

**PUBLICATION NO. 10 1986**



**GOVERNMENT OF NAGALAND**

**EVAUATION REPORT  
ON  
INTEGRATED RURAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME**

**EVALUATION UNIT  
(PLANNING & COORDINATION DEPARTMENT)  
GOVERNMENT OF NAGALAND**

## PREFACE

1. The integrated Rural Development Programme was initiated in the State during 1978-79 with the specific objective to bring up socio-economic life of the poorest families in the rural 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 evaluate its impact on the people. Consequently, the Directorate of Evaluation, Government of Nagaland was asked to undertake an Evaluation Study of the Programme. This Study was taken up by the Directorate of Evaluation with the objective of assessing its working and progress, its impact on raising the income of the beneficiaries, its problems and bottlenecks in the implementation of the programme, and suggest measures for improving the organisational and functional efficiency.
2. It is hoped that the information contained in the present report particularly the findings and suggestions will be found useful by the implementing Department, the administrators, Planners and those interested in rural development activities.
3. Shri N. Zeliang, Deputy Director of Evaluation carried the burden of conducting the study and preparing the reports.
4. I thank the investigating staff of the Directorate of Evaluation, Nagaland, Kohima and the officers and field staff of the Directorate of Economics & Statistics, Nagaland, Kohima who had painfully carried the burden of collecting information from the field and tabulation of data.
5. The assistance and co-operation received from the officers of the Rural Development Department particularly the B.D.Os and the individuals concerned are gratefully acknowledge.

( T.C.K. LOTHAN )

Development Commissioner & Ex-Officio  
Director of Evaluation

Dated, Kohima, the th  
Aug.'86.

## CONTENTS

Preface, Chapter.

### 1. MAIN FINDINGS AND SUGGESTIONS.

Selection of Beneficiaries, On subsidy, Duplication of Works, Follow-up Action, Reserved Fund, Supply of Livestock, Technical staff of Block Officers, Quality and Prices, Beneficiaries Selected and Actually Interviewed, Distribution of Sanctioned Amount, Fulfillment of objectives, Main Occupation of the Beneficiaries, Coverage of I.R.D.P. in the selected Blocks, Fund Utilisation in Changtongya Block, Honorarium of V.D.B. Secretary.

### 2. INTRODUCTION

General Background, Objectives of I.R.D.P., Physical Target Identification of Beneficiaries, Financial Input, Ceiling of Subsidy, The Programme in Nagaland, Physical Achievement Financial Average Expenditure for Beneficiaries Objective of the Study, Sampling Method, Limitation.

### 3. ADMINISTRATIVE ARRANGEMENT FOR THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROGRAMME.

### 4. AN APPRAISAL OF THE I. R. P. P.ACTIVITIES IN THE STATE.

Identification Particulars of the Selected Block, Physical Target and Achievements, Income of the Beneficiaries Interviewed, Occupation and Educational Status Staff, Publicity.

### 5. BENEFICIARIES REACTION AND IMPACT OF THE PROGRAMME.

Income of the Beneficiaries, Official Records, And Reported Receipt of Assistance, Beneficiaries View on Livestock / Material Supplied, Nos. of Beneficiaries Selected for Interview and Nos. Actually Interviewed.

## LIST OF TABLES

| Table No. | Title  |
|-----------|--|
| I.        | Particulars of the Blocks  |
| II.       | Allocation of fund   |
| III.      | Average Expenditure- per Beneficiaries,  |
| IV.       | The Sub-Allotment of Funds.  |
| V.        | General Particulars of the Selected Blocks                                       |
| VI.       | Block-wise Physical target and Achievement Under Various Schemes.                |
| VII       | Coverage of I.R.D. Programme in the Selected Block.                              |
| VII.      | Annual Income of Selected Beneficiaries Before I.R.D.P.Assistance.               |
| IX.       | Occupation and Educational Status of the Selected Beneficiaries.                 |
| X.        | Terrace land and Irrigated land holding of the sampled Beneficiaries.            |
| XI        | Block-wise Field Staff Position for I.R.D.P.                                     |
| XII       | Total Numbers of Beneficiaries Under Various Schemes During 1982-83.             |
| XIII      | Sources of I.R.D.P, knowledge.   |
| XIV.      | Annual Income Group Before and after and after I.R-D.P. Assistance.              |
| XV.       | Used of Improved Method of Cultivation —   |
| XVI.      | No5. of Beneficiaries Reported Received Less than the official Record.           |
| XVII.     | Beneficiaries view on the quality of Livestock/ Material Supplied by the Agency. |
| XVIII.    | Total Nos. of Beneficiaries Interviewed.   |

## CHAPTER—1

### MAIN FINDINGS AND SUGGESTION

1.1. Some of the main findings and suggestion that emerges out of the present study are given below ;

#### **Selection of Beneficiaries**

1.2. Practically no identification of poor families are made. The Agency gives benefit to any persons whosoever are recommended by the V. D. Bs. Thus about 50% of the beneficiaries interviewed by the Evaluation teams are comparatively richer class ( Ref. Chapter-IV para 4.7. & 4.11 ). Moreover almost all the villages the members of the V.D.B. consisting of few influential *pin* villages the members ions used to select the beneficiaries beneficiaries without the knowledge of the those V. D.B's think that they were empowered I in their respective villages and they do not allow other villagers to interfere in the selection process. It is reported that families/relatives of V.D.B. members are mostly enjoying the benefit. For example, in Kikruma block, the father, brother and sister of the village Development Board Secretary received the benefit under different schemes. The Department should see that selection of beneficiaries are done in the open meeting as it ought to be and not by the V.D.B. members alone.

#### **On Subsidy.**

1.3. The objective of the I. R. D. Programme is to raised the poorest of the poor above the poverty line on a lasting basis by giving them income generating assets. But, it may be too much in expect a poor family to raise above the poverty line by giving a subsidy of Rs, 200/- or below or by supplying the so called traditional weaving set of 3-4 wooden stick. It is, therefore, suggested that the total numbers of beneficiaries in each village be minimised and available schemes only be entertain by giving more subsidy.

