

COLLABORATIVE GOVERNANCE IN ANDHRA PRADESH: ANALYSIS OF SMART VILLAGE SMART WARD PROGRAM

Suneel Kumar Chitturi,

*Pursuing PhD from department of Political Science,
University of Delhi*

INTRODUCTION

The problems of modern governments are too complex and impervious to straight forward administrative solution and requires collaboration among agencies, citizens, and multiple stakeholders across policy arenas (Norris-Tell & Clay, 2010, p.5). In order to address these varied and complex problems, Governments across the world are increasingly encouraging the citizens and non governmental actors to take an active part in shaping the society through a variety of legal frameworks, policies and programs. Denmark has provided for the formation of local governance networks by engaging volunteers, social activists and social entrepreneurs to take up the civil responsibility by reforming municipal laws and United Kingdom had adopted policy of giving the community, voluntary, charity groups the opportunity in running local public services (Voorberg & Bekkers, 2016, p.282) and Sweden formed regional and municipal networks affected by combination of framework laws, economic incentives (Triantafillou, 2007, p.191). Such Policy initiatives are nurtured and facilitated to mobilize the capacities of individuals, groups, organizations, and networks creating an institutional mechanisms for enhancing the problem solving capacities of diverse actors and networks (Triantafillou, 2007, p.187), to empower the people, improve services or facilitate collective action. However theoretical benefits that a collaboration can deliver is different from the actual realization of the benefits of collaboration and depends on how the conditions necessary to the success of the collaboration are created and institutional structures developed and

incentive structure devised and civic virtue is mobilized through the Political authorizing environment.

In Indian context though the national policy on the voluntary sector identified strategic collaboration as a objective till date we do not have any program which has sought to engage a diverse set of nonstate actors for the socio economic development of the state. This Article evaluates how the government of Andhra Pradesh mobilized the capacities of individuals, groups, organizations, and networks to deal with the problems of the wider community through Smart Village Smart Wards program which it called as Creative Collaboration to mobilize the capacities of individuals, groups, organizations, and networks to deal with socio economic development of the state and various process, policies, methods and institutional setting utilised to steer the problem solving capacities of diverse actors and networks (Triantafillou, 2007, p.187), how the Program fared in comparison to the outcomes the program sought to achieve, the kind and variety of outcomes in terms of achieving that this creative collaboration generated and how inadequate attention to the authorising environment has skewed the outcomes generated .

WHAT IS SMART VILLAGE ?

A Village will be declared as smart village/ward once it achieves these key development goals spread across the the functional domain of various ministries and local government which related to social-economic development mentioned in the following table (see the table below)

The Program Goals and the Ministries Involved

Sector Goal Incharge
Official.....Department.

Basic infrastructure	Homes for all with access to toilets , safe drinking water and regular power	PS/AE-RWS	RWS
	Functional solid and liquid waste management system	PS	PR/RD
	Functional toilets , potable water electricity available in schools GP buildings , Anganwadi centres , health centres . (goal over lap between the first and the third goal)	AE-RWS/ PS/AE-PR	RWS
Livelihood opportunities	Every house has a diversified livelihood opportunities and or micro enterprises	APM	SERP/MEPMA
	Every village household has a functional bank account / PM Jan dhan account	PS	PR/RD
	SHG and youth skill development village enterprises development with bank and market linkage .	APM	SERP/MEPMA
Health for all	End all preventable maternal and infant deaths	PS/AWW	HEALTH
	100 institutional deliveries	PS/AWW	HEALTH
	Malnutrition free (children below 9 years of age)	PS/AWW	WD & CW
	End to open defecation across every village and	PS	PR

	ward		
Child rights	Zero drop out of boys and girls up to 12 th standard .	MEO/Head Master	Education
	No child marriages below 18 years of age	AWW/PS	WD/CW
Technology in agriculture and water use efficiency	Every farm has soil health card and enriched micro nutrients , diversification with live stock and trees	PS/AO	Agriculture
	Every GP has green trees all over its geographical boundaries	PS	PR&RD, Forest (Panchayat Raj and Rural Development)
	Every village has functional water conservation and harvesting structures	PS	Rural Development
Local self government	Every GP has dynamic development plan prepared with the help of the community participation	PS	PR&RD
	Grama sabha meetings are held 4 times a year with 2/3 participation of the people	PS	PR&RD
	Every village has functional water conservation and harvesting structures	PS	PR/MINOR IRRIGATION
Last mile connectivity	Every GP / Ward has telecom and internet connectivity	PS	ITE&C, APSFL

The Government created a state level mechanism with the chief minister as the head to steer the process of collaboration at the state level specifying the roles to be played by the officials till the village level.

