



GOVERNMENT OF NAGALAND

**EVALUATION STUDY REPORT
ON
"SERICULTURE DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME
IN
ZUNHEROTO, DISTRICT"
NAGALAND**

**DIRECTORATE OF EVALUATION
GOVERNMENT OF NAGALAND
KOHIMA.**

PREFACE

Comprising of hilly terrains with varying altitudes and underrated topography Nagaland is marked by peculiar physiographical conditions. The development of sericulture is not only found to be suitable to the conditions but also can profitably utilise the land in areas where cultivation of food crops is difficult. Its development can generate more employment and income, which ultimately raise the standard of living of the rural people. Realising this importance of sericulture development, the Zunheboto District Planning & Development Board has considered it necessary to undertake an evaluation study for assessing the progress made in this field or the shortcoming and problems if any so that corrective measures are taken for achieving the desired level of objective. This task was entrusted to the evaluation Department.

The District Evaluation office, Zunheboto under the technical guidance from the Directorate has conducted the study and the present report is the outcome of this study. Shri Shinito Sema, the District Evaluation officer, Zunheboto has only carried out the task right from the conduct of the report after the preparation of the first draft of the report. The research assistance rendered by the research staff of Zunheboto deserves much appreciation.

It is hoped that the information containing in the present report particularly the findings and suggestions will be found useful by the implementing department, the District Planning and Development Board, Zunheboto and those interested in sericulture development activities.

The Evaluation department gratefully acknowledge the help and cooperation received from officials of the department particularly the district level officer Zunheboto and the individual beneficiaries.

Dated Kohima
The th Sept/97

(N. ZELIANG)

JOINT DIRECTOR OF EVALUATION
NAGALAND: KOHIMA

LIST OF TABLE CONTAINED IN THE REPORT-

TABLE NO.

HEADING.

1. DATA ON ACTIVITIES AND PROGRESS OF SERICULTURE DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME IN THE DISTRICT.
2. PARTICULARS REGARDING GRANT OF SUBSIDY.
3. INFORMATION ON NO.OF BENEFICIARIES AND SUBSIDY AMOUNT RELEASED.
4. INFORMATION ON BENEFICIARIES UNDER CENTRALLY SPONSORED SCHEME DURING 1995-96.
5. PHYSICAL ACHIEVEMENT DURING 1994-95 AND 1995-96.
6. VIEWS AND REACTION OF THE RESPONDENTS
7. POSITION OF THE GOVERNMENT MULBERRY FARM DURING 1994-95 AND 1995-96.
8. SUPPLY OF MATERIALS/ REQUIPMENTS DURING 1994-95 AND 1995-96.

CHAPTER

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

1. Introduction.
2. Objectives of the Programme.
3. Project in the District.
4. Conduct of Study.
5. Objective of Study.
6. Coverage and period of study.
7. Sampling method
8. Methodology
9. Limitation

POSITION AND COVERAGE OF SERICULTURE BY THE DEPARTMENT.

1. Coverage of area and beneficiary.
2. Beneficiaries granted subsidy.
3. Coverage of private farms.
4. Selected beneficiaries granted subsidy.
5. Groups of beneficiaries granted subsidy.
6. Physical achievement
7. Respondents beneficiaries view.

GOVERNMENT MULBERRY FARM AT V.K.

1. Position of Mulberry farm
2. Achievement by the farm
3. Receipt of materials.

MAIN FINDINGS AND SUGGESTION.

1. Selection of beneficiaries.
2. Supervision of farm.
3. Training facilities.
4. Maintenance Allowances
5. Protection of farm
6. Supply of food plants.
7. Improvement of Government farm.
8. Labour shed.
9. Installation of reeling machine.

CHAPTER – 1

INTRODUCTION.

1.1. Sericulture has played an important role in rural economy. With the realisation of the advantages and the potentialities of the Sericulture development in the state, the state Government has introduced Sericulture activities by setting up Mulberry farms, Eh farms, Oak tasar farms and Mugafarm etc. In Nagaland the Sericulture activities was earlier a wing of the Industries Department. But it was bifurcated as a separate department from 1 st July' 88. Since then a separate Directorate of Sericulture has been established and a Director is heading the department now.

In Zunheboto district, a District Level Office was set-up during the year 1988. The office is headed by a superintendent of Sericulture. There are all together five technical staffs working under him at the district head quarter office.

Objective of the programme.