#### **Duplication of Work.**

1.4. All the schemes implementing by the State Rural Development Agency are being implementing by the respective Department as Well. For example, the Agriculture Department is having a big scheme for development of Minor Irrigation and subsidy are being giving to cultivators. Similarly the Soil Conservation Department on Land Development, Fishery Department on fishery, Animal Husbandry & Veterinary Department on Livestock, Forest Department on Farm Forestry/Social Forestry etc. Thus the work of the S.R.D.A. is nothing but a duplication of works already implementing by the respective departments with expert technical hands. As a result some influential leaders are likely to get subsidy from different sources for the same scheme. For example, a person can get subsidy on Farm Forestry Schemes from S.R.D.A. under I.R.D. Programme, from Forest Department under Farm Forestry Scheme and from Soil Conservation Department under Conservation of Soil and Water Management Programme. It is, therefore strongly feel that the respective department who are having man power and competent technical hards should be allowed to implement the I, R. D. Programme. This can be done by providing funds to the respective department by the Rural Development Department so that duplication of works can be avoided. If the above arrangement is not found suitable, the respective Department may be ask to obtain clearance from the Rural Development Department before giving any subsidy to individual beneficiaries. This may also avoid duplication.

**Follow up Action.**

1.5. There is no arrangement for follow-up action as to how the beneficiaries are utilising the subsidy given to him/her. Not to speak of follow-up action, the Departmental Staff are not making any physical verification even at the time of giving completion report of the Schemes. The beneficiaries are thus took it in a very loose term and the seriousness to establish the scheme are not develop after he/she get the subsidy. Many beneficiaries took this subsidy as relief.

**Reserved Fund.**

1.6. At present a good amount of fund are kept as State, Districts and Sub-Divisional Reserve. Since, as cent per-cent rural villages are covered under the programme, it is expected that all the deserving cases are entertained. Hence, it is suggested that the separate reserved for the State, Districts and Sub-Divisionals may be minimise if it could not be cut totally due to some ground and more fund are allocated to the villages by taking the existing procedure of allocating fund on the basis of tax paying household.

**Supply of Livestock,**

1.7. Livestock schemes under this programme is a complete failure. On physical verification of the scheme by the Evaluation teams. it has been reported by all the beneficiaries that disease and inferior quality animals were supplied by the Agency instead of health and improved quality animals. As a result the animals were reported to have died after reaching the villages. Since these disease animals are not only of no use to the beneficiaries but are also likely to communicate these diseases to other healthy animals of the villages, healthy animals duly checked by a competent doctors of Animal Husbandry & Veterinary Department alone should be supply even if improved quality livestock is not supply.

**Technical Staff of Block Officers.**

1.8. In all the Block Offices technical staff are very limited. It is physically impossible with the limited technical staff of the B.D.O's to check all the different schemes submitted by the V.D.B's in their respective blocks. Under this circumstances, the subsidy are been given at random without any technical check and guidance. This result in misused of the subsidy by the beneficiaries. As pointed out in 5.5 of this chapter, the technical staff are compelled to give even completion report from their table without making any physical verification of the scheme as to whether the schemes arc actually being implemented al the spot. If the present arrangement has to continue the technical staff of the B.D.O. should also be adequately strengthen not only for physical verification is made before the subsidy amount is release but also to guide and advice the beneficiaries for effective implementation of the scheme.

**Quality and Prices.**

1.9. The kinds/materials supplies by the Agency arc in many cases are very inferior quality. On the other hand the prices are abnormally high. To cite an example, each beneficiary under bee keeping scheme is supplied with a box for rearing honey bee. For the supply of the box a subsidy amount recorded are Rs. 500/- in each case. The prices of such box in the open market may cost about Rs, 50/- Similarly, the beneficiary under weaving scheme are supplied with

the so called traditional weaving set of 3-4 wooden sticks and tie subsidy amount recorded are Rs. 200/- in each case. Since such wooden sticks will cost about Rs. 30/- in the open market the beneficiaries are reported to have refused to accept such wooden sticks and these are still lying in the B DO's offices. The prices of ducks also comes to Rs. 60/- each at the Agency's subsidised rate. The Government should immediately stop all such unscrupulous purchases in future.

#### **Beneficiaries Selected and Actually Interviewed.**

1.10. Out of the 1982-83 beneficiaries in the 7 (seven) sampled blocks of the stale a total of 340 beneficiaries (i.e.10% of the total beneficiaries) were selected randomly for interview. In course of field investigation it was found out that 3.24% were non-existing and 7.36% reported to have not received any benefit under the programme. Since the official record recorded that the amount has already been disbursed to the concerned person, it has been wrongly utilised. But this study did not go into detail where and how the money was utilised. The Evaluation Department, therefore, leave it to the Government for decision.

#### **Distribution of Sanctioned Amount.**

1.11 In course of field investigation it was found out that 15 beneficiaries reported to have received more than what was actually sanctioned by the Government and 31 beneficiaries reported to have received less than the sanctioned amount of the Government. The same information from the 3 blocks out of the 7 sampled blocks could not be collected. For a beneficiary under Jalukie Block was sanctioned an amount of Rs. 2,725.00 by the Department whereas he was given only Rs. 250/- Moreover, as per the programme 50% of the costs of articles (such as knitting machine, sewing machine etc.) are supposed to be borne by the Agency. But actually the beneficiaries paid more (viz. Rs- 403/- by the beneficiaries on sewing machine and Rs. 250/- by the Agency). It is not known how this difference occurred after the sanctioned amount are drawn for a particular beneficiaries. This type of peculiar functioning of the Department should immediately be stopped.

#### **Fulfillment of Objective.**

1.12. The enquiry revealed that only 4 (four) poor families (i.e. annual income of less than Rs. 3,500/-) were brought above the poverty line (i.e. by crossing their annual income of more than Rs. 3,501/-). The rest of the beneficiaries interviewed were in the income group of above Rs. 3,501/- annually and hence these group of beneficiaries can be treated as already crossed the poverty line prior to the receipt of benefit. Wrong selection and defective implementation are the two major obstacles for fulfillment of the objective which need immediate attention of the Department.

#### **Main Occupation of the Beneficiaries.**

1.13. Under the programme Government servants are not entitled to the benefits. The main occupation of the beneficiaries interviewed are ; 10% from Government servants, 3.25% from businessman and 86.72% are from agriculture and related activities. In future the Department should see that the Government servants are not given the benefit which is against the laid down principle.

Coverage of I.R.D.P. in the Selected Block.

1.14. Out of the total household of 36,502 in seven sampled blocks 18,109 household had already been covered under the programme upto 1983-84. Thus about 13,138 household are remain to cover. As stated earlier the Department gives too

much emphasis on coverage of beneficiaries that they could not create avenue for income generating assets; of the poor families. Hence, here too, the suggestion made at 1.3 hold good.

#### **Fund Utilisation in Changtongya Block.**

1.14. As against the sanctioned amount of Rs. 4,25,675/- during 1982-83 only Rs. 1,82,350.75 were actually utilized.

#### **Honorarium to V.D.B. Secretary.**

1.15. The success of the programme depends largely on the sincerity and devotion of time by V.D.B. Secretary. The Secretary of the village Development Board should, therefore be given honorarium so that he can devote more time and energy for the development of the village.

