

GOVERNMENT OF NAGALAND

**EVALUATION REPORT
ON
INTEGRATED RURAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME
IN
ZUNHEBOTO DISTRICT OF NAGALAND**

**DIRECTORATE OF EVALUATION GOVERNMENT OF NAGALAND
KOHIMA**

PREFACE

The Integrated Rural Development programme was introduced in the State during the year 1978 -79. Its main objective is to bring up the socio Economic life of the poorest families in both rural and urban areas by giving them income generating assets and access to credit and other inputs. Considering the importance of the programme the state Government felt it necessary to know how far it has achieved the objectives. The Department of Evaluation was therefore directed to undertake a study on the programme. The District offices of the Department thus conducted the study in their respective Districts. This study relates to the I. R. D .P. in Zunheboto District of Nagaland.

The reference period for this study was from 1985-86 to 1987-88. Shri Shinito Semi District Evaluation officer Zunheboto was in overall charge for the conduct of this study and prepared the first draft of the report. The useful work done by the District Evaluation officer and his Field staff deserves much appreciation. It is hoped that the information contained in this report particularly the findings and suggestions would be of some help to the concerned implementing Department, planners and Policy Makers for follow-up action and future guidance.

The assistance and cooperation extended by the B. D. O. 's and their staff are gratefully acknowledged.

Sd/- L. COLNEY
DIRECTOR OF EVALUATION
NAGALAND: KOHIMA

CONTENTS

PREFACE :

CHAPTER:

1. INTRODUCTION:

General background, objective of IRDP, random method. Selection of beneficiaries, Subsidy and loans, objective of study.

2. AN APPRAISAL OF THE IRDP ACTIVITIES IN THE DISTRICT.

Particulars of the selected block, Physical target and achievement, grouped of schemes, coverage of IRDP in the Selected block, annual income of selected beneficiaries, beneficiaries having terrace land and irrigated land; educational status of beneficiaries, success of IRDP. knowledge, targeted and achievements of loan and grant, in position of staffing pattern.

3 MAIN FINDING AND RECOMMENDATIONS.

Supervision of the scheme adopted, Selection of beneficiaries, on subsidy Granted, on spot verification, Maintenance of Register honorarium to V D B Secretary.

LIST OF TABLE REPRESENTED IN THE REPORT

TABLE NO.	TITLE:
I.	General particulars of the blocks
II.	Block-wise physical target and achievement under various schemes
III.	Coverage of I R D P in the selected block
IV.	Annual income of selected beneficiaries before and after IRDP assistance.
V.	Selected beneficiaries having terrace land and irrigated land
VI.	Educational status of selected beneficiaries
VII.	Sources of IRDP knowledge
VIII.	Numbers of applicant and actually advanced from loan
IX.	Table showing the in position of staffing pattern at the block level as on 31-3-1989

CHAPTER-I INTRODUCTION

General Background:

1.1 The Zunheboto District of Nagaland covers a Total area of 1,255.00 Sq Km with 61161 as its population according to the Population census of 1981. Presently, there are four Blocks namely, Zunheboto, Akuluto, Tokiye and Pughoboto Block under the District. Altogether there are 155 Villages and the total number of households is 10373, in the three Blocks. Pughoboto Block which has been transferred to the Zunheboto District recently was included in this study. Out of these four Blocks in the District two Blocks are considered as backward namely Tokiye and Pughoboto. The economic condition of the rural people are still very poor and majority if not all are living below the poverty line.

1.2. In order to raise such rural population economically, the state Rural Development Department is implementing various Programmes; The I.B.L.D.P. is one of the programmes intended to generate additional incomes by helping these people to cross the poverty line once for all. The selection of beneficiaries are supposed to be done from among the poorest of the poor, This programme of IRDP has started in Nagaland along with the rest of the country.

1.3 OBJECTIVE OF IRDP

In brief the objective of IRDP is to raise the poorest families in the rural areas above the poverty line by giving them income generating assets and access to credit and other inputs.

1.4 Sampling method

Out of 115 Villages under this District ten (10) Villages were selected for this study. The selection of Villages were done on a random basis by taking into consideration that at least a reasonable number of villages from each of the three Blocks of the District are taken. In each Block the number of beneficiaries were grouped into three Categories viz.
> Agriculture and Allied Industry self Employment and live-stock.

