

IDENTIFICATION PHASE-I: CONCURRENT EVALUATION REPORT

May - June 2025

Telangana Inclusive Livelihoods Program

Prepared by :

Centre for Research in Schemes & Policies (CRISP)



Contents

Executive Summary:	1
Recommendations	2
Study Team	3
Abbreviations	4
Introduction:	1
Program progress so far:	1
CRISP's role:	3
Methodology:	3
Research Objectives	3
Research Design and setting.....	3
Tools Used and Stakeholders Covered.....	4
Sampling:	6
Limitations:	6
Findings:	7
Transect Walk:	8
Overview:	8
Observations:.....	9
Challenges:	9
Social Mapping and Vulnerability Assessments:.....	9
Observations:.....	10
Challenges:	11
Household Visits:	12
Overview:	12
Observations:.....	12
Challenges:	13
Village Organisation (VO) Endorsement & Wealth Ranking Meetings: Overview:.....	13
Observations:.....	14
Challenges:	14
Conclusion	15
Recommendations:	16

Tables:

Table 1:Description of Tools: Preparedness	4
Table 2: Description of Tools: Identification.....	4
Table 3: District-wise Activities covered	6
Table 4: Recommendations	15

Figures:

Figure 1: Program Timeline of TGILP	2
Figure 2. Kondaparthi(GP), Tadvai(M), Mulugu	7
Figure 3. Lankala(GP), Narva(M), Narayanpet.....	7
Figure 4. Bhupatipur(V), Gangaram(GP), Tadvai(M), Mulugu	9
Figure 5. Lankala(GP), Narva(M) Narayanpet.....	9
Figure 6. Chitlapally(GP), Kodangal(M), Vikarabad	10
Figure 7. kalvala(GP), Narva(M), Narayanpet	10
Figure 8. Bhupatipur(V), Gangaram(GP),Tadvai(M), Mulugu	11
Figure 9. Koushettivai(GP), Tadvai(M), Mulugu.....	12
Figure 10. Chitlapally(GP), Kodangal(M), Vikarabad	12

Executive Summary:

The Telangana Inclusive Livelihoods Programme (TGILP) adopts the globally recognised Graduation Approach to address multidimensional poverty and social exclusion. Over a 36-month period, the programme aims to enhance the quality of life, economic empowerment, and social inclusion for 6,000 vulnerable households, including tribal communities, Particularly Vulnerable Tribal Groups (PVTGs), and women. The programme is being implemented across eight mandals in five districts: Mulugu (Tadvai, Kannaigudem), Nagarkurnool (Amrabad, Padra), Narayanpet (Narva), Vikarabad (Kodangal), and Kumuram Bheem Asifabad (Tiryani, Lingapur). TGILP focuses on reaching economically weaker households, particularly those excluded from mainstream government entitlements, through customised interventions that promote sustainable livelihoods, income diversification, and resilience building. By leveraging community institutions and targeting geographies with significant forest coverage and socio-economic disadvantage, TGILP seeks to reduce poverty, bridge inequality gaps, and foster long-term prosperity for Telangana's most marginalised communities.

The Centre for Research in Schemes and Policies (CRISP), in partnership with BRAC International, conducted a concurrent evaluation of Phase 1 of TGILP. The evaluation, spanning initiated in May 2025, assessed the system preparedness effective planning, implementation, and management of the programme, as well as understanding of stakeholder participation, particularly in the process of identifying programme participants. This involved examining the robustness of operational frameworks and coordination mechanisms to ensure efficient programme delivery, alongside analysing the extent and quality of stakeholder engagement to promote inclusive and accurate participant selection.

Findings highlighted robust community engagement and immense guidance extended towards the CRP teams by District and Block Coordinators who in turn were supported by the SPMU. Few of the areas which can be improved include:

- a) Better coordination with local functionaries such as ASHA and Anganwaadi workers during the PRA processes (as these processes take long – appropriate communication with the line departments in advance will be helpful).
- b) Secondly, due to the intense nature and long duration of the social mapping and vulnerability assessment, community participation reduced during the latter part of the exercise. Hence, ways to reduce the duration of social mapping exercise (representatives from VO's/ ASHA/ Aanganwaadi workers can join for social mapping) and community representation could be prioritised for vulnerability assessment. It is also proposed that prior intimation on the length of the exercise, should be communicated to all the community members, to ensure effective

engagement.