## **CHAPTER—II INTRODUCTION**

### **General Background**

2.1. The necessity and importance of rural development has been receiving the attention of the Government since the country attained its independence in 1947. Attempts to bring about comprehensive changes in the villages are being made by the launching of the Community Development Programme in 1952. The programme, however, fails to take special care on rural weak and underprivileged section of the society. This led to the formation and implementation of special area programmes such as the Small Farmer Development Agency (S.F.D.A.) Marginal Farmer & Agricultural Labour (M.F.A.L.) and Drought Prone Area Development Programme (D.H.A.D.P.) during the Fourth Plan period.

2.2. It was, however, realized that the instrument of land based promotional activities like minor irrigation, high yielding varieties, Soil Conservation, etc. alone can not be relied upon to help the poorest and resource less rural families, cross the poverty barrier. The programme should cover non-land based activities and occupation and thus should include secondary and tertiary activities as well. Secondly, the additional income generated as a result of these developmental efforts has to be substantive so as to help these people cross the poverty line once for all and thirdly, even among the rural poor, priority would need to be given to the poorest among the poor rather than the Small Farmer as would seem to be the case with the S.F.D.A. Project. Perhaps, more importantly there was recognition of the existence of positive interaction effect of complementaries existing among different sectoral developmental activities and within the sub-activities of a sector as well as between the rural and urban habitats which could be usefully harnessed in a symbiotic manner to every body's benefit.'

2.3. The I.R.D.P, as a strategy was 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. With the introduction of I.R.D.P. in 1978-79, other specific area development programmes were merged with I.R.D.P.

(Discussion paper in Evaluation Workshop)



### **Objective of I.R.D.P.**

2.4. In short the objective of I.R.D.P. is to raise the poorest families in the rural areas above the poverty line on a lasting basis by giving them income generating assets and access to credit and other inputs.

### **Physical Target**

2.5 During the Sixth Plan Period it envisaged to cover at least 3,000 families on an average in each block. Thus it is expect to cover at least 600 families in each block every year. 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**

2.6. In order to identify the eligible families for I.R.D.P. 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 poor, the 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**

2.7. The targeted financial outlay is Rs.5 lakhs per I.R.D.P. 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 central sector an amount of Rs. 750 crores is provided for the I.R.D.P. during the Sixth Plan Period. This is a centrally sponsored scheme and the pattern of financing is 50:50 sharing basis between the Central and State Government.

### **Ceiling of Subsidy**

2.8. 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 maximum of Rs.5000/- has been fixed. As regard the rural industries and rural artisans programme, a subsidy of Rs, 3000/- has been fixed.

### **The Programme in Nagaland**

2.9. As in the rest of the country the programme of I.R.D.P. was launched in Nagaland during 1978-79. Now, the programme covered all the 21 blocks of the state. The particulars of the blocks in the state are as under :-

**TABLE—I**  
**Particulars of The Blocks**

| Sl. No. | Name of the Block | Total No. of<br>Recognised Village<br>in the block | Total No. of house-hold in<br>the Block (Both tax<br>paying and non-tax<br>paying household) |
|---------|-------------------|--|--|
| 1       | 2                 | 3  | 4  |
| 1.      | Phek              | 44   | 3367   |
| 2.      | Kikruma           | 39   | 8005   |
| 3.      | Zunheboto         | 87   | 6680   |
| 4.      | Tokiye            | 52   | 2467   |
| 5.      | Ongpangkong       | 16   | 3992   |
| 6.      | Mangkolemba       | 23   | 3720   |
| 7.      | Coangtongya       | 34   | 4395   |
| 8.      | Wokna             | 27   | 3989   |
| 9.      | Baghtj            | 57   | 4345   |
| 10.     | Moo               | 43   | 5405   |
| 11.     | Wakching          | 29   | 5236   |
| 12.     | Kohitna           | 41   | 8337   |
| 13.     | Tseminyu          | 43   | 4139   |
| 14.     | Ghaspani          | 86   | 7571   |
| 15.     | Jalukic           | 62   | 4635   |
| 16.     | Kiphire           | 62   | 5314   |
| 17.     | Sangsangyu        | 37   | 5283   |
| 18.     | Noklak            | 29   | 4561   |
| 19.     | Longkhem          | 27   | 4561   |
| 20.     | Longleng          | 24   | 4617   |
| 21.     |                   | 20   | 2510   |

[ Source :- R. D. Department Publication ]

### **Physical Achievement**

2.. The physical achievement of I. R. D. P. in term of numbers of beneficiaries during the last four year period (i. e. 1980-81 to 1983-84) is 42.740 out of a total household of 1,00,697 in the state (both rural and urban ). Thus even without taking into account the last 2 (two ) years lists of beneficiaries, about 50% of the total household in the State has already been benefited ur 6% of the total rural population had already been given benefit during the last four years periods.

### **Financial.**

2.11. The District wise allocation of fund during the last four years period are presented in table-II at the next page.

### **Average Expenditure per beneficiaries.**

2.12. The average expenditure per beneficiary by way of giving subsidy during the last four year period (i. e. 1980-81 to 1983-84) are show in Table-III

**TABLE-II**  
**Allocation of Fund**

| Dist. Sub-Division | 1980-81 (Rs.) |        |     |           | 1981-82 (Rs.) |           |        |            |
|--------------------|---------------|--------|-----|-----------|---------------|-----------|--------|------------|
|                    | VA            | DR/SDR | SR  | TOTAL     | VA            | DR/SDR    | SR     | TOTAL      |
| 1                  | 2             | 3      | 4   | 5         | 6             | 7         | 8      | 9          |
| Kohima             | 9,22,384      | NIL    | NIL | 9,22,384  | 10,45,352     | 59,660    | 93,050 | 11,98,003  |
| Mokokchung         | 13,93,614     | „      | „   | 13,93,614 | 11,11,102     | 1,01,050  | 2,000  | 25,96,766  |
| Tuensang           | 24,52,227     | „      | „   | 24,52,227 | 17,59,116     | 73,52,525 | 32,000 | 115,63,868 |
| Phek               | 9,94,012      | „      | „   | 9,94,012  | 9,20,890      | 99,945    | 26,650 | 2,18,648   |
| Zunheboto          | 9,28,095      | „      | „   | 9,28,095  | 7,56,399      | 99,880    | 5,000  | 8,61,224   |
| Mon                | 8,94,405      | „      | „   | 8,94,405  | 12,56,525     | 99,854    | NIL    | 8,25,479   |
| Wokha              | 9,11,155      | „      | „   | 9,11,155  | 5,74,101      | 1,00,000  | „      | 6,79,101   |
| Dimapur            | 4,62,170      | „      | „   | 4,62,170  | 4,96,260      | 49,963    | „      | 5,96,223   |
| Peren              | 5,07,400      | „      | „   | 5,07,400  | 3,29,615      | 69,030    | „      | 3,98,645   |
| Kiphire            | 4,63,375      | „      | „   | 4,63,375  | 4,78,108      | 49,850    | „      | 5,27,958   |

