

GOVERNMENT OF NAGALAND

Evaluation Report

On

**Horticulture Development Programme
in Wokha District (Nagaland)**

By

**The Directorate of Evaluation
Government of Nagaland, Kohima.**

PREFACE

The horticultural Development programme in Nagaland had been looked after by Agri.Department till 1992. Just after bifurcation from Agri.Deptt. The concerned department have paid more emphasis on the development of Horticultural crops in the state i.e. in the beginning of 8* five year plan.

An Evaluation study on HDP in Wokha District was undertaken by the Dist.level office of this Deptt. The main objective of the study is to assess its working and progress, its impact and effectiveness of the delivery of adequacy of funds and supplies and to study its problem and difficulties if any and to put forward constructive suggestion for the improvement of the scheme.

The report has been prepared by Shri. H.Hugie Zeliang, District Evaluation Officer., Wokha. The field study has been conducted by the Inspector, of this Deptt. This study was carried out under the supervision and guidance of Shri. N.Zeliang. Joint Director of Evaluation who gives the final touch of the report. The valuable service rendered by them deserves much appreciation.

It is hoped that the information contained in this report particularly the findings and suggestion would be some help to the concerned implementing Deptt. Planners and policy makers for follow up action and future guidance.

Sd/
Joint. Director of Evaluation,
Nagaland, Kohima.

LIST OF TABLE PRESENTED IN THE REPORT.

TABLE NO.	TITLE
I.	PHYSICAL TARGET & ACHIEVEMENT 8 th PLAN & NINTH PLAN OF 1997-98.
II.	PROPOSAL TARGET & ACHIEVEMENT
III.	PHYSICAL TARGET ACHIEVED UNDER AREA EXPANSION.
IV.	DEPARTMENT FARMS/ORCHARDS
V.	CENTRALLY SPONSORED SCHEME
VI.	AN APPRAISAL OF THE H.D.P INWOKHA DISTRICT.
VII.	PROJECT AREA IN HAC
VII.	FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE
IX.	KNOWLEDGE ABOUT TRAINING FACILITY

CONTENTS.

PREFACE

1. INTRODUCTION

General background, objective of the programme, its strategy, objective of the study, scope of the study and limitation.

2. IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROGRAMME IN NAGALAND

Organisational structure, physical target & Achievement under 8th plan & ninth plan of 1997-98. Proposal target & Achievement, Physical target achieved under area expansion, Deptt. Farms/ orchards. Centrally sponsored schemes.

3. AN APPRAISAL OF THE HDP. IN WOKHADISTRICT

Functioning of the project, project area in hac, Financial Assistance, and knowledge about training facility.

4. BENEFICIARIES VIEWS & COMMENTS.

5. MAIN FINDING & SUGGESTION.

CHAPTER – I

INTRODUCTION

1.1. General Background

Nagaland being blessed with good soil and Agro climatic condition is suitable for growing of various fruits and vegetables ranging from temperate to tropical crops under rainfed condition. The state has an annual rainfall of 200 cms to 270 cms. With a temperate ranging from 4°C to 3°C. Since time immemorial our people have been growing Agricultural crops, besides some few Horticultural crops. But after seventies the people of our state came to know the value of Horticulture crops. Horticulture programme mainly deals with the cultivation of fruits and vegetables plantation crops etc. These crops are more beneficial not rationally as well as economically and faster upliftment of the society as a whole.

The Horticultural programme had been looked after by Agricultural Deptt. Till 1992. In this respect, just after bifurcation from Agri. Deptt, the Horticultural Deptt. have laid emphasis on the development of Horticultural crops in the state (i.e. in the beginning of 8th Plan) so that the state as a whole will prosper. This programme is both state plan and C.S.S. funded scheme

1.2. Objective of the Programme.

The main objective is to produce Horticultural crops sufficient in the state by initiating the interested farmers from different Village in limited numbers. With the development of Horticultural crops they become self sufficient economically and to provide the nutritional aspect as our people are generally dependent on meat, rice, and pulse which are no doubt rich minerals, proteins and fat but are lacking in essential Vitamins which will in the long-run help faster upliftment and healthier environment.