GOAL DESIGN

Goals are defined by Koliba et.al as abstract expressions of prescribed values and beliefs undertaken in the pursuit of achieving prescribed desired ends(Koliba, Meek & Zia, 2010, p.116).

Varying between “official” goals, the authoritative pronouncements about general purposes of the organization and Operative goals which are the ends sought through the actual operating policies of the organization indicating what the organization (Koliba, Meek & Zia, 2010, p.68-69), goals serve as indicators of what the government of Andhra Pradesh aspire to achieve along with partners. The Official Goals seeking to achieve for each of the villages certain development targets which Vary from establishing certain key infrastructure at the village level (Solid and Liquid Waste Management, School Infrastructure) to realization of certain targets (health- eliminating maternal and infant mortality etc). The operative goals, which is to engage partner to trigger a participatory approach with partners for self-reliant development of the Gram Panchayat or Ward by Building partnerships with voluntary organisations, co-operatives, academic and research institutes, Engaging and mobilizing community for participatory, local-level development through convergence of government schemes with private and voluntary initiatives in line with people's aspirations and help local potential to develop and flourish. Leverage leadership, capacity, commitment and energy of partners volunteering for this task (Smart AP Foundation, 2016, p.1) and Sector Based Partnerships (Smart AP Foundation 2016 p.15).

The goals of Government of Andhra Pradesh seems to be more aspirational than realistic (Moore, 1993, p.328) and are not organized in to hierarchies on the basis of greater or lesser importance, ultimate ends to be pursued and intermediate/Preferred means to be used (Moore, 1993, p.334), establish a coherent relationship between the broad, simple narrative of what the public wants to accomplish (captured in the terms at the top of the hierarchy) and the many different and more concrete events that the narrative seems to require or entail (captured at lower levels of the hierarchy). At the philosophical and conceptual level, hierarchy of goals has to Start at the bottom writing down all the dimensions of public value and gradually working up to the agency's broadest

mission or at the top might mean beginning with the broad mission and working down to the particulars of operational and process values (Moore, 1993, p.331). The selection of Goal of eliminating the maternal mortality rate and infant mortality rate at the expense of seeing whether there exists adequate and necessary health infrastructure at the village level is without application of mind. The National Health Policy provides for a list of infrastructure and human resources necessary to be available at community health centre, Primary health care centres. However the state conveniently chose to ignore whether adequate health care facilities exist at the village level. Similarly, the goal of solid and liquid management system and afforestation is not linked to ground water availability and recharge which needs to follow an ecosystem approach. The goals did also not make adequate focus to the distinction between the public good, semi public goods and private goods like for example need for proper sanitary conditions in the village and the availability of drinking water to the purely private goals like housing which are purely individual benefit oriented. The mission statement defined by the SMART AP foundation document description of the particular values that public agency seeks to achieve through the agency's work (Moore, 2013, p.47).

As Sirianni argues some issues are not suitable for deliberation and some for co-production. Most of the goals designed by the program are essentially related to resource acquisition and are hardly there exists the need for debate and discussion which some intractable problems like dealing with environmental pollution requires. The goals of All other goals except the mobilizing of the resources appears Superficial and appear as Pseudo Goals. Integrating the goals of the state government with the goals of the village panchayat and the district panchayat remains inconclusive, though the state government at the top with the involvement of some of the representatives of the corporate sector do have a shared vision. However there is much scope for the goal interwinement at the inter organisational level between the non governmental organisations and

Corporates and the program goals. The Program goals arose at the level of the state government and are imposed goals which are to be implemented at the level of the village . However if we look at the goals most of the goals are related to the subjects in the state list and concurrent list and very few related to the subject matters or the competence of the village panchayat . Most of the goals except few are related to the resources and are collaboration independent meaning the goals can be implemented without the involvement of the community. Having diverse goals without regarding to the needs at the Village level appear as imposed goals .The absence of any clarity/effective directions about how the villages has to address the issue of resource constraint by identifying and mobilizing the sustainable resources both tax based and non tax based is also not given adequate attention. Goals are conceived of by individuals with out the effective involvement of community / local bodies are often conceptualized as though they belonged to collaborative aims (Vangen & Huxham 2011, p. 741) .