SDR – Sub Division Reserved  
S.R. – State Reserved

[Source: - Report of the S.R.D.A.]  
V.A. Village Allocation  
D.R. District Reserved

**TABLE-II**  
**Allocation of Fund**

| Dist. Sub-Division | 1982-83 (Rs in Lakh.) |        |      |       | 1983-84 (Rs. In Lakh) |        |      |       |
|--------------------|-----------------------|--------|------|-------|-----------------------|--------|------|-------|
|                    | VA                    | DR/SDR | SR   | TOTAL | VA                    | DR/SDR | SR   | TOTAL |
| 1                  | 10                    | 11     | 12   | 13    | 14                    | 15     | 16   | 17    |
| Kohima             | 10.51                 | 1.02   | 1.64 | 13.17 | 11.25                 | 1.02   | 3.00 | 15.27 |
| Mokokchung         | 11.32                 | 0.96   | 1.64 | 13.92 | 11.62                 | 1.00   | 2.90 | 15.51 |
| Tuensang           | 15.17                 | 0.99   | 1.00 | 17.62 | 19.76                 | 0.48   | 4.00 | 24.24 |
| Phek               | 10.49                 | 1.07   | 1.10 | 12.66 | 10.80                 | 0.75   | 2.50 | 14.05 |
| Zunheboto          | 8.26                  | 0.97   | 1.65 | 10.33 | 8.71                  | 0.98   | 2.34 | 12.03 |
| Mon                | 10.07                 | 0.47   | 0.25 | 10.79 | 10.70                 | 0.87   | 1.00 | 12.57 |
| Wokha              | 6.14                  | 1.02   | 1.30 | 8.46  | 6.07                  | 1.00   | 1.00 | 8.07  |
| Dimapur            | 5.65                  | 0.50   | 0.78 | 6.93  | 6.79                  | 0.75   | 4.21 | 11.75 |
| Peren              | 4.20                  | 0.55   | 1.15 | 5.90  | 4.32                  | 0.50   | 1.54 | 6.36  |
| Kiphire            | 5.22                  | 0.54   | 0.50 | 6.26  | 5.55                  | 0.50   | 4.00 | 10.05 |

SDR – Sub Division Reserved  
S.R. – State Reserved

[Source :- Report of the S.R.D.A.]  
V.A. Village Allocation  
D.R. District Reserved

| SL. No. | Names of the District/Sub-Division | Total No. of I.R.D.P. Beneficiaries during 1980-81 to 1983-84 | Amount Sanctioned |           |             | 1983-84    | Average expd. Per beneficiaries |
|---------|------------------------------------|---|-------------------|-----------|-------------|------------|---------------------------------|
|         |                                    |   | 4                 | 5         | 6 (in lakh) | 7(in Lakh) |                                 |
| 1       | Kohima                             | 4528 Nos.   | 9,22,389          | 11,98,003 | 13.17       | 15.27      | 1096.37                         |
| 2       | Mokokchung                         | 5969 ,,   | 13,93,614         | 12,12,352 | 13.82       | 15.52      | 928.12                          |
| 3       | Tuensang                           | 7868 ,,   | 24,52,227         | 18,64,641 | 17.16       | 24.24      | 1074.84                         |
| 4       | Phek                               | 5677 ,,   | 9,14,012          | 10,47,485 | 12.66       | 14.05      | 816.01                          |
| 5       | Zunheboto                          | 3732 ,,   | 8,94,405          | 8,56,724  | 10.28       | 12.03      | 1067.02                         |
| 6       | Mon                                | 3415 ,,   | 9,11,155          | 6,74,101  | 8.46        | 8.07       | 948.24                          |
| 7       | Wokha                              | 5084 ,,   | 8,94,405          | 13,56,379 | 10.79       | 12.57      | 902.20                          |
| 8       | Dimapur                            | 2620 ,,   | 4,62,170          | 5,70,573  | 6.93        | 11.75      | 1107.15                         |
| 9       | Peren                              | 2342 ,,   | 5,07,400          | 3,98,645  | 5.90        | 6.36       | 910.35                          |
| 10      | Kiphire                            | 1605 ,,   | 4,63,375          | 5,27,958  | 6.26        | 10.05      | 1633.85                         |

[Source : Report of the S.R.D.A.]

2.13 The allotment of funds during 1983-84 are as under: -

**TABLE- IV**  
**The Sub- Allotment of Funds**

| Sl. No.      | SUB-HEAD   | AMOUNT ALLOTTED (Rs. In Lakhs) |
|--------------|--|--------------------------------|
| 1            | Villagewise allocation of fund at the rate of Rs. 100/- per tax paying household (inclusive of committed expenditure of Longleng Block for 1982-83 | 100.25                         |
| 2            | District Reserve at the rate of Rs. 1.00 Lakh for seven Districts  | 7.00                           |
| 3            | Sub- Division reserve at the rate of Rs. 50,000/- for Peren and Kiphire and Rs. 75,000/- for Dimapur   | 1.75                           |
| 4            | TRYSEM at the rate of Rs. 75,000/- per district and Rs. 50,000/- per sub-division  | 6.85                           |
| 5            | Project Administration   | 15.00                          |
| 6            | State/Dosage Reserve   | 37.25                          |
| <b>TOTAL</b> |  | <b>168.00 Lakhs</b>            |

**Objective of the Study.**

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

1. To Study the working and progress,
2. To study the impact of the Programme on the targeted families,.
3. To analyse the problem and difficulties if any, and
4. To Suggest measure for improving the organisational and functional efficiency.

**Sampling Method.**

2.15. Originally it was proposed to cover 10 (ten) blocks out of (twenty One) blocks by taking one block from each of the 7 Districts and one each from the 3 (three) Sub-Division of the 21 (twenty One) blocks by taking one block from each (seven) Districts and one each from the 3 (three) Sub-Division of the State. But due to the non-cooperation by the Rural Development Department some blocks could not be covered. Thus a total of 7 (seven) blocks only is covered for the purpose of this study. In each block the numbers of beneficiaries during 1982-83 were group into three categories viz. Agriculture and Allied, Livestocks and Industry. 10% of the beneficiaries in each of the three groups are selected randomly keeping in view that the selected beneficiaries are spread over at least in ten villages.