1.3. It's Strategy.

Under this scheme, the Deptt. is proposing to take up projects on compact area basis of not less than 10 Hac. First of all the Deptt. Verify the said project area of its location, suitability, soil condition, climatic, Water source, market facility willingness of the farmers and his surrounding. After detail reports submitted by the Deptt. Technician selection is done by the District Horticultural Officer in the District. The selected project were given planting materials and some nominal financial assistance to maintained the project at the rate of Rs. 1500/- per hac.

1.4 Objective of the Study:

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

- (a) To study its working and progress,
- (b) To study the impact and effectiveness of the delivery of adequacy of funds and supplies, and
- (c) To suggest for more effectiveness or improvement if any. 2 2.

1.5. SCOPE OF THE STUDY: -

Evaluation study on HDP is for the period of three years i.e. 1995- 96, 1996-97 and 1997-98. Out of 21 Villages covered in the District by the implementing Department, 12 Villages were selected randomly covering the whole ranges in the District.

1.6 LIMITATION: -

Evaluation study report on Horticulture Development programme could not be submitted in time due to delay co-operation by the implementing agency, moreover, inspite of our best effort Evaluation team could not traced out most of the beneficiaries as implementing Deptt. Itself failed to produced the actual identity of the beneficiaries.

CHAPTER II.

IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROGRAMME IN NAGALAND.

2.1. ORGANISATIONAL STRUCTURE.

The Horticulture Department is the sole implementing agency in the state on developmental project on fruit & Vegetable, plantation crops etc. The department is headed by a Director with the headquarter at Kohima assisted by two Joint Director, one Sr. Fruits Technological, four, Dy. Directors, one Horticultural officer and few other technical staffs besides most of ministerial staff headed by a Registrar.

The Department is extended functioning in all the 8(eight) Districts. District Officers are posted with minimum technical and ministerial staffs, but till now no Officers have been posted in sub-Division due to shortage of Officers in the Department.

TABLE NO. I

**PHYSICAL TARGET & ACHIEVEMENT DURING THE 8TH FIVE PLAN ft
NINTH PLAN OF 1997-98**

SI. No.	MAJOR HEAD/ MINOR HEAD OF DEV.	Nature & Location of the scheme	Comment Cement Year	Eight Plan 1992-97 outlay		Ninth Plan 1997-2002	Annual Kan 1997-98	
				5	6		8	9
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1	Director & Admn.	Kohima	1992	300.00	179.00		29.00	21.75/-
2	Sub-Estt.	8(Districts)	-do-	300.00	242.61		32.61	40.80/-
3	Hort, Dev	-do-	-do-	600.00	184.00		45.00	39.00/-
4	Dev. Of Nurseries/Orchard	-do-	-do-	80.00	55.31		9.08	8.50/-
5	Dev. Of Olericulture	-do-	-do-	60.00	18.00		3.00	X
6	Dev. Of Mushroom	2(district)	-do-	30.00	17.00		4.00	X
7	Home Scale, press & food nutrition	-do-	-do-	30.00	17.52		4.00	1.52/-
8	Dev. Of Floriculture	-do-	-do-	15.00	7.00		2.00	X
9	Fruit canning factory	1(district)	-do-	75.00	48.31		13.31	13.31/-
10	Hort.Extn Melas & Exhibition	-do-	-do-	40.00	8.00		4.00	X
11	Dev. Of coffee plantation	-do-	-do-	160.00	44.00		5.00	X
12	Dev. Of Cardaman	-do-	-do-	160.00	84.80		20.00	17.00/-
13	Dev. Spices	-do-	-do-	60.00	11.00		3.00	2.00/-
14	Dev. Of Aromatic Medicinal Plant	-do-	-do-	30.00	14.00		6.00	X
15	Hort. Research programme	-do-	-do-	50.00	13.00		6.00	6.00/-
16	Marketing support to Hort. Produ/PHM	-do-	-do-	3.00	1.00		1.00	X
17	Capital works	-do-	-do-	200.00	104.00		45.00	32.00/-
	Total	-do-	-do-	2173.00	1049.00		252.00	181.88

PHYSICAL TARGET & ACHIEVEMENT UNDER 8TH PLAN & NINTH PLAN OF 1997-98.