GENERAL PARTNER FOR VILLAGE DEVELOPMENT AND LIMITATIONS OF MOBILISATION

The program, initiated to address the socio economic developmental challenges in the context of resource scarcity sought to acquire both material institutional resources and Social Structural resources, with the social structural resources acting as a channel to acquire the material institutional resources to the State and the Local governments from the Citizens and non state actors through the General Partner and his network of Social relations via the Smart AP Foundation. The success of the program is contingent on the General Partners acting as connectors building up a trove of relationships across the public, private, and nonprofit sectors enlisting champions, vision-keepers, resource bearers and those with expertise and leverage these relationships to build networks for the realization of the Program Goals(McGuire & Agranoff, 2014, p.144), in other words while the

primary network activation(selective) function in the form of selecting the General Partner is done by the State Government through Smart AP foundation, Activation, Mobilizing and synthesizing of Goal directed networks for achieving each of the Program Goals at the lower level should be done by the General Partner. By continuing process of identifying and sustaining these disparate actors(McGuire & Agranoff 2014 p.147) and by connecting and harnessing theirs and community assets to a community vision, general partner has to ensure the realization of the Program goals. In other words a General Partner should act as a Network activator and champion at the village level and work with leaders in the community by selling the idea before civic groups, trade associations , Voluntary organisations and business community using his ties within the community and across the society and mobilize the large numbers of individual citizens to assume new burdens and tasks(Moore, 2013, p.14) using his personal legitimacy and program legitimacy as resource, bargaining, negotiating, and mutually adjusting activities undertaken in networked relationships(Koliba, Meek & Zia, 2010, p.110).

However though Various studies on community power structures using positional and reputational approaches typically uncovered an upper economic class constituting an integrated power elite, possessing a strong network(Knoke, 1990, p.122), characterized by Borgatti as “Key Player Problem/Positive” (KPP-Pos) who are crucial for the co-creating value by influencing their immediate neighbors by choosing best persons in the village to further activate/expand the network in order to maximize the number of activated persons at the end of the process following the Independent Cascade model. In spite of the individual legitimacy of the General Partner, the Program Legitimacy, accessibility to people with resources did not automatically lead to Mobilization of resources for a given objective (Pena-Lopez & Sanchez-Santos, 2017, p.1) as the Mobilisation of the embedded resources in the General Partners network is limited by the conditions in the motivation level of non state actors as well as the legitimacy of the government

intentions, identification of citizens and non state actors with the the purposes and intentions of the government as well as the citizen capacity and Civic Environment (Pena-Lopez & Sanchez-Santos, 2017, p.2).

The Privileged position of the General Partners in the network will influence aggregate levels of participation (Siegel, 2009, p.124) only when the population is extraordinarily self-motivated(Siegel, 2009, p.128) and increasing network size and altering network structure will be effective internal motivations in the population(Siegel, 2009, p.128) as Mobilization is a complex process dependent on individual decisions and social context like needs, relational proximity, resources owned(Pena-Lopez & Sanchez Santos, 2017, p.2) and is directly linked the existence of an ample possible chance of interactions and strength of strong bonds(Pena-Lopez & Sanchez-Santos 2017, p.3). Motivation which is combination of net internal motivation, independent of the participation of others, driven by the passion to effect social change and external motivation which is dependent on the participation of others(Siegel, 2009, p.125). By excessively relying on the General Partner, who is expected to act as a unpaid public servant for achievement of all the goals, the state has limited the mobilisation of resources confined to the network range of the General Partner.

DEMOCRATISATION AND GENERAL PARTNER

There is absence of a visible and functional local governments for long in Andhra Pradesh with a staff of its own, functional independence and resources base adequate enough without relying on the State Government and central government grants. This did not create communities of active, interested citizens “ who are capable of acting with common purpose and mutual action by virtue of their civic attitudes and participatory institutions”. The Smart Village Smart Ward Program document openly admits that Development of a local Community and society is a dynamic process (Smart Andhra Pradesh Foundation,

2016, p.18) and Understanding the local social and political context, power centres and individuals who operate and the different perceptions is a prerequisite to engaging them(Smart Andhra Pradesh Foundation, 2016, p.30) and Identifying and grooming individuals in villages and wards who are passionate about serving society and are willing to work as partners, is a time consuming process as Smart AP foundation could not Organize regular interactive meetings between partners, communities and officials to bring about alignment in perceptions and shared vision (Smart Andhra Pradesh Foundation, 2016, p.23). The state did not play attention to the dynamics of closedness particularly when the goal is inclusion and empowerment and is not clear on how a program which seeks to mobilize voluntary contributions to the state initiated program includes and empowers citizens. The closedness of the networks in the social dimension is set by informal rules of behaviour which are developed within a network and regulate the inclusion of the actors in and their exclusion from the interaction within the network, without this being explicitly indicated in the formal rules (Schaap & twist, 1997, p.63). The State expected the General partner to mobilize the citizens to act as countervailing power to to level the power differentials in the community and polity at local level with little attention to reforming the structures of local government and the processes of decision making is bordered on utopia as general partner is himself not formally part of the village panchayat even as co-optive member. This reliance on general partner without expanding the horizon of Participation to wide varieties of civil society organisations and Non Governmental Organisations is also due to the fact that , the local panchayat at village level are hardly institutions on their own and are dependent on the state governments which decides its priorities.

