

PUBLICATION NO. 18

EVALUATION REPORT ON
INTEGRATED RURAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME IN
PHEK DISTRICT OF NAGALAND

DIRECTORATE OF EVALUATION GOVERNMENT OF NAGALAND KOHIMA.

PREFACE

This is the eighteenth Evaluation Report published by the Directorate of Evaluation, Kohima, Nagaland. The Integrated Rural Development Programme (I R D P) is launched in the State of Nagaland during 1978-79 with a view to promote the rural poor families those who are living below the poverty line (poorest of the poor) by giving suitable benefit under this programme.

2. Since more than a decade the programme is operating in the state, the Government of Nagaland desired to assess the achievement of the programme by the implementing department and its agencies whether the targeted group of the families are really benefited during the period. As such the department of Evaluation has taken up this study as desired by the Government

3. Due to paucity of manpower and lack of transportation facility in the district level establishment data have been collected with much pain through prepared schedule interview and personal discussion with each and every selected beneficiary covering three (3) blocks even on foot from Village to Village in the Phek district

4. As far as possible the study tried to reflect the impact of the programme as well as its defect and failure of the programme during the year and finding and suggestion of the study thinking that it may be beneficial to the implementing department as well as planners and policy makers for the future measures of the programme.

5. The department gratefully acknowledge the Co-operation received from the official of the Rural development Department and its field agencies at the same time the rural beneficiaries those who contributed their best while collecting information in the field to enable us to prepare this report in time.

6. Shri N. Zeliang, Joint Director who fully associated with the study team and finalised the drafted report submitted by the DEO, Phek for publication and Shri Jongpong Chiten District Evaluation Officer and his field staff who initiated all along the study and submitted the first drafted report to bring out this study report successfully are more appreciated. I am thankful to all of them for their contribution in completing this report in time.

Sdl-

(L. COLNEY)

DIRECTOR OF EVALUATION DEPARTMENT,
KOHIMA, NAGALAND.

CONTENTS

Chapter-I

I. INTRODUCTION. General Background - Objective of the programme Physical Target-Identification of Beneficiaries, Financial Input-Ceiling of Subsidy, Administrative Arrangement for the Implementation of the Programme - Objective of the Study, General Information of the Blocks in Phek District, Sampling Method Selected Villages as Sample for District Limitation.

II. IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROGRAMME IN THE DISTRICT

General Information of the Blocks under Phek District - General Particulars of the Selected Villages - House Holds Benefited under various Scheme Phek Block - House Holds Benefited under Various Scheme - Meluri Block - House Hold Benefited Under various Scheme -Kikruma Block, Selection of Beneficiaries -Literacy and Occupation of Beneficiaries - Land Holding of the Beneficiaries - Used of Improved method of Cultivation - Staff of the B D O's for IRD Programme.

III. MAIN FINDING AND SUGGESTION.

Functioning of Village Development Boards, Selection of Beneficiaries - on Loan, Untrained Beneficiaries - Beneficiaries Selected and Actually Interview - Occupation of Beneficiaries -Backwardness of Beneficiaries, Misused of Subsidy on Loan received. Supervision and Marketing facilities, Technical Staff of Block Officers, Power of V D B Changing System of V D B Secretary.

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE No.	TITLE
I.	GENERAL INFORMATION OF THE BLOCKS 7 UNDER PHEK DISTRICT.
II.	GENERAL PARTICULARS OF THE 8 SELECTED VILLAGES.
III.	(A) HOUSE HOLDS BENEFITED UNDER VARIOUS 9 SCHEME PHEK BLOCK.
	(B) HOUSE HOLD BENEFITED UNDER VARIOUS 10 SCHEME MELURI BLOCK.
	(C) HOUSE HOLD BENEFITED UNDER VARIOUS 11 SCHEME KIKRUMA BLOCK.
IV.	ANNUAL INCOME OF BENEFICIARIES 12 BEFORE I R D P ASSISTANCE AND AFTER IRDP ASSISTANCE.

- V. OCCUPATION AND EDUCATIONAL STATUS OF 15 SELECTED BENEFICIARIES.
- VI. TERRACE LAND AND IRRIGATED LAND HOLDING 16 OF THE SAMPLED BENEFICIARIES.
- VH. USED OF IMPROVED METHOD OF CULTIVATION. 18
- VIII. BLOCK-WISE FIELD STAFF POSITION FOR IRDP 20 (AS ON DATE OF VISIT)
- IX. TOTAL NOS. OF BENEFICIARIES UNDER VARIOUS 21 SCHEME DURING 1985-88
- X. SOURCE OF I R D P KNOWLEDGE. 23
- XI. TOTAL NOS. OF BENEFICIARIES INTERVIEWED 24

CHAPTER - I INTRODUCTION

GENERAL BACKGROUND

1.1. Since the attainment of Indian Independence in the year 1947, the Government of India is formulating and implementing various scheme and programmes for rural development such as Community Development Programme, Small Farmers Development Agency, Marginal Farmer and Agricultural Labour Drought Prone Area Development Programme etc. However, those schemes could not be implemented successfully. The Government has therefore, introduced a new programme called Integrated Rural Development Programme from the year 1978-79 to raise the poorest and resourceless rural families above the poverty line. This scheme is a Centrally Sponsored Funded by the Centre and the States on 50 : 50 basis.

