCCs or CSO representatives.

2.2 Maintaining records related to users and their feedbacks forms given.

2.3 Following up the users, to know about their satisfaction level, corruption freeness and time taken in resolving the problem.

3.1 Developing questionnaires survey, keeping indicators of objectives and goal in mind.

3.2 Orientation of surveyors about used tools and techniques

3.3 Data collection, Analysis and preparing results framework and updating final LFA

4.1 Two CGCCs Orientation Programme

4.2 17 Block Level RTI Chaupals (Jaipur 11 and Tonk 06)

4.3 Exposure Visit of selected 10 highly motivated and committed persons in dealing with corruption will be provided an opportunity to visit some *Gram Panchayats* of Kerala to witness the good practices of good governance

5.1 Scoping visits

5.2 Base line: Citizen's Report Card of select schemes keeping project outcomes and their means of verification in mind, analysis of findings and targets setting

5.3 Promoting filing of RTI applications by corruption victims for quality services

5.4 Three interface meetings of beneficiaries and GP members/officials to discuss the Issues & experiences of corruptions in routine meetings by ensuring peoples' Participation.

5.5 RTI evening classes & Youth and women mobilisation meetings

5.6 RTI orientation of the Service Providers/PRI members to educate & handle RTI Applications.

5.7 Move for proactive disclosure of information, End line: Citizen's Report Card, Analysis, comparison of baseline and end line data.

6.1 Constantly mobilising and providing resource material and other required support to CGCCs / CSOs networkers and proactive citizens will be provided and follow up of RTI applications will be done.

7.1 Issue, evidence and demand-based periodic meetings with multilevel target groups

7.2 Ensuring participation of demand and supply side key stakeholders including CUTS CART, CGCCs/ CSOs representative and officials.

7.3 Analysing decisions and actions taken and their implementation and ground level impact on reducing corruption in select schemes.

7.4 One day Mid Term Dissemination cum Advocacy Meeting: A set of recommendations will emerge out with the stake of service providers and service recipients.

7.5 State level Advocacy Meeting: A set of recommendations for procedural changes will be formed and put forward before state policy makers and programme implementers through a day long State Advocacy Workshop at state level.

8.1 Eight Focus Group Discussions

8.2 Analysis and Documentation of FGDs.

9.1 Design one RTK, which can be used for wider dissemination and replication

10.1 Preparation and distribution of Newsletter, mainly publishing project outputs

7.3 Project outputs (Details in Annex 2)

- RTI Ground Realities and corruption vulnerability survey.
- RTI Advisory and Information Centre established by second month of project and a RTI Tool kit produced by second last month of the project.
- Formation of 17 CGCCs and a Network of CGCC, CSOs and other interested individuals to work together for transparency and accountability in target schemes using RTI.
- Two Model RTI Gram Panchayat established
- At least 340 RTI Applications filed.
- At least 30 dialogue/peer learning events (2 district, 17 block level, one exposure visit One Mid Tern Advocacy, one final Advocacy Meeting and 8 FGDs) process with policy makers and implementers and citizens to mobilisation against corrupt processes, share their experiences regarding being victim of corrupt service providers and educating them for use of RTI Act for resolving and fighting against it for rooting out the causes of it.
- Set of recommendations for Simplified & transparent Service Delivery Processes.
- At least 85 (05 per CGCC) documented Case Studies of obtaining corruption free services under target schemes.
- 04 Quarterly Newsletters

7.4 Project Impact on Corruption (Outcomes /Results) (Details in Annex 3)

- Reduced incidence of bribery/corruption experience by the project area citizens for service delivery under the targeted schemes

- Transparency and accountability in the target schemes increased through increased use of the RTI Act
- Ensuring corruption free services through empowered network of the CGCCs, CSOs & other interested citizens that do advocacy at multiple levels and play the role of 'watchdog'

7.5 Self-Assessment of Project Progress:

Project team's capacity and contributions;

Team was good in terms of knowledge, communication skills, rapport building, extensive field visits and networking and all these qualities contributed towards achieving the project outcomes and goal.

Community involvement and support; any significant impact seen

Community involvement was good during the project period in terms of participating in the activities, using RTI as tool, raising the issue in front of service providers; filing RTI applications on areas of corruption in selected schemes.

External factors affecting project success - positively or negatively for the past one year

Attitude of the policy makers and bureaucrats in general towards initiatives against corruption was negative. Frequent transfers of service providers slowed down the progress of outcomes and it was difficult for team to orient the new officials about the project activities and sensitise them.

8. Lessons Learnt and their Replicability

Difficulties faced: -

- a. Most of the service providers either stay away from the discussions on public platforms. Such cooperative officials and public representatives shall be pursued and motivated through inviting them in other programmes of their interest where they can get opportunity to meet with ministers or international experts/professionals.
- b. The problem of frequent transfer of bureaucrats and other service providers break the rhythm of project progress but provide opportunity to replicate the model at new place where the official has to be transferred.
- c. The lengthy election process of *Panchayati Raj* Institutions also created problems in advocacy, dialogue process and ensuring participation of service providers in few block *Chaupals* and exposure visit to Kerala.
- d. Advocacy with government regarding reforming the corrupt process was very difficult but the top-down approach of advocacy and involvement of state Rural Development minister also motivated down the line officials to take some actions and behave responsibly.

- e. Most of the NGOs are small budget turnover and heavily depend on government's small grants so it is difficult to talk against corrupt officials whom they are dealing with.
- f. Completing all the project activities within the stipulated time.
- g. Tracking success of all the RTI applicants was a challenge.
- h. Setting up a Model RTI *Gram Panchayat* in terms of fully transparent, accountable and corruption freeness is difficult.
- i. Getting feedback from government officials and most of the RTI applicants about the extended help by CGCCs was a bit difficult.

Successes met: -

- j. Involvement of community is essential for the point of view of sustainability as well as owning the project's goals.
- k. Dialogue with concerned state minister/bureaucrats and service providers who are willing to bring some change.
- l. Internal monitoring system of the project activities has to be inbuilt in the organisation and project so that project goals can be achieved.

Operational issues with other stakeholders like government, community, Panchayat/municipality etc.: --

Government: State government always says that they are trying hard to bring good governance by motivating NGOs to do so. Higher level officials talk in good terms but lower level service providers never favor the move of ensuring corruption free service delivery of selected schemes.

Panchayats: The elected PRI representatives are bigger disappointment than government officials and they are not ready to work against corruption.

Explain where and how your experiences can be replicated: -

The CGCC model can be replicated where public participation has to be ensured and a network formed against corruption. This can be done through selecting proactive CSOs, people and citizens and building their capacity to work as a local resource agency for providing help to general masses and act as a watchdog against corrupt officials and system.

The Model RTI *Gram Panchayat* experience can also be replicated and this can be done through wider community mobilisation, identifying the areas of corruption in

Gram Panchayat, sensitisation of service providers for the corruption-free system and enhancing their response capacity.

9 . Constructive Engagement

The Rural Development Minister of Rajasthan government was very cooperative throughout the project period and always available for discussions and ensured the things to happen on ground. The Director of IAY, RP Chaudhary and Director of SGSY Pankaj Agrawal were extremely useful and cooperative in terms of participating in project meetings and dialogue events.

Throughout the project period, *Gram Sachivs* of both the MRGPs (Suraj Bhan Giri and Vikar Ahmad) and *Sarpanch* (Bajarang Lal Pareek and Ram Gopal Meena) were highly cooperative including their ward members. They worked as project partner. One SDO of Niwai block Kailash Narayan Meena and Chief Executive Officer of Jaipur *Zila Parisad* Nishkam Diwakar were also very supportive throughout the project period. Last but not least, all 34 CGCCs who belong to various small NGOs, were real actors of this intervention in all the blocks and both the districts.

As a result of this engagement Number of officials and political leaders are supportive of such initiatives taken under various projects but their motivation has to be maintained during the intervention. Media people are very much supportive of such initiatives against corruption and play a good role in giving wider coverage to the initiatives and issues.

10. Community Empowerment

The contribution of CBOs/NGOs has been very crucial as well as effective in this intervention and remarkable in terms of community mobilisation, sensitising the community against the issue of corruption in governments and benefits meant for the poor. They helped in identifying the areas of corruption etc. Under this project, a network of 34 CSOs/NGOs was formed and made active up to the extent that they can contact and share their experience with each other. They are sustainable in the sense that they have inbuilt this work agenda in their organisation's mission work and will carry forward till organisation is functional.

11. Peer Learning

The experience of such peer learning visits is always good if things are clear to visitors that what good things are there in the proposal which can be learnt while visiting the interventional area but it shall be the burden of the host organisation to make clear that which model piece of work/approach/innovation can be learnt during such visits. Peer review always provides an opportunity to a wider exposure bilaterally and learns with each other, which ultimately contributes towards the success of the project.

12. Project Sustainability

Technical:-

What measures have been taken to ensure sustainability of project processes like knowledge generation, constructive engagement and community empowerment adopted in the project?

The sustainability of knowledge generated among the CGCCs, RTI Applicants, and CSOs/NGOs who were trained under the project is very much there. These people are trained in a practical manner so they cannot forget lifelong and since they are in touch with other CBOs so this message will go in to that second layer and further deep.

Constructive engagement: The sustainability of this activity is a big challenge. Some strategy will have to be evolved for this in coming future.

Community empowerment: This is the activity, which gained most success during the project period as a result of knowledge generation about RTI, issue of corruption and its consequences. Community was also educated about the areas of corruption in form of bribe, cutting the share of benefit from grants, poor quality of construction and service etc. So as result of this project these common people are capable enough to deal with incidences of demanding bribe for delivering any service of benefit of any government scheme.

What plans for upcoming initiatives to ensure sustainability of project outcomes?

All the project activities are almost over. In upcoming activities evaluation of impact was done through survey and FGDs and a Model Framework of Replication (RTI Toolkit) was developed. So in terms of these activities aspect of sustainability does not play a big role.

Social:

How much ownership does the community have of the process?

Community understands the issue in a much better way now and about use of RTI as well so they are not only cooperating with CGCC members but consider as their leader in this regard. Community people themselves are suggesting to their fellows about saying no to bribe and using RTI as a tool.

How far the community is independent in dealing with the corruption issues on their own?

Since community is having knowledge, required tools and motivation for taking up this issue and using RTI as tool own its own so it can be said that in the interventional areas community people who participated in some project activities and received training are capable to do their own.

How far the community can independently organise the road shows or protests for their rights and curbing corruption?

Organising the road shows and protests are not the tools used by CUTS CART during the project implementation so this question is not applicable for us

Institutional: -

What are the organisational plans to continue the project on your own?

As such organisation is in principal agreed to continue few of the activities like running a RTI Advisory and Information Centre at CUTS CART office and integrating access to information with other projects at proposal stage itself so these project activities will remain sustainable. Organisation has already decided to work on good governance more intensively and rigorously with result based management (RBM) approach

How far the CBOs formed/strengthened can work on their own?

CGCCs formed and CBOs trained under the project are sustainable enough in terms of knowledge, courage to fight against corruption and working in networking mode to help each other. So during the project period itself these people have proved that they can work independently in their field areas with the issue of corruption using RTI and this network of CGCCs as a tool

Financial:-

Does the community financially contribute to the project?

As such communities are not contributing towards project any of the activities but NGOs/CBOs have inbuilt this issue in their areas of work and hopefully work in future as well among community

How much financial support can your Organisation mobilise on its own from other donors?

It is very difficult to make any comment but it is sure that Organisation has that capacity that if donors are there it can be proposed for widening and deepening the experience anywhere in south Asian region

Have any other donors expressed interest in supporting such initiatives?

No

Annexures to be attached to the Completion Report

1. Activities (Inputs) table (see the suggested format below).
2. Outputs Table (Plan vs actual -see the suggested format below).