- c) Thirdly, additional conceptual clarity is to be built around CRP's understanding of vulnerability criteria and documentation processes. In addition to these outcomes of each of the PRA processes can be clarified, as household data was being collected during transect walks and social mapping which was time consuming and not aligned with the program guidelines.
- d) Addressing challenges associated with wealth ranking, it was observed that most of the meetings did not allocate appropriate time towards this exercise, also there was confusion on the appropriate method that can be followed for this exercise. Hence, CRP training can focus on these in the 2nd phase of Identification.

Recommendations

- a) Refresher training for CRP's: Trainings for CRPs with a focus on building conceptual clarity and adherence to process protocol. In addition to these ideas to reduce time for social mapping exercise can be brainstormed, for example - Sample housing illustrations can be considered/ VO & ASHA workers can be mobilised for making the social maps, while village/ community members can be mobilised for the vulnerability assessment.
- b) Communication to field functionaries: Prior intimation to local field functionaries including ASHA and Anganwadi staff workers to ensure appropriate inputs from the community ensuring inclusivity.
- c) Revision of existing Flash cards: The flash cards being used for vulnerability mapping can include space for names and gender options in social mapping.
- d) Prioritisation of vulnerabilities during vulnerability assessment: The vulnerability assessment in villages, can adopt a prioritisation of vulnerabilities approach (such as starting with single women/ widows/ disabled and then moving to categories such as ownership of land), such that discussions in the field can be resolved amicably.
- e) Appropriate composition of Identification team for all processes: Identification team size should not be compromised on ground for any of the processes including household visits.
- f) Adoption of visual aids for VO endorsement and wealth ranking: As these are important exercises and require consensus building visual aids will help the participants. In addition to this, additional training on procedural clarity and documentation can be considered to enhance transparency and participation.
- g) Improving consistency of documentation across all locations is recommended, this can be done through digitising the information collected from field. Further proper documentation should be maintained of the excluded households.
- h) Creating a clear program learning strategy document, so that state adaptation strategies as well as learnings from program implementation are recorded periodically.

Study Team

The concurrent evaluation of the Telangana Inclusive Livelihood Program was conducted by CRISP. The primary objective of this assessment was to evaluate system preparedness, stakeholder participation, and the inclusivity of the participant identification process. The evaluation was led by Ms. Neha Dhingra, Program Lead, and supported by Mr. Mudavath Gnaneshwar, Fellow 2025 and Mr. Abhishek Challa. The concurrent evaluation was also supported by Mr. Bhaskar Tiwary, Manager-Monitoring and Evaluation, CRISP. The team expresses gratitude to CRISP mentors, Mr. SM Vijayanand (Retired IAS) and Mr. Subrahmanyam (Retired IAS) and Secretary, CRISP, for their valuable inputs and guidance throughout the evaluation process.

Abbreviations

AKF:	Aga Khan Foundation
ASHA:	Accredited Social Health Activist
CRISP:	Centre for Research in Schemes and Policies
CRP:	Community Resource Persons
DAY-NRLM:	Deendayal Antyodaya Yojana – National Rural Livelihoods Mission
EC:	Executive Committee
E-CRP:	External – Community Resource Person
GP:	Gram Panchayat
HHI:	Household Identification
I-CRP:	Internal – Community Resource Person
LoE:	Letter of Engagement
MMS:	Mandala Mahila Samakhya
MoRD:	Ministry of Rural Development
MoU:	Memorandum of Understanding
PHC:	Public Health Centre
PMU:	Project Management Unit
PoP:	Poorest of the poor
PRA:	Participatory Rural Appraisal
PRADAN:	Professional Assistance for Development Action
PVTG:	Particularly Vulnerable Tribal Group
SC:	Scheduled Castes
SERP:	Society for Elimination of Rural Poverty
SHG:	Self-Help Group
SPMU:	State Project Management Unit
SRLM:	State Rural Livelihoods Mission
ST:	Scheduled Tribes
TGILP:	Telangana Inclusive Livelihood Program
VO:	Village Organisation
VOA:	Village Organisation Assistance

