REPORT
Workshop with GEF/FAO SPACC MSP project at HYDERABAD
11-14 MARCH 2014

As per the guidance of Sh Shashi Shekhar, Addl. Secretary, MoEF, GOI & GEF SGP Chair and follow up plan to the **7th January 2014** meeting at New Delhi and the field visit by Mr Sodhi in November 2013 to create the necessary links and develop a partnership on the best practices with GEF/FAO SPACC project and its 9 partners, a learning mission was arranged for 4 GEF/SGP project partners who have been recently sanctioned GEF/UNDP SGP projects and had shown interest in setting up Climate Monitoring Stations (CMS) at their project sites in Rajasthan and Bihar – the states where climate variations are quite substantial over the past few years which disturbs the cropping pattern.

SPACC had organized a one full day session in a manner that each of their Sector Experts provide a presentation on their perspectives of the project and how they went about putting up the project. This followed the feedback from the visiting SGP partners and answering their queries in solving their problems in the field, if the replication is adopted in their respective areas.

Thereafter, the opportunity was availed to have one-to-one guidance workshop on 14th March for the 9 NGOs of SPACC who had shown interest during the 7th January meeting at Delhi to take up further activities beyond setting up the CMS and had desired GEF/SGP assistance. FAO/SPACC project had requested each of these NGO partners to bring their presentation or present the concepts that they intend taking up during the meeting specially scheduled for them on 14th March.

11th &12th MARCH 2014:

A total of 12 representatives from **4 GEF/ UNDP SGP** project partners participated in the learning mission. The GEF/FAO SPACC (Strategic Pilot on Adaptation to Climate Change) project had split the 12 representatives, plus GEF/SGP representative in three different groups. The **groups were divided in a manner that each of the three representatives from the visiting SGP partner NGO joins a separate field mission so that each NGO partner gets exposure to three different sites**.

On 11th March, the three groups led by Anil Arora (CARE project site); Dragpal Singh (CARVE project site) and Mrs Shashi Tyagi (BIRDS project site). They were accompanied the groups visiting the respective sites where the facilities have been set up by the NGO, CARE, CARVE and BIRDS as per a copy of the schedule enclosed. The Group was led by Dr. T.N. Reddy of CARE; Dr Ravindra KG of CARVE and Dr Paul, of BIRDS:

At each of the centres the following equipments installed:

1) Rain Gauge;
2) Temperature Recorders;
3) Humidity Recorder;
4) Evaporometer;
5) Sunshine Recorder;
6) Wind Direction Equipment;
7) Wind Speed Measuring Equipment

The total cost of the equipment, including installation charges, works out to roughly Rs.1.20 lac. The area gets an average annual rainfall of roughly 600mm and 75% of the farmers grow cotton and the rest cultivate vegetables, maize and groundnut. The maximum temperature in the area goes upto 48 deg. C and the minimum is 18 deg. C. CARE has formed a Climate Change Adaptation Committee comprising of 59 community members. One Climate Monitoring Station caters to 3 villages comprising of a population of 70,885 consisting of 17,804 households.

The various equipments at Climate Monitoring Station are managed by Mr. Brahmi Devi, Ms. Bhemamma, Ms. Sukanya and Mr. Srinivasulu who monitor the readings. The various data is passed on to the CCA committee through notations in the registers maintained on the spot and through SMS messages at fixed timings and dates. The Committee passes on the rainfall, humidity and sunshine data to the farmers and gets guided on the rainfall forecast. Based on the sunshine pattern, the farmers decide on spraying and sowing. The wind speed and the wind direction equipment help in deciding on cross-pollination of crops and the pesticide spraying. The temperature data is write on the School's Notice Board every day and also read during the prayer time and the children carry the message back to their parents to support in their decision making for sowing and harvesting.

The visiting GEF/SGP NGO partners discussed in detail the intricacies of data capturing, scheduling and timing and how the regularity of data collection and information dissemination is done. Several questions were asked on the procurement of equipment, costing and the usage of each instrument and how it functions and the measurements are taken. It was evident that they wanted to understand in detail as to how the details, if adopted by them, will be useful in their area back home in their villages.

The night stay on 11th March was done in a *"Sarai"* at Sriselam for CARE people and for others accordingly.