2.2 It may be seen at Table No. I and Col.No 5 & 6 that in the Eight plan ie., 1992-97 Physical target of Agreed out lay was 2178.00 but deptt.could actually made the expenditure less than 50%, Again, in the ninth plan, Agreed out lay was 3000.00 in col.no. 7 for 1997-2002 and an annual plan for 1997-98 in col.no. 8&9. Agreed out lay was 252.00 out of this deptt. Could make the expenditure 181.8, which is around 70%. This is an over all physical target & Achievement figure during 8* plan & initial year of ninth plan.

2.3. The development of Horticulture in the state proposal target and achievement during 8th plan and an annual plan 1997-98 may be at Table No.2 on next page:

TABLE NO.II.

PROPOSAL TARGET & ACHIEVEMENT.

SI. No.	Items	Eight Plan Target	1992-97 Achievement	Ninth Plan Target Target.	Annual Plan1 997-97	1997-98 Achievement.
1.	2	3	4	5	6	7
1.	Hort. Development	2600 ha	2000 ha	3000 ha	150 ha	150 ha
2.	Dev. of Nurseries/Orchard	50 ha	45 ha	60 ha	15 ha	15 ha
3.	Dev. of Olericulture	1760 ha	1760 ha	2500 ha	500 ha	500 ha
4.	Dev. of Mushroom	25,000 bottles of spawn	30,000 bottles of spawn	50,000 bottles of spawn	8000 bottles of spawn	7500 bottles of spawn
5.	Home scale pres & Food & Nutrition's	5000 trainees	5050 trained	6000 nos	500 trainees	625 trained.
6.	Dev. of Horticulture	50 ha	50 ha	50 ha	5ha	5 ha
7.	Fruit canning factory	250 Units	250 Units	500 Units	50 Units	75 Units
8.	Hort. Extn. Melas & Exhibition	45nos	32 nos	15 nos	8 nos	8 nos
9.	Dev. of Coffee Plantation	1500 ha	1500 ha	1500 ha	75 ha	75 ha
10.	Dev. of cardaman	2150 ha	2450 ha	3000 ha	200 ha	200 ha
11.	Dev. Spices	1650 ha	2000 ha	5000ha	250 ha	300 ha
12.	Dev. of Aromatic & Medicinal plants.	4nos	4 nos	8 nos	2 nos	2 nos.
13.	Hort. Research programme	45nos	45 nos	50 nos	5 nos	5 nos.
14.	Marketing support to Hort. product/PHM	1 nos	1 nos	7 nos	1 no.	! no.
15.	Capital works	160 Units	24 Units	12 Units	3 Units	3 Units

(Source: Dte. of Hort.)

2.4. The Department physical target achieved under. Area expansion in the state during 8th five year plan under both state plan and centrally sponsored scheme may be seen at Table No. 3.below: -

TABLE NO.III

PHYSICAL TARGET ACHIEVED UNDER AREA EXPANSION: -

SI. NO.	PARTICULARS	AREA IN <i>HACTARE</i>.
1	2	3
1.	Sub-Tropical fruits like Citms.Pineapple, Banana, Passion Fruits. Mango. Litchi.	3028 hac
2.	Temperate fruits like Plum, Peaches, Pears etc.	155 hac.
3.	Tropical fruits coconut, Arecanut, Cashaonut etc.	200 hac
4.	Cardaman	800 hac.
5.	Coffee	300 hac.
6.	Medicinal & Aromatic Plants	1580 hac
7	Spices & Condiments	1253 hac.
8.	Vegetables	1854 hac.
9.	Floriculture	134 hac.
	Total covered	9624 hac

(Source- Dte. of Horticulture)

2.5. The Total outlay for 8th plan i.e. 1992-97 for the Deptt. was Rs.1360.00 lakhs but the total expenditure sanction was only Rs.369.15I lakhs. Inspite of the best effort the Deptt. could not achieve its target both in area expansion as well as production level due to financial constraint. The deptt. has been trying its best to educate the farmers about the importance of Horticulture and encouraging them by way of supplying free planting materials and granting subsidy on compact area basis at the rate of Rs. 1500/- per hac.