Introduction:

The Centre for Research in Schemes and Policies (CRISP) has partnered with BRAC International to provide concurrent evaluation and strategic support for the Inclusive Livelihoods Programmes being implemented in Telangana, Karnataka, and Maharashtra for three years. This collaborative initiative seeks to strengthen the resilience of the poorest and most vulnerable communities by integrating BRAC's globally recognised Graduation Approach with context-specific strategies to address poverty and promote social inclusion.

As part of its mandate, CRISP conducted a concurrent evaluation of Phase 1 of the household identification process for program participants in Telangana. This evaluation serves as a critical step toward refining and strengthening the program's implementation strategy by offering timely insights and actionable recommendations.

Program progress so far:

The implementation of the Telangana Inclusive Livelihoods Programme (TGILP) followed a structured timeline of key activities and milestones beginning in mid-2024. A Poverty and Livelihoods Assessment recce visit was conducted by PRADAN during June–July 2024, laying the groundwork for program planning. In July 2024, a state-level workshop was organised to co-create the TGILP proposal, followed by the signing of the Letter of Engagement (LoE) in August 2024. Subsequently, on 28th August 2024, CRISP and BRAC signed an MoU, with CRISP designated as the Concurrent Evaluation Partner. A comprehensive Poverty and Livelihoods Assessment was carried out in September 2024.

In October 2024, a qualitative assessment focusing on social inclusion, gender, health and nutrition, and climate change was undertaken. The TGILP proposal was submitted to DAY-NRLM during the same month, and an MoU was signed between AKF and BRAC, confirming AKF as the Programme Management Unit (PMU). This was followed by a pre-Executive Committee (EC) meeting in November 2024 to review the TGILP proposal. The EC meeting in December 2024 sanctioned the proposal, and on 10th January 2025, the TGILP was formally approved by the EC of the Ministry of Rural Development (MoRD), Government of India. Shortly after, the PMU was set up by AKF on 18th January 2025, and a partners' meeting was held in the same month.

On 10th & 11th February 2025, a write shop was conducted to develop the criteria and guidelines for identifying participant households in collaboration with Mandal Mahila Samakhya (MMS) and Village Organisations (VOs). A convergence meeting with line departments was held on 17th February 2025 to ensure interdepartmental alignment. March 2025 saw the finalisation of

guidelines for the identification of participant households and the recruitment of coaches, alongside the release of an advisory on coaches. Tools for vulnerability assessment were also developed and tested during this period. From 2nd to 5th March 2025, an exposure visit to Bihar was organised for District Collectors, Additional Collectors, Chief Operating Officers, and the TGILP SPMU team. Additionally, orientations for Mandal Mahila Samakhyas, VO leaders, and their staff on TGILP were conducted in March.

In April 2025, Community Resource Persons (CRPs) were trained, and TGILP staff underwent induction from 09th to 11th of April. A National Partners Meet was held from 12th to 14th May 2025 to review progress and align strategies. The first phase of household identification took place during May–June 2025. Lastly, a TGILP half-yearly review meeting was conducted from 16th to 18th June 2025 to evaluate program implementation and plan the next phase of activities.



Figure 1: Program Timeline of TGILP

CRISP's role:

The Centre for Research in Schemes and Policies (CRISP), formed by ten former senior civil servants with extensive experience in designing and scaling national and state-level social sector initiatives, plays a pivotal role in supporting the Telangana Graduation-Inclusive Livelihoods Programme (TGILP). CRISP's primary objective is to assist governments in designing or redesigning social sector programmes and policies to enhance their effectiveness and impact.

In TGILP, CRISP's role encompasses a comprehensive concurrent evaluation function, focusing on assessing the performance of the program with respect to its processes, intermediate outputs, and overall effectiveness. The evaluation aims to identify gaps and offer timely recommendations for course corrective actions.