On 12th morning the visit was made to Uppununthala Mandal Headquarters. At the farm of Mr. Krishnayya, an Observation Bore Well has been set up in parallel to digging a 24'x11'x12' water pit for storing the rainwater. This pit helps in discharging the ground water in the neighbouring areas. On the Bore Well, water-level-measuring equipment is used to check the level of ground water before and after using the bore well to take informed decisions on the quantity of water available during different timings of the season and what type of crop to grow. The area gets six hours of power from the grid. This system of digging the pit and linking up with data collection and the drip irrigation system has helped the farmer to increase his income by Rs.1 lac annually. The drip irrigation system is funded by the State Government through a subsidy ranging up to 90% with a limitation to pay only up to 1 hectare of land. CARE has only provided the technical support and the entire investment on digging the pit and for putting up the bore well is of the farmer himself. CARE has put up 60 observation wells over 70 habitations in the project area. They have set up a Hydrological Unit Level Committee consisting of 13 members in 17 villages.

CARE had organized a group interaction with SHG members near the Kamsanipally CMS. Anil Arora informed the gathering of the purpose of the visit and complimented the farmers and SHG members of the good work being done which is very innovative and worth replicating in other parts of the country, especially in areas like Rajasthan and Bihar which are badly impacted due to climate variations over the past few years. The farmers were

happy to know that the guests have come to learn from their experience and shared full support. The project officials explained through meticulously made out charts the overall objectives of the project, annual work plan and the up-to-date achievements. They had prepared the Action Plan based on the objectives and shared with the communities. The Secretary of Kamsanipally, Mr. Ramakrishna informed about the crop water budgeting being done and the crop-wise estimation done on the number of wells required in the area. The visiting NGOs had detailed interactions and several queries on the quality and quantity of the crop harvested through these methods and how to monitor the ground water level and take informed decisions on the type of crop to be sown. GVSS described the work of the farmers as "beautiful" and a "very successful work". GRAVIS, while explaining the difficult water, fodder and food problems in their area, thanked the farmers for their hard work and informed that they will also try to practice such new techniques in their area. GVNML called the farmers of Kamsanipally as a complete Agriculture University to acquire detailed knowledge of land, soil testing, manuring, etc. and gave a standing ovation by getting up from his seat. He said, for him it is a 100% learning for him from the farmers and he felt that the work being done is very commendable and will reach other parts of the country.

13 MARCH 2014

A total of 20 persons participated in the meeting on 13th March as per the list attached which comprised of 9 NGO partners of GEF/SGP, 9 SPACC officials and subject experts and two SGP officials**).** Dr. Govardhan briefed about the PMU of SPACC and introduced his team who coordinates the project work. Each subject expert explained one-by-one through power point presentations the steps taken in putting up the CMS, the "how" and "what" and how the data is used in the field.

Mr. Robinson John, Project Officer, SPACC gave a presentation on climate variability. Key issues covered were:

Rainfall trends
Rainfall shifts
Drought analysis
Crop water requirement in different crops

Combined climate variability is captured by SPACC in all the 9 project areas under them and the trends mainly show increasing temperatures in all the project areas compared to the baselines. The data combines the information captured in the project plus the data collected from the Meteorological Department at the State Level. Dr. Govardhan shared with all the participants a book containing complete baseline study done in the project area. The way the rainfall is measured was explained by Mr. John.

Mr. Uma Mahesh Rao, Project Officer, Land and Water Management – He gave a presentation on Participatory Climate Monitoring giving details as to how the farmers take informed decisions based on integration of Climate Monitoring Units and Hydrological Units. The following steps were suggested for the benefit of visiting NGO partners to put up Participatory Climate Monitoring (CPM) Stations:

Procurement of equipment;
Staff training;
Feasibility study;

Construction of PCM Station;
Social and Technical Feasibility Study;
Selection of Volunteers;
Training of Volunteers;
Dissemination of PCM data; and
Application of PCM data.

According to him, seven equipments have been installed in each PCM Station, as described in detail on Page 1 (put up at Mallapa Vagu school premises). At some villages, the equipments were installed at one place and at others, the units were set up at different places, totalling to 25 locations in 9 project areas. A total of 295 volunteers (191 male and 104 females) were trained. The experience on setting up the PCM Station and data collection in schools and at the locations at the community areas was shared and it was found that both the experiences had their own advantages, irrespective of data collection at one point or at multiple points. The community takes the decision as to which model will suit in their area and how the community owns it. Depending upon the rainfall patterns (these should not be compared with what is being done in AP), the partners are free to look at whether they should have more than one rainfall monitoring unit in respective areas as the rainfall pattern in Rajasthan is absolutely different. The reliability and regularity of data makes the difference and it should be kept in mind.