1.5, Selection of Beneficiaries

Initially the Selection of Beneficiaries was done on the recommendation of VDB members in an open meeting. But from the last four five years the poverty base line survey was conducted to identify the eligible families for IRDP— assistance. This survey is to be confined to the families having their annual income of less than Rs.3.500/- or families owning an area of less than 5 acres of land. Now the selection of Beneficiaries are done on the basis of this poverty baseline survey by choosing the poorest among them.

1.6. Objective of the Study

This study has been carried with the following main objectives:

1. To study the condition and arrangement under which the programme is going implemented
2. To examine the progress made in the field of I. R. DP.
3. To study the problem arises and
4. To suggest measures for improvement of the programme

CHAPTER NO. II

An appraisal of the IRDP activities in the District.

2.1 Particulars of the Selected Block

It may be of important to present here the Identification particulars of the selected Block in the district. The table given below shows the detail General Identification particular of selected Block.

TABLE NO. I
GENERAL PARTICULARS OF THE SELECTED BLOCKS.

Name of the Block	Total No. of villages	Total No of House-holds	Total No. of beneficiaries during the year 1985-86 to 1987-88	Total No. of Beneficiaries selected of study
1	2	3	4	5
ZUNHEBOTO	56	4436	293	14
AKULUTO	43	3622	150	24
TOKIYE	56	2320	317	8
TOTAL	155	10378	760	46

SOURCE: (FROM SDO'S Office)

It may be seen from the above table that in three years out of 10378 households 658 had already benefited under various schemes. In regards to Akuluto Block beneficiaries record during 1985-86 were not available and as such the figure presented are only for the years record.

2.2 Physical Target and Achievement

The Physical target and achievement of IRDP in the district under various schemes since 1985-88 are presented below in table No. II at the next page.

TABLE NO. II.
BLOCK- WISE PHYSICAL TARGET AND ACHIEVEMENT UNDER VARIOUS SCHEMES.

Name of the Block	Target (1985-86 to 87-88)					Achievement (1985-86 to 87-88)				
	Agri	Livestock	Industry	Others	Total	Agri	Livestock	Industry	Others	Total
1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)
ZUNHEBOTO	67	92	28	2	189	67	90	28	2	187
AKULUTO	17	42	23	7	149	77	42	23	7	149
TOKIYE	92	103	37	11	243	92	103	37	11	243
TOTAL: -	236	237	88	20	581	236	235	88	20	579

(SOURCE: - B D O)

2.3. A scrutiny of Table No. II above shows that the Department has almost achieved the targeted figure. However, it is found that in Zunheboto District livestock are not supplied. It is said that due to unfavourable climatic condition in the District Improved livestock could not resist diseases and epidemics. The Block level purchased Committee have therefore reported to have resolved to grant subsidy in cash rather than in kind. The beneficiaries are allowed to purchase the local bread for rearing. This type of wrong implementation defeat the purpose of the schemes.

2.4. The implementation of programme with regard to the progress and coverage made in the district during three years are presented below :-

TABLE No. III.
COVERAGE OF 1RDP IN THE SELECTED BLOCK.

Name of Block.	Total No Of villages in the block	Total NO. of House hold in the Block.	Total No. of House holds Identified to be covered under I R D P during three years.			Total No. of house hold benefited during three years.		
			1985-86	1986-87	1987-88	1985-86	1986-87	1987-1988
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
ZUNHEBOTO	56	4436	-	-	-	63	82	126
AKULUTO	43	3622	153	942	921	88	62	—
TOKIYE	56	2320	2320	1738	1638	130	27	100
TOTAL	155	10378	2471	2680	2559	281	231	226

(SOURCE: - BDO)

TABLE NO. IV

Annual Income of selected Beneficiaries before and after IRDP Assistance

Name of Block.	Income before IRDP Assistance (in Rs.)		Income after IRDP Assistance (in Rs.)	
	Below Rs. 3500	Above Rs. 1500	Below Rs. 3500	Above Rs. 3500
1	2	3	4	5
ZUNHEBOTO	14	NIL	10	4
AKULUTO	24	NIL	21	3
TOKIYE	8	NIL	7	1
TOTAL	46	-	38	8

(Source: - Field Investigation)

A scrutiny of the above table shows that out of 46 beneficiaries selected for interview only eight beneficiaries could cross the poverty line Rs. 3500. This showed that the programme is not successful in the District. This is probably due to wrong implementation or wrong policy or both.