Methodology:

Research Objectives

The concurrent evaluation was conducted with following objectives

1. To assess the system's preparedness and capacity for effective planning, implementation, and management of the program.
2. To gain a comprehensive understanding of stakeholder participation, particularly in the program participant identification process.

Research Design and setting

A mixed-methods approach was developed to assess both system level readiness and the inclusivity of the participant identification process. The evaluation employed a combination of qualitative and quantitative tools to gather comprehensive data. To assess preparedness qualitative methods such as interviews and focus group discussions (FGDs) are planned to gain a comprehensive understanding of stakeholder participation. To understand the program the program participant identification process observations and survey will be undertaken. As part of the Identification Phase 1 – PRA exercises were covered.

This report covers only observation data from Identification PRA described below in Table no. 2, hence the data and observations are largely qualitative in nature. Subsequent Concurrent Evaluation undertaken by the CRISP team in Telangana will cover tools from Table 1 and also surveys for checking Inclusion and Exclusion errors.

Tools Used and Stakeholders Covered

Since the current program ties closely to the NRLM inclusion mandate and has also been approved as a national sub scheme, it becomes important to not only closely monitor the program implementation but also explore deeply aspects of system integration and sustainability of the program. Adopting this approach at the outset, will help highlight challenges with regards to system integration and also address aspects of inclusion that the program is to address. Such that key learnings from the current pilot can inform the state scaling and program adaptation strategies.

Hence, the tools of the study have been bifurcated in two categories, those which are concerned with the immediate program execution i.e. Identification PRA and secondly, other tools that look at aspects of system integration and sustainability.

The tools have been divided at all levels of execution – at the State SRLM level to understand more about ongoing initiatives of the SRLMs and their experiences in addressing livelihoods for the vulnerable populations. They also attempt to understand, what initiatives by the Department in livelihoods has worked for the specific geographies.

At the SPMU level, the tool attempts to understand planning and implementation aspects of the program in addition to the various functions they are to undertake in technical aspects including livelihood planning, Climate adaptation, gender and MEL. These become relevant to understand aspects of program adaptation taking place at the PMU level.

The third level that tools assess are at Community Institutions, these include the CLFs and VOs, it is important to understand their perspective, and engagement early on in the program to see – how they can contribute effectively to the program. In addition to their engagement with the ILP program, it is important to understand that they are the most important level that needs to be take ownership of this program for its success. Hence the tools attempt to understand the barriers to inclusion of the program participants in the fold of NRLM and also explore ways of meaningfully engaging the community institutions in the program.

Details of the tools have been discussed below:

Table 1: Description of Tools: Preparedness

Tool	Objective
SRLM Official Guide IBCB & Livelihoods	Department's engagement with vulnerable groups, highlighting challenges and assessing existing livelihood initiatives
SPMU Guide PMU lead	This tool outlines the team selection process, challenges, SRLM coordination for convergence, and program monitoring, including grievance redressal
M&E Function Guide	This tool details the M&E framework, fund allocation, review frequency with SRLM, district/block, process documentation, and prioritisation of learning.

District and Block Coordinators Guide	This tool covers CRP recruitment guidelines, vulnerable group representation, key challenges, and reporting structures, including review mechanisms at the district level. It also addresses data record-keeping, verification processes, and internal reviews.
MMS Coach Selection Checklist	This tool outlines the recruitment and engagement of coaches, role mapping as per guidelines, representation from vulnerable groups, and key challenges identified.
Community Institutions: FGD Guide	This tool evaluates the capacity of existing CLFs & VOs to anchor the ILP program, their understanding of target groups, and their role in the identification process, ensuring adherence to guidelines and grievance redressal mechanisms

Table 2: Description of Tools: Identification

Tool	Objective
VO Meeting Checklist	This tool assesses the communication of the ILP program, meeting duration and attendance, clarity on inclusion/exclusion errors, clear roles and responsibilities, representation of marginalised groups, and discussion of challenges.
Transect Walk Checklist	This tool evaluates the duration and area covered, team constitution, participation of CRPs/VO members, adherence to guidelines, and identifies any challenges faced
Social Mapping Checklist	This tool assesses the representation of various groups in social mapping, adherence to guidelines, neutrality of location, timely provision of materials, issues raised during beneficiary list preparation, and documentation.
Household survey	This tool checks for inclusion and exclusion errors in selection
VO Endorsement Meeting Checklist	This tool evaluates the representation of VO members, adherence to guidelines, issues related to inclusion/exclusion errors, addition/removal

	of members, appropriate ranking of households, and documentation
CLF Data Verification	This tool facilitates cross-verification with secondary data and household visits for verification purposes.