3. Outcomes/Results (update log frame)
4. Financial Progress Report (see the suggested format below)
5. Success stories (include photos if possible) and case studies
6. Materials/reports/toolkits published/disseminated and/or posted on the website

Annexure 1: Accomplishment of Activities:

Project Activities Planned. (Please reproduce what was in the Approved Proposal)	Actual Project Activities. (Please Describe what was actually done) Quantitative and Qualitative information and process followed to achieve the activity Evidence to verify the same (Pre and Post RGR Survey, FGDs and other primary sources)	Status of completion ² and Description of any major change in the activity with reason
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensuring corruption free services through empowered network of the CGCCs, CSOs & other interested citizens that do advocacy at multiple levels and play the role of 'watchdog' 		
Activity 1.1 Identification of CGCCs and CSOs network.	As an outcome of this rigorous exercise, active CGCCs were selected in the project including CGCCs of phase-I. In phase-1 total 39 CGCCs were there and out these only 07 were there from Jaipur (04) and Tonk (03). And all 07 were part of Phase-II as well. The contact detail of all the CGCCs has been annexed.	C
Activity 1.2 Orientation of CGCCs and CSOs representatives and strategy formulation, Task assignment & Target setting for them	As a result of this activity a vibrant networks of 40 CGCCs is in place. Out of total 12 CGCCs are from six blocks of Tonk and rest 28 CGCCs are from 11 blocks of Jaipur district. Two orientations programme for more than 100 NGO representatives and proactive citizenries. So an active and vibrant network of CGCCs is in place. List with name & contact is available.	C
Activity 1.3 Supportive monitoring and periodic evaluation of activities, targets and tasks Assigned to CGCCs or CSO representatives.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The CGCCs performed well as per given tasks, targets and other project related responsibilities Internally this activity was done as a part of monthly review of this project, which was based on monitoring, and feedback of CGCCs. All the monthly progress reports of the project are available with project team. Participation in training, meetings, consultations= 100 percent Sending photo copies of RTI applications=90 percent 	C

² C= fully completed, NC = very limited or no completion, D= Deferred to Phase 2, IP=In progress.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Making regular telephone calls for reporting=75 percent • Fully met their objectives=75 percent • Sending regular progress report=65 percent • Sending feedback forms regularly=50 percent • Level of completion of their monthly report = 40 percent • Average time spent by CGCCs in the field with citizens=6-7days in a month 	
<p align="center">• Transparency and accountability in the target schemes increased through increased use of the RTI Act</p>		
<p>Activity 2.1 Establishing RTI Advisory and information Centre (RAIC) at CUTS CART (CUTS Centre for Consumer Advocacy, Research and Training) and providing specialist advice and guidance.</p>	<p>Total 210 people were made aware on RTI for using this as tool against corrupt practices and contributing towards corruption free service delivery of the concerned services</p> <p>Total 210 people made calls/visited RAIC and followed up on time to time and found that approximately 43 people filed RTI applications and 26 succeeded in receiving information.</p> <p>An orientation was done of the concerned staff for handling it effectively. Total 210 phone calls were received and most of the callers were facing a situation in which service providers were demanding bribe in turn rendering the entitled services (Getting NREGS job cards, granting permission for construction and getting electricity connection etc.) and they were not paying it so around 43 caller/visitors filed RTI applications in various departments (26 of them received demanded information) and used it as a tool which helped these 41 people to got those services without paying any bribe which were denied earlier.</p> <p>Detailed analysis of these applications is under way.</p>	C
<p>Activity 2.2 Maintaining records related to users and their feedbacks forms given.</p>	<p>All the records related to project including filled in monitoring, reporting and other formats by CGCCs and stakeholders are well filed and catalogues and kept in to office so that these can be used to analyse at the stage of report writing and evaluation.</p>	C

<p>Activity 2.3 Following up the users, to know about their satisfaction level, corruption freeness and time taken in resolving the problem</p>	<p>Through out the project period stakeholders, mostly CGCCs and beneficiaries were followed up on time to time to know about the their targets achieved, problems faces, activities done and their expectations from project team and with the help of this information project team was able to make plans accordingly and in tern CGCCs were also updated about the project activities, targets and results produced under the project.</p> <p>As a result of that current status of most of the RTI applications, whether they have reached up to some logical conclusion or not are known.</p>	<p>C</p>
<p>• Reduced incidence of bribery/corruption experience by the project area citizens for service delivery under the targeted schemes</p>		

<p>Activity 3.1 Developing questionnaire survey, keeping indicators of objectives and goal in mind</p>	<p>‘RTI ground realities and corruption vulnerability survey’ Questionnaires were developed after internal mutual consultations, reviewing relevant documents on the website of Transparency International, questionnaires of the similar studies done by CUTS earlier and also shared with PTF for comments likewise draft questionnaires were developed for both service providers and beneficiaries/common citizenries.</p>	<p>C</p>
<p>Activity 3.2 Orientation of surveyors about used tools and techniques and field testing</p>	<p>Half-day orientation of CGCCs was done on tools and techniques of survey and corruption vulnerability analysis and special emphasis on confidentiality and objectivity. Project visited two villages of Bassi block to field test the questionnaires to refine and make it more strong, logical and relevant to cover the required data and necessary changes were made.</p>	
<p>Activity 3.3 Pre RGR and Post RGR Surveys, Data compilation, analysis and conclusion drawing</p>	<p>‘Post RTI Ground Realities and Corruption Vulnerability Analysis in NREGS, <i>Swarnagayanti Gram Swarojgar Yojana</i> and <i>Indira Awaas Yojana</i>’</p> <p>Fact about the Interventional area: In Jaipur and Tonk, two administrative districts of Rajasthan this pre and post surveys were conducted. In terms of RTI related work. It is the capital city of Rajasthan owing largely expended rural areas including 11 rural blocks with a history of a feudal state, was built almost 275 years back. The total geographical area of Jaipur district is 11,117.8sq. kms with the Population of 52.5 lakh (Urban Population-25, 93,791, Rural Population-26, 58,597, Male Population-27, 69,096, Female Population-24, 83,292 with Population Density of 471 per sq. kms, Literacy Rate-70.63 percent, No. of Sub-divisions-13, No. of Tehsils-13, No. of Panchayat Samiti-13, No. of Villages-2340 but two blocks are urban and rest 11 are rural blocks in which this project activities were implemented.</p> <p>Tonk district is located in north- eastern part of the state bordering Jaipur in the north, Sawai Madhopur in the east, Bundi and Bhilwara districts in the south and Ajmer district in the west with total geographical area of 7194 sq kms, Population of 1211671 (2001 census), Population Density-168 per sq. kms, Literacy Rate-52 percent, Sex Ratio-934 females per 1000 males, No. of Subdivisions-7, No. of Tehsils-7, <i>Panchayat Samiti</i>-6, No. Of Villages-1093 and number of blocks are six where project activities are under implementation.</p> <p>Research Methodology:</p> <p>Both the sureys were carried out by project stakeholders down the line called as Consortium of Groups for Combating Corruption</p>	

(CGCC) members at block level in all the seventeen rural blocks of both districts. Before starting the survey, all the CGCC surveyors were thoroughly oriented for conducting these surveys. The methodology in both the surveys was same with no difference. Survey methodology and all the questions were discussed one by one and a mock exercise of filling the questionnaires was also done to enhance the clarity level of all the surveyors. It was daylong exercise, done with the help of subject experts. At least two surveyors from each block were short listed and trained. The total sample size of the questionnaires was 600 including 413 of beneficiaries of NREGS, IAY and SGSY and other schemes and 187 of service providers form Rural Development and Panchayati Raj Department from both the districts. Selection of respondents was done on basis of the location of his/her residence, which has to be centrally located of the town or village that was selected for response.

In Pre RGR Survey; majority of respondents were (77) males and 23 percent were females. Most of the (52 percent) respondents were in the age group of 30 to 45 years. 55 percent of the respondents were educated up to middle and secondary class and 15 percent were college and above level educated. Most of the respondents (62 percent) were beneficiaries of NREGS, 22 percent respondents were beneficiary of IAY and 16 percent respondents were beneficiaries of SGSY.

In post RGR survey, majority (84 percent) of the respondents were males, 65 percent were in the age group of 26 to 45 years, 56 percent were educated up to middle and secondary standard and 21 percent were graduate and above. 46 percent of them were professing agriculture work and beneficiaries of NREGS and 28 percent were unemployed youths. In this post RGR survey a classification of respondents has been done on the basis of rural and semi urban areas of blockhead quarters level as well.

Findings:

Awareness about the workstation: During survey it was found that only 37 percent respondents know the fact that where a *Patwari* sits but about the *Gram Sachiv* almost 64 percent people know about his office and about *Sarpanch* 77 percent villagers know that he is also supposed to be sit at GP (*Gram Panchayat*) Office. 64 percent respondents said that GP members also sits at GP which is wrong to say and show that they are not aware about the role of GP members because GP members usually do not sit at GP office but only come if any meeting of activity is there.

Even today, it could a big surprise for a person who believes in participatory democracy and think that a public representative like *Sarpanch* is known in the small area like *Gram Panchayat*, but it is not reality. *Sarpanch* is unknown by a big chunk (20 percent) and Gram Secretary by 27 percent of the local people. *Rojgar Sahayak* appointed under NREGS is unknown for majority of (61 percent) people.

Visit to GP Office: As far as the visits of the local villagers to GP office is concerned, only 25 percent respondents visit often and 56 percent visit occasionally. Out of total respondents 15 percent never visited GP office any point of time in their life. Only 61 percent people visit the GP office for various sorts of works. 48 percent of the people who visit the GPs visit it very rarely and 13 percent of them visit it never. Remaining 39 percent visits the GP place regularly for different works.

Awareness regarding Gram Sabha: At the start of the intervention, 47 percent respondents have never heard about the provision of the *Gram Sabha* at all but around 08 percent respondents came to know about GP provision during last year but still 39 percent respondents not aware about it which seems to be the main reason of poor participation in *Gram Sabha* and in people's planning. The current participation level in *Gram Sabha* is around 29 percent, which improved around 07 percent during project period. There are some people who regularly participate in the *Gram Sabhas* are

only few (08 to 09 percent) which is less than the quorum mark which is 10 percent of the GP population. There are around 43 percent people who expressed their willingness to participate in *Gram Sabhas* if they are informed on time and their given suggestions are taken into account. The people who don't participate in *Gram Sabhas* said that they do not participate because of time constraint (20 percent), 19 percent said that it is a wastage of their time to participate in such meetings, 18 percent don't participate because of the reasons not mentioned here or say other reasons which are not defined here.

Awareness regarding RTI Act, 2005 among common man: In the selected two districts, only 39 percent people have heard about the RTI Act 2005 so by this it can be inferred that awareness regarding this act in rural areas is still not enough. As far as the awareness regarding the RTI application-filing process is concerned, 26 percent people know about Application format, 19 percent respondents know about Public Information Officer, 21 percent respondents known to fee

The use of RTI Act 2005 in rural areas is very minimal and only 09 percent people used this Act as a tool in various government departments for various purposes. 54 percent of out of total use of RTI was done in Rural Development and *Panchayati Raj* Department itself. Here important thing to note is that in majority of cases roughly 80 percent, people came to know about this Act through NGOs only. In all the cases of using RTI, 62 percent applicants received information remaining people could not receive it. Only 27 percent applicants were satisfied with the information. These RTI applications (48 percent) were related to corruption issues and 32 percent were related to personal issues, remaining 20 percent were related to public benefit issues of the villages.

Prevalence of Corruption: Common villagers shared their views regarding their experiences of corruption specifically in Rural Development and *Panchayati Raj* Department and 49 percent respondents expressed that in NREGS corruption is prevailing at high rate in comparison of IAY (35 percent said that it is high in this scheme) and SGSY (16 percent) schemes. But in case of

IAY in majority of cases, GP officials give benefits after receiving some bribe. So if comparison is done there is less corruption in SGSY scheme but IAY comes somewhere in middle of both schemes out of selected three schemes.

Among the total respondents 74 percent had the opinion that corruption is rampant in the selected three schemes of RD Department. In selected three schemes, NREGS is most corrupt as said 37 percent respondents and 18 percent SGSY beneficiaries say that it is least corrupt scheme. The level of corruption is less in IAY in comparison to NREGS but more than SGSY as said by 26 of respondents. 19 percent people said that corruption is equal in all the schemes as above because corrupt executives indiscriminately do the corrupt activities.

In the NREGS quantum and areas of Corruption are very high and wide. After discussing with the stakeholders certain areas were short-listed. These are as follows.

Registration for job and making job cards: At the initial stage when registration for entitlement for job was done and then job cards were made, lot of corruption had happened in this. As this scheme progressed and time passes most of the job cards were made but still number of cards are being made and service providers are taking bribe in 56 percent cases on an average P146 which is higher than pre RGR survey which was in 43 percent cases on an average P68. The main reason of this is that since most of the job cards are already made and these new cards are either left out cases or extra in the joint family in the name of any adult member therefore service providers charge heavy bribe for that. In the post RGR survey no case was reported in which bribe was paid for providing job and for measurement of the work done so these areas are no more areas of bog corruption now.

Payment of wages: This area is most corrupt area where beneficiaries have to pay lot of bribe. On every withdrawal a person has to give P40 as bribe to various service providers. Though the quantum of corruption is there in construction work and procurement under NREGS but those areas were not the focus of the activities.

IAY: This scheme is also sick of corruption. Since, beneficiaries of this scheme are BPL people who are gullible and raise their voice rarely. That's why in this scheme; corruption is prevailing at all stages especially in the following stages. *Selection of beneficiaries:* This is the first stage in which beneficiaries are selected from the BPL list. Lot of favouritism is done at this level and even bribes are taken and GP officials cut share of benefits given under this scheme. During Pre RGR survey total amount given, as bribe was 8059 and in Post RGR it is P6125.