Though citizens prefer to act for the good of the community in mind with commitment to the community and to its members and a significant level of involvement in public affairs, contemporary practice of democracy in Andhra Pradesh for a quite

long time is not centered on the participation of the people or the development of politically relevant qualities in the ordinary individual and relied on participation of the minority elite and non-participation of the apathetic majority. Politics at the local level in spite of 73rd amendment act is driven by "power politics," largely concerned with the activities of leaders, officials, and other power holders in society than based on politics of participation where ordinary citizens engage in dialogue and discourse concerning the community and local government issues. As Richard Harwood, argues Citizens say that politics has evolved into a 'System' made up of various institutions and political forces that have seized control of the political process and driven a wedge between citizens and politics" and feel "cut off from political debate and their concerns not reflected in the way current issues are discussed(Chrislip, 2002, p.11). The government did not allow the Local Village Panchayats Mandated by the the 73rd amendment act to exercise certain functions and fulfil certain responsibilities by taking away the beneficiary selection from the elected local village Panchayat and entrusted them to Janmabhumi committees and thus separating authority from accountability. As per the Andhra Pradesh Panchayat Raj Act 1994, village Panchayats are advised to appoint functional committees respectively for agriculture, public health, water supply, sanitation, family planning, education and communication and for any other purposes(Panchayat Raj Act 1994, p.22) and also constitute "Beneficiary Committee" for the execution of the works of the Gram Panchayat which can co-opt persons who are not members of the Gram Panchayat and the powers and functions and other related matters of the Beneficiary Committee(Panchayat Raj Act 1994, p.22).As citizens a act on their own account contrary to the Public organizations which driven by organizational goals, It is then the task of the public organization to motivate citizens to contribute to collaborative efforts. The nature of issues to be addressed are primarily driven by resource scarcity , and does not offer much scope for deliberation and also much

beyond the scope of a village panchayat to redress, leading to absence of any deliberation.

AUTHORIZING ENVIRONMENT AND THE LIMITATIONS OF ADEQUATE STRUCTURES

Collaboration require development of institutions and structures of Joint decision making as Institutions structure the conditions under which actors interact, structure the relations of inter-dependency leading to the establishment of networks(Sorenson & Torfing, 2007, p.173) and Structures encourage network members to engage in collective and mutually supportive action. Institutions are "the rules of the game in society...the humanly devised constraints that shape human interaction...complexes of norms and technologies that persist over time by serving collectively valued purposes...some have an organizational form, others exist as pervasive influences on behavior". Institutional design, then, means designing institutions, devising and realizing rules, procedures, and organizational structures to enable and constrain behavior and action and conform them to held values, achieve desired objectives, or execute given tasks. Institutional design is often a significant part of implementation. when policy implementation demands new organization or reorganization, legislation, regulation, or new routines and procedures, institutional design will be needed.‡ Since the above definition of institutions implies that organizations are also a kind of institution, we can think of organizational design as subsumed under institutional design(Alexander, 2015, p.114).

Steering of the program through intended collaboration cannot be achieved by setting up an empowered hierarchy at the top of the network in the form of executive committee at the state level as hierarchic approach to steering fails to take in to account mutual dependencies and balance of power and need to balance between tension between the dependence and autonomy. The actors in the

network will not accommodate the objectives of the one actor, even when that one actor is government related. In this field of tension the steering will take place through negotiation and exchange, persuasion and forming of coalitions and strategic cooperation.

The state government while taking few members of the corporate sector and voluntary sector among the governing body and secretaries to various departments of Andhra Pradesh Government in Collaboration through Smart AP foundation did not induct professionals related to the subject areas in which it sought to adopt collaborative working or built technical working groups along with the government departmental secretaries to serve in program capacities for their agencies or are not part of the network's core organizations, the absence of which led to failure in the Network as interaction of the Smart AP foundation and led to serendipitous process of working according to Deepak Korrapati ex resource mobilisation officer of Smart AP foundation (Barr & Huxham, 1996, p.114-115). The State merely relied on Knowledge infusion regarding to the problems faced, resources needed and opportunities for the corporates to work in areas where state is deficient in providing infrastructure and services. This reliance on Cognitive dimension of inter organisational network building ignoring of the structural dimension of embedding the corporates in the state agency teams, led to rudimentary form of collaboration in the form of information exchange.