2.6.The Department is functioning smoothly with minimum available Officers and staff but with the expansion of the Departmental activities and for proper implementation of the programme, the Department will require to create more Technical post to man at sub-Divisional level. The under mentioned Table No. 4 is the present Department progeny Orchard/Nurseries and farms in the state and at Table No. 5 below is the centrally sponsored scheme to the state.

TABLE NO.IV

DEPARTMENTAL FARMS/ ORCHARDS.

SL.No.	NAME OF FARM/ORCHARD	NAME OF LOCATION.
1.	2	3.
1.	Progeny Orchard	Longnak
2.	State Horticulture Nursery	Dimapur
3.	Progeny cum-research farm	Pfutsero
4.	Sangphur Farm	Tuensang
5.	Chontang Farm	Tuensang
6.	Mangakhi Farm	Iuensang
7.	Hamlu Orchard	Mon
8.	Tuli Farm	Mokokchung
9.	Coffee Demonstration Farm	Tisemyong
10.	Aghunato Farm	Zunheboto
11.	Atoizu Farm	Zunhcboto
12.	V.K Farm	Zunheboto
13.	Model Farm	Wokha
14.	Nursery Farm	Heninkunglwa
15.	Transit Nursery	Kohima.

(Source - Dte. Of Horticulture)

TABLE NO. V

CENTRALLY SPONSORED SCHEMES

Sl. No.	Name of Scheme	Pattern of funding		Eight Plan (1 992-97)			Ninth Plan 1997-2002			Annual Plan 1997-98	
		Central Share	State Share	Outlay Expenditure			Agreed Outlay			Provision The Annual Plan	Annual Expenditure
				C.S.	S.S	C.S	S.S	C.S	S.C.S		
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
1.	Dev. of Fruits	C.S	-	122.38	-	122.38	-	125.00	-	50.00	50.00
2.	Dev. of Spice	C.S.	-	44.53	-	44.53	-	300.00	-	14.84	14.84
3.	Use of plastic in agri.	C.S.	-	87.47	-	87.47	-	500.00	-	70.00	15.00
4.	Produ & Supply of Veggies., Seeds	C.S.	-	18.25	-	18.25	-	39.60	-	5.80	5.80
5.	Commercial Floriculture	C.S.	-	12.60	-	12.60	-	25.00	-	6.00	6.00
6.	Mushroom Cultivation	C.S.	-	76.50	-	76.50	-	310.00	-	13.10	-
7.	Bee-keeping	C.S.	-	-	-	-	-	78.00	-	5.90	2.40
Total			-	361.73)	-	-	2752.60	-	163.24		93.24

(Source: Dte. of Horticulture)

CHAPTER III

AN APPRASISAL OF THE H.D.P. IN WOLHA DISTRICT

TABLE VI

FUNCTIONING OF THE PROJECT

SL. No.	Name of the	Name of the Project	Year of Establishment			Total no. of Beneficiaries	Total no. of Actually Interviewed	Total no. of Non-Existence Non-Available
			995-96	996-97	1997-98			
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1.	Shakti	Citrus		21		21	5	16
2.	Vankhosung	Cardamom	3	-	-	3	2	1
3.	Koio	Cardamom/Passion Fruit/Pineapple	3	1	1	5	3	2
4.	Elumyo	Citrus	-	8	-	8	6	2
S.	Selukvu	Pineapple	-	-	1	1	1	-
6.	Phiro	Citrus	-	27	2	29	16	13
7.	Yikhum	Cardamom/Banana/Pineapple	77	-	2	79	79	-
8.	Hanku	Citrus	-	-	1	1	1	-
9.	Pongitong	Citrus	-	11	-	11	7	4
10.	Changsu	Banana	-	-	3	3		3
11.	Tsungiki	Citrus/Passion Fruits/Pineapple		12	2	14	5	9
12	Yankeli	Citrus	-	10	-	10	6	4
	Total	-	83	90	12	185	131	54

(Source; Dte. of Horticulture)

3.1. As shown above at Table No. VI the Deptt. has almost achieved the targeted figures. In 1995 to 1997 the Deptt. Could covered 21 Villages, with a minimum of 242 beneficiaries. Out of 21 Villages Evaluation team selected randomly 12 Villages to be covered bearing 185 beneficiaries leaving 57 beneficiaries for 9 Villages.