Changing the order up in the list: This area of corruption is also very big. The reduction in the bribe amount was reported from P22,300 to 16,948. Like wise in the Post RGR this form was noticed in which service providers demand bribe while submitting the utilization certificate of the first installment. In this area rate of corruption was reported higher than before due to initiating a new system of crediting the sanctioned amount directly in beneficiary's bank account. The corruption in the first two areas is around 20 to 25 percent on an average and the new system of bank payments overall reduced the rate of corruption in this scheme.

SGSY: In Post RGR survey the facts came out for the changing areas of corruption was that grading and granting loan for those SHGs came up as big areas of corruption but in some areas like group formation and trainings, no corruption was reported. Due to various reasons corruption in these two areas of SGSY is happening. Banks are overloaded with social and commercial banking and grading and sanctioning loans to SHGs is in priority of these banks so NGOs and SHG members are giving bribe to bank officials to do so while they demand for this that's why these areas are more hot beds of corruption

Corruption Vulnerability Analysis: In post RGR 21 percent overall beneficiaries have accepted that they have paid bribe (Pre RGR 27 percent) to service providers and the amount of this given bribe was varied from one person to another which come on an average

around P285 per beneficiary in whole interventional areas in NREGS which is P18 lesser than the Pre RGR figure of P303.

In IAY, only 34 percent respondents accepted (Pre RGR 52 percent) that they have paid cash bribe for availing the benefits of this scheme at various level of service delivery. In this case as well the amount of bribe demanded from beneficiary was different in most of the cases and after negotiations; the bribe paid to various service providers mainly to Gram Sachiv comes around Rs. 960 in each case.

In SGSY 13 percent beneficiaries said to pay bribe (Pre RGR 18 percent) mainly to bank officials for doing the long pending grading of their group and than accordingly sanctioning the subsidy loan and transferring it in their account. The bribed amount comes around P417 on an average in cash. One important aspect of this story is that NGOs who are coordinating the ground level activities have to pay a fixed percentage of bribe at *Zila Parisad* level while getting check of their honorarium for tasks completed and as a result they start to compromise with the field activities therefore they can follow up properly with bank officials and their grading gets delayed and they have to pay bribe to speed up the process.

Trend in the level of corruption: As per the opinion of majority of the respondents, the level of corruption in NREGS is on the rise as said by 48 percent people which is 19 percent lesser than the last year in which 67 percent people had the opinion that it is increasing. Big chunk of respondents around 38 percent said that in the menace of corruption nothing had happened during last year and still it is static.

The level of corruption in IAY: Majority of the beneficiaries 34 percent said that the level of corruption is unchanged in comparison of last year but at the same time 28 percent people think that has decreased in last one year. But one fourth of the people do not know about this change if had happened. They are not in a position to say any thing regarding this.

The level of corruption in SGSY: The beneficiaries of this scheme as well told that level of corruption is static as mentioned by 31 percent which is 15 percent lesser than the pre RGR findings. 20 percent of people are unaware about his positive change if has happened during the year.

Conclusions: Awareness regarding RTI is very low in rural areas and awareness about filing process is further down

*RGR&CVA Survey for Service Providers:
'RTI Ground Realities and Corruption Vulnerability Analysis in NREGS, SGSY and IAY'*

Service Providers/PIOs/First Appellate Authorities Survey

Methodology: The survey was conducted in the seventeen blocks of two districts, which are Jaipur and Tonk. Total 187 (121 from Jaipur and 66 from Tonk) service providers were interviewed. The respondents were from Rural Development and *Panchayati Raj* Department including *Gram Sachivs, Sarpanchs* and *Pradhans* only.

About the GP level programmes and implementation strategies and fact

In pre RGR survey total respondents were asked about the total number of schemes under implementation in their GP and 77 percent respondents said that total number of schemes is up to 20 which are correct to say but rest 23 percent were event unable to tell the correct number of schemes under implementation.

In post RGR survey majority of respondents (83 percent) were males and 45 percent were in the age group of 26 to 40 years and another 45 percent were in the age group of 41 to 60 years. 75 percent of respondents were educated up to graduation and above. Among the respondents 55 percent were secretaries of GPs and rest were *Sarpanch* and other PRI members.

Advertisement of schemes: Respondents were asked

about the strategies adopted for advertisement of public welfare schemes among the common masses then 55 percent respondents said that they are advertised by print media, signboards, *Nukkad Nataks*, TV & radio and with the help of NGOs. 31 percent respondents said that *Gram Sabha* and PRI members are good mean of advertising the govt. schemes. 14 percent people said that *Panchayat* notice boards are also helping in to making the schemes known in masses.

In Post RGR survey, all the respondents said that *Gram Sabha* is the main forum where most of the schemes, decisions taken for beneficiaries and other service processes are discussed in detail with *Panchayat* elected members and public as well. Other than *Gram Sabha*, monthly meetings (25 percent), during visit to nearby villages as well about various public schemes are discussed with villagers and as a result local people involve in the decisions taken by GPs. In NREGS, through social audit forums as well public participation is ensured as said by 11 percent respondents but in every social audit a big effort has to put by GP staff to ensure the presence of local people.

People's way of knowing about schemes and Forums of public participation: 60 percent respondents said that if any thing has to know about GP they ask from local elected PRI members either at village or they visit GP office to know. Only 07 respondents have habit of writing to GP officials for enquiring about govt. welfare schemes under implementation.

As per post RGR survey findings; It is onus of the public itself to visit the GPs offices and try to know about the means/forums of public participation otherwise GP officials do not take pain to make these provisions popular among them. In 65 percent cases, people who participated in the GP meetings they themselves visited without any prior information at GP office for some work but they are asked to participate in this. 50 percent People responded that *Panchayat* members also share the dates of such meetings with common people. 10% respondents said that via NGOs also, common people get information about such meetings and motivate to

participate.

Lack of Public Participation: 45 percent respondents said that there is lack of awareness among people regarding the services rendered by GP and decisions are taken by them due to various reasons important to mention is lack of education. 20 percent respondents said that people are not interested at all to participate in the public meetings and *Gram Sabhas* due to their lost interest in these meetings because of several reasons, which need to be explored. 20 percent respondents said that people very often blame service providers that their suggestions and requests are not entertained and taken in to account and due to this they do not participate. 15 percent respondents said that various reasons like people are busy in their work, participating in meetings means wastage of time for them and they think that it is job of politicians and people who are economically well settled.

When service providers were asked about selection process of the beneficiaries 75 percent respondents said that name of beneficiaries of various schemes are selected by *Gram Sabha* itself and rest are selected on the basis of survey reports and during field visits as said by 14 percent of respondents. 11 percent respondents said that selection of respondents is also done on the basis of as per scheme norms and selection criteria. But some time selection is also done on political basis as well and this percentage is not much.

In post RGR survey: All the respondents (100 percent) said that during the last one-year, public participation in the decision-making and service delivery processes of the selected three schemes has gone up due to education, media and initiation of NREGS as said by 40 percent of respondents. 42 percent respondents said that due to rising in the level of awareness among common man regarding their entitlements and public participation provisions because of mass mobilization by NGOs (as said by 18 percent people) and IEC campaign of Govt., people are coming and participating in these meetings. 40 percent respondents also said that due to

NREGS, people are visiting the GPs and block officers for various purposes and along with this; they also come to know several other things including these meetings and participate as well.

Awareness of RTI Act, 2005

78 percent respondents said that yes, they have heard about this act but do not know much in detail about this. So the real concern is that 22 percent of the functionaries at GP level are still not aware about the Act and question is that if they are not aware then definitely they will not be able to implement it. As per post RGR survey: Awareness of RTI Act 2005 among service providers of RD Department is increasing year by year. Around 86 percent service providers (including *Sarpanch, Pradhan, BDOs and Gram Sachivs*) are aware about this RTI Act 2005.

Awareness regarding filing process

The respondents were also discussed about the key provisions which are needful to implement the act effectively and it came to light that 18 percent of the functionaries were not know to the way in which application can be processed the way means that they were not aware that application can be done in written in a format or there is no format for application. Only 80% respondents were aware about the required fee of Rs. 10 and very surprising to know that 46 percent functionaries were even not aware that they are designated as PIO or FAA (First Appellate Authority). Most of the (64 percent) respondents were aware that demanded information has to be provided within the stipulated time of 30 days. Total 78 percent of the respondents were not aware that there is provision of first appeal and second appeal (88 percent were not aware) at departmental and state information commission level respectively.

In the post RGR survey data: Now most of the service providers, around 90 percent are aware about the format on which RTI applications are requested. They are clear about the fact that there is not any prescribed

format for RTI requests and that can be made on plain paper as well. Almost 83 percent Service providers are aware about the required fees for filing an application. Awareness of these officials about the Public information Officer appointed under this RTI Act is only 68% and same percentage of officials (68 percent) know correctly about the stipulated time period of 30 days for providing the requested information.

Awareness about the appeal is very less. Only 38 percent respondents know correctly about the first appeal and 22 percent of them know about second appeal. When it was asked by respondents about the PIOs and first appellate authority of their own department then only 64 percent of them replied correctly about PIOs and 48 percent about first appellate authority.

Training on RTI

Only 22 percent of functionaries are RTI trained in a superficial manner. They were educated about this in some monthly meeting just after this act came in to force in the year of 2006, but after that no any formal training was conducted. Their source of knowledge about the Act was mass media and their fellow colleagues at work.

In post RGR survey: Out of total respondents 34 percent people came to know about RTI during the last year through various sources and earlier they were not aware about this Act. Most of these new people almost 55 percent came to know about this Act through their departmental trainings on RTI. Other main source of their learning was daily Hindi newspapers in which stories and articles on RTI are published and they read these thoroughly and try to learn more and more on RTI Act. NGOs also contributed in making the service providers aware about this legislation as said by 35 percent service providers. Few people (15 percent) came to know about RTI through TV as well.

PIOs/FAAs at office

When respondents were asked about the PIO of their

office then only 54 percent respondents replied correctly and about the FAAs, only 36 percent .respondents replied correctly.

Possible reasons which are asked by PIOs before accepting any RTI Applications: After keeping the previous experience in mind respondents were asked about the reasons which can be asked/looked at before accepting or rejecting the filed RTI applications can be rejected and it came to open that 32 percent PIOs ask about the objective of filing of RTI Application and if they are satisfied then only they accept the application otherwise they try to confuse him and motivate for not filing the same and assure then that their problem will be solved even if they will not file it. 24 percent PIOs ask to the applicant about the use of the demanded information and they ask that what you will do of the requested information? 14 percent of the respondents accepted that they ask to the applicant that your demanded information be not related to any public welfare so you cannot file any RTI application and finally they did not accept it by any mean. 19 percent PIOs said that they check before accepting any RTI application the personal relations and political motivation as well.

As per Post RGR survey findings: 50 percent respondents said that yes, it is legal to ask the reason of filing a request under RTI from applicants.

Rejection of RTI Applications

Respondents who were PIOs, asked about the possible grounds on which RTI applications are be rejected by most of the PIOs. In reply of this question most of the PIOs were very cautious to say but what ever came out of their mouth was sufficient enough to present the actual picture of the truth that at large scale, applications are denied to accept by PIOs. 32 percent PIOs said that applications can be rejected if any question is related to any other department. 30 percent PIOs said that if there is any doubt upon applicant that he/she will misuse the demanded information then his application will not be accepted. 17 percent PIOs said that applications are rejected because numbers of questions are too much and applicants' behaviour with

PIOs is not proper as said by 08 percent respondents. 13 percent respondents expressed that applications are also rejected by PIOs because the demanded information is either not clear or demanded information is not available with PIOs or address of the applicant is not written on that.

In post RGR survey findings: When respondents were asked about the grounds on which these RTI requests can be rejected. Two major categories of answers came up. One is that, 45 percent respondents said that they do not accept the requests if the application is related to some other department and 30 percent respondents said that if they think that applicants in any way will misuse the requested information and requester is misbehaving with PIO is not at all concerned with the applicant than they refused to accept the RTI Request.

Problems faced by PIOs and FAA

- Not proper training is imparted
- Record management is very poor at GP level
- PIOs are highly burdened with other work so as a PIOs providing the demanded information to applicants further complicate the problem
- Attitude of the applicant is to get some benefit rather than doing something good for public and they want to create trouble in the way of PIOs

RTI Applications

Only 28% of the total PIOs admitted that yes, they have received some RTI Applications filed by local community people or political party members. They said that on an average two RTI applications were filed in their office and all were responded appropriately. 65 percent respondents said that in the respect of section 4(1) b, GPs have proactively published about the filing process under RTI at office walls. They also publish the names of the beneficiaries, about schemes and annual budget and expenditures at walls and most of the records are put before *Gram Sabha* in which most of the elected members and villagers participate. They also publish on the notice boards about their day-to-day activities and this information is sufficient enough for common man. Remaining 35 percent respondents added to say that

proactive disclosure of information is also done at worksites and at the public places which are prominent but lot more is required to be done and more and more infrastructure has to developed for disclosed and digitalization of records has to done otherwise nothing much can be done in his regard.