Sampling:

A mixed sampling approach was used to ensure both representativeness and relevance. The approach utilized also balanced practical feasibility with methodological rigor.

- In the first phase, three out of five districts were selected purposively based on the current level of program implementation.
- Within each selected districts, specific blocks were also chosen purposively considering factors such as the presence of implementing partners and active field interventions.
- To avoid selection bias at the community level, a random sampling method was applied to select 13 villages across the selected blocks.

Limitations:

The CRISP team in Phase I implementation faced several limitations that affected the timely and complete execution of identification processes. Out of the planned 8 blocks, only 3 were covered due to delays in communication regarding identification starting dates. It is important to highlight that the CRISP evaluation took place under severe time constraints, which limited the no. of processes covered by CRISP. The observations shared process wise are from the sample covered by CRISP in the short timeline.

Additionally, preparedness activities were hampered by administrative challenges, including the transfer of State Rural Livelihoods Mission (SRLM) staff and changes in MMS leadership. These factors led to delays in field-level coordination. As a result, the remaining 5 blocks and pending preparedness processes have been deferred to the next phase, scheduled for July and August.

Findings:

Below is a summary of the districts and villages covered as part of the Identification Phase 1 – PRA exercises:

District	Mandal	Gram Panchayat	Village Name	Transect Walk	Social Mapping & Vulnerability Assessment	Household Visit	Wealth Ranking & VO Endorsement Meeting
Vikarabad	Kodangal	Chitlapally	Chitlapally			✓	✓
Narayanpet	Narwa	Lankala	Lankala	✓	✓	✓	
		Kalwal	Kalwal			✓	✓
		Raikod	Raikod				✓
Mulugu	Tadvai	Gangaram	Bhupatipur	✓	✓	✓	
		Dhamaravai	Dhamaravai	✓	✓	✓	✓
		Beerelli	Beerelli	✓			
		Tadvai	Kondaparthi	✓			
		Vengalapur	Gonepalli		✓		
		Ankampalli	Ankampalli		✓		
		Ankampalli	Koushattiva				✓
		Kannepalli	Kannepalli				✓
		Beerelli	Asannagudem Yellapur	✓	✓		✓

Table 3: District-wise Activities covered

As part of the concurrent evaluation, the CRISP team observed and participated in a series of community engagement activities across three districts—Narayanpet, Mulugu, and Vikarabad in the Phase I household identification process. These activities included transect walks, social mapping

exercises with vulnerability assessments, household visits, Village Organisation (VO) endorsement, along with wealth ranking meetings, all aimed at identifying vulnerable households and ensuring inclusive and transparent processes for targeting the poorest of the poor (PoP). The exercises were conducted in participatory way, involving community members, village organisation members, Community Resource Persons (CRPs), and other stakeholders such as ASHA workers, Anganwadi Workers, and block and district coordinators.

Despite these activities' systematic and inclusive nature, challenges such as time constraints, absence of key stakeholders, and procedural inconsistencies were observed. This report attempts to provide a detailed activity-wise analysis of the observations, challenges, and recommendations for each observed PRA activity.



Figure 2. Kondaparthi (GP), Tadvai(M), Mulugu



Figure 3. Lankala (GP), Narva(M), Narayanpet

Transect Walk:

Overview:

A total of six transect walk exercises were conducted across two districts in Telangana—Narayanpet and Mulugu. One transect walk was held in Lankala village of Narva mandal, Narayanpet district, while the remaining five were conducted in Bhupathipur, Dhamaravai, Beerelli, Kondaparthi, and Assannagudem Yellapur villages in Tadvai Mandal, Mulugu district. The transect walk aims to walk through all streets, village boundaries, and areas where the poorest of the poor reside. This process helps the team gain a deeper understanding of high-poverty zones, the lifestyle and occupations of the people, and their social conditions. It plays a crucial role in identifying the most vulnerable families and their residential locations and contributes significantly to ensuring accuracy and inclusiveness in the subsequent social mapping exercise.