OBJECTIVE OF THE PROGRAMME

1.2. The objectives of the programme is to assist selected families of target group in rural areas to cross the poverty line by taking up self-employment ventures. The programmes aims to achieve the stated objectives and thus designed to improved the economic and social life of the poorest families in the rural areas by giving them income generating assets and access to credit and other inputs.

PHYSICAL TARGET.

1.3. The plan perspective is to bring the percentage of the families below the poverty line in rural areas to less than 10% by the year 1995. Consistent with the global figures of the families below the poverty line, a uniform target of assisting 3,000 families per block at the rate of 600 families per year was set for the Sixth Plan. The approximate proportion out of the 600 families to be assisted are 400 families under Agriculture and related activities 100 under Village and Cottage Industries and 100 under service sector. These proportion, however, may vary from area to area depending upon the conditions and potential obtaining in different blocks.

IDENTIFICATION OF BENEFICIARIES.

1.4. In order to identify the eligible families for IRDP assistance household survey will be conducted. This survey is to be confined to the families having their annual income of less than Rs. 3,500/- or families owing an operational area of less than 5 acres, out of these identified poorest among them are to be selected for providing the assistance. To ensure fairness of the selection the list of identified families is finalised in the meeting of the Village Council/Village Assemblies.

FINANCIAL INPUT.

1.5. The targeted financial outlay is Rs. 5 lakhs per IRDP block for the first year and Rs. 6 lakhs for the Second year and Rs. 8 lakhs

for the third, fourth and fifth year. In the control sector an amount of Rs. 750 crores is provided for the IRDP during the Sixth Plan Period. This is a Centrally Sponsored

Scheme and the pattern of financing in 50 : 50 sharing basis between the Centre and State Government.

CEILING OF SUBSIDY.

1.6. Under the Programme subsidies at the rate of 25 and 33 percent of Small and Marginal Farmers are provided. The ceiling for Small and Marginal Farmers Agricultural Labourers and non-agricultural labourers and schedule Caste are fixed at Rs. 3000/- For schedule Tribe 50% of the project cost subject to a minimum of Rs. 5000/- has been fixed. As regard the rural industries and rural artisans programme, a subsidy of Rs. 3000/- has been fixed.

ADMINISTRATIVE ARRANGEMENT FOR THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROGRAMME.

1.7. At the State Level there is the 'State Rural Development Committee' headed by the Minister for Rural Development. All the Schemes of IRDP are approved by the Committee. It also acted as the sanctioning authority for the Schemes.

For the implementation of the Schemes, the State has one Agency Known as the 'State Rural Development Agency' with head quarter in Kohima. The Agency has one project Director with other necessary supporting staff.

At the District and sub-divisional level, there are District Planning Board and Sub-Divisional Planning Board respectively. The District Planning Board are headed by the Deputy Commissioner of the District and the Sub-Divisional Planning Boards are headed by the Additional Deputy Commissioner of the Sub-Division. In each District one Sub-Office of the Agency headed by a Deputy Project Officer/Asstt. Project Officer with other Ministerial Staff had been set up to assist the District Planning Boards as also to guide and watch the implementation of the Programme.

At the Block level, there is the Block level Advisory Boards. The BDO..E O., and V L W at the Block played an important role in the formulation and implementation of the various Schemes. They helped the Villagers in the preparation of their Schemes and submit them to their respective District Planning Board, Sub-Divisional Planning Boards. There after physical verification and give completion report for drawal of money.

The implementation of the programme at the Village level are carried out through the V D B. of the Village. The lists of the selected individual beneficiaries along with their Schemes are submitted to the BDO by their respective VDB of the village.

OBJECTIVE OF THE STUDY.

1.8 The present study has been carried out mainly with the following objectives :-

1. To study its working and progress.
2. To study the impact of the programme on the targeted families.
3. To analyse the programme and difficulties if any, and
4. To suggest measures for improving the organisational and functional efficiency.

GENERAL INFORMATION OF THE BLOCKS IN PHEK DISTRICT.