During post RGR survey as well; Majority of service providers (75 percent) accepted that yes, common men are filing requests under RTI Act to get information related to Panchayat-related programmes and activities. Most of the officials (65 percent) said that in last year itself they received 6-10 RTI requests on an average. 20 percent respondents said that they received 01-05 RTI requests and 10 percent said that they receive 10-25 requests on an average. 70 percent respondents also said that during the last year, number of RTI requests has increased manifold in comparison of previous years. They also said that these RTI applications help in improving the quality of services provided by GPs and also promotes public participation as said by 62 percent respondents.

Potential of RTI Act in combating corruption and promoting good governance

As per the opinion of the 88 percent of the respondents, RTI Act has that potential that it can promote transparency and accountability among service providers and policy makers. 84 percent respondents were agreeing with the fact that it has that much capacity that it can control on the corruption. But on the other side only 45 percent of the respondents were having the opinion that this RTI Act will increase public participation in the decision-making and service delivery process. So it means that Panchayat functionaries are confident enough that RTI applicant is not that much capable that they can influence the decision making of officials as well in the rural area.

In post RGR survey; Majority of service providers (around 75 percent) said that RTI Act 2005 is capable enough and enhancing the Accountability among government officials and also forcing them to maintain their official

records properly as said by 85 percent respondents. 44 percent of service providers responded that this act is successfully combating corruption and compelling them for taking immediate action on the issues asked by RTI Applications as mentioned by 65 percent respondents.

82% of the total respondents replied that during last year they have observed that transparency in the selection process of beneficiaries, decision-making process and public expenditure has increased up to certain extent. They also reacted about the reasons, which contributed in to this increased level of transparency. Majority of respondents around 60 percent said that due to effective implementation of government schemes and following the guidelines is the main reason of this increased level of transparency in select schemes but 55 percent said that due to suitable policy changes it has happened. Only 32 to 35 percent respondents made responsible to the efforts put by NGOs and people's demand for greater transparency in government service delivery and decision-making.

But on other side, POs also think that RTI work is putting extra burden on the head of service providers as mentioned by 76 percent of respondents and sometime because of workload of the flagship schemes they are unable to respond these requests due lack of human and infra structural facilities at *Gram Panchayat* level.

Step taken to promote transparency and accountability

During post RGR survey, 35-40 percent respondents replied that they have proactively printed about rights and qualifications of beneficiaries and RTI Act, 2005 respectively on the walls of their GPs and 70 percent said that even they write about the annual income and expenditure details as well. 80 to 85 percent of respondents said that they have also proactively printed on the walls of GPs and other prominent public places.

Prevalence of corruption in selected schemes

Big chunk of the respondents, almost 39 percent were

<p>Activity 4.1 Two CGCCs Orientation Programme</p>	<p>agreed that corruption is prevailing in the NREGS and most of the officials who are responsible for implementation are involved in that but rest of the respondents are either not accepting or saying that there is no corruption in the department. In the IAY, corruption is prevalent as admitted by 20 percent of the respondents and rest is in denial mode. 31 percent respondents accepted that corruption is integral part of SGSY and most of the programme implementers are involved in that but rest of the respondents are not ready to say anything about the issue.</p> <p>Reasons of corruption in NREGS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of awareness among rural people • People do not want to be indulged in the paper work. • Some people don't have any supporting documents, which are necessary for making job card so in that case they offer or the concerned official demand some bribe. • Some time GP functionaries take bribe in the name of higher officials and falsely tell to rural people that they are not taking bribe for themselves but higher officials will take this amount. • As some respondents mentioned that always there is conducive atmosphere for corruption in NREGS and it is part of culture and sighted local saying '<i>KHAI BADI KI MAI BADI</i>' it means bribed money is bigger and works better than mother. • As respondents admitted that higher officials who are responsible for monitoring are also involved in corruption specially in tendering process, construction work, purchase of materials and passing any bill, certain percentage of moneys is fixed at various points and that percentage has to be paid to concerned official otherwise those bills/accounts will not be passed. <p>Reasons of corruption in SGSY</p> <p>As mentioned by respondents that SGSY schemes is not working effectively in the districts because bank officials have the opinion that these common people will not repay the loans sanctioned at all which seem to be true as per their history so they are very slow in doing grading</p>	
--	--	--

<p>Activity 4.2</p> <p>17 Block Level RTI Chaupals (Jaipur 11 and Tonk 06)</p>	<p>of Self Help Groups and if doing they are demanding bribes from NGOs facilitators.</p> <p>Respondents opined that NGOs, which are given responsibility of community mobilisation and facilitating the activities at ground level, are both victims as well as bribe taker. One side they are victim of the system and forced to pay bribe to the accounts people of DRDA and on the other side they are reimbursing these expenses from the SHG members. NGOs also do lot of savings by not doing or doing the programme activities by names shake only. So all are contributing and washing their hand in the flowing river.</p> <p>Reasons of corruption in IAY</p> <p>The benefit of this scheme is given to BPL family only but the selection process of BLP is not foolproof and numbers of non-eligible candidates are selected due to various reasons and take benefits of eligible BLP families. These powerful people create pressure and officer bribes on/to the service providers to change their order upward at the cost of actual beneficiaries. Even otherwise service providers also give people who are willing to pay bribe out of turn preference.</p> <p>Usually most of the beneficiaries have to give some bribe before getting the check of sanctioned amount, which directly goes in bank for payment. Bank officials also demand some bribe while payments.</p> <p>Measures for controlling corruption</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CSOs shall be part of the tendering process so that corruption can be avoided • BSR rates must be updated as per market rates • Social audit and CAG audit must to regular and measures have to be taken to reform the processes. • RTI Act shall be promoted and more and more public awareness programmes has to be started • People themselves have to be educated about the service delivery process. • People has to be motivated for participating the 	
--	---	--

<p>Activity 4.3 Exposure Visit of selected 10 highly motivated and committed persons in dealing with corruption will be provided an opportunity to visit some Gram Panchayats of Kerala to witness the good practices of good governance</p>	<p><i>Gram Sabha</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Complaint redressal mechanism has to be established • More proactive disclosure of information at GP level must be done • Entitlements of BPLs and Pattern of payments in any welfare scheme must be written at office walls. • Beneficiaries of NREGS shall also work sincerely <p>On the occasion of project launch itself, Orientations of CGCCs of both districts was done to share with them the project goal, objectives, activities; role and responsibilities of stakeholders specially CGCCs members and tasks and targets were decided and given to CGCCs for one year as per project outputs and goal that helped them to show a roadmap ahead. Total 135 RTI activists/NGO representatives (75 from Jaipur and 65 from Tonk) participated in the two-day residential workshop, which includes the representatives of more than 60 Civil Society Organisations of all the selected 17 blocks of both districts.</p> <p>In the Jaipur orientation, presence of Shailesh Gandhi, Information Commissioner, Central Information Commission, New Delhi as a chief guest and Harinesh Pandya, famous RTI Activist from Maheti Adhikar Gujarat Pahal (MAGP), Gujarat as a resource person provided inputs to the team, motivated the RTI Activists and pull media attention and coverage.</p> <p>In Tonk as well presence of Ram Vilas Chaudhari, <i>Zila Pramukh</i> as chief guest and Dr Rajesh Ranjan from 'Commonwealth Human Rights Initiatives (CHRI), Madhya Pradesh as a resource oriented them in effective manner.</p> <p>Outcome All 34 CGCCs were fully trained for using RTI as a tool against corruption rather using for redressing complaints and fully oriented towards project goals, outputs and objectives that are for reforming the corrupt processes of select three schemes, NREGS, IAY and SGSY.</p>	
--	--	--

Wide media coverage at state and national level.

Total 17 Block Chaupals were organised for the purpose of disseminating the corrupt practices and areas of corruption in the selected schemes and sharing with the service providers, CGCCs, beneficiaries and common men to disseminate the survey findings and getting feedback on these findings in addition of providing a platform to the local participants, CGCCs, RTI applicants, corruption victims for further handholding, facilitating for future strategies and motivating for working with renewed force and energy.

As far as participation is concerned total 876 (553 in Jaipur and 323 in Tonk) people participated including 211 service providers and 215 women participants. All participants got RTI newsletters, Brief of RGR&CVA survey findings, CUTS publications, agenda of the Chaupals and Issues to be discussed. So resource packs were developed to give all the participants. The participants were from nearby villages, local CSOs/NGOs representatives, PRI members, Youth leaders, College students and more important is block level service providers of selected schemes. Media representatives also took part in BLRCs which resulted in around 29 media coverage in different local and state news dailies. Around 45 participants were regularly in touch with project team and participated in other project activities as well.

These block Chaupals were highly interactive in which findings and areas of corruption were discussed and use of RTI was suggested to combat and reform the processes but it is very difficult to say that how far these Block Chaupals helped in reducing the corruption in the selected schemes.

Outcome:

- Participants including new set of people are informed about survey findings, corrupt practices, bribes taken & Corruption vulnerability, strategies to fight against corruption using RTI as a tool.
- First time in the history of these *Panchayat Samitis*, such meeting in which issue of corruption and strategies were discussed.
- Consensus emerged that issue of corruption is

	<p>prevalent in all parts of society and all are responsible for this rather than service providers only so all stakeholders will have to act against it.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wide media coverage of the findings and strategies for reforming the corrupt processes using RTI as a tool. <p>An exposure visit to Kozhikode, Kerala was done in the month of November 2009 having 11 visitors including state officials, PRI representatives and project officials. It was quite exciting, full of learning and fruitful in terms of ensuring implementation of learnings in project implementation areas by the visitors.</p> <p>Outcome of the visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All the visitors were well clear about the project purpose and need of the intervention and now become Advocates of reforms in the Rural Development Department. • They are enlightened about the good practices taking place at GP level in Kerala and are ready to take good initiatives for replicating these processes in selected schemes in particular and others in general. • All the visitors were more helpful and cooperative than before in ensuring the success of the project activities and intensify their efforts in their areas. <p>Major learnings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The differences in the transparency and accountability mechanisms at GP level in Kerala and Rajasthan became clear in the mind of visitors. • The big difference in the size of local revenues collected at GP level in Kerala and Rajasthan was understood. In Rajasthan it is not more than P10-15,000 per year but in Kerala it was more than P1.5 Crore which means people's participation in the GP level activities is incomparable in Kerala. • The availability of infrastructure facilities and human resource at GP level and single window system in which every request is registered in the computer and a receipt is given with date of service delivery which shows high level of accountability and transparency in the functioning of GP. • Effective role of ward members in the GP meetings and planning process was remarkable. 	
--	---	--

	<p>Replication efforts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per the visitors it is very difficult to replicate all the things which were seen out there during the visit because of lack of infrastructure availability but few things which are cost less like trying to collect all the applications and requests of people and give them proper acknowledgement receipt has been started by them. • Putting complaint cum suggestion box at GP office was done immediately and writing the names of GP officials at GP wall was also done. • Responding the RTI applications with demanded information as soon as possible even before 30 days. Though these are small steps but good start towards reforming the processes. <p>Change of attitude:</p> <p>Though these visiting people could not do the major structural changes at their workplace but a big change in their mindset and attitudinal is visible in terms of motivation, readiness and quickness in taking actions in support of project activities and participating in meetings, dialogues and public interfaces.</p>	
<p>Activity 5.1 Scoping visits</p>	<p>Scoping visits were done in both districts along with CGCCs.</p>	
<p>Activity 5.2 Base line: Citizen's Report Card of select schemes keeping project outcomes and their means of verification in mind, analysis of findings and targets</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed report cards were done in both the MRGPs and findings were shared with local community, scheme beneficiaries, CGCCs, service providers and Media. • The proposed report cards were done in both the MRGPs, which were kept separate from RGR&CVA Survey because CRC was exclusively used at MRGP level only. The project team made two separate questionnaires with the inputs from other colleagues within centre for service providers and selected scheme beneficiaries. And an intern pursuing her diploma in rural development collected data and she analyzed data also with team. These findings were shared with local community, scheme beneficiaries and CGCCs during evening classes and with service 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •

<p>setting</p>	<p>providers during dialogues and public interfaces and with media as well, which got coverage in various daily newspapers. The key findings of these CRC are as follow;</p> <p>Service Providers;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Majority of the service providers (98 percent) are aware of the RTI Act but 85 percent don't know about the entire appealing process. • 85 percent respondents reported that they have not obtained any training regarding RTI <p>Beneficiaries:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Total 95 percent respondents were unaware about the RTI Act. 64.50 percent respondents are ready to use RTI Act if guided properly to combat with corruption if demanded bribe. • 4.73 percent NREGS beneficiaries responded that they have paid some extra amount for the photographs (Average P20) at the time of job card formation • 8.26 percent beneficiaries responded that they have paid up to P100 for Account opening. 74.85 percent respondents has reported that they did not receive the full payment and 69.49 percent said that it was not on time and 68.26 percent were dissatisfied with the measurement process • In Indira Awaas Yojana, 86.67 percent beneficiaries have reported to paid bribe to avail the scheme • 4.38 percent respondents have reported that they have paid extra amount in case of receiving a land document from Panchayat • 8 percent people said that they have paid bribe at the time of taking electricity connection 	
<p>Activity 5.3 Promoting filing of RTI applications by corruption victims for quality services</p>	<p>Around 450 RTI applications were filed focusing on the corrupt issues came out of survey and experienced by CGCCs and local community/beneficiaries in the selected three scheme of state government.</p> <p>In NREGS total 199 RTI applications were file and out of those 23 were related to registration for job and making job cards. 21 people filed RTI asking about the reasons of giving priority of few people (who were near and dears one of service providers) in providing Jobs ignoring other entitlement holders. Under the scheme 47 RTI applications were filed because service providers were</p>	<p>C</p>

lenient in work measurement and given extra benefits in comparison to other common people.