Mr. Sodhi enquired as to what is the thinking of Policy makers on the setting up of the PCM Stations. Dr. Govardhan explained that nobody else is adopting this approach in the country so far except for the respective IMDs. The policy makers feel that the data collection from such stations at the farmers' level is replicable in the country. The farmers from other neighbouring villages are also welcome to use the data from these stations. Dr. Govardhan opined that the farmers benefit should be kept supreme in mind. Mr. Sodhi informed that the sustainability of the Units that the SGP partners wish to put up should be kept in mind at the planning stage itself. It was discussed as to what is the "take" of the Andhra Pradesh government on this approach. Dr. Govardhan informed that there is a lukewarm acceptance of the State Government so far, as everything depends upon the concerned officer in the ministry. It was felt that a dialogue should be made with the State Government. Dr. Govardhan reiterated that the farmers' interest and benefit should be primary and we should not at this stage think of the acceptance by the government which may take time.

Mr. C. Konda Reddy, Project Officer - He explained that the real strength of the program lies in the institutionalization of the system through community-managed committees (Climate Change Adaptation Committee, Hydraulic Unit-CCAC (divided into the sub-committees of PCM Sub Committee, SLWM sub-committee, FCS- Farmers Climate School sub-committee) and the pilots to be adopted. The roles and responsibilities of each committee should be defined.

Mr. S. Sivaprasad, Project Officer - He gave the presentation on Farmers Climate Schools (FCS) to demystify the science of climate variability/change and to make informed decisions on adaptation. He informed that the salient features of a typical FCS are:

Lasts a full year – synchronizes with crop seasons
25-30 participants
Primary learning material – local micro-environment, local weather data collected by the farmers and farmers' fields

Learnings and corrections adopted;

The steps on pre-FCS activities were also explained by discussing during the meetings, workshops and by developing documents/materials for implementation of various sessions. Complete details of a total of 12 Sessions were explained as to how the process was adopted in forming the FCS. Thus the confidence level achieved by the communities by adopting the sessions was enhanced. Some exclusive FCSs were formed with women participation to involve them in the process. Dr. Govardhan informed that the continuous involvement of farmers is the key issue in the entire exercise.

Mr. S.S. Kandagal, Project Officer explained the process adopted to implement the Sustainable Land and Water Management (SLWM) pilots with the involvement of communities at each stage, including organizing workshops, and involving visits of farmers to Agricultural Research Stations. The soil moisture management was explained with different strategies for different types of crops. The suggested strategies included deep ploughing, conservation of furrows or dead furrows, crops sowing across the slope or contour, mulching, inter-cropping with leguminous crops and rain water harvesting with farm ponds for protective irrigation.

The strategies on non-pesticide management were also explained. These strategies included, bio-pesticides, use of neem based products, installation of bird perches, intercropping also serves as pest management strategy, use of pheromone traps and light traps to destroy *spodoptara* and *redhariv* caterpillar, timely operations and destroying the host plants. The strategies on soil nutrient management, soil moisture management and to improve soil organic carbon were also explained through four different methods. The reasons why the farmers should go for border crops (especially to ward off insects) and how the crop cutting exercise should be adopted was also explained.

Mr. Sodhi suggested that business models should be developed for setting up systems for mulching, pesticides and any other bio-methods of agricultural practices. He also shared that how we need to create the CC adaptation Centres as business models. How we need the farmers to pay at least Rs 100 per season for the information accessed and that would act as a pay off/ maintenance of the centres by the NGO on ongoing basis. An interactive session was held as to how to create this model.