1.9. There are three blocks in the district viz :-Kikruma, Phek and Meluri block.

i. Kikruma Block :- This block was opened in the year 1980-81 with 40 (forty) recognised villages and the rural population of about 45,000. Kikruma block covers two division of Phek district i.e. Pfutsero and Chozuba divisions.

ii. Phek Block ÷ The block is under Phek division and it was opened in the year 1980-81 with 46 villages having about 24,612 of rural population. Before the introduction of Meluri block, Phek block covered both Phek and Meluri division. In the year 1986-87 the

Meluri block was also opened separately. At present there are only 20 recognised villages under this Phek block with about 10,612 rural population.

iii. Meluri Block ÷ Before opening Meluri block it was under Phek block. But in the year 1986-87 a separate block was opened covering Meluri division having 26 recognised villages and about 14,000/- rural population.

SAMPLING METHOD.

1.10. For the Evaluation study on Integrated Rural Development Programme for the period of three years i.e. 1985-86, 1986-87 and 1987-88. 12 villages were selected randomly as sample covering all the three blocks in the district.

SELECTED VILLAGES AS SAMPLE FOR WHOLE DISTRICT.

1.11. The villages which were selected for the Evaluation Study on IRDP are as follows :-

1. Meluri
2. Sowhemi
3. Ketsapo
4. Phek Basa
5. Lozaphuhu
6. Tsetselumi
7. Chizami
8. Enhulummi
9. Mesolummi
10. Suthozu Old
11. Suthozu
Nasa
12. Ketsami.

LIMITATION.

1.12. In Nagaland there is no land records system nor income survey has to be conducted. Hence, the data are based on more verbal estimation of the poor illiterate beneficiaries. Moreover at the time of this study, there were only two evaluation staff for the whole Phek District. So the uniformity of selection of villages from each blocks could not be done due to lack of transport facilities and man power.

CHAPTER - II

IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROGRAMME IN THE DISTRICT.

2.1. For the implementation of the programme the Phek District was divided into three Blocks.

In order to have a complete picture of the Blocks and the Villages selected for the purpose of this study are presented in a tabular form as table-I & II :-

TABLE NO. 1 GENERAL INFORMATION OF THE BLOCKS UNDER PHEK DISTRICT.

Name of the Blocks.	Date of introduction of IRDP in the Block.	No. of villages in the Block.	Population in Rural Urban	No. of House hold other	Tot Schedule al	Tribe	
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
PHEK	April, 1980	20	10,612	NIL	1887	NIL	1887
MELURI	April, 1986	26	14,000	NIL	-	NIL	NR
KIKRU MA	1980-81	40	45,000	NIL	8944.	150	9094

TABLE NO. 2
GENERAL PARTICULARS OF THE SELECTED VILLAGES.

Name of the Village.	Total Nos. of Household in the Village.	Total Population
1	2	3
Meluri Village	319	1345
Sowhemi	69	330
Ketsapo	190	1011
Phek Basa	54	287
Lozaphuhu	232	1072
Thetselumi	231	1441
Chizami Vill.	325	1512
Eohulumi	118	570
Mesulumi	242	1176
Suthozu old	135	613
Suthozu Nasa	50	225
Khetsami	58	284
TOTAL	2,023	9,866

(Source:- 1981 Census)

2.2. The total numbers of households benefitted in Phek District during the three years period was collected from the official record of the respective B D O's Office and is presented in table-3 (a) 3 (b) and 3 (c).

TABLE NO. 3 (A)
HOUSE-HOLDS BENEFITED UNDER VARIOUS SCHEME PHEK BLOCK

TARGET	ACHIEVEMENTS
--------	--------------

SCHEME	S					
	1985-86	1986-87	1987-88	1985-86	1986-87	1987-88
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1. Agriculture	-	-	-	-	.	-
2. Minor Irrigation	50	60	130	50	32	130
3. Live Stock	30	40	80	30	37	80
4. Industries	15	20	50	15	20	50
5. Trysem	50	60	90	50	60	90
6. Other (Specify)	-	-	-	-	-	-
7. Land Development	200	250	300	200	250	200
8. Animal Power	30	50	60	30	50	60
9. Fishery	40	60	80	40	60	80
10. Forest	20	30	40	20	30	40
12. Power	-	-	-	-	-	-
TOTAL :-	435	570	830	435	539	730

(Source: B.D.O.)

TABLE NO. 3 (B)
HOUSE-HOLDS BENEFITED UNDER VARIOUS SCHEME MELURI BLOCK

SCHEME	TARGETS			ACHIEVEMENTS		
	1985-86	1986-87	1987-88	1985-86	1986-87	1987-88
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1. Agriculture		-	-			-
2. Minor Irrigation		-	-		-	-
3. Live Stock		87	69		87	69
4. Industries		6	4		6	4
5. Trysem		-	-		-	
6. Other (Specify)		-	-			-
7. Land Development		-	-		-	-
8. Animal Power		-	-		-	
9. Fishery		18	4		48	3
10. Forest		-	-		-	-
11. Horticulture		-	-			-

12. Power	-	-	-	-
TOTAL :-	III	77	141	76

(Source: B.D.O.)