3.2. However, it is observed that the Deptt. Development/given grant-in aid to the fanners are seems to be partialled, or some VTP /intellectual class/influential persons were seems to be interfered in the programme or whether the implementing Deptt. Failed to educate the poor farmers as per their strategy as shown in Col.No.5 & 9 were benefited single out where as particular like Yimkhum Village in Col.No 7 were benefited more than 40% of the 185 beneficiaries. This shows very bad impression to the general public.

3.3.It may be seen from the above Table No.IV that out of 185 beneficiaries 131 beneficiaries could actually interviewed at the time of Evaluation team visit and out of 54 beneficiaries in Col.No 9 10% are found to be non-existence in the locality. Moreover, it is reported that three projects from different Villages/area had drawn the given subsidy amount without any spot. It is also reported that there are some duplication projects in the Villages.

3.4.As indicated above at Table No. VI Sl.No. 10,3(three) beneficiaries were benefited but reported to be non-existence of both persons and spot and also at Sl.No 12. Four (4) beneficiaries were benefited but reported to be non-existence in the locality and spot less, this shows that the implementing deptt. Is granting financial assistance without any spot verification.

TABLE VII
PROJECT AREA IN HAC.

l. No.	Name of the Village	No. of Respondent	No. of Persons Reported Having Less than 1 hac	No. of Person Reported Having 1-3-tac.	No. of Person Reported Having 3-5-hac.	No. of Persons Reported Having 5&abovehac.
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1.	Shaki	5	1	4	-	-
2.	Vankhosung	2	-	1	1	-
3.	Koio	3	-	2	1	-
4	Elumyo	6	-	6	-	-
5.	Selukvu	1	-	1	-	-
6	Phiro	16	-	16	-	-
7.	Yikhum	79	CAB	-	-	-
8,	Hanku	1	-	-	-	1
9	Pongitong	7	-	7	-	-
!0.	Changsu	-	-	-	-	-
11	Tsungiki	5	-	5	-	-
12	Yankeii	6	-	5	-	-
	Total	131	2	49	2	1

(Source: Field Investigation)

3.5. It is observed that in all the projects, the climatic condition is quite favorable but lack of maintenance is another causes of failure.

As indicated above at Table No. VII that almost all the beneficiaries are well developed the project and it is observed that all the projects areas are much bigger in size than the official recorded.

3.6. As mentioned under the Table No. VIII financial assistance figure receipt by the Beneficiaries could not be given in the report. However, it is reflected the percentages comparison to the Official record and physical data receipt from the actual beneficiaries.

As the time of Evaluation team visit more than 84% reported receipt in full 8% reported receipt but not in full and 8% reported applied but not receipt. However, it is found that 10% were benefited triple amount than they are to get, 20% were benefited double amount and 56% were benefited less amount, moreover, 14% reported to be received by unknown persons who is having spotless.

TABLE NO. VIII.
FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE.

Sl. No.	Name of the Village	No. of Respondents	No. of Persons Reported Receipt in full	No. of Persons Reported Receipt in full	No. of Person Reported Applied But not in full	No. of Person Reported Non-Existence	Remark
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1.	Shaki	5	2	3	-		
2.	Vankhosung	2	1	1	-	-	
3.	Koio	3	3	-	-	-	
4.	Elumyo	6	6	-	-	-	Col. 6 & 7
5.	Selukvu	1	1	-	-	-	Were drawn
6.	Phiro	16	11	5	-	-	By unknown person
7.	Yikum	79	79	-	-	-	
8.	Hanku	1	1	-	-	~	
9.	Pongitong	7	7	-	-	-	
10.	Changsu old/new	-	-	-	-	3	
11.	Tsungiki	5	2	-	3	-	
12.	Yankeli	6	-	-	6	4	
	Total	131	113	9	9	7	

(Source: Field Investigation).