OBSERVATIONS OF NGOs FROM THE FIELD VISIT:

Although the instant reactions of the three teams that went to three different field areas are given above during the interaction with the communities, their specific observations provided to the SPACC and GEF/SGP team is as under:

GRAVIS:

The best part was to convey messages to the farmers through the children during the school prayer meetings and through the school's Notice Board. How to control the ground water level at Rajasthan is a question where there are inequalities in the water availability - for few through tube wells whereas the neighbouring villages may not have any water at all. The techniques developed for "tomorrow" based on weather forecast for the increase in crops is very good. The community adopted the techniques and its acceptance was very good. The low cost agriculture practices through organic fertilizers are a good learning. It was

interesting to see the women's participation in data collection and their commitment. The farmers are eager to adopt and the remedial actions taken by the communities for crop sowing was good. The awareness amongst communities on the water table going down is growing. Experimentation of mix-agriculture with small land holding is good. It can lead to motivate the large land-holders to follow such practices. People have started learning the use of organic farming and increased output from it compared to chemical fertilizers and the amount of increase in income by the farmers.

GVNML:

The community is well aware and trained of what is being practiced. The model of appointing a community resource person is very useful. The fact that the Gram Panchayat will own the activities on completion of the project is a good sign and success criteria. Rather than data circulation, the information should go to the community on the weather forecasts. Crop water budgeting is a good lesson and it was interesting to know that the communities are practicing. The use of sustainable ground water and linking up with the weather monitoring data is very useful. More focus of the SPACC is on agriculture and increased income, but common property is not being focused at in the project. The hydrological unit should also be linked to water bodies and monitoring done on how the results will emerge. The increasing quantity Biomass also needs to be looked at and requires to be dealt with in the area. The water evaporation instrument needed certain clarification as to why twice the portion of water is to be reduced compared to what is captured in the rain-water gauge. The SPACC expert informed that the systems are developed by the manufacturer and the guidance is provided which is followed by the CMS.

GVSS:

The land holding and cropping pattern was similar to what is being done in their area in Rajasthan. They were not confident earlier as to whether the Climate Monitoring Centres will be useful, but after seeing the adoption in the field we feel it is doable. Although it may not be possible to follow 100% in their area, but there are a lot of areas of new learning. The water budgeting is also a good lesson. The children are good message carriers and setting up of the system in the School is a good idea. To switch to changing cropping patterns is a clear message through the use of Climate Monitoring Station and the hydrological unit. The awareness has risen among the communities on the climate adaptability.

WAY FORWARD:

Mr. Sodhi explained as to how to go about in carrying this activity beyond. We are looking at the budgeting and how to do the adaptation activities in parallel to the already sanctioned activities. He explored if SPACC team could visit the project sites to operationalize the activities on the ground. We should work out a two-page note for each partnership as to how to go about in doing it in the SGP area in the field.

14 MARCH 2014:

A **Guidance Workshop** was arranged for the 9 NGO partners of FAO/SPACC who had implemented the project in the field. Presentations were arranged in the groups of two NGOs to understand the proposal of each one of them and providing specific guidance to focus on GEF thematic areas and how the outcome based approach should be adopted.

BIRDS:

They are working in 100 villages and also acting as the nodal agency for a couple of donors. They are also the nodal agency for FAO for the SPACC project and coordinate with other 8 NGO partners to implement the activities on the ground. They are also managing the Hunger project (worth annually Rs.50 lacs) and giving grants to the NGOs in South India. This Hunger project is on livelihood, water and land management. Through the FAO project, 20,000 farmers will have access to local weather data. Their proposal to SGP is to seek Rs.46.80 lacs, with co-financing of Rs.9.06 lacs from communities and Rs.8.0 lacs from NGO. The NGO's total turnover is Rs.28 crore and it seems providing assistance to them to implement a small activity in the field may not be relevant.

SGP's GUIDANCE:

It was felt that if BIRDS can be used as a trainer to our NGO partners, it will be more useful. They were suggested if they can put up a project to support and train the existing SGP partners and replicate activities in the field. Having done the FAO project, demonstrating another similar model will not serve much purpose but they should develop a project to make the replication real in the field in other areas like Rajasthan and Bihar. The BIRDS were guided to prepare the proposal clearly describing the road-map of replication, with clear steps described, with clear institution building issues defined for the partners they will be guiding. The steps should also focus at business models.

CARE (Centre for Applied Research & Extension):

The presentation was given by Dr. T.N. Reddy. They have a turnover of over Rs.1 crore. The FAO/SPACC project is being done with a population of 33,000 villagers (out of them 27% are SC and 10% ST). The rainfall in the area is 600 mm and is very deficient. The ongoing projects they have are -

SPACC
Restoration of livelihoods in flood affected areas of Raichur
Support for Nilam Cyclone affected corn production areas in AP
Hussain-sagar lake improvement project
Preparation of C DAPs for North, South Goa districts and SAP Goa
Evaluation of FDAs in Kerala
M&E support to a world bank funded Water sector project.