TABLE NO. 3 (C)

HOUSE-HOLDS BENEFITED UNDER VARIOUS SCHEME KIKRUMA BLOCK

SCHEME	TARGETS			ACHIEVEMENTS		
	1985-86	1986-87	1987-88	1985-86	1986-87	1987-88
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1. Agriculture	-	-	-	-	-	-
2. Minor Irrigation	-	-	-	-	-	-
3. Live Stock	42	47	58	42	47	58
4. Industries	-	-	-	-	-	-
5. Trysem	-	1	5	-	1	5
6. Other (Specify)	-	-	-	-	-	-
7. Land Development	-	-	-	-	-	-
8. Animal Power	-	-	-	-	-	-
9. Fishery	13	18	34	13	18	34
10. Forest	9	19	9	19	19	9
11. Horticulture	-	-	-	-	-	-
12. Power	-	-	-	-	-	-
TOTAL :-	64	85	106	74	, 85	106

2.3. Even though the physical target and achievement of I R D Programmes in the selected blocks for a period of three years, i.e. 1985-88 are presented above there is no record of village wise physical target and achievements.

The figure as presented in the table are based on the verbal information furnished by the office of the BDO's concerned, for the whole Phek District.

SELECTION OF BENEFICIARIES.

2.4. An attempt was made by collecting information as to whether the selection of beneficiaries were made as per the policy decision of the Government. The income groups of the Sampled beneficiaries are presented in the table No. 4 below. :-

TABLE NO. 4

ANNUAL INCOME OF BENEFICIARIES BEFORE IRDP- ASSISTANCE AND AFTER IRDP ASSISTANCE.

SI. No	Name of the Village	of BEFORE IRDP. Income	AFTER IRDP. Income	Income	Income
--------	---------------------	------------------------	--------------------	--------	--------

o.

		Group From Rs. 1 Rs. 3500/-	Group from Rs.3,500/ -	Group from Rs.1 Rs. 3500/-	Group from Rs. 3500/- and above
1	2	3	4	5	6
1.	Meluri	13	4	7	10
2.	Sowhemi	4	3	4	3
3.	Ketsapo	6	1	2	5
4.	Phck Basa	4	-	1	3
5.	Lozaphulu	10	1	4	7
6.	Thetslumi	6	1	8	4
7.	Chizami	6	4	4	6
8.	Enhulumi	2	2	2	2
9.	Mesulumi	7	-	7	-
10	Suthozu old	2	1	1	2
.					
11	Suthozu Basa	3	-	3	-
.					
12	Kctsami	2	2	2	2
.					

TOTAL 65 19 45 44

= 44 - 19 = 25 Nos. (Source:- Field Investigation)

2.5. As per the policy of Government families having an annual income of more than Rs. 3500/- are not entitled to receive any subsidy under IR D P.

However from the above figure it indicates that 19 families who have already crossed the poverty line or having crossed the annual income of Rs. 3500/- even before they received the subsidy amount were selected as beneficiaries. It shows nearly 16% of the beneficiaries are economically better of families. In other words, about 16% of the beneficiaries are not supposed to get the benefit under this programme. Thus there was a wrong selection of beneficiaries of about 16%.

2.6. The above table No. 4 also shows that 25 families have crossed

the poverty line of Rs. 3500/- after receiving the benefit. Very negligible percentage of the families have crossed the poverty line after receiving the benefit from the IR D P Scheme.

There is a marked improvement of the beneficiaries.

2.7. For the successful implementation of the programme proper selection of the beneficiaries is the most important factor to be taken care of by the authority. The authority should see that wrong selection of beneficiaries does not regular in future.

Literacy and Occupation of the Beneficiaries.

2.8. The main occupation as well as their educational status of the beneficiaries are presented at table No. V.

2.9. A scrutiny of the above table No.5 showed that out of 84 beneficiaries actually interviewed, 71 beneficiaries are agriculturists, 6 Government Servant, 2 business-men and 5 others. As per the policy of the programme, a Government servant are not to be given assistance. But the above table indicates that about 5% of the beneficiaries are Government employees which is not permitted.

LAND HOLDING OF THE BENEFICIARIES.

2.10. One of the criteria to Judge whether the programme is successfully implemented on the ground is the proper selection of beneficiaries. The policy under this programme is that no one whose land holding is more than 5 acres of land should be given the benefits. An attempt was therefore, made by collecting information on land holding of each individual beneficiaries and was presented in table-VI.