TABLE NO. V

Selected Beneficiaries having terrace land and irrigated land

Name of Block.	No of person having less than 5 acres of terrace land	No. of person having more than 5 acres of terrace land	No of person having less than 5 acres of irrigation land	No. of person having more than 5 acres of irrigation land
1	2	3	4	5
ZUNHEBOTO	12	2	12	2
AKULUTO	24	-	21	3
TOKIYE	8	-	7	1
TOTAL	44	2	40	6

As stated earlier, the, selection of beneficiaries should be done on the basis of Baseline survey and select the poorest families from among those whose income is less than Rs.3500/- annually or who own an operational area of land less than 5 acres. However, some of the beneficiaries who's income is above Rs.3500/- annually find owned an area of more than 5 acres are also selected for the benefit However this practice is a violation of the laid down policy of the programme. This should be avoided in future.

26. The Educational Status of selected beneficiaries interview by the Evaluation team are as follows: -

TABLE NO. VI.
Educational Status of Selected Beneficiaries.

Name of Block.	Illiterate	Up to Middle School	High School	Above High School
1	2	3	4	5
ZUNHEBOTO	49	12	9	-
AKULUTO	117	19	14	-
TOKIYE	36	2	-	-
TOTAL	202	33	23	-

(Source: - Field investigation)

2.7 An attempt has been made by interviewing the beneficiaries about this source of knowledge of IRDP. The information collected are tabulated and presented below in table VII:-

TABLE VII
SOURCES OF IRDP KNOWLEDGE

Name of Block.	No. of person reported known through BDO	No. of person known through VDB	No. of person reported known through Govt. functionaries	No. of person reported known through friend
1	2	3	4	5
ZUNHEBOTO	16	6	-	2
AKULUTO	4	10	-	-
TOKIYE	2	4	-	2
TOTAL	22	20	-	4

(Source :- Field investigation)

2.8 Statement showing numbers of applications received and numbers actually given during the three years 1985-86 to 1987-88 is represented below:-

TABLE NO. VIII
NUMBERS OF APPLICANT AND ACTUALLY ADVANCES FOR LOAN

Name of Block.	Name of the bank granted loan	No. of application received for sanction of loan	Amount	No. of applicant actually benefited	Amount sanctioned
1	2	3	4	5	6
Tokiye	SBI Aghunato	87	4,75,895	87	4,66,695
	SBI Aghunato	100	6,39,200	100	6,15,770
Akuluto	Nagaland Rural Bank V.K.	95	4,68,980	95	4,68,980
	SBI Akuluto	34	1,66,975	33	1,62,100
	SBI Satakha				

Zunheboto	Cooperative Bank	63	2,98,575	63	2,98,575
	Cooperative Bank	128	5,94,305	126	5,87,585
		507	26,41,930	504	25,87,585

(Source :- Official Record)

2.9 The staffing pattern at the block level and in position during date of visit are presented in Table IX.

TABLE NO. IX
TABLE SHOWING THE IN POSITION OF STARTING OF STAFFING
PATTERN AT THE BLOCK LEVEL AS ON 31-3-1989

Sl. No	Name of the spot	Zunheboto	Sanction Strength In position	Name of the block Akuluto block In position	Sanction Strength	Tokiye block In position	Sanction Strength
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1	BDO	1	1	1	1	1	1
2	JT. BDO	1	2	1	1	1	1
3	HA	1	1	1	2	1	1
4	UDA	1	1	1	1	-	-
5	LDA	1	1	1	2	2	2
6	Typist	1	2	1	1	1	1
7	Peon	1	1	1	1	2	2
8	Chowkidar	2	2	1	1	1	1
9	Driver	1	1	1	1	1	1
10	E.O.(Engg)	1	1	1	1	1	1
11	N.O (Agri)	1	1	1	1	1	1
12	SIS (Statistic)	-	-	-	-	2	1
13	Overseers	2	2	1	1	1	1
14	V.L.W. (Agri)	3	4	3	3	2	3
15	Stockman	1	1	1	1	1	1
16	Dhai	3	3	2	3	2	3
17	Cashier	1	1	1	1	1	1
	Total	29	23	19	21	20	22

As can be seen from the above table all the Block in Zunheboto District are hving all the staff posted against the sanction strength excepting Akuluto and Tokiye where 2 staff each are yet to be posted.

