

Terms of Reference for the Evaluation of Fodder Development Programme Implemented under SDP of Department of Animal Husbandry and Veterinary Services, Government of Karnataka from 2009-10 to 2012-13.

1. Title of the study:

The study is titled “*Evaluation of Fodder Development Programme Implemented under SDP of Department of Animal Husbandry and Veterinary Services, Govt. of Karnataka from 2009-10 to 2012-13*”

2. Background:

Cattle remain an important part of rural economy. Their health depends upon the availability and quality of fodder all the year round. Generally, grazing cattle depend upon available grass in the *gomala lands* belonging to the Government and agricultural crop residues. But, due to the shrinking extent and carrying capacity of *gomala* lands and also due to frequent occurrence of natural calamities like drought and floods, fodder production is gaining importance in the State of Karnataka. Fodder, in particular green fodder, remains a seasonally scarce commodity. To mitigate the shortage of availability of green fodder, Minikits distribution under State Disaster Relief Fund for fodder production was under taken. In the State livestock farms, fodder production and training to farmers is being undertaken with the assistance of Government of India and Calamity Relief funds. Therefore, in addition to these programmes, the Special Development Programme (SDP) has been implemented under the State sector for fodder development in all the 114 backward taluks in 27 districts of the State.

3. Objectives of the scheme:

- a) To gradually decrease the gap of the deficit of green fodder against the requirement and creating awareness amongst farmers regarding growing of different varieties of fodder crops.
- b) By giving good green fodder, the quantity of concentrate feed requirement is to be reduced which results in lesser expenses to farmers.
- c) To mitigate the scarcity of fodder due to rain and crop failures in drought situation.

d) By promoting perennial grasses, soil erosion is prevented, soil fertility is increased and the practice is eco-friendly.

4. Implementation of the Scheme:

Before selection of beneficiaries, the following details and documents are obtained about and from farmers-

1. Details of animals, particulars of lands and survey number (through RTC) available with the farmer for growing fodder, particulars of irrigation facilities etc.
2. Caste certificate.
3. Details of land holdings (small/marginal farmers).

Implementing officers advertise about the scheme at *hoblil* level and send the list of beneficiary farmers to Assistant Director of Animal Husbandry and Vet services in the taluks. The Assistant Directors in turn scrutinise the applications and send it to the Deputy Directors of Animal Husbandry and Vet services of the district. The Deputy Directors send these applications for sanction to the head office.

When sanctioned, beneficiary farmers are provided with assistance for raising fodder plots.

The area of a fodder plot is 10 guntas (0.1 hectare or 1000 square mts.) The total cost of this plot is Rs. 6000, of which Rs. 3000 is the contribution of the farmers for ploughing of land and cost of fertilizer/organic manure and other works. The cost of providing roots of grass [2000 Napier (*Pennisetumpurpleum*)/Guinea (*Megathyrusmaximus*)/Rhodes (*Chlorisgayana*) roots for a plot] and its transportation cost is borne by the State Government.

During the year 2011-12 and 2012-13 the beneficiaries have been provided hand driven chaff cutters as well as power operated chaff cutters. The cost of hand driven chaff cutter is Rs. 7500 (Rs. 3750 is the subsidy), and the cost of 2HP motor driven cutter is Rs. 20000 (Rs.9500 is the subsidy)

5. Monitoring of the Scheme:

As per the guidelines of the Scheme, it is monitored by the Deputy Directors of Animal Husbandry and Vet services at district level and by the Assistant Directors of Animal Husbandry and Vet services at the taluk level. The

Commissioner, Animal Husbandry and Veterinary Services and Secretary, A&VH Departments also review the financial and physical progress every month in the MPIC meetings. The particulars and relevant records are being maintained at taluk level by the Assistant Directors of Animal Husbandry and Vet services.

6. Evaluation Scope and Purpose:

The scheme was implemented in the 114 backward taluks in 27 districts (All except the districts of Dakshina Kannada, Kodagu and Udupi) identified by Nanjundappa Committee. This scheme was implemented through Animal Husbandry Department especially through cattle owners who had irrigation facility. The purpose of evaluation is to know whether the objectives set under scheme are fulfilled or not, and to get feedback from farmers on awareness, benefits, economic improvement of farmers and loopholes in implementation of the scheme.

7. Financial and Physical Progress of the scheme from 2009-10 to 2012-13:

Sl.no.	Year	Budget (Rs. Lakhs)	Amount released (Rs. Lakhs)	Amount utilized (Rs. Lakhs)	Achievements		
					Area (hectares)	Beneficiaries	Fodder yield (tonnes)
1	2009-10	114	114	114	285	2850	51300
2	2010-11	225	224.99	224.99	750	7462	67500
3	2011-12	390	389.73	389.73	320	3209 *	28800
4	2012-13	300	300	291.81	390	3993 @	35000

** In addition to fodder plots distribution of hand driven chaff cutters as well as power operated chaff cutter was also done for 5990 beneficiaries.*

@. In additions to fodder plots distribution of hand driven chaff cutters as well as power operated chaff cutter was also done for 1803 beneficiaries.