**Limitation.**

2.16. In Nagaland there is no land records nor no income survey has conducted Hence, the data are based on mere verbal estimation of the poor illiterate beneficiaries. Moreover, the lukewarm attitude of the Department on the conduct of the study proved a veritable handicap for indebt study through discussion.

### **CHAPTER-III ADMINISTRATIVE ARRANGEMENT FOR THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROGRAMME.**

3.1. At the State Level there is the 'State Rural Development Committee' headed by the Minister for Rural Development. All the Schemes of I.R.D.P. are approved By the Committee. It also act as the sanctioning authority for the Schemes.

3.2. For the implementation of the Schemes the State has one Agency known as the 'State Rural Development Agency' with head quarter at Kohima. The Agency has one Project Director with other necessary supporting staff.

3.3. 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 District and Sub-Division. In each District one Sub-Office of the Agency headed by a Deputy Project Officer/ Asstt project officer with other Ministerial staff has been set up to assist the District Planning Boards as also to guide and watch the implementation of the programme.

3.4. At the Block level, there is the Block level Advisory Boards. The B.D.O., E.O., and VLW 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. They, after physical verification, give completion report for drawal of money.

3.5. 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 B.D.O, by their respective V.D.B. of the village.

3.6. The model schemes for I.R.D.P. (from 1983-84 onwards) issued by the State Rural Development Agency, Nagaland Kohima are as under.

**1. Land Development :-**

Subsidy for Land Development is Rs. 800/- per acre in plain area and Rs. 2700/- per acre in hill area (Plain area means land measuring slope not more than 10 %)

**2. Minor Irrigation :-**

For construction of Minor Irrigation Channel the subsidy is 50% of total investment subject to maximum subsidy upto Rs. 5,000/- per channel. Only individual cases will be covered under this scheme ( As per the existing schedule of rates of P.W.D. )

**3. Horticulture :-**

a) pineapple Rs. 3,000/- per acre { in one installment )

b) For other fruits Rs. 2,000/- per acre is the subsidy 75% to 80% of which will be given in kind (First year Rs. 1,000/- with second year dosage of Rs, 500/- and third year dosage of Rs. 500 )

**4. Animal Power :-**

Subsidy for a pair of Ploughing animal is Rs. 2,000/- which may be given to farmers having terraced field not less than one hectare.

**5. Fishery Development :-**

Subsidy is 50% of the total expenditure as per the existing schedule rates of P.W.D. Subsidy can be given for Fishery Pond measuring 35'x100'x4' and above with permanent water subject to the maximum subsidy of Rs. 5,000/- per beneficiary.

**6. Farm Forestry :-**

Subsidy for Farm Forestry is Rs. 1,500/- per beneficiary ( i.e. not exceeding 1 hectare per beneficiary). Since protection is the primary requirement, fencing materials be provided.

**7. Sericulture :-**

Subsidy is Rs. 2,500 per hectare. This should be done in selected areas only if the schemes viable.

**8. Bee-Keeping :-**

Subsidy is limited to Rs. 1,000/- per Bee-Keeping unit (i.e. 5 boxes and one extractor consist one unit).

**9. Black smithy: -**

Subsidy is 1,000/- per Centre/Unit.

**10. Weaving :-**

Rs. 800/- per beneficiary may be given as subsidy per Weaving Centre (.Complete indigenous traditional set with Nahor Wood)

**11. Dairy: -**

One cross-breed milch cow and heifer will consist a Dairy unit for which Rs. 5,000/- will be available.

**12. Piggery :-**

3 Piggings (Female) consist one piggery unit for which a subsidy of Rs. 1,500/- will be available.

**13. Goat-Keeping .-**

In one Goatery unit, there will be 9 ewes and one ram (fully grown) for which Rs. 3,000/- will be available a subsidy.

**14. Duckery :-**

25 Ducklings (22 females 3 male ) Chinese/Hoscowy will consist a Duckery Unit for which a subsidy of Rs. 1,500/- will be available.

**15. Poultry :-**

30 Poultry birds (6 month or more) will consist a poultry unit for which Rs. 2,500/- can be spent as subsidy per unit.

**16. Knitting & Tailoring :-**

One Knitting Machine or a Sewing Machine may be issued to those trained under TRYSEM and deserving person on 50% subsidy. Subsidy for a Knitting Machine is Rs. 2,100/- and that of a Sewing Machine is Rs. 400/- Knitting Centre or Tailoring Centre may also be taken up for which a subsidy of Rs. 5,000/- and Rs. 3,500/- respectively can be provided for each centre.

**17. Agri Tools & Implements :-**

Tools and implements like Jumper, Kodali, Pick Axe, Fellin Axe Pumping Sets. Wheel Borrow etc can be purchased for sale to farmers at 50%.

The Livestock shall be issued to the beneficiaries after receipt of the verification report from the implementing officer about the completion of construction of cattle shed for Dairy, Pigs-stye for the Piggery, Poultry Shed and enclosure for Poultry, Goatery, Duckery and arrangement of other accessories/equipments etc. by beneficiary to ensure 50% contribution to the total capital investment.

Addl. Scheme :-

- a) Paddy Thresher
- b) Maize Cultivation Rs. 1,000/- per acre.

**CHAPTER-IV.**

**AN APPRAISAL OF THE I.R.D.P. ACTIVITIES IN THE STATE**

**Identification Particulars of the Selected Blocks.**

4.1. At the outset it may be worthwhile to present here the identification particulars regarding the total number of Villages, households and population of the block selected for field Investigation.

**TABLE-V.**

**General particular of the selected Blocks.**

| Names of the Blocks. | Total Nos. of Village in the Block. | Total Nos. of household in the Block. | Total population. |
|----------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-------------------|
| 1                    | 2                                   | 3                                     | 4                 |
| Kikruma              | 39                                  | 8,195                                 | 30,203            |
| Jalukie              | 63                                  | 4,319                                 | 32,234            |
| Tolriye              | 52                                  | 2,47«                                 | 12,069            |
| Wakching             | 29                                  | 5,475                                 | 64,000            |
| Tseminyu             | 43                                  | 3,800                                 | 25,980            |
| Longkhim             | 27                                  | 2,336                                 | 21,447            |
| Changtongya          | 23                                  | 4,740                                 | 38,945            |
| TOTAL :-             | 276                                 | 31,341                                | 2,24,887          |

**Physical Target and Achievements.**

4.2. The Physical target and achievement of I.R.D. Programmes in the selected blocks since the introduction of the programme up to the year 1982-83 are presented in table-VI at the next page.

