## Memos

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Nodes</th>
<th>References</th>
<th>Created On</th>
<th>Created By</th>
<th>Modified On</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collective action tends toward protest rather than self-help</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12/08/2011 7:27 AM</td>
<td>SIA</td>
<td>12/08/2011 7:34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content of Faridha's follow-up to Waste Mgmt Day</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>31/10/2011 4:18 PM</td>
<td>SIA</td>
<td>31/10/2011 4:38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convenience for COMM!</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>31/10/2011 3:08 PM</td>
<td>SIA</td>
<td>31/10/2011 3:08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance of regular supply of water</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>05/08/2011 1:36 AM</td>
<td>SIA</td>
<td>10/08/2011 6:28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INT #5 Notes and Transcripts</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15/08/2011 7:41 AM</td>
<td>SIA</td>
<td>24/10/2011 12:22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not able to identify speakers and water sources to content</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>05/08/2011 3:37 PM</td>
<td>SIA</td>
<td>10/08/2011 6:31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preference vs. Viability of a COMM system</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>04/08/2011 2:56 PM</td>
<td>SIA</td>
<td>10/08/2011 6:40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Bank's role</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15/08/2011 8:32 AM</td>
<td>SIA</td>
<td>15/08/2011 8:48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Friday, August 12, 2011
In reading this and other transcripts, one of the things that is emerging is that the collective action tends toward protest rather than self-help. There may be propensity to work together, but it may be limited to short-term political action, rather than long-term sustained self-help, self-organization for the provision of services. There are no known examples of this. Even where a service was provided (waste management by Exnora or the hired cleaners of the latrines) for a small fee, people derelicted paying their contribution citing that they aren't causing the problem, so why should they pay?

For water, it seems a better strategy (that builds on their strengths and experiences) for improving water quality would be lobbying the Panchayat to improve the water quality of the public supply (i.e. by deploying political action tool of H2S strip bottles) instead of organizing a sustained self-help program of water treatment....

This is a larger learning that has emerged though the initial scope was restricted to finding the most appropriate self-help solution (i.e. selection of HH vs. COMM & technologies)

Linked Item
Internals\Interviews\INT #2 - Rehman Bibi - Notes
Monday October 31, 2011

- Some 26 people seemed to have been involved in the waste management program that was implemented in MBN some years ago (the one started-up b/w EXNORA and the Panchayat)
- Only 3 people are still working on it (incl. Rehman Bibi), and not even at MBN (but at the nearby NIOT campus)

- This program has fallen apart for the following reasons:
  1. Ward allotment
  2. No tricycle
  3. No proper facility
  4. Salary problems

- When asked what needs to happen to make it successful, respondents say:
  1. They want a 5-year contract
  2. Permanent job facilities
  3. Minimum salary of Rs. 3000/-
  4. They want a job from the Kancheepuram District [gov't].

- On Jan 2, 2010 we organized a clean-up day. Faridha's feedback of that is:
"If a dustbin facility is provided and maintained weekly, all the peoples assure that they will use that. But the Panchayat officer has said that a dustbin should not be used in that area.

Then on 2nd we did a clean-up program in this area [4th sector] with the help of a JCB. In this program, the people's participation was very [minimal]. The reasons that were given by people as to why they did not participate were:
  1. Went out
  2. Personel reasons
  3. Had to take care of our children
  4. Went to work (as it was a working day for me)."

Linked Item
Internals\Exploratory Work\Faridha - Follow-up on post-Waste Mgmt Day (Jan 2010)
- an emerging issue observed here is the linking of COMM to CONVENIENCE! (this does not figure in so far in my dimensions! but it is obviously an important and pertinent factor... go grounded theory! > Keep dropping in here for now, will analyze later

Linked Item
Nodes\Analytical I\Community Preferences\Level of Application\COMM
For Ligy's interview, I have not added positive/negative statements about the Rajasthan project to nodes for Social Capital etc. I have just put them in the most relevant HH vs. COMM nodes. The reason I have not put them into any other (i.e. social capital) nodes is that these examples pertain to another site. I have placed them in the HH & COMM nodes however as they do contain arguments which may be generalizable, and thus, worthy of consideration when thinking about either level of application.

Linked Item
Internals\Interviews\INT #18 - Ligy - Transcript
Friday, July 5, 2011

The following passage highlights that one of the most pressing priorities for the community is having regular and convenient access to water supply, at all times. Perhaps even more so than water quality.

FGD#1:  
**Archana:** In a short time during April and May, water may come even once a month [only] and even if water comes and if something happens to the main pump - I mean if the pipe is broken due to lorry [damage] - then water will not come and we will stand near the pumps at the middle of the night waiting for water.

**Kasturi:** Water may come in the pipes well after twelve and one and we will wait to collect water. We have to wait for getting water. Getting water is the biggest problem here in Balaji Nagar. Otherwise there is no problem here.

In these statements, what we see is that participants are highly concerned about the **availability** and **accessibility** of adequate **quantities** of water. Water quality is important for a range of reasons, but water quantity is important for another set - namely, convenience and the ability to engage in other activities (i.e. income-earning etc.) instead of having to wait for water to come on.

This may also be linked to why people seem to prefer a COMM system, as it is clear that such an innovation would represent a departure from the status quo of unpredictable water supply and then long periods of rationing and storing water in the home. A COMM system clearly suggests that the water would be treated en masse and thus available at whatever time the households needed it. This may be a 'hidden' or 'assumed' benefit of a COMM system, over and beyond its apparent (and suggested by me) water quality benefits.
Monday, August 15, 2011

There are some good stories of failed/successful community interventions with the govt or by themselves. They are a bit difficult to recreate from the transcript as it is conversational, but the notes provide sufficient synthesis and explanation.

Linked Item
Internals\Interviews\INT #5 - Raniyamma - Transcript
Ok. So it looks like they aren't all TWU as I had written before in the List of Participants (it turns out it was my mishearing mistake cos I was the one taking the notes! Only Srini and I were present at this one, not the interpreter). This means I can no longer accrue everything said in this FGD to be representative of TWU. And since the speakers aren't ID'd anyway, I can't disaggregate what a TWU says in this or what the BWU are saying.

And looking at the other transcripts, they are also not ID'd by name. So the game of assigning content to speakers (and then to Water Source) isn't gonna happen.

But this is not altogether a bad thing. I can do my analysis and (re)structure my Methodology in a different way. I can still collate (in my List of Participants) each of the respondents and which source they use. I can then see what proportion of my respondents are BWU/LWU/TWU. In this way I can demonstrate that I got a range of WU respondents who have contributed to the content of the FGDs. Thus, the substantive content from each WU group is still present in the content. The only thing that is lost is the ability of doing a comparative analysis of the different WUs - something which is not necessary for the selection tool's main goals - only getting the info in hand to influence the decision is pertinent (i.e. it would be of interest to a more general socio-economic examination of water system preferences, which is not my goal anyway). That level of analysis would be additional work that I really need not do to accomplish my stated goals anyway, so it seems I've saved myself some work (that I inevitably would've struggled with deciding to do or not anyway!)
What is apparent here is that there is a great desire for a COMM level system. The respondents are clearly articulating their preference for it and the reasons why. However, none of these comments speak to the viability of the system. Though people may want, it doesn't elucidate per se whether it would be an appropriate or viable strategy here.

> There may also be additional factors relating to the importance of regular access to water supply that are coming into play here.

**See Also Links**

i Memos\Importance of regular supply of water

**Linked Item**

Internals\FGD I\FGD #1 - Transcript
Gotta do some digging to see how the World Bank was exactly involved with this.

(Add my leads and what I learn here)