Under SGP they intend doing soil & water management, agronomic interventions to cope with water scarcity, nutrition and prevention of disease measures in livestock; Institution development, market intelligence and linkages, technology parks (poultry birds, perennial fodder, shade-house, vermin unit, water recycling, etc). The objective of the proposal is to -

They take up Climate Advisory Services, Production Technology, Market linkages, and Farmer Resource Centre for livelihood activities.
Enhance farmers' capacity in climate resilient vegetable, flower and fruit production technologies;
Encourage more farmers in production of vegetables and fruits;
Increase in crop yields per unit water

Increase the per-capita consumption of vegetables
Increase in farmers' income from cultivation through market linkages
Support for integrated farming system for climate resilient livelihoods

The total project proposed is for Rs.48 lacs with co-financing of Rs.29 lacs from CARE. They also wish to take up Climate Advisory Services, Production Technology, Market linkages, and Farmer Resource Centre for livelihood activities. They were advised to link up with Small Agri Business Farmers Association. They were advised to provide a draft proposal, with detailed activity-wise budget for SGP's review and need based guidance on the proposal.

CARVE

Mr. G. Ravindra Kumar, Secretary provided a briefing. They established their organization in 1994. Their goal is to rejuvenate environment and support art and culture. In addition to working with SPACC, they have also done work on SRI with the help of NABARD, trainings on pottery design development through Handicrafts Department and acted as training consultants for National Drinking Water.

Under SGP proposal, they intend to do preservation of water and linking with alternate cropping to suit to climate variations.

The aim is to rejuvenate 75 farm families in 15 habitations;
Establish fruit producers' market linkages in 15 habitations;
Promote Bio pesticides and bio fertilizers;
Promote alternative orchards (from orange to pomegranate) in 75 ha in 15 habitations which are decreasing as a result of climate change.

COMBINED GUIDANCE TO CARE AND CARVE:

The SGP suggested that the proposals should be in QQT pattern. The SGP is a demand driven support and not a top-down approach that was adopted under SPACC where the outcomes were already defined and the partners were chosen to intervene in the respective areas. **The projects of CARE and CARVE should focus on biodiversity, land development and climate change rather than focusing only on adaptation**. The solar pottery unit could also be tried. The preservation of species could be linked at. The number of households to be taken up, number of trainings to be provided and their purpose should be described. They should continue working in SPACC areas and expand the scope of activities to benefit the farmers and simultaneously focusing on GEF thematic areas of BD, LD and CC. Activities, outputs and outcomes should be clearly defined, with budgets linked to each, with detailing of co-financing. They should list out all the activities clearly, including those which have been just developed through SPACC and then the money needed for the next step. CARE should go to Yerala at Sangli to see the market linkages from the farm outputs. They should try to form a Federation. CARVE should visit MGIRI to see the solar pottery wheel for adoption in their area. The brochure of MGIRI with contact details was sent to them through email.

DIPA: (Mr. Yasu Das):

They are a 20 year old organization and are based at Prakasham District. They want to work in 14 villages in Ongole District. They intend doing organic farming with climate variability methods adopted under SPACC. The proposed project budget is Rs.46.22 lacs, with SGP support of Rs. 34.47 lacs and co-financing of Rs.12.34 lacs.

GVS: (Mr. Ram Babu)

They were established in 1980 and have a turnover of Rs.50 lacs. They intend working with 3 Panchayats, through SHGs. The Climate Monitoring Station has been set up but what to do in the field is sought for from SGP. The traditional knowledge needs to be revived and applied through SGP. They have done some experimentation on integrated farming on individual households and wish to adopt this approach under SGP.