8. Evaluation Questions (inclusive not exhaustive):

1. What is the estimated total fodder requirement/demand of the State
2. What has been the grass species wise yield obtained by beneficiary farmers in each of the taluks where the scheme is implemented? How does this compare with the projected yields?

3. Based upon the figures of the previous question, whether it is possible to suggest the species that ought to be popularized in each district/taluk? What would these be?
4. What is the level of awareness of farmers about the scheme?
5. What is procedure and criteria followed in selecting beneficiaries under the programme? In selection of beneficiaries, what is the land size wise (marginal, small, medium, big) and social representation of farmers? What is the representation of women amongst them? What is the social and land holding wise representation of beneficiaries selected?
6. What proportion of the beneficiaries grew fodder for their own use and what proportion for own use as well as for sale?
7. Whether the beneficiary farmer has the same extent and unit of fodder plot today as was established under the Scheme, or has extended the area under the cultivation of fodder decreased or become nil? What are the reasons for the downward change, where it occurs?
8. What is the perceived impact the Scheme has made on the economy of the farmers and health of the livestock of the beneficiary farmer?
9. What are the other schemes that provide fodder plots? Where does this programme stand in intensity and coverage as compared to those other schemes?
10. Whether the post-harvest technology has made any difference on the farmers as it supposedly reduces the wastage of fodder?
11. Whether the scheme has inspired other farmers in taking up fodder cultivation? [to be measured as the number of farmers resorting to growing fodder on their lands **without any subsidy** after the sanction of fodder plots in the village under this Scheme (reduced to new farmers per fodder plot sanctioned)].
12. What is the condition and actual use of chaff cutters given to beneficiary farmers under the scheme? Have chaff cutters really reduced the wastage of fodder?
13. Which chaff cutter is more desirable by the beneficiary farmer; the hand driven one or power driven one? Why?
14. Are the chaff cutters being used only by the beneficiary farmers, or has lending of the cutters or cooperative/ joint cutting of fodder resorted to?
15. Whether the farmers are adopting fodder enrichment and preservation methods?
16. Whether the beneficiary farmer is satisfied with the scheme?

17. What is the opinion of the farmer/beneficiary about implementation and benefits of the scheme that is fodder as well as chaff cutters?
18. Are there any good success stories or unique examples worth dissemination and emulation? If yes, they may please be documented.
19. Should the programme be continued? If yes, what are the suggestions for modifications?

9. Sampling and Evaluation Methodology:

The population to be studied involves fodder plots and farmer beneficiaries. In the former, diversity (heterogeneity) is expected due to agro-climatic conditions; source of irrigation and edaphic factors, but these will largely be homogenous within a taluk. In case of farmer beneficiaries, heterogeneity is expected on the size of land holdings and social class; though the region (old Mysore, Bombay Presidency, and Nizam's Hyderabad etc.) is expected to provide some heterogeneity. In case of chaff cutters, the scheme is too new and population for the use can be taken as homogenous.

The indication this analysis of heterogeneity provides for sampling is that-

- The sampling has to be such that agro climatic zones and historical regions are adequately represented.
- The sampling intensity may be kept more in selection of agro climatic zones, but within the same zone/district, selecting about 30 beneficiary farmers would suffice for evaluation of the scheme of one year.
- The sampling intensity of beneficiary farmers who have received chaff cutter can be very small.

In view of these, the sample is selected as follows-

FOR EVALUATING FODDER PLOTS AND CHAFF CUTTERS

Sl. no	Year	Taluk Selected					
1	2009-10	Kudlagi	Sindhur	Hukkeri	Kalghatagi	Malur	Sira
2	2010-11	Humnabad	Gangawati	Indi	Ron	Chalkere	Gundulpet
3	2011-12	Shahpur	Devdurga	Badami	Byadagi	Jagalur	Tarikere
4	2012-13	Aland	Sedam	Bilagi	Bhatkal	Gudibande	H D Kote

For fodder plots of 2009-10 to 2012-13, at least 30 beneficiary farmers may be randomly selected from each taluk such that they represent at least two villages for each year i.e. There will be at least two villages per taluk selected for 2009-10, and these will be different from the two villages selected in that taluk for 2010-11, and so on.

For chaff cutters given to 2012-13 and 2013-14, a sample of 15 beneficiary farmers may be selected in any one or more than one village, for each of the years in each taluk, and it is not mandatory that the villages for 2012-13 and 2013-14 be different. However, the beneficiaries for fodder plots and chaff cutters should be different.