Observations:

- **Community Participation:** Community members in all villages actively participated and extended their cooperation to the teams, ensuring a collaborative process.
- **Duration:** The duration of transect walks varied from 45 minutes to up to 3 days, depending on the geographical spread and population size of the villages. Most walks were completed in less than half a day.
- **Infrastructure Coverage:** Teams visited key public infrastructure, including Mission Bhagiratha water tanks, Anganwadi centres, Primary Health Centres (PHCs), religious structures (churches and temples), Public Distribution System, food storage buildings, Gram Panchayat offices, and, in some cases, ponds and post offices.
- **VO Involvement:** Village Organisation (VO) members were actively involved throughout the process, providing consistent support and engagement. They played a key role in ensuring that every part of the village was covered, particularly areas where poor and vulnerable households reside, and helped in understanding the village socio-economic conditions.
- **CRP Role:** Community Resource Persons (CRPs) sketched rough outlines of the villages, marking key infrastructure points, which served as a foundation for social mapping.
- **Community Awareness:** During the walks, community members were informed about upcoming social mapping sessions, including details on date, time, and location.

Challenges:

- In some villages, CRPs began collecting household-level information during the transect walks. This was outside the scope of the activity.
- Delays occurred in the transect walk due to the absence of community members at the scheduled time.
- The absence of key frontline workers, such as ASHA and Anganwadi staff, was noted, potentially leading to incomplete coverage of village areas.

Social Mapping and Vulnerability Assessments:

Overview:

Six social mapping exercises and corresponding vulnerability assessments were observed across Narayanpet and Mulugu districts. One exercise took place in Lankala village (Narva Mandal, Narayanpet district), while the remaining five were held in Bhupathipur, Dhamaravai, Ankampalli, Gonepalli, and Assannagudem Yellapur villages (Tadvai mandal, Mulugu district). This is a

community-led participatory process aimed at identifying vulnerable households for accurate targeting of the poorest of the poor, while also mapping the village's socio-economic conditions, infrastructure, and resources.

Observations:



Figure 4. Bhupatipur(V), Gangaram (GP), Tadvai(M), Mulugu



Figure 5. Lankala (GP), Narva(M) Narayanpet

- **Preparatory Briefings:** Detailed instructions were provided by the Block or District Coordinator before the social mapping sessions, covering the purpose, vulnerability criteria, and participant roles, fostering clarity and cooperation.
- **CRP Facilitation:** CRPs effectively guided community members in drawing maps and illustrating housing structures, using necessary materials to ensure efficiency.
- **Location Accessibility:** Social mapping exercises were held at central locations such as primary schools, Gram Panchayat offices, or village centres to ensure accessibility and inclusivity.
- **Community Involvement:** The vulnerability assessments involved VO members, I-CRPs, E-CRPs, GP members, and a broad representation of the community, who actively contributed to identifying vulnerable households.
- **SERP Oversight:** In some villages, SERP officials were present to oversee and support the process, enhancing its credibility.
- **Documentation:** The CRP team documented the social map on chart and also on A4 paper for documentation at Mandal level.

Challenges:

- The social mapping process was time-consuming, leading to community fatigue and reduced participation in subsequent vulnerability assessments. The vulnerability assessment exercise is extremely important as community members through their understanding discuss about respective households and their vulnerabilities. Sharing which households are most vulnerable and potential program participants. Hence, giving appropriate time for this exercise is of extreme importance.
- Extended mapping sessions caused delays, resulting in some community members leaving before the vulnerability assessment began.
- Some CRPs began collecting individual vulnerability data during the mapping phase, which should have been reserved for the collective vulnerability assessment.
- Confusion among CRPs regarding the inclusive criteria led to misunderstandings among community members. Unless there is clarity amongst the CRPs on all concepts – issues of translating these to the field will be an issue, therefore giving time to training of CRPs in pilots and then planning for scale would be effective.
- The flash card used for vulnerability assessments lacked space to record candidate names and additional gender options beyond male, female, boy, and girl.