CHAPTER III.
MAIN FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.

Supervision

31. It is found that subsidies given to the Beneficiaries were on mostly livestock Fishery, Industry and Self Employment Schemes. It is reported that as per decision of the District Purchasing Committee cash are to given to the beneficiaries for purchase of local breed livestock by the beneficiaries themselves. This practice seems to be a wrong policy • f the District purchasing Committee in view of the fact that it is not only violate the system prescribed but is likely that they may not start the work after getting the cash.

It is also reported that diseases and epidemic of birds are very of ten effected the area and the people used to incurred heavy losses. It is therefore, suggested that the Department in elaboration with tie Veterinary & Animal Husbandry Department at least once or twice visit the areas where such farm are established and supplied with medicine to prevent such cases.

This found that schemes on Industry and Self Employment for with kind are supplied to the Beneficiaries are not utilised. These are just kept like that and not use for productive purposes. The Department should see that these are properly utilised.

3.1. Selection of Beneficiaries.

The V.D.B. members are claimed to have selecting the name of Beneficiaries basing on the base line survey. But in practice, it is found that in most occassion some beneficiaries whose .income is above the poverty line are being selected leaving the poorest one`In some Villages, this base line survey has been prepared arbitrarily and submitted by V.D.B. Secretary without the knowledge of the members and G.B.s of the Village. Since selection of beneficiaries will be base on the base line survey, preparation of base line survey must be done in a village meeting where everyone should be present. Then only it should be submitted to the authority.

ANNEXURE –I
GOVERNMENT OF NAGALAND
RURAL DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT

:No. D/MISC-15/86

: Dt. Kohima the 24th Nov 91.

To

1. The Joint Director,
Evaluation, Nagaland, Kohima.
2. The Deputy Commissioner, Zunheboto.

Sub:- EVALUATION REPORT ON IRDP IN ZUNHEBOTO DISTRICT,
NAGALAND.

Sir,

I am directed to forward herewith a copy of letter No. SRDA/IRD-51/86/414 dated 29-9-1991 received from Project Director, SRDA on the above subject and to request you to look into matter for further necessary action, if any.

ENCL :- AS ABOVE

Yours faithfully

Sd/-

(K. JAMIR)

Joint Secretary to the Govt. of
Nagaland.

**STATE RURAL DEVELOPMENT AGENCY
NAGALAND: KOHIMA.**

HO. SRDA/IRD-51/86/414

Dt, Kohima, the th Oct/91

To

The Secretary to the
Govt. of Nagaland.
RP DEPARTMENT, KOHIMA.

SUB EVALUATION REPORT ON IRDP IN ZUNHEBOTO
DISTRICT. NAGALAND

Sir,

I have the honour to state that I have examined the Evaluation report submitted by Joint Director, Evaluation Nagaland Kohima vide hit letter HO. BVL/PUB/2/85/132-53 dated 4-6-1991 and mjr observations are as follows: -

As far as the comment of introductory part of the report appearing In Para-1. I have nothing to comment as it is more than in the nature of the procedure adopted by the Department for their study.

Regarding tie total number of beneficiaries in three blocks of Zunheboto District viz. Zunheboto, Akuluto and Tokiye blocks during 1985-86 to 1987-88 is concerned it is observed that the figures given by the Evaluation Officer themselves are contradictory. Vide table No. 1 Column No. 4 he has shown that the total number of beneficiaries during these period was 658 Whereas if we total the yearly break up of beneficiaries shown by the Evaluation Officer vide table No. 3 Column No. 7.8&9 the total comes to 738 beneficiaries. Again vide Fore table-2 the total number of beneficiaries is shown as 579. There fore as It may be observed that the Evaluation Officer has given three different figures of beneficiaries during this period. It is stated here that when the Agency fix target for each block, generally the Agency will not fix scheme wise target as indicated by him the table no. 2 but simply the total number of unit to be undertaken by the block and as far as selection of schemes are concerned It is left to the beneficiaries concerned.