Though the state government document on Smart Village Smart Ward Program mentions about Constituting District and Mandal coordination committees to conduct monthly review meetings regularly for supporting partners and redress their grievances with SAPF, Planning department, SVSW Nodal Departments and district collectors. The Program structure for providing support to the partners linking them with resource agencies with SAPF, Planning department, knowledge partners and district administration did not evolve as intended. The state failed at the outset to compile information on the Voluntary organisations, their mode of funding and functional competencies and provide them to public at large or to the partners an

similarly it failed to compile the data on the corporates working in the state on corporate social responsibility, their area of operation, competencies. In other words the state failed to take in to account the resources endowment and competencies of the Non State actors. This led to a situation of General Partners falling back on their own network of contacts than relying on the steering of the state, where directed/indicated to the NGOs/Corporates to work. Herrting understands dependency as a matter of the perception of the network actors involved. "It is possible to find situations where all actors are aware of strong mutual dependencies, while the intensity of their motives for handling the situation through some kind of coordination still differs slightly (Koliba, Meek & Zia, 2010 p.98). nonprofits sometimes share some or most of government's agenda but they also tend to be founded upon and organized around missions analogous to, and overlapping with, those of the government.

Lester Salamon argue that policy tools structure collective action by influencing the flow of resources and services. Policy tools mobilization, composition, and function of a governance network by structuring how authority gets distributed across a governance network and, in some cases, how resources get distributed. However state government has relied more or less on "Automaticity defined by Lester Salamon as a policy tool utilizes an existing administrative structure rather than having to create its own special administrative apparatus" (Salamon, 2002, p.32). The state preferred make this intended collaboration a centrally directed one instead enabling the District and other Local Level institutions to enter in the collaborative agreements within the subjects allotted to them. The state did not pay adequate attention to the Institutional Capacity Development of the Panchayat Raj bodies for transformation of local governance which is affected by locality's quality of life and social relations. Institutions also matter because governance typically occurs in and through them, whether they are specific organisations or clusters of rules, norms, or other institutional

arrangements(Kildauff & Tsai, 2003, p.87-88). Institutional capacity which is associated with many civic associations, high interaction among social groups, coalitions crossing particular interests, and a sense of common purpose is built through Knowledge resources, Relational resources defined by range of stakeholders, social networks' morphology, locus of power and Mobilization capacities involving opportunity structure, institutional arenas, mobilization techniques. The Government of Andhra Pradesh has only used one Policy tool of Matching grant up to 50 percent in case any donor comes to fund a program .

THE PROBLEM OF LEGITIMACY AND NETWORKS ACTIVATION FAILURE

Complexity theory argues that decision making is not isolated but connects to a wider environment, and systems development stems from co-evolution with other systems. Strategies are seen not as one-sided responses to a changing environment or another actor, but as constant adaptive moves related to the context, affecting both the initiator of the action and all others influenced by it (Koppenjan & Klijn, 2014, p.162). Social domain at the village level should evolve due to the strategic actions of state government and in particular Smart AP foundation. The Political Authorising environment should ensure that the collaboration effort of the government at the level of the state with the SMART AP foundation should effect changes in the social domain by bringing changes in the politico administrative domain. Political ,administrative and social domain changes did not occur or the social sphere of the local areas did not change due to the imposed and mandated nature of the collaboration. Strategy of the state remained as one-sided responses to a changing environment or another actor, but as constant adaptive moves related to the context, affecting both the initiator of the action and all others influenced by it (Koppenjan & Klijn, 2014, p.162). The General partner though possessing NATO(Nodality, Authority, Treasure, Organisation) resources(Torfin, 2016, p.259) need the support of

the Village Sarpanch and Grama Sabha to form affective networks with the village panchayat acting as a core organization, integrating their activities, or some subset of their activities, acting like a single, larger organization, collectively representing the skills and resources of all member organizations evolving in to what Kilduff and Tsai have referred to as a "goal directed" network(Kilduff & Tsai, 2003, p.89). However as the Village Panchayat itself failed / did not make the General Partner Cooptive member the , the network even if created by the general Partner will end up as informal Linkage rather than part of formal structure.

The SMART AP foundation established in the form of NAO is itself new and not well established, often with any successful models to emulate and despite its role as the primary force behind development and maintenance of the collaboration, It could quickly establish and continually demonstrate its value, both to members and outside stakeholders. Early commitment to the network by the corporates is modest and calculated, and Network Administrative Organisation(SMART AP) needs to generate enthusiasm and support by building and establishing its own legitimacy through "outreach" to new, allegiant constituencies and to existing entities that can provide support(Provan, Kenis & Human, 2008, p.129) , which however is doubtful given the absence of incentives or sharing of power by the government. As Keast and Brown (2002) argue that networks threaten Status Quo by giving over decision-making ability to external players so comfortable position of a centralized authority telling others what to do. By doing so they destroy the very networks they set up to assist them. Structures and processes are sometimes imposed externally .This cognitive legitimacy is particularly important in a CGR because it provides the participants with specific, substantive grounds beyond relational benefits that enable them to justify their continuing engagement to those they represent (Emerson & Nabatchi, 2014, p.67). In the absence of any network at the village level where integration of the activities did not take place , cognitive legitimacy which reflects the trust about

the compatibility of interests , realisation of the relational benefits did not emerge(Provan, Kenis & Human, 2008, p.127)