**TABLE VI  
Block-wise Physical Target and Achievement Under Various Schemes.**

| Name of the Block | Target upto 1982-83 |     |     |     |       |        | Achievement upto 1982-83 |     |     |     |       |        |
|-------------------|---------------------|-----|-----|-----|-------|--------|--------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-------|--------|
|                   | 2                   | 3   | 4   | 5   | 6     | 7      | 8                        | 9   | 10  | 11  | 12    | 13     |
| Kikruma           | 3731                | 421 | 101 | -   | 290   | 4543   | 3656                     | 421 | 101 | -   | 290   | 4468   |
| Jalukie           | 288                 | 75  | 163 | 134 | 509   | 1167   | 288                      | 75  | 163 | 138 | 507   | 1167   |
| Tolriye           | 2093                | -   | 63  | -   | -     | 2161   | 2098                     | -   | 63  | -   | -     | 2161   |
| Wakching          | 1980                | 295 | 69  | 253 | -     | 2597   | 1980                     | 295 | 69  | 253 | -     | 2597   |
| Tseminyu          | 2334                | -   | 39  | -   | 100   | 2473   | 2334                     | -   | 39  | -   | 100   | 2473   |
| Longkhim          | 1228                | 13  | 29  | -   | -     | 1270   | 1228                     | 13  | 29  | -   | -     | 1270   |
| Changtongya       | 788                 | 187 | 203 | -   | 600   | 1778   | 788                      | 187 | 203 | -   | 600   | 1778   |
| TOTAL: -          | 12,342              | 991 | 667 | 487 | 1,497 | 15,989 | 12,372                   |     | 667 | 391 | 1,207 | 15,914 |

[Source: Field Investigation]

4.3. The 17 (seventeen) schemes implemented Development Agency are grouped into Agri, Livestock, Industry and Other. Trysem is implemented separately.

4.4. The progress of I.R.D. Programme with regard to it coverage of individual beneficiaries out of the total household in the selected blocks are given below: -

**TABLE - VII.  
Coverage of I.R.D. Programme in the Selected Block.**

| Names of the Blocks | Total Nos of house-hold in the Block | Total Nos of house-hold benefited under I.R.D.P. in the Block upto 1983-84 | Total Nos. of household not covered by I.R.D.P. |
|---------------------|--------------------------------------|--|---|
| 1                   | 2                                    | 3  | 4   |
| Kikruma             | 8,195                                | 4,543  | 3,652   |
| Jalukie             | 4,319                                | 1,572  | 2,747   |
| Tokiye              | 2,476                                | 2,433  | 43  |
| Wakching            | 5,377                                | 2,949  | 2,432   |
| Tseminyu            | 3,800                                | 3,848  | 752   |
| Longkhim            | 2,336                                | 1,565  | 771   |
| Changtongya         | 4,740                                | 1,999  | 2,741   |
| Total :-            | 36,562                               | 18,109   | 13,138  |

[ Source :- Field Investigation ]

4.5. Since it becomes difficult to collect the yearwise lists of all the beneficiaries right from inception upto 1982-83, the information furnished by the Block Development Officers were presented in table -VII Col-3. However, it is felt that



the total numbers of household benefited may be even more than the data presented above because it was found that in Wakching Block where a sample checked is made the B.D.O. furnished the total numbers of beneficiaries during 1982-83 as 565 only whereas the people who actually got the benefit during 1982-83 is 794.

4.6. A scrutiny of the above table indicate that more than 50% of the total household in the Blocks were already covered under I.R.D.P. assistance. In Tokiye Block accept all the households except 43 households in the block were already given the benefit. If we exclude the rich families and urban household out of the total household in the block, the, entitled families or poor families may be negligible if not cent per cent coverage of poor families has already made.

**Income of the beneficiaries interviewed.**

4.7. The annual income of the beneficiaries selected for interview ( before J.R.D.P. help ) are reported as under :-

**TABLE - VIII**  
**Annual Income of Selected Beneficiaries Before I.R.D.P. Assistance**

| Names of the Block | Income group from Rs. 1<br>Rs. 3,500/- | Income group from Rs.<br>3,500/- and above |
|--------------------|--|--|
| 1                  | 2                                      | 3  |
| Kikruma            | 49                                     | 35   |
| Jalukie            | 15                                     | 19   |
| Tokiye             | 18                                     | 4  |
| Wakching           | 35                                     | 12   |
| Tseminyu           | 5                                      | 33   |
| Longkhim           | 35                                     | -  |
| Changtongya        | 7                                      | 27   |
| Total: -           | 164                                    | 130  |

[Source: - Field Investigation]

4.8. As has already stated in 1.6 families having their annual income of less than Rs. 3,500/- alone are entitled to benefit under this programme. However, the above table showed that nearly 50% of the beneficiaries are economically better of families. In other words, about 50% of the beneficiaries are not supposed to get the benefit under this programme. This showed wrong implementation of the programme. Occupation and Educational Status.

4.9. The main occupation and educational status of the beneficiaries interviewed by the Evaluation team are as under :-

**TABLE-IX**  
**Occupation and Educational Status of Selected Beneficiaries.**

| Name of the block | Main occupation of beneficiaries |              |            |         |               |          |        | Edu. Status of the beneficiaries |                     |                   |                   |
|-------------------|----------------------------------|--------------|------------|---------|---------------|----------|--------|----------------------------------|---------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
|                   | Agri                             | Horticulture | Live stock | Artisan | Govt. Service | Business | Others | Illiterate                       | Up to middle School | Up to High School | Above High School |
| 1                 | 2                                | 3            | 4          | 5       | 6             | 7        | 8      | 9                                | 10                  | 11                | 12                |
| Kikruma           | 72                               | -            | -          | -       | 9             | 3        | -      | 55                               | 15                  | 14                | -                 |
| Jalukie           | 21                               | -            | 2          | -       | 6             | 55       | -      | 13                               | 10                  | 19                | 1                 |
| Tokiye            | 20                               | -            | -          | -       | 2             | -        | -      | 11                               | 6                   | 5                 | -                 |
| Wakching          | 45                               | 1            | 1          | -       | -             | -        | -      | 24                               | 18                  | 5                 | -                 |
| Tseminyu          | 30                               | -            | -          | -       | 7             | 1        | -      | 18                               | 9                   | 9                 | 2                 |
| Longkhim          | 32                               | -            | -          | -       | 1             | -        | 2      | 24                               | 9                   | 2                 | -                 |
| Changtongya       | 37                               | -            | -          | -       | 6             | -        | 1      | 10                               | 28                  | 7                 | -                 |
| Total: -          | 257                              | 3            | 3          | -       | 31            | 10       | 3      | 155                              | 96                  |                   | 3                 |

[Source: Field Investigation]

4.10. A scrutiny of the above table showed that about 15% of the total beneficiaries are Government Servants. As per the policy of the Government, Government Servants are not to be given assistance under this programme. However, a small percentage here is wrong selection of beneficiaries.