In NREGS adding names of family members and friends of *Sarpanch* and other PRIs can be seen often so targeting this issue total 38 RTI applications were filed by beneficiaries/ CGCCs asking reasons of adding name without working in must rolls and photocopies. 05 RTI attempted to ask about taking commissions in payment of wages, and 65 were related to the worksite facilities.

In SGSY total 89 RTI applications were filed and the issue of grading was targeted most. So majority of RTI Applications (69) were filed related to this issue, which has to be done by the concerned bank. There were some incidences of corruption in the selection of beneficiaries and group formation that was done NGOs so 11 RTI were filed to target that issue.

At bank level bribe is demanded for granting loan and disbursement of that grant so such nine issue were identified and filed RTI asking the reasons of delay in disbursement of grants and in one case grant was immediately given, in 03 cases it took months to get the grant and in case of 05 cases still grants were not given. In few cases the NGOs that are responsible for mobilizing and coordinating the SGSY activities at field level are taking money from beneficiaries and making savings from expenses sanctioned for them and compromising with quality.

In IAY total 150 RTI applications were filed in which the issue, which came as, a most corrupt was selection process and for that 38 applications were filed. Second issue was changing the orders of beneficiary in the list and for that 26 applications were file for enquiring about the reasons. While giving sanctioned check by *Gram Sachiv* (16), During inspection of under construction house (05), during encashment of check by bank officials (06). Under the project painting the list of beneficiaries was given prime focus and for that total 74 applications were filed to know about the current status of this and actions taken in future to write this. In case of 33 applications demanded information was received mentioning that this list is not written at GP level and appeal has been done in 26 cases before *Sarpanch*, who

is first appellate authority.

The information demanded in most of the RTI applications were related to some act of corruption, and can be called an attempt to hit the corrupt service providers and the process it self so that they are made accountable and systemic issues of corruption are also fixed and change can be initiated. These RTI applications are need based, represent most burning issues among beneficiaries and were filed individually but were supported collectively and contributed in to simplifying the processes, use of RTI by common people, satisfactory resolution of problems, enhancing responsiveness of services providers and reducing corruption experience of common people in interventional areas. Details of RTI Applications in various schemes:

S. No.	Name of Scheme	Subject of RTI application	No. Of RTI	Info. Received	Cases in Appeal
1.	NREGS	Registration and making job cards	23		
2.	,,	Priority in providing jobs	21		
3.	,,	Payment of higher wages	47		
4.	,,	Fake names in must rolls	38		
5.	,,	Commissions in payment	16		
6.	,,	Worksite facilities	65		
		Total	209	124	26
1.	SGSY	Selection of beneficiaries and group formation	11		
2.	,,	Grading of the group	69		
3.	,,	Disbursement of grant and granting loan	09		
		Total	89	66	13
1.	IAY	Selection of beneficiaries	26		
2.	,,	Changing the order up in the list o	23		
3.	,,	Giving sanctioned check by GS	16		
4.	,,	Inspection of constructing house	05		
5.	,,	Check Encashment at Bank	09		
6.	,,	Proactive disclosure of list of beneficiaries	74		

			Total	153	98	21
Activity 5.4 three interface meetings of beneficiaries and GP officials to discuss the issues & experiences of corruptions and way forward			Total six interface meetings (three in each model <i>Gram Panchayat</i>) of GP service providers and common people were conducted and lot of local corruption issues were unearthed, followed up later on by CGCCs and project also pursued the issues while visiting GPs every month and having dialogues with them. Since these people were also part of evening classes and these issues were raised and followed up these as well.		C	
Activity 5.5 RTI evening classes & Youth and women mobilization meetings			Total 20 RTI evening classes (10 in each MRGP) were done and as a result of this MRGP people were mobilised; local issues were discussed and then advocated before GP and district level service providers of selected three schemes during official's visits, newsletters and dialogue with them. Total 20 RTI evening classes (10 in each MRGP) were done and as a result of this around 700 MRGP people were mobilized, local issues were discussed and around 70 RTI applications filed from MRGPs. After using the attendance sheets and filed RTI applications these participants were followed up twice by project team over phone			
Activity 5.6 RTI orientation of the Service Providers/ PRI members to educate & handle RTI Applications			Two RTI orientation programmes were conducted in both the MRGPs including elected PRIs and GP Staff twice in the project period. One was done with older elected PRIs and second was done with the newly elected PRIs members of both MRGPs Two RTI orientation programmes were conducted in both the MRGPs including elected PRIs and GP Staff twice in the project period. One was done with older elected PRIs (25 in no.) and second was done with the newly elected PRIs members of both MRGPs (25 in no.)		C	
Activity 5.7 Move for proactive disclosure of information,			In both the MRGPs, to promote the proactive disclosure, role and responsibilities of <i>Sarpanch</i> and GPs, selection process of beneficiaries in IAY, name of all six committees constituted at GP level and members, and RTI filing process was printed at the walls of Harsulia and Mundia GPs. By this exercise local people came to		C	

	know about functioning of GPs and processes and benefited at well.	
Activity 6.1 Continued support to CGCCs	An active network of CGCCs in all the 17 blocks of both districts is existing and is able to own the project objectives and work as an citizen against corruption and resource person for wider local community. Constantly mobilizing and providing resource material and other required support to CGCCs/ CSOs net workers and proactive citizens will be provided and follow up of RTI applications will be done.	C
Activity 7.1 Issue, evidence and demand-based periodic meetings with multilevel target groups	<p>A dialogue process was started in the beginning of the project itself and total 11 high level dialogue events took place between CUTS, CGCCs and policy makers including RD minister, Pr. Secretary/Secretary, CEOs, Collectors and others. There was not a readily made action plan but a strategy was made that in preliminary round introductory dialogue will be done and then dialogue will be issues/findings based to take a commitment to suggest some policy changes in the select schemes but things happened in different way. Dialogues were started from top level but ultimately these top policy makers deputed the project directors as their representatives to participate in such future dialogues and give direct feedback to them.</p> <p>In the first round of dialogues only project details were shared with abovementioned policy makers. Since two secretaries and three principal secretaries changed till mid of the second quarter so more than one introductory meeting were held and that took lot of time.</p> <p>After introductory rounds one round was held with Secretary, Directors of SGSY and IAY for talking about the issues came out of RGR&CVA survey and citizen report cards in the months of September and October, 2009. These officials including minister said that most of the policies are absolutely fine but all the problems come at implementation level so they made commitment to instruct the lower level officials to cooperate in the project activities and take actions accordingly and for that Minister instructed to his secretary and secretary deputed both the directors of SGSY and IAY for further dialogue events and give feedback to him directly.</p>	C

	<p>Mid project level dialogues happened with both the directors and Deputy Secretary, Department of Administrative Reforms and Deputy Secretary of Rajasthan state Information Commission.</p> <p>Final round of talks held with Secretary and Minister only and as a result of these dialogues events few official orders were passed but it is difficult to say that how far these orders helped in to curbing the corruption in select schemes but it is for sure that they helped in to implementing the schemes as per norms within the state.</p>	
<p>Activity 7.2 Ensuring participation of demand and supply side key stakeholders including</p>	<p>Participation of key participants was ensured in each and every dialogue event</p> <p>As a result of this constructive engagement with govt. and advocacy efforts of project activities contributed in to passing 11 general orders related to transparency.</p>	C
<p>Activity 7.3 Analyzing decisions and actions taken and their implementation on and ground level impact on reducing corruption in select schemes.</p>	<p>As a result of this constructive engagement with govt. and advocacy efforts of project activities contributed in to passing 11 general orders related to transparency, Almost five officials orders were reminders in nature and it means similar letters were written to concerned NREGA officials to carry out the tasks effectively but they were not doing satisfactorily for that and at the same time policy makers were also receiving recommendations, complaints, suggestions, consultations by beneficiaries, various CSOs/NGOs including CUTS & its project team so constructive dialogue by project team with these policy makers as a project activity was also contributed in passing these orders but few orders were passed exclusively because of this project intervention.</p> <p>1) Proactive disclosure of the Information related to construction work under NREGS at GP, ordered on Nov. 19,2009 2) Painting the names of NREGS labourers with payment details at GP walls, ordered on Jan. 10, 2010 3) Order for following the NREGA (Grievance Redressal) rules, 2009 in letter and spirit ordered on Dec. 18, 2009 4) Better record management under NREGA at GP level as per rules and guidelines, ordered on Oct. 23, 2009</p>	C

	<p>5) Regarding NREGA help line, ordered on April 23, 2010</p> <p>6) Publicizing NREGA Citizens charter among common people by GPs, ordered on Feb 05, 2010</p> <p>7) Maintaining the NREGA records well & furnishing full details, ordered on Dec. 15, 2009</p> <p>8) Constitution of NREGA Permanent Committees at GP level and effective role in NREGA monitoring, ordered on Feb. 08, 2010</p> <p>9) Effective implementation of RTI act at GP level and regular updation of NREGA labourers details twice in month, ordered on March 11, 2010</p> <p>10) Ensuring transparent, accountability and making it corruption free by developing an effective complain redressal mechanism at dist and block level, ordered on June 17, 2009</p> <p>11) Ensuring effective implementation of RTI act in department through good proactive disclosure. Project officials participated in the dialogue process with Govt. along with other NGOs at Jaipur on September17, 2009</p> <p>Though these orders were helpful in further strengthening the implementation process of the concerned schemes but it is difficult to say that up to what level these reduced the corruption in the select schemes.</p>	
<p>Activity 7.4 one day Mid Term Dissemination cum Advocacy Meeting: A set of recommendat ions will emerge out with the stake of service providers and service recipients.</p>	<p>Mid Term Dissemination meetings was successfully conducted on February 23, 2010 at Jaipur. The objective of the workshop was to disseminate the key findings of the 'RTI Ground Realities and Corruption Vulnerability Analysis Survey' before service providers of select schemes, and other stakeholder participants and taking the critical views and suggestions to make these findings more logical. Based on their field experiences. Around 80 stakeholders participated including directors of SGSY, IAY, state resource centre and Deputy Secretary, Administrative Reforms. In the meeting findings were presented and accepted by policy makers with minor comments. During this advocacy meeting itself a decision of going for a joint monitoring visit (including CUTS and Govt. officials) was taken to look in to the issues came out in the survey and with the permission of Secretary it was ordered for April 21, 2010 and done successfully. Important is that several good decisions were taken on the spot during this joint monitoring visit to take corrective measures.</p> <p>Decisions taken on the spot: Related to IAY</p>	<p>C</p>

Showing the released amount orders, pending from long time by dist officials to block officials and giving copies of those, Enquiring about the complaints received and action taken on those, mutually agreed for proactive disclosure at walls but block level people expressed concerns but state representative ordered to start to do some thing for this and also print logo of IAY on all the houses, state official made a note that some technical problem is there in the feeding software for IAY, prepared by NAC. Reviewing two yrs achievements and decided to make a special note of IAY incomplete up-gradation cases,

SGSY: Progress of the scheme was discussed, complaints received by beneficiaries were discussed but the complaints related to banks were specifically noted down and discussed in the Block level bankers meeting and more need of being sensitized towards poor was felt and it was also felt that social banking is quite different from commercial banking but bankers are not sensitized for that. Bankers are not receiving the applications within stipulated 15 days and opening accounts easily so these matters were also put forward the bankers.

NREGS: Complaints Redressal Mechanism was reviewed and instructed to speedup the disposal rate of complaints and send a copy of action taken to the complainant as well, two people visited block level in front of the team having complaints about not making job cards, BDO directly called to concern Gram Sachivs and instructed to take action and report back.

At GP level: IAY

State/block authorities given orders to print permanent waiting list at GP, Some waiting candidates were communicated for sanctioning Indira Awaas but it was not sanctioned, so reason given by dist officials that as per higher level orders, priority was given to SC BPL so other than SC BPL quota was taken that's why these people could not get sanction but in current financial year they all will be sanctioned at priority basis as given assurance.