CONCLUSION

As Chrislip argues that bringing together appropriate people in constructive ways with good information will create authentic visions and strategies for addressing the shared concerns of the organization or community(Chrislip, 2002, p.50). However Transformative social progress is held back more by precedent and existing structures and processes than by resource limitations or a lack of the public's interest(Goldsmith, Georges, & Burke, 2010, p.3). The state in spite of program legitimacy and shared vision failed to develop interorganisational collaborative capacity due to relying on the cognitive dimension and affective dimension of the interagency collaborative capacity in preference relational structural embeddedness driven by the political preferences of politicians who are disinclined to share power and preferred to share burden and responsibility. However the program is still in nascent stage and it is moving in the right direction and with time it may evolve and state may develop the structural and affective/ relational dimensions of interorganisational collaborative capacity which may take some years.

By ineffective means of authorizing environment , the state failed at the outset in the words of Mark Moore to orchestrate a political process that would "create an identity of interests" between the citizens' aspirations and their government's activities and efforts—a goal more closely aligned with creating a citizenry that could become articulate about and active in pursuing collectively desired social outcomes(Moore, 2013, p.12). While selecting the goals and in devising a policy of adaptation of village by becoming general partner the state did not pay attention to the required Sectoral partnerships at the state level with the general partnership with the citizens at the village level which is necessary . By failing to integrate community goals of having adequate

institutional infrastructure for basic services to the government goals of reaching sustainable development goals targets, the state could not see whether district administration, Mandal level bureaucracy and local panchayat has adequate capacity to establish relationships with non state actors and is in a position to develop necessary institutional conditions for the collaborative working. The government has also neglected collaborative Process management by the failure to facilitate interactions between the General partner and the local Village panchayat by altering the institutional characteristics of the network (like for example making the General Partner co-opted member of village panchayat i.e institutional design strategies(Koppenjan & Klijn, 2014, p.161). This reliance on the Automaticity as a policy principle led to the process of growth of network trajectory to achieve multiple goals as a serendipitous network processes, where General Partners of the Village made choices about who to connect with, what to transact, and so on, without guidance from any central network agent/SMART AP Foundation concerning goals or strategy leading to the formation of ties or partnerships based on their own interests.(Kildauff & Tsai, 2003, p.90). This Serendipitous process of network formation relying on processes of chance and opportunism (Kildauff & Tsai, 2003, p.90) failed to expand what in the words of John Dryzek are essential in the governance process in a democracy - *Franchise* - the number of active participants in any political setting , *Scope* concerns the domains under the public control and *Authenticity* is the degree to which democratic control is substantive , informal and competently engaged (Salamon, 2002, p.567). The Reliance on the Atomicity Principle and inadequate capacity of the Panchayat Raj institutions led to the evolution of the this Creative Collaboration along the trajectory of information exchange model rather than information processing model in the words of the Lukensmeyer and Torres leading to information and consultation giving little role to the citizens a role in the decision-making process nor to change their perceptions of government and/or their trust in government. As John Donahue argues - Individual

charity, corporate philanthropy, and other forms of voluntarism though help in achieving goals of public missions can not be termed Collaboration as shared discretion is the hallmark of collaborative governance which the program has achieved .

However Greater collaboration is not a very new idea in public administration, it has never fulfilled its promising potential” and so is the attempted collaboration in Andhra Pradesh (Gadot, 2003, 147). The state has failed till now to mobilize the capacities of individuals, groups, organizations, and networks be nurtured and facilitated to deal with the problems of their own and/or the wider community due to inadequate attention to the schemes, devices and methods, institutional necessity to enable self-steering and problem solving capacities of diverse actors and networks? (Triantafillou, 2007, p.187). However it should be noted that effective collaboration is a state that emerges relatively slowly and so must be guided through a complex developmental process overcoming disruptive political and fiscal shift and agency positions and managerial/ official turnover which may affect personal relationships essential for collaboration to work(Bardach, 1998, p.4).

As Eran Vigoda-Gadot argues -

Modern Governance and modern modern administration will continuously have to battle powerful and centrifugal forces of citizens passivism as well as economic and self interest based considerations of private and third sectors . The Pragmatic scenario for the years ahead is that governments and public administration , citizens and private sector will continuously tango between two types of interaction : the demand for growing responsiveness and the utopia of optimal collaboration(Gadot, 2003 p.165)

Some Suggestions for the Improvement of the Program.