1.2. The main objective of the Sericulture Development Programme are: -

- i). Better Utilisation of land in areas where cultivation of food crops is not suitable.
- ii). Purifies the atmosphere through intensive host plantation of silk worms.
- iii). Prevent soil erosion through block cultivation of host plants.
- iv). Provide multiple income through sale of products and by products which can meet internal and external market.
- v). Generates high percentage of employment especially for women folk in the activities of Silk worm rearing, cocoon spinning/reeling and weaving of silk fabrics in their leisure time and
- vi). To raise the standard of living of the rural people.

Sericulture Programme in Zunheboto.

1.3. With the establishment of office in the district the schemes sponsored by the state are also being implemented in the district. The central sponsored scheme was started in the district during the year 1994-95. There is only one Government Mulberry Farm (Kuzukika) in V.K. area under Zunheboto district. This farm is having 15 acres of land approximately. There are 32 numbers of private Eri farm covering 40.12 acres of land and 59 numbers of private Mulberry Farm covering 59 acres of land. So far there is no Oak tasar Farm and Muga Farm cultivating by Government nor private under the district.

1.4. Though Zunheboto District is having potential for sericulture Development, the progress made so far does not appears to be very encouraging. The District Planning & Development Board had therefore considered it necessary to conduct an Evaluation study. This task was under entrusted to the District Evaluation Office, Zunheboto by the Zunheboto District Planning and Development Board.

Objectives of the studies: -

- 1.5. The study was thus carried out with the following as main objectives: -
1. To assessed the working of the programme and the progress made so far,
 2. To assess its impact on the people, and
 3. To suggest measures for effective implementation of the Programmes.

Reference period of study.

1.6. The reference period of the study was 1994-95 and 1995-96 (2 years). Being a quick study, the last 2 years period is considered reasonable enough to give clear picture of development of the programme in the District.

Sampling Method.

1.7. There are 8 Blocks under Zunheboto district. The Department has so far covered 6 blocks only 50% of the blocks namely Satakha, Zunheboto and Akuiuto have been selected for the purpose of this study. In the 3 blocks a total of 22 beneficiaries were selected at random for interview. Out of the 22 beneficiaries interviewed 19 were state sponsored scheme beneficiaries and 3 were Central Sponsored Scheme beneficiaries.

Methodology.

- 1.8. For the conduct of this Study 3 (three) schedules were prepared:
1. Schedule - I was used for collection of datas from the concern head of the Office in the district.
 2. Schedule - II was used for collection of data from the lone Government Mulberry farm in V.Ks - under Zunheboto district, and
 3. Schedule - III was used for collection of information from the beneficiaries.

Limitation.

1.9. The main limitation of the study was the non availability of required datas from Beneficiaries as they does not maintain records. Hence information was collected only through verbal discussion and based on memories of the beneficiaries.

CHAPTER-2

2.1. The over-all activities and progress of the Sericulture development programme in the district up to the period 1995-96 has been compiled and presented in a tabular form below: -

TABLE-I

**DATA ON ACTIVITIES AND PROGRESS OF SERICULTURE
DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME IN THE DISTRICT.**

SI. No.	Particulars	No. of Govt. farm.	Having area in acre.	Total coverage developed	Total coverage of private farm land (In acre)	Total No. of individual persons engaged in Sericulture activity.	Total coverage of area (In acres) (5+6)
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1.	Eri Farm	-	-	-	40.12	32	40.12
2.	Mulberry Farm	1	15	7	59	59	66
	TOTAL	1	15	7	99.12	91	106.12

(Source - Superintendent office)

2.2. The Department has opened one Mulberry Farm at V. K. It has a total area of 15 acres of land. Only 7 acres of land could be developed so far and remaining 8 acres are yet to be developed.

2.3. A total of 91 private individual have taken up sericulture activities in the District in a total area of 99.12 acres of land. Thus an area of 106.12 is under Sericulture activities. Eri farm covered an area of 40.12 acres of land and Mulberry Farm covered an area of 66 acres of land (including Govt. Mulberry Farm of 7 acres of land).

Subsidy.

2.4. The information regarding grant of subsidy for development of sericulture in the District during 1994-95 and 1995-96 has been collected and presented in table-II below: -

TABLE - II.

PARTICULARS REGARDING GRANT OF SUBSIDY.

Sl. No.	Name of the blocks	No. of beneficiary granted subsidy.	No. of beneficiary selected for interview.	No. of beneficiaries reported received subsidy.	No. of beneficiaries not received subsidy.	No. of beneficiaries reported less than the official record.
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1.	Zunheboto	17	11	9	2	4
2.	Satakha	10	8	6	2	-
3.	Akuluto	6	3	2	1	1
	TOTAL	33	22	17	5	5

[Source: - Field Investigation]

2.5. It can be seen from the above table-II that 33 persons have been granted subsidy by the Department during 1994-95 and 1995-96. Out of the 33 beneficiaries 22 beneficiaries were selected for interview. 17 (seventeen) beneficiaries have reported that they have received the subsidy amount whereas 5 persons reported that they have not received the subsidy amount and 5 persons reported that they have received the subsidy amount less than what was sanctioned as subsidy against them.