4.11. Another criteria for selection of beneficiaries is on land holding. The position of terraced land and irrigated land holding of the selected beneficiaries are reported as under: -

**TABLE-X**  
**Terrace land and irrigated land holding of the sampled beneficiaries.**

| Block       | No. of Person having less than 5 acres of terrace land | No. of person having more than 5 acres of terraced land | No. of person having less than 5 acres of irrigated land | No. of person having above 5 acres of irrigated land |
|-------------|--|---|--|--|
| 1           | 2  | 3   | 4  | 5  |
| Kikruma     | 70   | 14  | 71   | 13   |
| Jalukie     | 34   | 12  | 39   | 7  |
| Tokiye      | 19   | 3   | 21   | 1  |
| Wakching    | 21   | 23  | 42   | 2  |
| Tseminyu    | 23   | 15  | 33   | 5  |
| Longkhim    | 5  | 30  | 34   |  |
| Changtongya | 35   | 9   | 34   | 13   |
|             |  |   |  |  |

[Source: - Field Investigation]

4.12. Selection of beneficiaries under this programme should be done from amongst the families owing an operational area of less than 5 acres of land ( Ref. 1.6. ) A scrutiny of the above table reveals that out of the 313 families interviewed 106 are families owing an operational area, 5 acres and above.

**Staff.**

4.13. As has already stated the Block level staff played an important role in the formulation and implementation of the various schemes. The existing field staff position at the block level are, therefore presented at the next page.

**TABLE-XI**  
**Block-wise field staff position for IRDP ( As on date of visit)**

[Source :- B.D.O. 's. ]

4.14. The existing implementing machinery at state and District levels are mostly for policy matters and the real implementing agency of the programme are the Block-level staff and the V.D.B. 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.

4.15. With the limited staff as shown in table-XI it was not physically possible for the block staff to supervise and check all the various schemes of all the villages. As such it is observed that the block staff are compelled to give even completion report from their table without making any physical verification of the works. Against the available block level staff as presented in table-XI the various schemes taken up during 1982-83 are presented in the table-XII in the next page.

**TABLE - XII**  
**Total Numbers of Beneficiaries Under Various Scheme During 1982-83**

| Name of the block | Seri. Dev. | M.I. | Land Dev | Horticulture | Animal power | Fishery Dev. | Farm Forestry | Sewing Machine | Duckery | Knitting | Bee Keeping | Black Smithy | Carpentry | Weaving | Piggery | Diary | Goatery | Poultry | Total |
|-------------------|------------|------|----------|--------------|--------------|--------------|---------------|----------------|---------|----------|-------------|--------------|-----------|---------|---------|-------|---------|---------|-------|
| 1                 | 2          | 3    | 4        | 5            | 6            | 7            | 8             | 9              | 10      | 11       | 12          | 13           | 14        | 15      | 16      | 17    | 18      | 19      | 20    |
| Kikruma           | -          | 146  | 654      | 42           | 29           | 40           | 6             | 17             | -       | 6        | -           | -            | -         | 4       | -       | -     | -       | 6       | 950   |
| Jalukie           | 3          | 72   | 68       | 3            | 32           | 58           | 39            | 150            | 6       | 13       | 4           | 8            | 9         | 12      | 9       | 3     | 7       | -       | 489   |
| Tokiye            | -          | 62   | 23       | -            | 13           | 78           | -             | -              | -       | -        | -           | -            | -         | -       | -       | -     | -       | -       | 176   |
| Watching          | -          | 183  | 374      | 27           | 10           | 75           | 87            | 7              | 23      | -        | -           | 2            | 2         | -       | 7       | -     | 11      | 13      | 794   |
| Tseminyu          | -          | 173  | 123      | -            | -            | 62           | -             | 39             | -       | -        | -           | -            | -         | -       | -       | -     | -       | -       | 397   |
| Longkhim          | -          | 90   | 244      | -            | -            | -            | -             | 10             | -       | -        | -           | -            | -         | -       | -       | -     | -       | -       | 347   |
| Changtongya       | -          | -    | 126      | 27           | -            | -            | 157           | 71             | 10      | 17       | 17          | 5            | 5         | 3       | 7       | 20    | -       | -       | 454   |

[Source : - B.D.O.'s Office Records]

## Publicity

4.16. The success of any rural development programme particularly the I.R.D.P. depend target largely on the acknowledge of the programme by the rural masses. Even though a full enquiry about the knowledge of the programme is oat ma-ie as attempt has been make to know how the programme has come to the knowledge of the beneficiaries.

**TABLE-X**  
**Source of I.R.D.P. Knowledge**

| Kikruma    | 28 | 28 | 51 | 5  |
|------------|----|----|----|----|
| Jalukie    | 3  | 2  | 16 | 13 |
| Tokiye     | 14 | —  | 8  | —  |
| Watching   | 29 | 2  | 8  | 8  |
| Tseminyu   | 14 | 1  | 23 | —  |
| Langkhim   | 23 | —  | 12 | —  |
| Changtonya | 6  | —  | 26 | 2  |

[Source: - Field Investigation]

## CHAPTER-V.

### BENEFICIARIES REACTION AND IMPACT OF THE PROGRAMME

Income of the Beneficiaries.

5.1. Since the main objective of I.R.D.P. is to raise the poorest families (i.e. whose annual income is below Rs. 3,500/-) in the rural areas above the poverty line, the present study tried to find out the impact of the programme on their annual income of the beneficiaries households before and after I.R.D.P. Assistance. The study revealed the position as under.

**TABLE - XIV**  
**Annual Income Group Before and After I.R.D.P. Assistance.**

| Names of the Block | Income Group Before I.R.D.P. Help (in Rs.) |           |            | Income Group after I.R.D.P. Help (in Rs.) |           |            |
|--------------------|--|-----------|------------|---|-----------|------------|
|                    | Upto 3500                                  | 3501-5000 | Above 5000 | Upto 3500                                 | 3501-5000 | Above 5000 |
| 1                  | 2  | 3         | 4          | 5   | 6         | 7          |
| Kikruma            | 49   | 13        | 22         | 49  | 12        | 23         |
| Jalufcie           | 15   | 5         | 14         | 13  | 3         | 18         |
| Tokiye             | 18   | 3         | 1          | 18  | 3         | 1          |
| Wakching           | 35   | 10        | 2          | 35  | 10        | 2          |
| Tseminyu           | 5  | X         | 33         | 4   | X         | 34         |
| Langkhim           | 35   | X         | X          | 34  | 1         | X          |
| Changtonya         | 7  | 2         | 25         | 7   | 2         | 25         |
| Total :-           | 164  | 33        | 97         | 160                                       | 31        | 103        |

[Source: - Field Investigation]

5.2. A scrutiny of table-XIV indicate there is virtually no difference in the annual income of the beneficiaries before and after the I.R.D.P. assistance. This is observed to be mainly on two reasons:

1. The assistance given to the beneficiaries household were very negligible in almost all the cases. We can not expect a household to raise their annual income by giving them 2-3 wooden stick under weaving schemes or cash amount of Rs. 200/- in some other schemes or by supplying a sickly livestock that died after reaching the village.
2. Many schemes were actually not implemented in the field. It appears that to obtain a completion report for drawal of money is not a problem even if this works are actually not done nor there is none to check whether the works are actually implementing or not.