Beneficiaries faced:

At GP level: At Madhorajpura more than 110 beneficiaries of IAY and SGSY gathered to report their problems (one by one-24/groups-05) were heard and accordingly orders were given to the present GS for taking appropriate action on the grievances and complaints.

Interface between district, block and GP level officials:

At block level:

At block level, officials of district level and block level had an interface to discuss the issues related to these three schemes and reviewed the progress made so far, implementation of transparency and accountability norms at block and down the line, problems faced in achieving the targets and complaint handling and grievance redressal mechanism related to these schemes. It is important to mention that district authorities gave several clarifications to block officials regarding orders passed, relay happened, what to do in certain cases where IAY beneficiaries migrated outside, non starter cases and others

At GP level:

Visiting group met GP officials, scheme beneficiaries and elected PRIs at Gram Panchayat Office and discussed about the problems faced at their level and progress made in the selected scheme specifically. Gram Sachiv came out with some practical problems and present officials helped then in to solving them, they were also suggested to write the names of beneficiaries for last four years and permanent waiting list at GP wall. Officials also suggested to beneficiaries to contact them directly if they have any complaints regarding corruption of any thing so that action can be taken directly. District officials also instructed GS to maintain record properly and also respond RTI applications, which are filed in a satisfactory manner.

SGSY bankers meeting:

	<p>District administration convened a block level SGSY bankers meeting on the same day in which all the bank representatives of block and few district officials were present to discuss the problems faced including the block administration and BDO.</p> <p>Bankers invited the some suggestions for SGSY and visitors given by saying that Bankers shall be lenient enough in terms of grading and loaning and does not treat it as strict as commercial loaning so that benefits can be reached up to poor.</p> <p>Outcome:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • On the spot several decisions were taken regarding quick service delivery and inclusion of some potential names in the beneficiaries in front of /on request of villagers. • Healthy interface of different level of officials and clarifications were made from each other. <p>Further follow up is required to see the implementation of the decisions taken during the visit but few evidences are there in which at GP level list of beneficiaries were painted at the wall and block level officials instructed to Panchayat officials about the decisions taken and instructed to implement at their office strictly since they have to report back to the higher authorities.</p>	
<p>Activity 7.5 State level Advocacy Meeting: A set of recommendations for procedural changes will be formed and put forward before state policy makers and programme implemente</p>	<p>This meeting was also well participated by different sort of stakeholders as in midterm. Wide media coverage in national and state daily newspapers which resulted in to discourses on reforms using RTI as an instrument.</p> <p>Outcome A set of recommendations was put forward before present policy makers which were later formally submitted to RD minister and department to take immediate actions so that processes in the selected schemes can be reformed: the recommendations are as follows:</p> <p>NREGS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proactive disclosure at all levels.(Model GPs has to be established as a test case by Govt.) • Multiple counters of availability & acceptance of form 	<p>C</p>

<p>rs through a day long State Advocacy Workshop at state level.</p>	<p>06</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Phasing out payments through post offices; Introducing mobile banking <p>IAY:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lists and names of beneficiaries has to be followed/printed at all levels.(Not written, if yes; not updated regularly) • Periodic meeting of all BPLs including media has to done at GP • Smooth Fund Flow. Special strategy for non-started cases <p>SGSY:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Flexible social banking norms & not as difficult as corp. loaning and for that sensitization is needed. • Interdepartmental convergence has to be ensured including ICDS • Further it will be followed up to ensure the implementation of these recommendations. 	
<p>Activity 8 External Evaluation</p>	<p><i>Evaluation visit of Ms Stephanie, PTF advisor</i></p> <p>Stephanie de Chassy, one of PTF advisors, was in Jaipur to evaluate the RTI PTF project phase-II from May 10-13, 2010 and visited CUTS office on first and last day of his visit and also visited both the Model RTI Gram Panchayats on May 11-12, 2010.</p> <p>One the first day formal reception and welcome was arranged at CUTS conference hall. Project team members' given introductory remarks and talked about the good governance interventions and also a power point presentation on activities done and progress achieved so far and other also given their inputs on time to time. Than in evening same group went to meet MD Kaurani and SP Baswal to discuss the implementation of RTI Act in Rajasthan.</p> <p>On second day, Project team members along with Stephanie visited Harsulia GP and met with GP staff, elected PRI members and CGCCs and also visited a NREGS site where few women and other RTI applicants were present and discussed the project related issues. In evening group also met with Sallauddin Ahmed,</p>	<p>C</p>

	<p>Additional Chief Secretary and First Appellate Authority of Secretariat to discuss about the RTI Act and practical aspects in the implementation of this act in his office at Secretariat, Jaipur.</p> <p>On third day same group visited Mundia GP and met with Sarpanch, PRI members, CGCC members, community members and visited a nearby NREGA site where few entitlement holders talked about use of RTI which they come to know through this project and group went to meet Kailash Narayan Meena, SDO, Niwai and discussed about their involvement in project activities and its outcome.</p> <p>On last day Stephanie was invited at CUTS conference hall again for formally concluding the things and it was done by the project team members. Stephanie given some suggestions for extension phase and all were incorporated in extension phase proposal.</p>	
<p>Activity 9 Exposure visit to MKSS, Dev Dungari, Rajsamand, Rajasthan</p>	<p>After conducting a highly successful and well appreciated learning cum exposure visit to Kerala described above, all the CGCCs were interested to go for such similar visit and as per the decision unanimously taken this exposure visit was organized with the aim of strengthen the capacity of CGCCs and providing first hand experience of the model work done by the Mazdoor Kisaan Shakti Sangthan situated in Dev-Dungari in Rajsamand district.</p> <p>It was two days learning cum exposure visit from August 12 to 13, 2010 in which 21 CGCCs participated. The group visited MKSS office and met with Nikhi Dey, Shanker Singh, and other who are the leading known RTI activists and practicing and helping in doing the historic work to implement the RTI Act, 2005 in its true spirit at few Gram Panchayats in the neighborhood and advocacy at state and national level. The CGCC members not only learnt but seen the things actually to happen so that they can also adopt these good practices in their respective field areas. They all were happy to see this good work in Rajasthan itself.</p>	<p>C</p>

<p>Activity 10.1 Eight Focus Group Discussions</p>	<p>As a part of the project impact study at the end level 08 Focus Group discussions are done. These were three in Tonk and Five in Jaipur district. In first round four FGDs (Harsulia, Niwai including Mundia, Tonk and Malpura) were conducted.</p> <p>In Second round remaining four FGDs were conducted at Phagi and Chaksu and at Dudu and Sambhar. In these FGDs RTI applicants of the local area were invited to share their experiences in detail for documentation to showcase the project results at grassroots. Total 98 RTI applicants who came along with CGCCs members of the block shared their experienced of using RTI and getting their entitlements without paying any bribe or cutting any share from grants and benefits received from selected three govt. schemes</p>	<p>C</p>
<p>Activity 10.2 Analysis and Documentation of FGDs</p>	<p>Documentation of all these FGD cases has been done and most of these RTI Applicants can be shown as a success story since they had been able to get corruption free service delivery of the selected three schemes otherwise it would not had happened without paying bribe or giving some cut from the grant money or wages. Few of the success stories are being annexed herewith.</p>	
<p>Activity 10.3 Preparation and distribution of Newsletter, mainly publishing project outputs</p>	<p>All the newsletters have been printed and distributed among project stakeholders, CGCCs, policy makers and service providers to share the project activities and findings/experiences in larger community and govt. The web links of these newsletters are given below in sequence.</p> <p>http://www.cuts-international.org/cart/pdf/RTI_in_Action01-09.pdf</p> <p>http://www.cuts-international.org/cart/pdf/RTI_in_Action02-09.pdf</p> <p>http://www.cuts-international.org/cart/pdf/RTI_in_Action01-10.pdf</p> <p>http://www.cuts-international.org/cart/pdf/RTI_in_Action02-10.pdf</p>	<p>C</p>
<p>Activity 11 Design one RTK, which can be used for wider dissemination and replication</p>	<p>The RTI Toolkit or Model Framework of Replication has been designed and finalized with the inputs from 'Partnership for Transparency Fund'. The introductory part of this product is as follows. The Toolkit can be found at the following link of CUTS CART website.</p> <p>http://www.cuts-international.org/CART/pdf/RTI-Toolkit.pdf</p>	<p>C</p>

Annexure 2: Planned and Actual Outputs

Outputs Planned (Please reproduce what was in the Approved Proposal).	Actual Project Outputs	Status of completion ³ (Description of any major change in the outputs with explanation as needed.)

- RTI Ground Realities and corruption vulnerability survey.
- RTI Advisory and Information Centre established by second month of project and a RTI Tool kit produced by second last month of the project.
- Formation of 17 CGCCs and a Network of CGCC, CSOs and other interested individuals to work together for transparency and accountability in target schemes using RTI.
- Two Model RTI Gram Panchayat established
- At least 340 RTI Applications filed.
- At least 30 dialogue/peer learning events (2 district, 17 block level, one exposure visit One Mid Tern Advocacy, one final Advocacy Meeting and 8 FGDs) process with policy makers and implementers and citizens to mobilisation against corrupt processes, share their experiences regarding being victim of corrupt service providers and educating them for use of RTI Act for resolving and fighting against it for rooting out the causes of it.
- Set of recommendations for Simplified & transparent Service Delivery Processes.
- At least 85 (05 per CGCC) documented Case Studies of obtaining corruption free services under target schemes.
- 04 Quarterly Newsletters

Annexure 3: Project Outcomes/Impact

Project Indicators Please refer to the log frame in the proposal submitted as per the agreement	Impact	Baseline Value	End of project Value	Sources and evidence to verify the results
Number of effective actions taken by the Department to curb corruption in the target Schemes.		There was no base line available for this indicator	Though several such decisions were taken by the department at various levels but the data was not collected in this regards. There are evidences that at District, block and GP level several decisions were taken in response of filed	*Review of relevant Studies and surveys. Information obtained from the department using RTI.

³ C= fully completed, NC = very limited or no completion, D= Deferred to Phase 2, IP=In progress.

		<p>RTI applications. In certain cases instructions were given by state information commission for providing the demanded information and department taken several actions and than information was provided about the progress made in the action taken.</p>	<p>* Information provided by the department using the RTI. Baseline before advocacy. End of project after advocacy.</p>
<p>Percentage of citizens who report that corruption in the PR&RD department is decreasing/increasing /about the same.</p>	<p><i>Trend in the level of corruption:</i> As per the opinion of majority of the respondents, the level of corruption in NREGS is on the rise as said by 48 percent people which is 19 percent lesser than the last year in which 67 percent people had the opinion that it is increasing. Big chunk of respondents around 38 percent said that in the menace of corruption nothing had happened during last year and still it is static.</p> <p>The level of corruption in IAY: Majority of the beneficiaries 34 percent said that the level of corruption is unchanged in comparison of last year but at the same time 28 percent people think that has decreased in last one year. But one fourth of the people do not know about this change if had happened. They are not in a position to say any thing regarding this.</p> <p>The level of corruption in SGSY: The beneficiaries of this scheme as well told that level of corruption is static as mentioned by 31 percent which is 15 percent lesser than the pre RGR findings. 20 percent of people are unaware about his positive change if has happened during the year.</p>	<p>* RTI Ground Realities and corruption vulnerability survey at beginning and end of survey.</p> <p>* Initiatives taken by R.D. department for developing more model Gram Panchayats in the state.</p>	

<p>Number of model Gram Panchayats established following the project example.</p>	<p>Under the project initiatives were taken to develop two selected GPs under Jaipur and Tonk districts and several activities were done as per plan. As a result these GPs are an example in terms of RTI Awareness not only among common masses but among the PRI members and GP staff.</p> <p>The response capacity of these GPs is much more fast and qualitative in comparison of neighboring GPs. But government could not take up this model to replicate at other GPs mainly because one year period too less to come in terms with government to adopt such model and scale up the same. Though the policy makers were much impressed with the initiative.</p>	<p>'RGR & CVA Survey' of scheme beneficiaries of the project area at the start and end of the project.</p>
<p>Percentage of project area citizens who report paying a bribe to obtain benefits under the Schemes.</p> <p>Data related to percentage of surveyed beneficiaries and bribe paid by them on an avg. for availing the facilities of select schemes and extrapolation with total expenditure of schemes and total no. of beneficiaries in interventional area</p>	<p><i>Corruption Vulnerability Analysis:</i> In post RGR 21 percent overall beneficiaries have accepted that they have paid bribe (Pre RGR 27 percent) to service providers and the amount of this given bribe was varied from one person to another which come on an average around P285 per beneficiary in whole interventional areas in NREGS which is P18 lesser than the Pre RGR figure of P303.</p> <p>In IAY, only 34 percent respondents accepted (Pre RGR 52 percent) that they have paid cash bribe for availing the benefits of this scheme at various level of service delivery. In this case as well the amount of bribe demanded from beneficiary was different in most of the cases and after negotiations; the bribe paid to various service providers mainly to Gram Sachiv comes around P960 in each case.</p> <p>In SGSY 13 percent beneficiaries said to pay bribe (Pre RGR 18 percent) mainly to bank officials for doing the long pending grading of their group and than accordingly sanctioning the subsidy loan and transferring it in their account. The bribed amount comes around P417 on an average in cash. One important aspect of this story is that NGOs</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Information obtained from the department on funds disbursed under the scheme and estimating the proportion affected by corruption by using the survey data. • An evaluation form to obtain feedback from the citizens and service providers reached by the CGCC, RAIC, and block level consultations.