TABLE NO. V
OCCUPATION AND EDUCATIONAL STATUS OF SELECTED BENEFICIARIES

SI. No.	Name of the Village	MAIN OCCUPATION OF BENEFICIARIES				EDUCATIONAL STATUS OF THE BENEFICIARIES.				
		Agriculture	Govt. Service	Business	Other	Illiterate	Upto L. P. School	Upto Middle School	Upto High School	Above High School
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
1.	Meluri	15	1		1	7	3	2	4	1
2.	Sowhemi	4	3	-		2	1	3	1	-
3.	Ketsapo	6	-	-	1	5	-	-	1	1
4.	Phek Basa	4	-	-		-	-	2	2	-
5.	Lozuphuha	9	1	1		5	-	5	1	-
6.	Thocsulumi	5	-	1	1	3	1	1	2	-
7.	Chizami	10	-	-		4	2	1	3	-
8.	Enhulumi	3	-	-	1	1	-	1	2	-
9.	Mesulumi	7	-	-		7	-	-	-	-
10.	Suthozu old	2	1	-		1	-	1	-	-
11.	Suthozu Nasa	2	-	-	1	3	-	-	-	-
12.	Kctsami	4	-	-	-	3	-	-	1	-

TOTAL	71	6	2	5	41	7	16	17	2
-------	----	---	---	---	----	---	----	----	---

(Source:- Field Investigation)

TABLE NO. VI
TERRACE LAND AND IRRIGATED LAND HOLDING OF THE SAMPLED
BENEFICIARIES

SI. No.	Name of the Village	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 Irrigated Land	No. of Person Having Above 5 Acres of Irrigated Land	No. of Person Having Less Than 5 Acres of Unirrigated Land	No. of Person Having Above 5 Acres of Unirrigated Land
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1.	Mcluri	8	6	15	-	16	-
2.	Sowhemi	2	4	5	-	6	-
3.	Ketsapo	7	2	7	-	7	-
4.	Phek Basa	2	3	4	-	4	2
5.	Lozaphuhu	8	3	10	-	8	-
6.	Thetsulumi	2	2	5	-	5	-
7.	Chizami	8	2	10	-	10	-
8.	Enhulumi	2	2	4	-	4	-
9.	Mesolumi	4	3	7	-	7	-
10.	Suthozu Old	1	2	3	-	3	-
11.	Suthozu Nasa	2	-	2	-	2	-
12.	Khetsami	4	-	4	-	4	-

(Source:- Field Investigation)

2.10. Another guideline for selection of beneficiaries is on land holding. The selection of beneficiaries under programme should be done from amongst the families owning operational area of less than 5 acres of land. However the above table shows that out of the 103 families interviewed 27 are families owning operational area of 5 acres and

above. This shows wrong selection and implementation of the programme. A very sound programme, also if it is wrongly implemented will lead to failure. Hence, selection of beneficiaries should be done purely on the basis of the guideline adopted for the programme if it is to be a successful one.

USED OF IMPROVED METHOD OF CULTIVATION.

2.12. One of the method to judge the effectiveness of the programme on the agricultural families are the adoption to the used to improved method of cultivation. The Evaluation team, therefore, collected information on the used of improved method of cultivation by the beneficiaries which are presented in table No. VII.

2.13. The table No. VII above indicates that not a single family has used improved method of cultivation before receiving the benefit from the IRDP Scheme. However after receiving the benefit, there is a mark improvement in using the improved method of cultivation. Out of the 84 beneficiaries actually interviewed 26% of the beneficiaries reported using improved seed, 27% improved implements, 25% fertilisers and 24% pesticides.

STAFF OF THE B D O'S FOR I R D PROGRAMME.

2.14. The success of the programme depends mostly on the guidance

TABLE NO. VII

USED OF IMPROVED METHOD OF CULTIVATION

Name of the Village	Before IRDP	After IRDP	Before IRDP	After IRDP	Before IRDP	After IRDP	Before IRDP	After IRDP
	Nos. of Person reported using improved seed.	Nos. of Person reported using improved seed.	Nos. of Person reported using improved implement	Nos. of Person reported using improved implements	Nos. of Person reported using chemical fertilizer	Nos. of Person reported using chemical fertilizer	Nos. of Person reported using pesticides	Nos. of Person reported using pesticides
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1. Meluri	-	7	-	7	-	6	-	6
2. Sowhemi	-	2	-	1	-	1	-	1
3. Ketsapo	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	-
4. Phek Basa	-	4	-	4	-	4	-	4
5. Lozaphuhu	-	3	-	4	-	3	-	2
6. Thetsulumi	-	4	-	4	-	4	-	4
7. Chizami	-	4	-	4	-	4	-	4
8. Enhulumi	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
9. Mesolumi	-	1	-	1	-	1	-	1
10. Suthozu Old	-	3	-	3	-	2	-	3

11. Suthozu Nasa -	1	-	1	-	1	-	1
12. -	3	-	3	-	3	-	3
Khetsami							
TOTAL	32	-	33	-	30	-	29

and assistance given by the technical staff of the B D O to the Villagers. The numbers of field staff available in the B D O's office will indicate whether they can judiciously perform their assigned functions such as giving technical guidance, advised the people, supervised their work etc. It is, therefore, considered necessary to present the staff position at the B D O's Officer for IRDP works.