Amount of Subsidy Released.

2.6. It is reported that the amount of subsidy-granted to the selected beneficiaries were not released by the Government during 1994-95. Thus payment were not made to the beneficiaries selected till the time of conducting this study.

2.7. the amount of subsidy released to the selected beneficiaries during 1995-96 are presented in table-IV below. This information relates to only subsidy under state sponsored scheme.

TABLE - III.

INFORMATION ON NOS. OF BENEFICIARIES AND SUBSIDY AMOUNT RELEASED.

Sl No.	Name the Scheme.	No. Of beneficiary	Subsidy Given For development of land (in Acres)	Actual Developed land (in Acres)	Amount Released in official Record (In Acres)	Actual Amount Received By beneficiary (in Acres)	Received in short less than official record (In Acres)
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1.	Eri farm	8	8	31/2	8,000	25,500	2,500
2.	Mulberry farm	6	6	3	21,000	19,500	2,000
		14	14	61/2	49,000	45,5000	4,500

(Source: - Field investigation)

2.8. During the year 1995-96 14 beneficiaries under state sponsored scheme have been selected for the development of one acre each of land. It is found during field visit that no beneficiaries could achieve the targeted level. (Both Eri farm and Mulberry Farm) Some beneficiaries are simply rearing them in their kitchen garden just on experiment basis. As against the targeted area of 8 acres of land, the actual area brought under sericulture activity is only 6.2 acres (approximately). As per the record, 8 beneficiaries of Eri farmer has been amount of given an amount of Rs. 28,000 @ 3500 per beneficiary as subsidy. But during field investigation it is reported that only Rs. 3,000/- were actually paid to each beneficiary against the sanctioned amount of Rs. 3,500/- It is interesting to know that one Smt. Itoli of Zungti who was recorded as beneficiary was given only Rs. 1500/- as against Rs. 3,500/- sanctioned against her. More interesting is that She too does not know how much was sanctioned against her nor under what ground the subsidy was given to her. Similarly all the 6 (six) beneficiaries under Mulberry farmers were also given Rs. 3 000/- only as against the sanctioned amount of Rs. 3,500/-each It is highly irregular less than the sanctioned amount to the beneficiaries. The Department may enquire into the reasons why less payment were made and necessary action taken.

2.9. Three groups of 1995-96 beneficiaries under Centrally Sponsored Scheme were selected for interview. The outcome of this interview were compiled and presented in table-IV. -

TABLE - IV.

**INFORMATION ON BENEFICIARIES UNDER CENTRAL SPONSORED
SCHEME DURING 1995-96.**

I. lo.	Name of the group of beneficiary	Name of Scheme	Subsidy given for area Development in acre.	Actual area Developed by the group of beneficiary	Developed Less than Targeted.	Amount granted as subsidy (as per record)	Actual amount received by beneficiary.	Received in short
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	6	9
1.	SHINIZU & GROUP.	ERI FARM	5 acres	2 1/2	2 1/2	17,500/-	17,500/-	-
2.	KAKUTO & GROUP	ERI FARM	3.6 unit	1/2	2 1/2	10,500/-	10,500/-	-
3.	YEVIHE	ERI FARM	3.6 unit	1	2.6	10,500/-	4,500/-	6,000/-
TOTAL			11.12 Unit	4	7.12	38,500/-	32,500/-	6,000/-

(Source: Field Investigation)

2.10. A scrutiny of table-IV showed that not a single group could achieve the targeted level of development, Kakuto and group have developed only half acre of land and Yevihe and group could developed only 1 acre of land for sericulture activities to be taken up. Thus the group in Zunheboto District are found to be interested only for getting the subsidy and not to take up sericulture activities with seriousness.

2.11. It was brought to the notice of the evaluation team that Yevihe & group were given Rs.4500/- only though the official record showed that an amount of Rs. 10,500/- has been paid to them. On enquiry it is reported that a family member of the group working in the Department simply put their name in the beneficiary list and they were paid only Rs. 4500/-. Since they neither applied nor asked for the subsidy they are not aware of the actual amount sanctioned by the government as subsidy. The balance amount of Rs. 6000/-has been charge for inclusion in the beneficiary list. The department must see that this practice is stop forthwith.