AT VILLAGE ADMINISTRATION LEVEL

1. 2nd Administrative reforms commission report on Local Governance identifies that

many of the Gram Panchayats are too small to function as autonomous institutions of local government. a Gram Panchayat needs to have a minimum population size in order to be an economically viable administrative unit, capable of discharging multiple responsibilities envisaged for it under the present decentralization plan. The Panchayats In Andhra Pradesh should be reorganized with the minimum size of a Gram Panchayat decided by the criteria given by the 2nd Administrative reforms commission which are (a) potentiality for resource generation, (b) sustainability of the staff structure, (c) suitability as a unit of planning for core functions, (d) geographical cohesiveness, (e) terrain conditions and (f) communication facility within the Panchayat area(2nd ARC Local governance , 2007:127)

2. The collaboration to work needs a supporting institutional structures , in the form of village development committees which are well integrated in to the institutional mechanisms created by the general partners of the village. It is not clear in the rules who will play the role of the convenor of the collaborative which has the officers reporting to the state government , Head of the local elected panchayat and the general partner who convenes/mobilizes the community . It is necessary to create a village development council with wide membership , including the general partners , village elected representatives and mandal level officials , self help groups and farmers associations etc which will help to synchronize the efforts and resources as well as some corporate s.
3. It should be made mandatory for the panchayat to present data related to Tax Base and Non Tax revenue Base , Tax compliance, Tax realisation, sources of funds received by the panchayat from various sources. otherwise the creative

collaboration becomes a creative fraud making up the revenue loss through misappropriation and non mobilization from the altruistic individuals. Despite the important role that local bodies play in the democratic process and in meeting the basic requirements of the people, the financial resources generated by these bodies fall far short of their requirements. More than 93 per cent of the total revenues of rural bodies were derived from external sources. Also the percentage of revenue expenditure covered by their own resources for rural and urban local bodies is 9.26 per cent and 68.97 percent, respectively, in 2002-03. The percentage of revenue derived from own taxes for rural local bodies are 3.87 per cent in 2002-2003 (2nd ARC 2006, p.59).

1. A successful collaboration at the local level can not be built on the foundation of a weak local government. Unless the local governments are strengthened and made to functional as a autonomous local entity, the mechanism created with the general partner will become a mere appendage artificially grafted to the local administration rather than emerging as a true collaboration. The subject committees mentioned in the panchayat Raj Act are either non existent and where are exists, they are non functional. The subject committees mentioned in the Panchayat Raj Act should be constituted and even in the subjects under the state and central list, appropriate mechanisms should be devised to exercise the oversight functions.

2. High level of corruption at the local level demotivates the citizens to contribute to the society's welfare as they don't wish to subsidize the corruption of local level officials. An Ethical transparent and corruption free environment acts as inducer/ motivator for public contribution. A local body Ombudsman as recommended by the 2nd Administrative reforms commission should be constituted by amending of provisions Panchayat Raj Act to look into complaints of corruption and

maladministration against functionaries of local bodies, both elected members and officials. The Ombudsman should be appointed by a Committee consisting of the Chief Minister of the State, the Speaker of the State Legislative Assembly and the Leader of the Opposition in the Legislative Assembly.

DISTRICT LEVEL REFORMS

3. The 2nd administrative reforms commissions has drawn attention to the weak state of District Planning Committees prescribed in Article 243Z D and recommended single elected District Council with representatives from all rural and urban areas, that will function as a true local government for the entire district. In such a scheme, the District Council will be responsible for all the local functions, including those listed for them in the Eleventh and Twelfth Schedules. As per 2nd ARC report on Local Governance, The DPC in its present form will be redundant, once a District Council comes into existence as envisaged by the Commission. Planning for the whole district – urban and rural – will become an integral part of the District Council's responsibility. The role of the District Collector/DM also needs to be reviewed in the context of the District Council and the District Government. (2nd ARC 2007, p.31). The district Planning Committees need to be restructured amending the Panchayat Raj act and provision should be made for utilizing the expertise of big corporate groups in preparing and implementing district development plans.

4. The state Government should bring district cooperative registrar under the newly created Joint collector Village and ward secretariats, simultaneous a post of assistant Mandal parishad development officer should be created at the Mandal level with recruitment from voluntary sector and entirely financed by corporates or NGOs who express willingness to collaborate and this officer should be reporting to Mandal Parishad development officer and through district Nodal Corporate to Connect to Andhra Foundation.

5. State Level - At the level of Connect to Andhra, functional specialists should be appointed related to

specific subject areas to coordinate the activities with corporates and NGOs

6. Till now there is no data available / collected regarding the size of the NGOs or Corporate groups , or their core areas of interest . everything is done informally . First NGOs should be classified on the basis of Size and Scope of their operation.

7. Each department should identify an demarch areas on which collaboration can be taken up .

8. Adequate Attention should be payed to the problem of scale . Some subjects like housing ,creation of employment opportunities through skill development and establishing micro and small scale enterprises which require huge resources are beyond the scope of the citizen general partners who may not be linked to Corporates or big NGOs, and the program should ensure that the goals adopted to be realised are within the capacity of the citizens to contribute. It is worthwhile to consider assigning of particular sectors for the corporates to partner for a group of villages instead of asking them to adopt villages .