Under the circumstances I have the Impression that proper evaluation was not carried out as far as target and achievement are concerned.

In para- 2,3 the Evaluation Officer stated that as per his information livestock was not supplied purposely on the ground that the climate was not favorable for the Improved variety of livestock. I am more than certain that the block officials had given him wrong information. It has been observed that Jersey Breed thrives well elsewhere under similar condition.

In page- 6 of the report the Evaluation Officer had expressed the opinion that non procurement of livestock through purchase committee defeated the very purpose and that the beneficiaries were allowed to purchase locally. He has not stated how many livestock belonging to how many beneficiaries were actually seen by him and that kind of breed were being reared by those beneficiaries. Although, initially » purchase committee was constituted for procurement of livestock, for various reasons, the committee did not function. Hence cash disbursement was made to enable the beneficiaries to procure livestock of their choice.

Incidentally of late, the Government of India is of the opinion that the procurement of livestock through purchase board has many disadvantages besides it becomes the breeding ground of corruption and a directive has been received from the Government of India that cash disbursement should be made so as to allow the beneficiaries to procure assets of their choice by themselves.

As far as the staffing pattern of any block ii concerned the agency has nothing to comment as they are RD Department staff directly under the control of Director (RD) who is the sole authority for deployment of block staff with the exception of BDO and and JT BDOs which is done by the Government

Comments on main findings and recommendations.

Against para-3 of the Chapter-3 the Evaluation officer stated that the activities on the IRDP confined mostly to livestock, industry and self-employment schemes which he considered to be wrong policy *In* this context it is stated here that the basic objective of the programme is to generate additional income so as to bring the poorest of the poor above the poverty line. In this respect we can safely assume that the beneficiaries himself or herself is the best choice as to what scheme is likely to bring benefit, although there may be other activities which could produce more advantage but if the beneficiary himself is not capable of undertaking such scheme, there is no point to force such idea upon him.

Regarding disease affecting birds and cattles the Agency has not received only such reports during the last three years. However, the Agency will be writing to the Vety. & A.H. Department for extending help in case such reports are received.

While it is a fact that monitoring even in the field level is very much lacking, it would have been much helpful if the Evaluation Officer state at least some specific cases where industrial materials supplied are kept idle so that proper inquiry could be conducted.

In para-4 it was stated that most of the beneficiaries were above the poverty line. This observation of the Evaluation officer is highly probable for reasons stated below:

In Soma area traditionally and customarily the Village Chief theoretically owns all land in the Village, the rest of the Villagers are considered as tenants to him Therefore he has domineering power in this Village. That being the case even if a Village Chief put any family of his choice who may be above poverty lint there may not be any member to raise objection or to report to the appropriate authority. The situation which is not avoidable unless the customary practices are change.

In para-3-3 it was reported that in certain cases subsidy of Rs.500/ only was given to the beneficiaries. It is true that in the initial stage when no base line survey was conducted, as per the information received by the Agency, every house paying house tax started claiming subsidy amount was reduced to vary small amount so as to cover larger number of families more or less with a view to pacify those aggressive families. Since 1988 the Agency repeatedly instructed all the implementing officers to see that reasonable amount commensurate with the unit cost should be given as subsidy.

In para-3-4 it was stated that moat of the block staff including RDOs do not actually supervise the implementation of various schemes entitled to them and that all the works are done on their desk without seeing the actual scheme. I agree with the observation of the-Evaluation Officer. On many occasions during tour as well as during meetings I hve repeatedly emphasised the need of visiting the schemes on the ground, since the project Director is not disciplinary authority of the Mock staff. It is not possible for him to take any act in against any negligent and earing block staff. On sevaral occasions I have pointed out this difficulty to the Chairman, SRDA and even went to the extent of requesting the Chairman that the Project Director should be allowed to give his remarks in the ACRs of, atleast, BDOs and Jt. BDOs.