2.12. The total numbers of D.L.F. and seedling supplied to the private farmers and the production of cocoon during the two years period were collected and presented in table-V.

TABLE NO -V.

PHYSICAL ACHIEVEMENT DURING THE YEAR 1994-95 AND 1995-96

SI. No.	Particulars	1994-95			1995-96		
		No. Of DLFs supplied to private farmers	No. of sampling/ seedling supplied.	Cocoon Produced during the year	No. Of DLF's supplied to Pvt. farmers.	No. Of sampling/ seedling supplied.	No. Of cocoon produced by the Pvt. farmers during the year.
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1.	ERI FARMS	250	10kgof	37,500 Nos	300	10 kg of castrol seeds	31,450 Nos
2.	MULBERRY FARMER	-	10,000 seedlings	-	100	-	29,671 Nos.
TOTAL		250	10,010	37,500 Nos	400	10 kgs	61,076 Nos

[Source: - Superintendent Office]

2.13. During the 1994-95 the Government supplied 250 Nos of disease Laying Free (DLF's) and 10 kgs. of castrol seed to the private Eri Farmers. The total production of cocoon by the Eri Farmers during the year was 37,500 Nos. In the same year 10,000 seedlings were supplied to private mulberry Farmers but there was no production. During the year 1995-96 300 DLF's of Eri and 10 kgs of castrol seed were supplied to the Eri Farmers and the production as 31,405 Nos. of cocoon only 100 DLF's were supplied to Mulberry Farmers and 29,671 Nos. of Mulberry cocoon produced during the year.

2.14. The success of the programme depends largely on the knowledge and interest taken by the people. An attempt was therefore made to collect the views and reaction of the beneficiaries regarding the functioning of the department in this district. The outcome of this interview were tabulated and presented in table-VI.

TABLE NO. VI.

VIEWS AND REACTION OF THE RESPONDENTS.

Sl. No.	Name of the block	No. of Beneficiaries Interviewed	No. of beneficiaries reported know through.			Implementation of programme.	
			Govt. Functionaries	Others	Friends	No. Of beneficiaries Reported. Satisfied	No. Of beneficiaries reported not satisfied
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1.	Zunheboto	11	6	-	5	2	9
2.	Satakha	8	2	-	6	1	7
3.	Akuluto	3	1	1	1	1	2
Total		22	9	1	12	4	18

(Source: - Field investigation)

2.14. It can be seen from the above table that out of 22 beneficiaries interviewed only 9 reported known the programme of sericulture department through Government sources, 1 reported known through others and 12 beneficiaries reported known through friends. Only 4 beneficiaries reported satisfied on the implementation of the scheme and, 18 beneficiaries reported not satisfied. During field investigation, it has been reported by all the beneficiaries that subsidy granted to them is very less and with this meager amount of subsidy it is not possible to establish a farm as per planned. On the other hand no beneficiaries are found to be seriously taking up the Sericulture activities in the District. This appears to be mostly due to lack of knowledge due to poor publicity by the implementing Department.

CHAPTER - 3.

Government Mulberry Farm at V.K.

3.1. There is only one Government Mulberry Farm at V.K. area in the district. This farm has an area of about 15 acres of land approximately. Of this 15 acres only 7 acres of land was developed and put to use. The rest 8 acres of land is yet to be developed. This farm has 1 Farm Manager, 2 Demonstrators, 1 Chowkidar and 4 labourers. A bird eye view of the only Government Mulberry Farm in the District is presented in table-VII.

TABLE NO. VII.

GOVERNMENT MULBERRY FARM (KUZUKIKA) IN V.K. POSITION OF THE FARM DURING 1994-95 AND 1995-96.

SI. No.	Particulars	Total area having Size in acre	Developed brought under Cultivation in acre.	Undeveloped in acre.	Total No of. Cocoon produced during.1994-95	Total No. Of cocoon produce during 1995-96	Total Production Of cocoon in 2 years.
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1.	Mulberry Farm	15	7	8	7481	10,763	18,244

(Source: - Field Investigation)

3.2. The only Government Mulberry farm (Kuzikika) in V.K. area in the district has a total area of 15 acres of land. Up to the time of this enquiry only 7 acres of land could be developed and a 8 acres of land is yet to be developed. During the year the farm produced 18,244 Nos of cocoon. The cocoons are send to the Dimapur reeling unit. Practically this cannot be treated as a Farm. If the Farm can not be run properly it has no justification for its continuance as at present state of the Farm.

3.3. The information on materials and equipment supplied to the farm during 1994-95 and 1995-96 can be seen from table- VIII below: -

TABLE NO.VIII.