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- ❖ Alexander, E.R.(2015).Effectuating Public Values by Institutional Design. In John M. Bryson, J.M., Crosby, B.M., & Bloomberg, L (Eds). *Creating Public Value in Practice: Advancing the Common Good in a Multi-Sector, Shared-Power, No-One-Wholly-in-Charge World*. Boca Raton: CRC Press.
- ❖ Bardach, E. (1998). *Getting Agencies to Work together Theory and Practice of Managerial Craftmanship*. Washington D.C: Brookings Institution Press.
- ❖ Barr, C., & Huxham, C. (1996). Involving the community: collaboration for community development. In Huxham, C.(Eds.).(1996). *Creating Collaborative Advantage*. London:Sage.
- ❖ Chrislip, D.D. (2002). *The Collaborative Leaders Field book a Guide for Citizens and Civic Leaders*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- ❖ Donahue, J., & Zeckhauser, R. (2011). *Collaborative Governance : Private roles for Public Goals in Turbulent Times*. Princeton, NY: Princeton University Press.
- ❖ Salamon, L.M. (Ed.). (2002). *The Tools of Government: A Guide to the New Governance*. London:Oxford University Press.
- ❖ Gadot, E.V.(2003). *Managing collaboration in Public Administration The Promise of Alliance among Governance Citizens and Businesses*. Westport: Praeger.
- ❖ Goldsmith, S., Georges, G., & Burke, G.T. (2010). *The Power of Social Innovation How Civic Entrepreneurs Ignite Community For Good*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- ❖ Keast, R., Mandell, M., & Agranoff, R.(Eds.).(2014). *Network Theory in Public Sector: Building New Theoretical Framework* . London:Routledge.
- ❖ Kilduff, M., & Tsai, W. (2003). *Social Networks And Organisations*. London:Sage.
- ❖ Koliba, C., Meek, J.W., & Zia, A. (2003). *Governance Networks in Public Administration and Public Policy*. Boca Raton: CRC Press.
- ❖ Koppenjan, J., & Klijn, E.H.(2014). What Can Governance Network Theory Learn from Complexity Theory? Mirroring Two Perspectives on Complexity. In Keast, R., Mandell, M., & Agranoff, R. (Eds.). *Network Theory in Public Sector: Building New Theoretical Framework* . London:Routledge
- ❖ Moore, M.H.(2013). *Recognising Public Value*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- ❖ Pena-Lopez, J.A., & Sanchez-Santos, J.M. (2017).Individual social capital: Accessibility and mobilization of resources embedded in

- social networks. *Social Networks*, 49, pp.1–11.
- ❖ Provan, K.G., Kenis, P., & Human, S.E. (2008). Legitimacy Building in Organizational Networks. In Bingham, L.M & O’Leary, R.(Eds). (2008). *Big Ideas in Collaborative Public Management*. New York, NY: Routledge.
 - ❖ Salamon, L.M. (Ed). (2002). *The Tools of Government A Guide to the New Governance*. London: Oxford University Press.
 - ❖ Schaap, L., & Twist, M.J.W.V.(1997). The Dynamics of Closedness in Networks. In Kickert, W.J.M., Klijn, E.H., & Koppenjan, J.F.M.(Eds). *Managing Complex Networks: Strategies for the Public Sector*. London: Sage.
 - ❖ Smart Andhra Pradesh Foundation. (2016a). Journey so Far- Partner Success Stories. Retrieved from <https://www.connect.ap.gov.in/docs/manuals/JourneySoFar.pdf>
 - ❖ Tirrel, D.N., & Clay, J.A. (2010). *Strategic collaboration in public and non profit collaboration: A Practice Based Approach to Solving Shared Problems*. Boca Raton: CRC Press.
 - ❖ Torfing, J. (2016). *Collaborative Innovation in the Public Sector*. Washington D.C: Georgetown University Press.
 - ❖ Triantafillou, P. (2007). Governing the formation and mobilisation of Governance Networks. In Sorenson, E., & Torfing, J.(Eds). *Theories of Democratic Network Governance*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
 - ❖ Vangen, S., & Huxham, C. (2012). The Tangled Web: Unraveling the Principle of Common Goals in Collaborations. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, Volume 22, Issue 4, pp.731–760, <https://doi.org/10.1093/jopart/mur065>.
 - ❖ Voorberg, W., & Bekkers, V. (2016). Interactive Governance and Social Construction of citizens as co-creators. In Edelenbos, j., & Meerkerk, I.V.(Eds). *Critical reflections on interactive governance Self Organisation and co evolution in Public Governance*. Rotterdam: Elgar Edward Publishing.