2.15. The actual implementing agency of the programme as the Block-level staff and the B D O's. The staff at the Block-level are to give technical guidance, inspect the work, and give completion report for drawal of money for all the various schemes implemented under their respective block.

2.16. With the limited staff as shown in table No. VIII it may not be physically possible for the block staff to supervise and check all the various schemes of all the villages. It is a fact that the block staff are not giving proper technical guidance and is not making any physical verification of the works. They are concentrating in giving completing report from their table. This was proved amply by the present study on IRDP scheme by the Evaluation team. Some VDB's and beneficiaries stated that not even a single block-level staff has visited their village for giving technical guidance for physical verification of the works of any scheme done by them.

The villagers are left to themselves, there is much to be desired from block staff.

2.27. Against the available block-level staff as presented in table NO. VIII the various schemes taken up during 1985-88 in 12 selected villages are presented in the table at the next page.

TABLE NO. VIII

BLOCK-WISE FIELD STAFF POSITION FOR I R D P (As on date of visit.)

Name of The Block	B D O.		Joint B D O.		E.O.		S.O.		V.L.W.	
	Sancti- oned	In Posi- tion	Sancti- oned	In Posi- tion	Sanc- tioned	In Posi- tion	Sanc- tioned	In Posi- tion	Sanc- tioned	In Posi- tioned
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
Meluri	1	1	1	-	-	-	1	1	-	.
Phek	. 1	1	1	1	2	2	-	-	2	2
Lolrma	1	1	1	1	-	-	2	2	2	2
TOTAL	3	3	3	2	2	2	3	3	4	4

(Source:- B.D.O.'s)

TABLE NO. IX
TOTAL NOS. OF BENEFICIARIES UNDER VARIOUS SCHEME DURING 1985-88

Name of the Village	Horti- cultre	Fis- hery.	Land dev.	Pig- gery	Goa- tcry	Pou- ltry	Duck- cry	Bee- kee- ping	Black- smithy	Tail- oring	Carp- entry
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Mcluri	.	2	5	9	2		5	-		-	
Sowhemi	2	6	1	-	-						
Ketsapo	2	-	2	-			1	-	-	-	1
Phck Basa	3	-	1	1	-	-	-	-			
Lozaphub	2	3	2	4	-	-	-				
a											
Thcisulu	3	-	2	2	-						
mi											
Chizami	-	-	1	7	2	1					-
Ennulum	-	1	1	-			2				-
Mcsolumi	-	3	3	1	2	-	-	1			
Sulhozu	-	-	2	1							
Old											
Suihozu	1		1	1							
Nasa											
Khetsami	-		2		1	1	-	-			
TOTAL	13	15	23	26	10	2	8	1			

2.18. If we considered the numerous schemes implemented by each villages in a Block, the number of staffs available to the B D O's Offices and the functions assigned to the field staff of the B D O Office we can easily come to conclusion that the programme is haphazardly implemented without practically no guidance, advise, supervision and checked. The block staff do not seem to take interest in the various works which should not be. The success of the scheme depends much on the role played by there under direct supervision of the B D O.

2.19. The success of any rural development programme particularly the IR D P depends largely on the knowledge of the programme by the rural masses. An attempt has been made to know how the programme has come to the knowledge of the beneficiaries.

It is found that out of 84 beneficiaries actually interviewed, 6 persons reported knowledge of Government functionaries, 52 persons through V D B and 16 person reported that they

don't have any knowledge about I R D P. Even though this is an important aspect of the programme, it does not directly involves in the implementation of the programme.

2.20. Out of 103 beneficiaries from the 12 selected villages, 84 beneficiaries were selected for interviewed by the Evaluation Team, It was found that 2 beneficiaries were non-existing, 15 beneficiaries reportedly received less than the official record, 9 persons reported applied for subsidy but not received any benefit from the I R D P Scheme. In other words, about 12% of beneficiaries received less than the amount of official record, 8% of persons applied but not received the benefit and 21% persons applied but not received any amount as subsidy. But in the official record, it has been recorded that the amount of subsidy paid to the beneficiaries. But in the official record it has been recorded that the amount of subsidy has already been disbursed to the concerned persons. In fact those persons did not received

TABLE NO. X
SOURCE OF I.R.D.P. KNOWLEDGE.