5.3. Another way of judging the effectiveness of the programme on agricultural families are the adoption of improved method of cultivation. The families reported adopting improved method of cultivation are presented in table-XV below :-

**TABLE - XV**  
**Used of Improved Method of Cultivation.**

| Name of the Block | Nos of person reported using improved seed | Nos of person reported using improved implement | Nos of persons reported using chemical fertilizer | Nos of persons reported using pesticides |
|-------------------|--|---|---|--|
| 1                 | 2  | 3   | 4   | 5  |
| Kikruma           | -  | -   | -   | -  |
| Jalukie           | 5  | 2   | -   | -  |
| Tokiye            | 13   | 12  | -   | 14                                       |
| Wakching          | 30   | 24  | 8   | 1  |
| Tseminyu          | 1  | 1   | -   | -  |
| Langkhim          | 5  | 1   | 2   | 10                                       |
| Changtonya        | 6  | 4   | 1   | 1  |
| Total :-          | 60   | 44  | 11  | 25                                       |

[ Source :- Field Investigation ]

5.4. Out of the total beneficiaries interviewed about 17% reported using improved seed, 12% improved implement 3% fertilisers and 7% pesticides. It appears that the adoption of the above method of cultivation are the efforts of the Agricultural Department and not an effect of the I.K.D. Programme.

**Official Record and Reported Receipt of Assistance.**

5.5. After obtaining the actual amount given to each beneficiaries from the official record, the evaluation team approach the sampled beneficiaries to know whether they had actually received the amount as per official records. The finding are as under.

**TABLE — XVI.**  
**Nos. of Beneficiaries Reported Received Less than the Officials Record.**

| Name of the Block | Under Agri and Allied | Under livestock | Under Industrial | M.I. | Total |
|-------------------|-----------------------|-----------------|------------------|------|-------|
| 1                 | 2                     | 3               | 4                | 5    | 6     |
| Kikruma           | 4                     | -               | -                | -    | 4     |
| Jalukie           | 3                     | -               | -                | -    | 3     |
| Tokiye            | -                     | -               | -                | -    | -     |
| Watching          | 9                     | -               | -                | 9    | 28    |
| Tseminyu          | NC                    | NC              | NC               | NC   | -     |
| Langkhim          | NC                    | NC              | NC               | NC   | -     |
| Changtonya        | NC                    | NC              | NC               | NC   | -     |
| Total :-          | 26                    | -               | -                | 9    | 35    |

[ Source :- Field Investigation ]

II. NC :- Not Collected.

5.6. The figures as indicated above are beneficiaries who received the assistance in term of money only. In some cases there were vast difference between the official record of disbursement and the actual amount reported to have received by the beneficiaries. For eg. a beneficiaries under Jalukie Block is reported to have received Rs. 250/- only as against the official record of Rs. 2,725/-

**Beneficiaries View on Livestock/Material Supplied.**

5.7. The view expressed by the beneficiaries of Livestocks/materials are given below :-

**TABLE—XVII.**  
**Beneficiaries view on the Quality of Livestock/Materials Supplied by the Agency.**

| Names of the Block | Nos reported received quality | inferior | Nos reported received quality | good | Nos without comment |
|--------------------|-------------------------------|----------|-------------------------------|------|---------------------|
| 1                  | 2                             |          | 3                             |      | 4                   |
| Kikruma            | 44                            |          | 40                            |      | -                   |
| Jalukie            | 7                             |          | 26                            |      | 1                   |
| Tokiye             | 16                            |          | -                             |      | 6                   |
| Watching           | -                             |          | -                             |      | 47                  |
| Tseminyu           | -                             |          | 3                             |      | 1                   |
| Langkhim           | 2                             |          | -                             |      | 33                  |
| Changtonya         | NR                            |          | NR                            |      | NR                  |
| Total :-           | 69                            |          | 69                            |      | 88                  |

I. Source :- Field Investigation.

II. NR - Not Reported.

5.8. The table XVI in the previous page relates to beneficiaries who received assistance in term of money and the table. XVII above relates to the view expressed by the beneficiaries who received the assignee in terms of livestock/materials. Since the table is a clear radiation to show what type of materials livestock are distributed to the poor beneficiaries, no further analysis is attempted.

**Nos. of Beneficiaries Selected for Intel Nos. Actually Interviewed**

5.9. After collecting the 1982-83 list of beneficiaries from the 7 (seven) blocks a sampled of 340 beneficiaries were selected on random sampling method for interview. The Evaluation team approached each selected beneficiaries household for interview. The finding are presented here below :-

**TABLE—XVIII.  
Beneficiaries Interviewed.**

| Names of the Blocks | Total beneficiaries during 1982-83 | Total beneficiaries selected for interview | Total Nos of beneficiaries actually interviewed | Nos of beneficiaries not interviewed due to non existence | Nos of beneficiaries reported not received the benefit |
|---------------------|------------------------------------|--|---|---|--|
| 1                   | 2                                  | 3  | 4   | 5   | 6  |
| Kikruma             | 950                                | 100  | 94  | 6   | 10   |
| Jalukie             | 489                                | 48   | 47  | 1   | 13   |
| Tokiye              | 176                                | 22   | 22  | -   | -  |
| Watching            | 794                                | 50   | 47  | 3   | -  |
| Tseminyu            | 397                                | 40   | 39  | 1   | 1  |
| Langkhim            | 347                                | 35   | 35  | -   | -  |
| Changtonya          | 454                                | 45   | 45  | -   | -  |
| Total :-            | 3,607                              | 340  | 329   | 11  | 25   |

[ Source:- Field Investigation ]

5.10. The table-XVIII above showed that out of 340 beneficiaries contacted by the Evaluation team the number of non-existence of such beneficiaries comes to 11 and 25 persons reported not received the benefit. Any impartial observer after going through this chapter will come to the conclusion that somewhere something goes wrong in the implementation of the programme.

\*\*\*\*\*