**TABLE NO. IX
KNOWLEDGE ABOUT TRAINING FACILITY**

SI. No.	Name of the Village	No. of Respondent	No. of Persons Reported Knowledge about	No. of Persons Reported unknown Training facility	No. of Person Reported Need Training	No. of Person Reported Need Not Required Training.
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1.	Shaki	5	-	5	3	2
2.	Vankhosung	2	-	2	2	
3.	Koio	3	-	3	2	1
4.	Elumyo	6	-	6	4	2
5.	Selukvu	1	-	1	1	-
6.	Phiro	16	-	16	14	2
7.	Yikum	79	-	79	74	5
8.	Hanku	1	-	1	1	-
J.	Pongitong	7	-	7.	6	1
10.	Changsu old	-	-	-	-	-
11.	Tsungiki	5	-	5	5	-
12.	Yankeli	6	-	6	-	6
	Total	131	X	131	112	19

(Source : Field Investigation).

3.7. as indicated above at table No. IX Col.No. 6.90% farmer are needed training and proper guidance to maintained the crops properly, But unfortunately, no training has been conducted by the implementing Deptt. Till today in the District as shown in Col No.4

3.8. As shown under the table No.x Official visiting/spot verification for taking up the project report etc. Were initiated 50% Village and 50% were totally neglected.

3.9. Evaluation team observed that Official visiting/spot verification to the project by the implementing Agency is very is much encouraged to the farmer, so, the implementing agency is requested to extend co-operation to the poor farmers.

CHAPTER IV.

BENEFICIARIES VIEWS & COMMENTS.

4.1. Technical training and guidance to the farmers for improvement and proper knowledge of the project is required.

4.2. If Govt, could provide more assistance i.e. loan with subsidy the project could improved to some further extend.

4.3. Horticultural Development programme should be well publicised/ to educate all the villages so as to minimised the misconduct/mismanagement of the fund allotted by the Government.

CHAPTER V

MAIN FINDING & SUGGESTION.

5.1. Full particulars of the beneficiaries and grant-in-aid provided by Govt, of Nagaland did not furnished detailed by the implementing Deptt. to the DEO (Evl.) Wokha on Horticultural Development Programme in Wokha District for data collection.

Half-information is something like a halfway. These, We, Evaluation team could detected while compiling the field information with the given official records. This kind of false information to the Govt, agency is not acceptable by the Evaluation team. Therefore, Govt, of Nagaland may please be taken necessary action to the concerned Deptt. So as not repeat in future

5.2. Evaluation teams observed that Horticulture Deptt. is very beneficial department, if it can be implemented properly according to the programme, it will have tremendous impact on the live of farmers in particular and public in general as a whole, unfortunately HDP could not properly publicised in the District level. Moreover Evaluation team observed that in many cases influential persons/V.I.P.'S were found to interfered in the programme. It is therefore, suggested that the concerned department should publicised the programme in time to the general public farmers for further development, so that all the interested fanners could take part in the programme.

5.3. As reported by the beneficiaries so far no training has been imparted in the Dist by the concerned Deptt. The Evaluation team strongly felt that technical training/guidance should be given to the fanners time for proper knowledge to maintain the project as provided in the programme.

5.4. Implementing Agency's Official visiting/spot verification etc. were seems to be neglected as per Evaluation teams observation and information receipt. Therefore most of the project report was done on Official table on without the verification. The Evaluation team felt that Official visiting/ spot verification to the project area, by the implementing agency is very much encouraged to the farmers So, We suggested that the implementing Deptt. To extend more Cooperation to the farmers and should be done everything with the spot verification report.

Lastly, The Evaluation team observed that the present selection is not satisfactory as most of the needy farmers were dropped out in the selection and factious name spot less projects are always visible in the selection list. So, Evaluation team suggested that if selection is done through the V.D.B's recommendation then only the needy farmers could take part in the Development programme.