SUPPLY OF MATERIAL/ EQUIPMENT DURING 1994-95
& 1995-96.

Sl. No.	List of materials received.	1994-95 Nos/quantity Received.	1995-96 Nos/quantity Received.
1	2	3	4
1.	Lantern Lamp	1 No.	NIL
2.	Chopping	2 Nos.	
3.	Rearing tray	1 No.	
4.	K.Oil	5 Litres.	
5.	News paper Packing	2 kg.	
6.	Empty Gunny bag	2 Nos.	

(Source: - Field Inspection)

3.4. It can be seen from the above table that during the year 1994-95 the farm has been supplied with the above mentioned materials for use in the farm. However, during the year 1995-96 nothing was supplied to the farm. It is reported during the field investigation that the staffs are facing problem due to shortages of materials and equipment such as, spade, daos etc. There is no labour shed for labours. The labourers staying In the neighboring villages are coming to the Farm daily for duty. This has affected the efficiency of the Farm. The above factual position as presented in table-VIII clearly indicate that it is not worth making detail study. The efficiency or otherwise can be judge by any sensible person.

CHAPTER - 4.

MAIN FINDING AND SUGGESTION.

Proper utilisation of subsidy amount.

4.1 Normally each beneficiary is given a subsidy amount of Rs. 3500/- per acre. Selection of beneficiaries are appears to have done by those who are prepared to take up sericulture activities on 5 acres of land. Thus each beneficiary got subsidy of Rs. 17,500/- . During filed investigation it is found that none of the beneficiaries has taken up the sericulture activities with seriousness. Almost all the beneficiaries are simply practicing on a half acres of land just for experiment basis. It appears that the beneficiaries main objectives are simply to get the subsidy and not for taking up the activities with seriousness

Supervision.

4.2 The success of the scheme depends largely on the efficiency and effective supervision of the technical staffs working in the department. It is found during field investigation that most of the farmers do not know the technique of rearing the silk worm but are blindly cultivating the food plants and rearing the worms. The method and guideline should be properly taught particularly the selected beneficiary farmers. The technical staff should visit all the, farms every year especially during the time of planting the food plants and rearing of worms and guide them properly if the scheme is to be effectively implemented. During the field investigation it is reported that supervision is practically nil from the Department side. It is therefore suggested that arrangement must be made to supervise the farmers by visiting their farm at least once or twice a year by the technical staff of the Department.

Training facilities.

4.3. As stated earlier, it is found during field investigation that all the farmers does not have any idea about the technique of rearing silkworms. Unless they are provided with some basic idea it will be impossible for them to carry out the scheme successfully. Therefore it is suggested that the department arrange a short duration training for all the beneficiaries farmers. This training can be conducted at the district headquarter. In future the Department may see the possibility of arranging a short training course before the selection for grant of subsidy is made and those who successfully completed the training should only be selected for grant of subsidy.

Protection of Farm.

4.4. For the safety of food plants, barbed wires are said to be very essential for fencing the Farm areas. Unless this is done, stray cattles are reported to have normally spoiled the plantation. The Department may like to see the possibility of providing such barbed wire to the beneficiaries.

Supply of food plants.

4.5. It is reported that Sericulture farmers used to procure food plants from the open market mostly from the neighboring places. They are facing problem for procuring the food plants. It is therefore suggested that the department should arrange for supply to the farmers at reasonable rate so as to enable them to collect food plants without problem.

Government Mulberry farm at V.K.

4.6. This is the only Govt, farm in the District. It has an area of 15 acres of land. Only 7 acres are put to use till the time this study is conducted. The remaining 8 acres of land are yet to be developed. As stated in the body of the report, this farm cannot be considered as a farm in the true sense of the term. If the Department cannot run the Farm properly there is no justification for its continuance. It is simply wastage of stated limited resources by way of maintenance of staff and other establishment expenses.

Labour shed.

4.8. There is no labour shed for the four labourers working in the farm. These labourers are coming from the neighboring villages to attend their duty. This tells upon the efficiency of the farm. The Department may therefore see that this problem is solved by making some arrangement if construction of labour shed cannot be done at the present stage of the functioning of the farm.

4.9. At the present level of production, installation of reeling machine may not be profitable or viable. However, due to non-availability of reeling machine in the District the cocoons produced in the District are sent to the reeling Unit at Dimapur. The cocoons are to be reeled in a specific time. Sometimes the cocoons could not be sent to the reeling Unit at Dimapur within the specific time due to a number of reasons. The Department may see that a reeling machine is installed in the Government Farm when situation demand.