The evaluation methodology will be individual interviews and Focused Group Discussion(FGD) with beneficiary farmers and officers of the implementing department and inspection of fodder plots (their photographs should necessarily be taken and some of these made a part of the report. In case of answering questions 1 to 4 and 6, sampling will not be needed.

10. Qualifications of the consultants and method of selection:

Consultant Evaluation Organizations should have and provide details of evaluation team members having minimum technical qualifications/capability as below-

- i. Graduate in Agriculture/Forestry/ Veterinary Science with at least 5 years field experience.
- ii. Sociologist, and,
- iii. Research Assistant/Statistician.

Consultant Evaluation Organizations not having these kind of personnel will not be considered as competent for evaluation.

11. Deliverables and time schedule:

The Director, Animal Husbandry Department will provide the guidelines of the scheme and details on process of sanctions etc. which are available at the head office level and issue necessary instructions to the concerned district officers to provide the details required to the consultant organisation and co-operate in completion of the study in the stipulated time. It is expected to complete the study in 5months' time, excluding the time taken for approval. The evaluating agency is expected to adhere to the following timelines and deliverables.

The Consultant Evaluation Organization should complete the study in 5 months' time, excluding the time taken for approval. They are expected to adhere to the following timelines and deliverables or be quicker than the follows.

- a. Work plan submission : One month after signing the agreement.
- b. Field Data Collection : Two months from date of Work Plan Approval.
- c. Draft report Submission : One month after field data collection.
- d. Final Report Submission : One month from draft report approval.
- e. Total duration : 5 months.

12. Qualities Expected from the Evaluation Report:

The following are the points, only inclusive and not exhaustive, which need to be mandatorily followed in the preparation of evaluation report:-

1. By the very look of the evaluation report it should be evident that the study is that of the Karnataka Evaluation Authority (KEA) which has been done by the Consultant. It should not intend to convey that the study was the initiative and work of the Consultant, merely financed by the Government of Karnataka.
2. The Terms of Reference (ToR) of the study should form the first Appendix or Addenda of the report.
3. The results should first correspond to the ToR. In the results chapter, each question of the ToR should be answered. It is only after all questions framed in the ToR are answered, that results over and above these can be detailed.
4. In the matter of recommendations, the number of recommendations is no measure of the quality of evaluation. Evaluation has to be done with a purpose to be practicable to implement the recommendations. It is desirable to make recommendations in the report as follows:-
 - (A) **Short Term practicable recommendations**

These may not be more than five in number. These should be such that they can be acted upon without major policy changes and expenditure, and within (say) a year or so.

(B) **Long Term practicable recommendations**

These may not be more than ten in number. These should be such that they can be implemented in the next four to five financial years, or with sizeable expenditure, or both but does not involve policy changes.

(C) **Recommendations requiring change in policy**

These are those which will need a lot of time, resources and procedure to implement.

13. Cost and schedule of budget releases:

Output based budget release will be as follows-

- a. The **first instalment** of Consultation fee amounting to 30% of the total fee shall be payable as advance to the Consultant after the approval of the inception report, but only on execution of a bank guarantee of a scheduled nationalized bank, valid for a period of at least 12 months from the date of issuance of advance.
- b. The **second instalment** of Consultation fee amounting to 50% of the total fee shall be payable to the Consultant after the approval of the Draft report.
- c. The **third and final instalment** of Consultation fee amounting to 20% of the total fee shall be payable to the Consultant after the receipt of the hard and soft copies of the final report in such format and number as prescribed in the agreement, along with all original documents containing primary and secondary data, processed data outputs, study report and soft copies of all literature used in the final report.

Taxes will be deducted from each payment, as per rates in force. In addition, the evaluating agency/consultant is expected to pay service tax at their end.

14. Selection of Consultant Agency for Evaluation:

The selection of evaluation agency should be finalized as per provisions of KTEPP Act and rules without compromising on the quality.

15. Contact person for further details:

Dr.D.M.Dass, Director of Animal Husbandry and Veterinary Sciences,Ph: 22866431, Dr.T.S.Manju, Joint Director (Farm),Ph no. 22860873, Mobile no. 9448526329,Office of the Commissioner, Animal Husbandry and Veterinary Services Department 2nd Floor, Mini Tower, will be the contact persons for giving information and details for this study.

The entire process of evaluation shall be subject to and conform to the letter and spirit of the contents of the Government of Karnataka Order no. PD/8/EVN (2)/2011 dated 11th July 2011 and orders made there under.

The Terms of Reference were approved by the Technical Committee of KEA in its 18th Meeting held on 04th May 2015.

Chief Evaluation Officer
Karnataka Evaluation Authority