Name of the Village	Nos. of Person Reported Known Through B D O.	Nos. of Person Known Through Govt. Functioneries.	Nos. of Person Reported Known Through V D B.	Nos. of Person Reported Known Through Friend	No. Idea
1	2	3	4	5	6
Meluri	1	1	13		2
Sowhemi	-	2	4	-	1
Ketsapo		-	6	-	1
Phek Basa	1	2	1	-	-
Lozaphuhu	2	2	7	-	-
Thetsolumi	-	-	5	-	2
Chizami	-	3	4	-	3
Enhulumi	2	-	-	-	2
Mesolumi	-	-	4	-	3
Suthozu Old	-	-	3	-	-
Suthozu Nasa	-	-	1	-	2
Khetsami	-		4	-	-
Total :-	6	10	52		16

(Source:- Field Investigation)

TABLE NO. XI
TOTAL NOS. OF BENEFICIARIES INTERVIEWED.

Name of the Village	Total Beneficiaries During	Total Nos. of Beneficiaries	Nos. of Beneficiaries not	Nos. of Beneficiaries Reported	Nos. of Person Reported Appli-	Nos. of Person Reported not
---------------------	----------------------------	-----------------------------	---------------------------	--------------------------------	--------------------------------	-----------------------------

	1985-88	Actually Interviewed.	Interviewed due to non-existence	Receipt Less Than the Official Record	ed but not Received the Benefit	Applied nor Received the Benefit
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mcluri	23	17	1	-	5	3
Sowhcmi	9	7	-	-	1	2
Ketsapo	11	7	-	1	-	2
Phek Basa	5	4	-	-	-	
Lozaphuhu	12	11	-	1	2	1
Thelsolumi	7	7	1	-	-	3
Chizami	11	10	-	4	i	5
Enhulumi	4	4	-	3		-
Mcsolumi	11	7	-	1	-	6
Suthozu Old	3	3	-	1		.
Sulhozu Nasa	3	3	-	1	-	2
Khelsami	4	4	-	3	-	1
Total :-	103	84	2	15	9	25

(Source:- Field Investigation)

even a rupee and the fund has been misused in the name of the so called beneficiaries. If the above is the percentage of misused of fund, in a small sample of 84 beneficiaries interviewed, what will be the percentage and amount of money misused in the entire district and state is any-bodys' guess and need no further elaboration. The study team is of the view that there is evidence of misused of I R D P fund in the name of fictitious beneficiaries.

1. This study did not go into detail where and how the money was utilised. The Evaluation Team leaves it to the Government for decision. Any impartial observer after going through this report will come to the conclusion that somewhere, something is going wrong in the implementation of the programme which need immediate remedial measures.

CHAPTER-III

MAIN FINDING AND SUGGESTION

Some of the observation and suggestion that emerges out of the present study are given below :-

1. Functioning of Village Development Board.

The success or failure of the Integrated Rural Development Programme depends largely on the sincerity and devotion given by the Village Development Board (VDB) member particularly the VpB Chairman or its Secretary and the Block staff. But in course of field investigation, it was found that in some of the villages there is no proper record how the selection of beneficiaries are made. There is no record on the tenure of VDB, Chairman, Secretary or members. Frequent changes of VDB Secretary due to allotted misappropriation of fund and negligence to duties are reported in certain villages. Out of twelve villages investigated by the Evaluation team, it was found that in two villages, the

VDB Secretaries stationed outside their village who hardly visits their villages. In any case, the VDB Secretary should be a resident of the village, physically the needs of the poor public.

2. Selection of Beneficiaries.

The present system shows that the agency gives benefit to any persons whatsoever are recommended by the VDB's members.

Favouritism of relatives in selection of beneficiaries among the VDB's members are also found. It was also found that many beneficiaries get benefits for various schemes without the knowledge of the VDB by taking recommendation from higher authority. As a result influential and richer people are getting benefit at the cost of the poor people. The concerned department should see that selection of beneficiaries for various schemes are done in the open meeting as it ought to be done and not by a few selected members or VDB alone. The existing system of favouritism from among the VDB members for their relatives as well as the practice of getting benefit through VIP Chits etc. are not a healthy sign for a successful programme.

3. On Loan

The objectives of the IRDP is to raised the poorest of the poor above the poverty line on a lasting basis by giving them income generating assets. Taking into account the total amount of loan the beneficiaries received, it appears that such amount could implement any schemes without much difficulties. But the loan are not released at a time but in installment at the interval of four or five months or even to the extent of a year in some case. While appreciating the policy, it was found that the beneficiaries are compelled to go to the concerned department and then bank to get the payment by spending days together involving many physical difficulties and expenditure. Thus, most of the amount they received are consumed before the scheme gets started. A liberalised system may therefore, be worked out for the interest of the beneficiaries.

4. Un-trained Beneficiaries.

From the 12 selected villages, 84 beneficiaries were actually interviewed by the Evaluation team and found that not a single beneficiaries was trained in the scheme for which they received subsidy or loan.