COMBINED GUIDANCE TO DIPA AND GVS:

After the presentations by DIPA and GVS, Mr. Sodhi explained that the outcomes are required to be need based and SGP does not practice top-down approach unlike other GEF's Full/Medium Scale projects. The SGP requires clear costing against each activity, with co-financing budget linked to it. SPACC activity should support on its own. The SGP can provide funds for the next stage of activities that should be self-sustainable and not for stand-alone activities. SGP encourages innovations which should become a business model, wherever possible. Maintenance of Climate Monitoring Stations set up through SPACC should be supported by the NGO through some sustainable methods of collecting some minor fee (say Rs.100 per year) from the farmers or through some other funding approach or by the NGO themselves. SGP should not be funding for such activities which have already been set up by SPACC. The SGP can provide funds for risk mitigation and for developing business models. The focus should clearly be on GEF thematic areas – BD, CC and LD. Since the area of both the NGOs is cotton growing, they should also look at solar applications. A copy of the brochure of MGIRI was shared with them to think of adopting the solar technologies that suit their requirement. If they wish to take up honey-bee which has not been done in their area, they are free to adopt as one of the additional activities as a business model, but the partners are free to chose whether to adopt or not as it should not be a top-down approach. The SGP promotes pilots and does not provide funds for business as usual activities. More the co-financing a partner provides, it is more useful from the GEF/SGP point of view.

PARTNER: (Mr. Nazir Khan)

They have their current annual budget of Rs.32.70 lacs. They took loan of Rs.25.0 crores as a micro finance from three different NBFC organizations at an interest rate ranging from 8 to 13.5% for a period from 2005-2010. All this was given at 1% loan margin for income generation activities (vegetable vending, sewing machine, *kirana* shop, poultry, puffed rice business, cloth business, embroidery, etc). A repayment of Rs.2.60 crores is still due to be paid. The loan was distributed to 8,000 poor women members. Each woman received Rs.3,000 to Rs.25,000. They wish to replicate SPACC in other areas and also take up proposals in a similar way as is being proposed by SAFE.

SAFE: (Mr. Madhukar Reddy)

The total turnover is Rs.1.8 crores. The project is on sustainable livelihood for climate resilient communities in Prakasam District. They work in 72 villages with more than 5,200

farmers. They require SPACC activities to continue for another two years to concretise the experience of the farmers. Now wish to do market linkages between consumers and producers. Want to integrate traditional knowledge with modern science and technology in pilots in Jampaleru and Peddavagu areas. Farmers are selling their animals due to shortage of fodder. They wish to bring back the biodiversity into the project. They proposed a budget of Rs.36 lacs from SGP, with equal co-funding.

COMBINED GUIDANCE TO PARTNER AND SAFE:

Mr. Sodhi informed them that GEF/SGP is not supporting SPACC activities which have already been demonstrated by both of them. GEF provides funds because the NGOs have done some activities and wish to go beyond for sustainable actions. GEF does not provide more than 20% funds for administrative costs. SGP can provide funds for expansion of SPACC activities and not for maintenance. The maintenance part of SPACC equipment and facilities should be done through a self-sustainable funding that the NGO should generate. SAFE can ask funds for putting up chick-pee grinding and packaging unit. They can set up solar weaving unit as their area is a cotton growing area. They should prepare flow-chart of activities and the outcomes, with related budgets.

SAID (Mr. Sujan Dass):

They are a 20 year old organization with a turnover of Rs.1.5 crores and working in Nalgonda District. They wish to take up pilots on SLWM on cotton and pulses. Want to set up two more CM Stations in two surrounding areas. They wish to eliminate middle men by forming a farmers' committee and collecting goods at a common place and linking with the market.

SYA (Star Youth Association) – Mr. Hasssan:

They did not bring any presentation but want to do a replication of SPACC activities in Anantpur area.

COMBINED GUIDANCE TO SAID AND SYA:

Both "SAID" and "SYA" were explained that SGP does not provide funding for the activity that has already been successfully demonstrated. Since both of them have established a platform by accessing funds from SPACC, they should look for the next step to bring in sustainability in their project area. Unlike SPACC where the outcomes were defined in advance, SGP looks for demand driven activities. The GEF thematic areas of CC, LD and BD were explained once again and they were asked to link up with the indicators defined in the last Page of the Application Form. They were asked to prepare detailed activity-wise budget, with co-financing component, which was explained on the board so that the SGP could look at the additionality that needs to be supported. They were explained what is innovation and how the incremental activities should be looked at and the funding sought. In the case of SAID, if they wish to link up the community with the market, they should list out the steps and funds linked to them for the understanding of the SGP Regional Advisory Committee. They were asked to share the draft proposals with us and we will provide them further guidance wherever necessary to improve the quality and outcomes of their proposals.

The meeting ended on 14th evening with a vote of thanks to Dr. Govardhan and his team for organizing the field visits, various sessions of the meeting and for all the logistics so well.