	<p>who are coordinating the ground level activities have to pay a fixed percentage of bribe at <i>Zila Parisad</i> level while getting check of their honorarium for tasks completed and as a result they start to compromise with the field activities therefore they can follow up properly with bank officials and their grading gets delayed and they have to pay bribe to speed up the process.</p>	
<p>Percentage of respondents (beneficiaries and providers) who found the use of RTI Act to be effective in curbing corruption in letter and spirit, at various levels of execution of target schemes.</p>	<p>Under the project around 450 RTI applications were filed by CGCCs and local community/beneficiaries in the selected three scheme of state government with a focus on the corrupt issues came out of survey and experienced by them while availing the services of these schemes.</p> <p>In NREGS total 199 RTI applications were file and out of those 23 were related to registration for job and making job cards. 21 people filed RTI asking about the reasons of giving priority of few people (who were near and dears one of service providers) in providing Jobs ignoring other entitlement holders. Under the scheme 47 RTI applications were filed because service providers were lenient in work measurement and given extra benefits in comparison to other common people.</p> <p>In NREGS adding names of family members and friends of <i>Sarpanch</i> and other PRIs can be seen often so targeting this issue total 38 RTI applications were filed by beneficiaries/CGCCs asking reasons of adding name without working in must rolls and photocopies. 05 RTI attempted to ask about taking commissions in payment of wages, and 65 were related to the worksite facilities.</p> <p>In SGSY total 89 RTI applications were filed and the issue of grading was targeted most. So majority of RTI Applications (69) were filed related to this issue, which has to be</p>	<p>Analysis of total RTI applications filed under the project and feedbacks taken from CGCCs and RTI applicants themselves.</p>

done by the concerned bank. There were some incidences of corruption in the selection of beneficiaries and group formation that was done NGOs so 11 RTI were filed to target that issue. At bank level bribe is demanded for granting loan and disbursement of that grant so such nine issue were identified and filed RTI asking the reasons of delay in disbursement of grants and in one case grant was immediately given, in 03 cases it took months to get the grant and in case of 05 cases still grants were not given. In few cases the NGOs that are responsible for mobilizing and coordinating the SGSY activities at field level are taking money from beneficiaries and making savings from expenses sanctioned for them and compromising with quality.

In *Indira Awaas Yojana* total 150 RTI applications were filed by raising the issues of corruption like corruption in was selection process and for that 38 applications were filed. Second issue was changing the orders of beneficiary in the list and for that 26 applications were file for enquiring about the reasons. While giving sanctioned check by *Gram Sachiv* (16), During inspection of under construction house (05), during encashment of check by bank officials (06). Under the project painting the list of beneficiaries was given prime focus and for that total 74 applications were filed to know about the current status of this and actions taken in future to write this. In case of 33 applications demanded information was received mentioning that this list is not written at GP level and appeal has been done in 26 cases before *Sarpanch*, who is first appellate authority.

In most of the RTI applications, the information demanded was related to some act of corruption, and can be called an attempt to hit the corrupt service providers. Through strategic RTI filing by common man,

	<p>these corrupt processes were targeted so that systemic issues of corruption are fixed and change can be initiated and service providers are made accountable. These RTI applications were need based and represent most burning issues among beneficiaries. These applications were filed individually but were supported collectively. Satisfactory resolution of these RTI applications resulted in to simplifying the processes, resolving the problems, enhancing responsiveness of services providers and reducing corruption experience of common people in interventional areas</p>	
<p>Percentage of increase in RTI awareness, use and resolution.</p>	<p>Awareness regarding RTI Act, 2005 among common man: In the selected two districts, only 39 percent people have heard about the RTI Act 2005 so by this it can be inferred that awareness regarding this act in rural areas is still not enough. As far as the awareness regarding the RTI application-filing process is concerned, 26 percent people know about Application format, 19 percent respondents know about Public Information Officer, 21 percent respondents known to fee rules for APL and BPL applicants, 08 percent respondents were aware about the Time Period in which information has to be provided to applicants and only 7 percent respondents are aware about the provisions of first and second Appellate Authorities.</p> <p>Awareness regarding application filing process under RTI Act, 2005: The people who are aware about this Act and used this as filing RTI application in various departments but their percentage is not more than 5.4 percent in these two districts. Only twelve respondents filed RTI application out of 242 total respondents only in 33 percent cases information was provided by PIOs and out of them 75 percent of RTI applicants were not satisfied with the provided information but as far as going for first appeal is concerned merely 8.4 percent applicants opted this option and rest were</p>	

	<p>decided for not going in to that due to various reasons.</p> <p>Aware about the potent law of RTI is still a concern in rural areas because only 19 percent of them have heard about this progressive legislation. But in the semi urban areas of the blocks headquarters in the two districts is quite high as 39 percent which was 35 percent at the start of the project.</p> <p>Regarding the filing process of RTI Act 2005; 32 percent people know about the request format that it can be made on plain paper as well. 27 percent people know about required fee and 22 percent know about the Public Information Officer. Only 14 percent people could correctly answered about the mandatory time period of 30 days but even less than this only 10 percent people are aware about first appeal and 04 percent about the second appeal.</p> <p>The use of RTI Act 2005 in rural areas is very minimal and only 09 percent people used this Act as tool in various govt. departments for various purposes. 54 percent of out of total use of RTI was done in Rural Development and Panchayati Raj Department itself. Here important thing to note is that in majority of cases roughly 80 percent, people came to know about this Act through NGOs only. In all the cases of using RTI, 62 percent applicants received information remaining people could not receive it. Only 27 percent applicants were satisfied with the information. These RTI applications (48 percent) were related to corruption issues and 32 percent were related to personal issues, remaining 20 percent were related to public benefit issues of the villages.</p>	
--	--	--

<p>Percentage of respondents (users and service providers) who regard CGCC assistance, and orientation/ consultations events to be effective to help citizens obtain corruption free services.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The CGCCs performed well as per given tasks, targets and other project related responsibilities Internally this activity was done as a part of monthly review of this project, which was based on monitoring, and feedback of CGCCs. All the monthly progress reports of the project are available with project team. • Participation in training, meetings, consultations= 100 percent • Sending photo copies of RTI applications=90 percent • Making regular telephone calls for reporting=75 percent • Fully met their objectives=75 percent • Sending regular progress report=65 percent • Sending feedback forms regularly=50 percent • Level of completion of their monthly report =40 percent • Average time spent by CGCCs in the field with citizens=6-7days in a month 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CART records and RGR and Corruption Vulnerability Survey • Documented 'cases' of enhanced service delivery
--	--	---

4. Financial Progress Report

Partnership for Transparency

Fund

“Reforming the processes in the Rural Development Department through policy and civic engagement, based on RTI Act 2005, in Rajasthan, India”

Expenditure statement May 2009 to Feb.2011

S. No.	Budget head (particulars) as per the approval	Approved Annual Budget	Add. Budget approved (Ext. Phase)	Grant total budget	Q-1 Expenses	Q-2 Expenses	Q-3 Expenses	Q-4 Expenses	Total annual Expenses	Expenses during the extension phase	Total Expenses	Balance
	Months	12	5	(12+5) 17	2	4	3	3	12	5	(12+5) 17	
1	Personnel Costs [No .X Months	516,000	64,000	580,000	64,000	143,000	111,000	146,000	464,000	100,773	564,773	15,227

	<i>X Salary per Month X Time]</i>												
1.1	Project Coordinator [1 X 12 X 18,000 X 100%]	216,000	36,000	252,000	36,000	72,000	54,000	54,000	216,000	36,000	252,000	-	
1.2	Assistant Project Coordinator [1 X 12 X 12,000 X 75%]	108,000	18,000	126,000	18,000	36,000	27,000	27,000	108,000	18,000	126,000	-	
1.3	Support Staff [1 X 12 X 10,000 X 50%]	60,000	10,000	70,000	10,000	20,000	15,000	15,000	60,000	10,000	70,000	-	
1.4	CGCC members [40 X 11 X 300 X 100%]	132,000		132,000	-	15,000	15,000	50,000	80,000	36,773	116,773	15,227	
II	Programme Cost	982,000	112,000	1,094,000	142,062	182,748	228,749	227,036	780,595	247,410	1,028,005	65,995	
2.1	Setting up & functioning of the RAIC at CUTS CART off.	40,000	-	40,000	20,000	8,000	10,000	2,000	40,000	-	40,000	-	
2.2	Dialogue with Govt.& project Officials.	20,000	-	20,000	5,000	7,000	4,000	2,000	18,000	-	18,000	2,000	
2.3	Selection of 35 CGCCs	10,000	-	10,000	10,000	-	-	-	10,000	-	10,000	-	

2.4	Two District Level CGCCs Orientation Programme.	100,000	-	100,000	98,062	-	-	-	98,062	-	98,062	1,938
2.5	Developing 'RTI Ground Realities (RGR) and Corruption Vulnerability Analysis' questionnaire and field testing	8,000	15,000	23,000	4,000	5,000	-	-	9,000	10,000	19,000	4,000
2.6	Administering 600 RGR and Corruption Vulnerability Analysis Survey	60,000	63,000	123,000	-	59,858	-	-	59,858	59,632	119,490	3,510
2.7	Consolidation of RGR and Corruption Vulnerability Analysis.	25,000	30,000	55,000	-	25,000	-	-	25,000	32,000	57,000	(2,000)
2.8	Organising 17 Block Level Chaupals (BLCs) (17x8,	136,000	-	136,000	-	-	112,000	26,387	138,387		138,387	(2,387)

	000)											
2.9	Filing 340 RTI application, analysis & Documentation	10,000	-	10,000	-	5,000	2,500	2,500	10,000	-	10,000	-
2.10	RTI Exposure Visit (REV)	65,000	-	65,000	-	32,549	45,039	-	77,588	-	77,588	(12,588)
2.11	Eight FGDs	40,000	-	40,000	-	-	-	-	-	25,532	25,532	14,468
2.12	Impact assessment	7,000	4,000	11,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	11,000
2.13	Developing two Model RTI Gram Panchayat (MRGP)*	200,000	-	200,000	-	22,681	22,550	63,737	108,968	45,646	154,614	45,386
2.14	Mid Term Dissemination cum advocacy Meeting	40,000	-	40,000	-	-	-	34,657	34,657	-	34,657	5,343
2.15	Networking & advocacy	20,000	-	20,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	3,000	18,000	-	18,000	2,000
2.16	State Level Advocacy Meeting (SLDM)	60,000	-	60,000	-	-	-	59,175	59,175	-	59,175	825

2.17	Development, finalization & distribution of the RTI Tool Kit	50,000	-	50,000	-	-	-	-	-	64,600	64,600	(14,600)
2.18	Submission of quarterly & final narrative reports with actual expenditure statements	6,000	-	6,000	-	-	-	5,000	5,000	-	5,000	1,000
2.19	Production of 4 issues of quarterly newsletters [4X10,000]	40,000	-	40,000	-	12,660	12,660	13,580	38,900	-	38,900	1,100
2.20	Monitoring and Evaluation (Internal)	35,000	-	35,000	-	-	15,000	15,000	30,000	-	30,000	5,000
2.21	Audit Fees	10,000	-	10,000	-	-	-	-	-	10,000	10,000	-
	Total	1,498,000	176,000	1,674,000	206,062	325,748	339,749	373,036	1,244,595	348,183	1,592,778	81,222
	Overheads 5%	75,000	9,000	84,000	10,303	16,287	16,900	18,700	62,190	17,000	79,190	4,810
	Grand Total	1,573,000	185,000	1,758,000	216,365	342,035	356,649	391,736	1,306,785	365,183	1,671,968	86,032

5. Success stories (include photos if possible) and case studies

Success Story 1

Gram Panchayat: Jai Singhpura, Chaksu, Jaipur
Applicant: Shiv Sahai Gurjar s/o Ram Chandra Gurjar
Problem: Non-issuance of job card under NREGS
Date of application under RTI: 2009-08-03
Date of resolution: 2009-08-16

The Case: Shiv Sahai was demanding the job card under NREGS for six month from the Secretary and the Sarpanch of the Gram Panchayat. However, they kept postponing action on the pretext that in his family there are three job cards already in the name of three brothers and, therefore, a fourth one cannot be issued. But, in reality, all the brothers were residing separately.