Household Visits:



Figure 7. kalvala(GP), Narva(M), Narayanpet



Figure 6. Chitlapally (GP), Kodangal(M), Vikarabad

Overview:

Five household visit exercises were observed across three districts: one in Chitlapally village (Kodangal Mandal, Vikarabad district), two in Kalwal and Lankala villages (Narva mandal, Narayanpet district), and two in Bhupathipur and Dhamaravai villages (Tadvai mandal, Mulugu district). After the initial identification through social mapping, the CRP team conducts household visits to verify and document the socio-economic conditions of listed families, ensuring only the most eligible are selected under the TGILP program.

Observations:

- **Team Composition:** Teams typically included the VO President, Secretary, VO Assistant, I-CRPs, E-CRPs, ASHA, and Anganwadi
- **Sensitive Approach:** Teams adopted a friendly and sensitive approach, fostering trust and encouraging residents to share socio-economic information openly.

- **Visit Duration:** Each visit lasted approximately 10–15 minutes, allowing for data collection and meaningful community engagement.
- **Non-Participant Follow-Up:** For households absent during social mapping, teams collected contact information from neighbours and coordinated with the VOA to ensure inclusion.

Challenges:

- In some cases, household visits were conducted by a single team member, limiting verification.



Figure 8. Bhupatipur(V), Gangaram(GP), Tadvai(M), Mulugu

Village Organisation (VO) Endorsement & Wealth Ranking Meetings:

Overview:

Seven VO endorsement meetings were observed across three districts: one in Chitlapally village (Kodangal Mandal, Vikarabad district), two in Kalwal and Raikod villages (Narva mandal, Narayanpet district), and four in Koushettivai, Kannepalli, Dhamaravai, and Asannagudem Yellapur villages

(Tadvai mandal, Mulugu district). These meetings aimed to validate the list of PoP households, promote community ownership, and ensure transparency.



*Figure 9. Koushettivai(GP), Tadvai(M), Mulugu
Kodangal(M), Vikarabad*



Figure 10. Chitlapally (GP),

Observations:

- **Structured Process:** Meetings followed a standard structure, with the purpose and PoP selection criteria explained, followed by a public reading of the household list and open discussions to address concerns.
- **Participatory Decision-Making:** Final decisions on household inclusion or exclusion were made collectively with VO members, ensuring transparency.
- **Documentation:** CRPs documented identified and rejected households in a register, A4 sheets and 42-column record book, to ensure the list was proper.

Challenges:

- The absence of ASHA workers and Anganwadi teachers in some meetings, due to a lack of prior communication, limited the verification process's effectiveness.
- The early departure of VO members before the wealth ranking exercise reduced inclusiveness and accuracy. Wealth ranking is an important exercise that needed community participation, as it helps to rank the households as per their own understanding of wealth. It would help in future to prioritise the participants, and which households would need entitlement and consumption support on priority.
- The method of calling out household names during wealth ranking lacked clarity, confusing.
- Some teams struggled with procedural clarity and documentation,

Conclusion

The concurrent evaluation of Phase 1 of the Telangana Inclusive Livelihoods Programme (TGILP) by CRISP, in partnership with BRAC International, has provided critical insights into the household identification process across Narayanpet, Mulugu, and Vikarabad districts. The structured timeline of activities, from the Poverty and Livelihoods Assessment in June–July 2024 to the half-yearly review in June 2025, demonstrates a systematic approach to proPimplementation, supported by participatory methods such as transect walks, social mapping, vulnerability assessments, household visits, and VO endorsement meetings. These activities effectively engaged community members, Village Organisations, and Community Resource Persons, ensuring inclusivity and transparency in identifying the poorest of the poor.