Regarding the opinion expressed by the Evaluation Officer in para -4.5 for the maintenance of TDBs register off on and the importance regarding the schemes undertaken in each village has been emphasised. It will, effect is issued from the Government level with the instruction that future help may not be extended to those villages who did not even care to record developments given to them.

As desired by you the original copy of the Evaluation Report I enclosed.

Kindly acknowledge receipt.

Yours faithfully

Sd/-

(K. Thong)

Project Director, SRDA. Nagaland,
Kohima

ANNEXURE-II

COPY
GOVERNMENT OF NAGALAND DIRECTORATE OF EVALUATION
NAGALAND: : : JLOHIMA.

NO.EVL/PUB/2/I5/140

Dated Kohima the 15th May' 92

To,

The Joint Secretary to the Govt, of Nagaland,
Rural Development Department Nagaland Kohima.

Sub:- EVALUATION REPORT ON I.R.D.P. IN ZUNHEBOTO DISTRICT
NAGALAND.

Sir,

I have the honour to refer to your letter NO.RD/MJSC/ 15/86 dated 27-11-91 on the above subject and to say that the Evaluation Department appreciated the observation and comments offered by the Department on the Evaluation report on I.R.D.P. in Zunheboto District. The Clarification given by the Evaluation. Department on the observation and comments of the R.D. Department it enclosed as Annexure to this letter.

In view of the clarification given by the Evaluation Department the report will be sent to the press for printing for Publication to avoid delay.

Sd/-
N. ZBLIANG, JOINT DIRECTOR
OF EVALUATION
NAGALAND : KOHIMA.

ANNBXURE.

**CLARIFICATION GIVEN BY THE EVALUATION DEPARTMENT ON THE
OBSERVATION'S AND COMMBNTS OFFERED BY THE R.D. DEPARTMENT
NAGALAND.**

1. COMMENTS ON TOTAL NOS. OF BENEFICIARIES.

The impression of the R.D Department on improper conduct of the study in regard to target and achievement art not correct.

The Evaluation Department it fully aware that there are contradictory figures in the total Numbers of Beneficiaries in Table. I, II & III. However, this being the official records of the R.D. Department we are compelled to present the same in the body of the report. It is clearly indicated in the foot notes that the data are furnished by the officials of the R.D.

Department based on records. It is a happy sign that the implementing agency has now realised how records are haphazardly maintained.

The totaling mistake in Col.4 of table 1 as pointed out by the Agency is appreciated and is corrected now.

2. COMMENTS ON PARA. 2.3.

It is clearly stated by the project Director S.R.D.A. under his letter No.S.R.D.A./IRD—15/86/414 dated Nil addressed to the Secretary. R.D. Department that the beneficiaries were allowed to procure assets of their choice This was in time with the resolution of the purchase committee as stated in the report The presentation is therefore a Statement of facts

3 COMMENTS ON MAIN FINDING AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The report has stated that the activities were mostly on Livestock, Fishery, Industry and Self Employment Schemes, It did not recommend to force open other activities on the beneficiaries which they are not capable of undertaking such schemes, i he evaluation Department considered that cash disbursement to the beneficiaries seems to be a wrong policy in view of the fact that the beneficiaries normally received the amount as relief without actually implementing the works on the ground for which the subsidy is given.

In order to avoid harassment by the implementing agencies, normally the identity of the respondents are not given in any of the Evaluation reports. Hence, the identity of the beneficiaries where the industrial materials supplied and kept idle are not mentioned in the reports.

In the Sema system the founder of the Village is regarded as the Village Chief and the Village is named after his name. However, and individual has got every right to purchase land and property. These purchased land and property are absolutely individual. Thus each family possesses land and property either through purchase or by inheritance. The criteria to judge whether a beneficiary is within the poorest of the poor groups are judged based on the land possession of the individual. Moreover, with the introduction of Village and Area council act as well as the V.D;B, in the state the council and the members of the V.D.B, alone are the competent authority to recommend names for a beneficiary, This system worked successfully in Sema area too. Hence, selection of beneficiaries is not done by the Village Chief as per his wishes.