One day, Shiv Sahai came in touch with CGCC member Suresh Saini and shared his problem. Suresh informed him that every ration cardholder is considered a separate household and is entitled for a job under NREGS and suggested to Shiv Sahai to file an RTI application at the Gram Panchayat. CGCC provided all the requisite support for filing the application, which was filed.

The entire Panchayat machinery came into action and contacted the CGCC and called him for discussion. Thereafter, a job card was issued to Shiv Sahai.

Learning: Writing a one-page RTI request works more effectively than visiting the Gram Panchayat on daily basis and requesting for some work for the requester is entitled for.

Success Story 2

Name of applicant: Badri Lal Bairwa
Gram Panchayat: Kathawala, Chaksu, Jaipur
Problem: Non-sanction of Indira Aawas
Date of application under RTI: 2009-07-03
Date of resolution: 2009-07-22

The Case: Badri, a young below-poverty-line (BPL) person, lived in a small thatched house and was toiling hard as a mason to support his seven-member family. He often wondered how some people better off than him could manage to obtain benefits under the Indira Aawas Yojana and he could not under the said scheme.

Badri came into contact with local CGCC member, who advised him to file an RTI application at the Gram Panchayat office and he did that, seeking his waiting number in the IAY list and the reasons for not sanctioning Indira Aawas to him so far. Eleven days after filing this application, the Gram Sachiv visited his residence and assured sanctioning of Indira Aawas to him in the next Gram Sabha. The Gram Sachiv

requested him to withdraw his RTI application and later on tried to pressurise him through the local wardpanch, but Badri refused to do so.

On 19th day, the Gram Sachiv came back with written information about Badri's waiting number, which was on the top of the list, and handed it over to Badri. He informed Badri that his Indira Aawas has been sanctioned and guided for starting construction work, assuring him that the first instalment of the grant will reach in his account in coming months, which happened. Badri himself did masonry work and his house was constructed.

Learning: The delay in service delivery is common, but RTI can change the scenario.

Success Story 03

Name of applicant: Jai Kumar Bakliwal s/o Navratan Bakliwal
Gram Panchayat: Kirawal, Malpura, Tonk
Problem: Non-issuance of a duplicate job card
Date of application under RTI: July 07, 2009
Date of resolution: July 16, 2009

The Case: Educated only up to the Secondary level, Jai Kumar was working in NREGS and was enjoying the earnings under the scheme. However, he lost his job card and went to the Gram Panchayat and met the Gram Sachiv to get a duplicate job card, who bluntly refused. A neighbour suggested to Jai Kumar to gratify the Gram Sachiv.

Jai Kumar, however, kept following up the matter with the Gram Sachiv, without success. On one such visit, he came in contact with a member of the CGCC in the Gram Panchayat office, who suggested to him to file an RTI application in the Gram Panchayat, asking the reasons for not issuing the duplicate job card. He did as advised and within a week he was issued the duplicate job card. Jai was happy to get it and was able to join his job mates at NREGS worksite again and earn his livelihood. Today, he himself is advising his fiends to use RTI if something thing has not been delivered by government officials.

Learning: The uneducated villagers do not know the procedures under the RTI Act, 2005. Whenever guided properly, they can expect favourable results.

Success Story 04

Name of applicant: Kalu Ram s/o Roop Narain
Gram Panchayat: Sitarampura, Malpura, Tonk
Problem: Non-payment of wages of 15 days by the Gram Sachiv
Date of application under RTI: July 30, 2009
Date of resolution: August 17, 2009

The Case: Kalu Ram was working in the NREGS scheme, but did not receive his wages from 2009-01-16 to 2009-01-31. Verbal and written complaints yielded no results.

One day, Kalu too came in touch with a member of the CGCC, who explained to him about RTI Act and motivated him for filing an RTI application at the Gram Panchayat, asking about the unpaid wages of 15 days and the reasons of non-payment. Kalu Ram filed a RTI application on July 30, 2009, at the Gram Panchayat. It was a big surprise for Kalu to see prompt action taken by the Gram Sachiv. The Gram Sachiv turned up with entire related records and found that, due to the mistake of the Employment Assistant, Kalu's name was omitted from payment. In the next payment sheet sent to the bank for NREGS wage payments, Kalu's name was included for payment and Kalu's bank account was promptly credited with 15 days' wages.

Learning: Lack of complaint redressal mechanism and insensitive attitude of officials can also be corrected by moving under the provisions of the RTI.

Success Story 05

Name of applicant: Manni Devi Raigar w/o Prahald Raigar

Gram Panchayat: Natwara, Niwai, Tonk

Problem: Delaying in the grading process.

Date of application under RTI: 2010-06-16

Date of resolution: 2010-07-06

The Case: Manni Devi, aged 59 years, was member of a well functioning Shoba Swayam Sahayata Samooh, a Self-help Group, made for starting a dairy business under the SGSY scheme. The SHG was entitled for granting a revolving fund by the Bank, but the concerned bank official was demanding some bribe for doing that and had been delaying the process for long. All women members were helpless. One day, Manni Devi's son came in contact with a visiting CGCC and told him the entire story. The CGCC suggested filing an RTI application with the bank, asking the reasons of delay in the grading process of the Shoba SHG. Next day, an RTI request was filed and with the bank by Manni Devi, asking the reasons for delay in the grading of the group.

On June 22, 2010, the local NGO coordinator of the scheme received a call from the concerned bank official who was enquiring about the 'SHG and Manni Devi' and told him that on July 05, 2010, he will visit this group for grading, without mentioning about the RTI request. The bank official visited the group and completed the formalities of grading on given date of July 05, 2010 and, in the same week, revolving fund was granted, without any bribe.

Learning: RTI changed the preference of bank from commercial banking to social banking.

Success Story 06

Name of applicant: Gumani Devi Bairwa w/o Sheonath Bairwa

Gram Panchayat: Chimanpura, Chaksu, Jaipur
Problem: Delaying in the granting loan to SHG
Date of application under RTI: 2010-12-09
Date of resolution: 2011-01-15

The Case: Gumani Devi was a member of the Shagun Swayam Sahayata Samooh which was constituted under SGSY for starting 'Breeding of Goats and Dairy Business'. The SHG was granted revolving fund and had its own income from group members, who deposit monthly fixed amount and the second grading was pending since long, which was the basis on which loan was to be granted to the SHG. The bank official was demanding money for doing so. The coordinator of the NGO given the responsibility of facilitating the activities of concerned SHG, Norat Lal called in 'RTI Advisory and Information Cell' and as per given suggestions came in touch with the local CGCC, who supported him in filing an RTI application with the bank by Gumani Devi, asking about the reasons of delay in the second grading and sanctioning of the loan to the SHG.

The RTI application reached the Bank Manager directly, who instructed the concerned bank official to complete the second grading process of the SHG within 30 days and it was done within that time. As a result of this grading, the SHG was able to get a loan of P2.25 lakh to start the planned business activity.

Learning: Though RTI is not a complaint redressal mechanism, but it puts in place the complaint redressal mechanism if it is not there in any department and streamlines the existing one.

Success Story 07

Name of applicant: Kailash Chand Bagdolia s/o Radhe Lal
Gram Panchayat: Gudaliya, Tonk
Problem: Non-availability of medicines and tents at NREGS worksites
Date of application under RTI: 2009-11-02
Date of resolution: 2009-11-27

The Case: Kailash was an employee in a medical shop in a nearby town and his wife and other family members worked in the scorching heat of summer under NREGS in the village. He was well aware of the poor arrangements at worksites, but had no idea of how to improve the situation. One day, Kailash met with the local CGCC at his shop and enquired about the provisions of worksite facilities. The CGCC suggested to him to file an RTI application with the Gram Panchayat, asking the same question and he did so, adding a few more questions in the application about medicines and availability of tents.

This RTI application was the first one of its kind, which created havoc in the Gram Panchayat. The Gram Sachiv enquired about the provisions under RTI Act from higher ups and his colleagues and came to know about the provision of penalty and departmental action, in case of not providing the requested information within 30

days of time and acted immediately. The Gram Sachiv ensured immediate availability of two tents and a few essential medicines used in first aid at all worksites.

Learning: The provision of penalty and fear of its imposition among service providers works well and ensures accountability among them. Merely filing an RTI application ensures redressal of complaint.

Success Story 08

Name of applicant: Jagdish Chand Meghwal s/o Jaina Ram Meghwal

Gram Panchayat: Panchala, Uniara, Tonk.

Problem: Non-sanction of a house under Indira Aawas Yojana

Date of application under RTI: 2010-01-07

Date of resolution: 2010-02-12

The Case: Jagdish Chand, a poor BPL person, lived in abject poverty and worked as a daily wager in the nearby town. Two years back, he was informed by the earlier Sarpanch that an IAY will be sanctioned to him soon, but nothing had happened. He enquired of the new Sarpanch about the same and got the answer that your turn will come next year. Jagdish was anticipating some corruption in this matter and told the story to the local CGCC, who suggested to him to file an RTI application, asking the waiting number in the permanent waiting list made for IAY. Jagdish did the same.

The Gram Sachiv talked with the local wardpanch and requested him to bring Jagdish to the Gram Panchayat Office. Jagdish went to the Gram Panchayat Office with the CGCC and came to know that, by mistake, Indira Aawas had been allotted to some other person with a similar name (Jagdish Meghwal s/o Jaina Ram Meghwal), who was known to the applicant Jagdish and richer than him, but both the Sarpanch and the Gram Sachiv assured him that this mistake will be rectified and he will be sanctioned Indira Aawas in that month itself. On Feb 12, 2010, Jagdish got formal sanction of his Indira Aawas and started the construction and, very soon, the first instalment had been credited to his bank account.

Learning: RTI attacks favouritism and corrects the administrative mistakes and ensures accountability and service delivery.

6. Materials/reports/toolkits published/disseminated and/or posted on the website

Under the project a RTI Toolkit or 'Model Framework for Replication: Usages of RTI in Rural Rajasthan, India: *Enhancing Transparency and Reforming the Processes*' was published. There is a brief about the published Toolkit which can be accessed on the given web link below.

<http://www.cuts-international.org/CART/pdf/RTI-Toolkit.pdf>

About the Toolkit

The Toolkit is an analytical compilation of experiences gained during the implementation of the project, including a wide range of diverse activities, public and stakeholders' consultations/peer learning and formation of RTI support groups in rural areas and CSOs' networking for promoting strategic use of RTI

What is the Aim?

The Toolkit, entitled, 'Model Framework for Replication: Usages of RTI in Rural Rajasthan, India: Enhancing Transparency and Reforming the Processes', is published under the project Reforming the Processes in the Rural Development Department through Policy Dialogue and Civic Engagement, Based on RTI Act (2005) in Rajasthan, India. It explores the need of reforming the service delivery and decision-making processes in three selected national flagship schemes implemented by the Rural Development Department, Government of Rajasthan. The main aim of this Toolkit is to enhance the capability of the citizens to use the RTI Act constructively, which would contribute to reducing the systemic forms of corruption *vis-à-vis* reforms.

How Was It Developed?

The Toolkit is designed for citizens/coalitions working against corruption in India and across the world and has been developed as part of focused and welfare schemes targeted in two project districts of Rajasthan by involving CGCCs, proactive citizens, scheme beneficiaries and local CSOs. It is an analytical compilation of experiences gained during the implementation of the project, including a wide range of diverse activities, public and stakeholders' consultations/peer learning and formation of RTI support groups in rural areas and CSOs' networking for promoting strategic use of RTI.

What Is the Structure?

The Toolkit is divided into four sections. Section 1 contains the introduction, aims, objectives and usage of the Toolkit. Section 2 deals with the rationale behind the project and emphasises the need of reforming the processes in the Rural Development Department and sheds light on the RTI Act, 2005 as an effective tool. Section 3 is related to the effective implementation of the RTI Act through people's participation and constructive policy dialogue. Section 4 carries several success stories, in the form of real case studies while using RTI.

How to Use It?

This Toolkit has been designed to assist and guide the citizens to use the RTI 2005 and exercise this right more effectively. The Toolkit consists of a set of tools that can be used to obtain and use information on various aspects related to the functioning of public agencies to improve governance. It can be effectively used to increase transparency and accountability in government agencies and thus directly benefit marginalised groups. The Toolkit can be used for making the recently introduced RTI Act effective.

Who Can Use It?

The Toolkit is mainly targeted at NGOs, activists and civil society groups that are working on governance issues. It will also be useful for individuals and organisations

working on human rights, justice and corruption issues. Community members (either individually or collectively) can also use this Toolkit. It will be particularly useful for NGOs and activists working in those countries/areas where the RTI has been enacted on paper, but its implementation is poor. While the presence of an enabling environment, in the form of a specific RTI law helps, the Toolkit can be also used effectively in areas/countries where there is no specific law on RTI.

End of the PCR