The evaluation highlighted several areas where process improvements could enhance the effectiveness of PRA activities under TGILP. Firstly, better coordination with frontline workers such as ASHA and Anganwadi staff throughout the PRA cycle would support smoother implementation, especially given the time-intensive nature of these exercises. Timely communication with relevant line departments could help ensure their availability and participation. Secondly, it was noted that community participation tended to decline during the latter stages of social mapping and vulnerability assessments, largely due to the extended duration of these sessions. Providing advance information on the time requirements and exploring ways to streamline the process could help sustain engagement and ensure broader representation. Additionally, there is a need to strengthen conceptual clarity among Community Resource Persons (CRPs) regarding the application of vulnerability criteria and associated documentation practices. Clarifying the intended outcomes of each PRA step and aligning field practices with program guidelines would help reduce inconsistencies, particularly in instances where household-level data collection was initiated during transect walks and social mapping. Finally, with regard to wealth ranking, challenges were observed in both time allocation and clarity of method. Ensuring structured guidance and adequate time for this step would support more transparent and consistent decision-making.

A few recommendations have been given for more effective implementation, mentioned below.

With regards to the completion of the Concurrent evaluation, Inclusion and exclusion surveys are planned in the month of August, 2025 alongside Key Informant Interviews and Focus Group Discussions to understand aspects of preparedness as per the proposal.

Recommendations:

Activity	Recommendations
Transect Walk	· Ensure CRPs are trained to focus solely on mapping infrastructure during transect walks and defer household data collection to the appropriate phase. · Improve coordination between CRPs and frontline workers (ASHA, Anganwadi) to ensure availability during scheduled walks.
Social Mapping	· Provide sample illustrations of housing structures (e.g., నమూనా ఇండ్లు) to streamline the mapping process and reduce time requirements.
Vulnerability Assessment	· Train CRPs to strictly separate social mapping from vulnerability data collection to maintain procedural clarity. · Organize vulnerability criteria from MOST to LEAST vulnerable to improve the flow and effectiveness of assessments. · Revise the flash card design to include space for vulnerable candidate names and additional gender options (e.g: “Other”) for inclusivity.
Household Visit	· Ensure household visit teams include multiple members to enhance data verification
VO Endorsement Meeting & Wealth Ranking	· Improve communication with frontline workers (ASHA, Anganwadi) to ensure their participation in endorsement meetings. · Adopt a visual representation method (e.g., a chart with household names and vulnerability counts) to enhance clarity during wealth ranking. · Provide additional training for teams to improve procedural understanding and documentation accuracy.
Embedding the Role of Gram Panchayats in the beginning of the program	· Onboarding Gram Panchayats as an implementation partner, such that they are engaged in selection of participants, overseeing implementation, Convergence, bringing in financial resources. Setting up of a Gram Panchayat Level committee (GPLC) consisting of representatives such as ASHA, PHC health officer,

	representation from SHGs. The Panchayats have key roles to play in facilitating entitlements and also working on several aspects such as agriculture and allied sectors, rural housing, electrification, water supply, health, sanitation, education, social welfare, poverty alleviation, family welfare, women and child development and also local infrastructure. Given that they have so many village development related functions, their participation and ownership of this program would be crucial for sustainability. A detailed note on the role of Panchayats has been detailed and shared with the respective SPMU and SRLM.
MIS and Data management	· The current program was highly dependent on papers/ chart papers and registers to capture all the developments in the field. Digitising the data, of the various processes and process flows will be extremely beneficial to the program. Further it will ensure consistency in formats across locations, making them comparable. · In addition to this, clear record of rejected HHs need to be maintained along with the reasons for rejection.
Strengthening program learning	· Learnings during identification, the challenges and how these were resolved are not well documented. Documentation of these will be helpful and contribute towards program learnings.

Table 4: Recommendations



CRISP

Deliberate. Design. Deliver.

Centre for Research in Schemes and Policies

Address: B-38, First floor, Panchsheel Enclave, Malviya Nagar,
New Delhi-110017

Central Office: TSIC Zonal office Building, Financial District, Nanakramguda,
Gachibowli, Hyderabad-500032

www.crispindia.net