To add to this, practically there exist no agency in the state to advise and guide them in the implementation of their schemes. Almost all the beneficiaries are poor, illiterate and untrained. For effective implementation of the schemes the Rural Development Department should conduct a short term training to the beneficiaries whenever and wherever necessary.

5. Beneficiaries Selected and Actually Interviewed

Out of the 103 beneficiaries during 1985-88 in 12 villages, a total of 84 beneficiaries were actually selected by the Evaluation team for interview. In course of field investigation, 2 beneficiaries were found non existing, 9 persons reported applied but not received the benefit, 25 persons reported not applied nor received the benefit. It is interesting to see that as per official record the above 34 persons has been given the benefits under different Schemes and the amount disbursed to them. On enquiry as to how their names are recorded in the official report as beneficiaries, it was found out that most of such persons are illiterate old men and women who do not have the capacity to enquire or question the reasons why they did not get the benefit when their names are

included in the beneficiaries list. Since the official record shows that the amount has already been disbursed to the concerned person, it has been proved that the money was misused. But this study did not go into detail where, how and who misused the money. The Evaluation team therefore, leave it to the Government for taking necessary decision.

6. Occupation of Beneficiaries.

The objective of the I R D P is to raised the poorest of the poor above the poverty line. Out of the 84 beneficiaries interviewed, 71 are from agriculturists, 6 Government Servants, 2 Businessman and 5 are from other activities. Though majority of beneficiaries are from agriculturists families, Government servants and business-men are also benefited in different schemes. As per the policy of the Government, Government servant are not to be given assistance under this programme. However small may be the percentage this is wrong selection of beneficiaries. The Department should see that such wrong selection is not done at all.

7. Backwardness of Beneficiaries.

For the proper utilisation of fund, the people are not only to depend on the department concerned and Village Development Board alone, but they too should have at least some awareness and knowledge about the schemes, the V D B proposed for implementation. But in course of field investigation, it was found that most of the beneficiaries are completely unaware of their schemes and never enquire regarding its progress at the official level by keeping full confidence to the words of VDB Chairman or Secretary. It was observed that due to this unawareness on the part of the public, the funds are normally misused by some unsempuloss leaders.

8. Misused of subsidy or loan received.

Most people take the subsidy as relief and spend the amount received according to their wishes and not as per the scheme for which the beneficiaries received the subsidy or loan. For, example, in Ketsapo Village of Phek block one beneficiary received subsidy for the scheme on growing pine-apple. He used the subsidy amount for construction of his house instead. Such similar cases are also found by the Evaluation team in other villages. It is the duty of the concerned department as well as VDB to check and stop such practises. At present there does not exist any agency to checked such misused of the fund. The Department must have arrangement for follow-up action after giving the benefit.

9. Supervision and Marketing facilities.

There is no arrangement for marketing of the product of the beneficiaries. To cite an example, a Horticultural products like banana, pine-apple and other similar fruits are perishable items and has to be disposed off within a limited period of time. Some beneficiaries pointed out that they don't have any facilities to dispose off their products. They are therefore, compelled to dispose off their products at the low price or freely distribute to the village. The Government or departmental" concerned should arranged ways and means to dispose off the product of the beneficiaries.

10. Technical Staff of Block Officers.

In all the block offices technical staff are very limited and it may not be physically possible for the block staff to supervise and check all the various schemes of the villages submitted by the VDB's. Even the existing staff do not visit the fields to supervise. It is found that the' block staff do not practically give any guidance and they are not making any physical verifications of the works done. They are busy in completion report from their table. This has resulted into misused of the subsidy. While conducting this study on

IRDP scheme some members of the VDB's as well as the beneficiaries stated that not even a single block-level staff has visited their village for giving technical guidance and physical verification of the works of any scheme. If the present arrangement has to continue, the technical staff of the B D O should be adequately strengthen not only for taking physical verification before the subsidy amount is release but also to guide and advice the beneficiaries for affective implementation of the scheme. The present arrangement for supervision guidance physical verification of works done etc. are only on paper which is the real cause for misused of fund and failure of the scheme.

11. Power of the V D B.

Still there appeared to have some confusion among the villagers regarding the power of the V D B. Some members of the V D B's think that they were empowered to select the beneficiaries in their respective villages and do not allow other to interfere in the selection process or any other IRDP activities. Such misconception should not be allowed and the B D O should properly educate the people.

12. Changing System of V D B Secretary.

It has been observed that in some villages due to frequent changes of V D B. Secretary or members on grounds of misappropriation of fund and negligence to duties many complications arise particularly to keep record of the activities of the V D B's. In case changes if found necessary especially the V D B Secretary, the record maintained by the Secretary should be thoroughly checked by the Deputy Commissioner of the district along with the V D B members of that particular village in the open meeting. It is found necessary that handing over and taking over of the record of the Secretary should be done only when the Deputy Commissioner alongwith the members of the VDB satisfied themselves about the correctness of the records.