

Terms of Reference for the study
'Evaluation of National Horticulture Mission in Karnataka from 2015-16 to 2018-19'

1. Title of the study

Evaluation of National Horticulture Mission in Karnataka from 2015-16 to 2018-19

2. Department implementing National Horticulture Mission

Department of Horticulture, Government of Karnataka

3. Background and the context

National Horticulture Mission (NHM) is a sub-scheme of Mission for Integrated Development of Horticulture (MIDH) which was launched as centrally sponsored scheme since 2014. NHM scheme is being implemented in all the districts of the State, including Yadgir, a newly created district. It primarily aimed at holistic growth of horticulture sector through an area based regionally differentiated strategies. Karnataka state is one among the 18 NHM implemented states. The NHM was implemented in 18 states of the country. The Government of India (GOI) contributes 60% of total outlay for developmental programmes in all the States and 40% share is contributed by the respective State Governments.

The main objectives of NHM are as follows:

- Promote holistic growth of horticulture sector, including bamboo and coconut through area based regionally differentiated strategies, which includes research, technology promotion, extension, post-harvest management, processing and marketing, in consonance with comparative advantage of each State/region and its diverse agro-climatic features.
- Encourage aggregation of farmers into farmer groups like FIGs/FPOs and FPCs to bring economies of scale and scope.
- Enhance horticulture production, augment farmers, income and strengthen nutritional security.
- Improve productivity by way of quality germplasm, planting material and water use efficiency through micro irrigation.
- Support skill development and create employment generation opportunities for rural youth in horticulture and post-harvest management, especially in the cold chain sector.

Broad strategies adopted to achieve the objectives of NHM were:

- Adopt an end-to-end holistic approach covering production, post-harvest management, processing and marketing to assure appropriate returns to growers/producers.
- Promote R&D technologies for production, post-harvest management and processing.
- Enhance acreage, coverage, and productivity through-
 - Diversification, from traditional crops to plantations, orchards, vineyards, flower and vegetable gardens.
 - Extension of appropriate technology to farmers for high-tech horticulture cultivation and precision farming.
- Improve post-harvest management, processing for value addition and marketing infrastructure.
- Adopt a coordinated approach and promote partnership, convergence and synergy among R&D, processing and marketing agencies in public as well as private sectors, at state and sub-state levels.
- Promote FPOs and their tie up with Market Aggregators (MAs) and Financial Institutions (FIs) to support and adequate returns to farmers.
- Supporting capacity-building and Human Resource Development at all levels.

Mode of Implementation of NHM Scheme

The National Horticulture Mission scheme is being implemented in Karnataka as per the guidelines¹ and cost norms² of MIDH and as per the Annual budgetary provision. At the State level, Committee headed by the Hon'ble Horticulture Minister discuss and finalise the Annual Action Plan and budgetary allocation. At district level the District Monitoring Committee headed by Chief Executive Officer (CEO), Zilla Panchayath with finalise implementation of the scheme.

The Mission Director and the Executive Director supervise the implementation of NHM programmes while at district level, the Deputy Director of Horticulture and Taluka Officers will implement the scheme with the due publicity. The eligible beneficiary will implement the programme as per the specifications and the eligible subsidy released to the beneficiary account after verifying the completion certificate given by competent officers.

¹ [https://midh.gov.in/PDF/midh\(English\).pdf](https://midh.gov.in/PDF/midh(English).pdf) - MIDH guidelines

² <https://midh.gov.in/PDF/Annexure-V.pdf> - MIDH cost norms

Components covered and the expenditure

During the period of four years under NHM programme in Karnataka (2015-16 to 2017-18), 203433 beneficiaries have availed benefit with a total expenditure of Rs. 52208.3 lakhs.

Component-wise beneficiaries for the evaluation period (2015-16 to 2017-18) is given below:

Component/Intervention	Number	Expenditure in Rs. Lakh
1. Research and Development	0	0.0
2. Production and Productivity Improvement	6	250.8
3. Production and Distribution of Planting Material	222	538.7
4. Establishment of New Gardens	37708	5052.7
5. Mushroom Production	12	115.5
6. Rejuvenation & Replanting of senile plantation	12016	1129.7
7. Creation of Water resources	3501	5053.3
8. Protected Cultivation	12924	14000.1
10. INM/IPM	89889	1447.1
11. Organic Farming	3026	494.0
12. GAP	0	0.0
13. Centre of Excellence for Horticulture	10	1336.4
14. HRD in Horticulture	28422	433.4
15. Beekeeping	4993	294.9
16. Horticulture Mechanisation	2950	1929.7
17. Technology dissemination through demonstration	21	105.0
18. IPHM	6884	15811.3
19. Cold Chain Infrastructure	0	0.0
20. Creation of Market Infrastructure	849	460.9
21. Processing & Value Addition	0	0.0
Maintenance	24154	1388.7
Mission Management	-	2366.1
Total	203433	52208.3

Note: Number of beneficiaries under maintenance was not considered while totalling physical achievement as it related to establishment of new gardens.

4. Evaluation Scope and Objective

The main objective of the Socio-Economic Impact Evaluation is to examine the extent to which the NHM has actually met the desired objectives of each of the component that were implemented.

The study covers the time period from 2015-16 to 2018-19. The main thrust of the study shall be on the 'output, outcome and impact' of the NHM scheme at beneficiary and state level.

Specific objectives of the evaluation are to analyse:

- Implementation process to determine how successfully the NHM interventions followed the log frame (input- output-outcome-impact)
- District-wise analysis of components/activities
- To examine the extent to which the components and activities under NHM have met or are meeting their stated targets for expansion of area, increasing employment, improving agricultural productivity, production, income of the farmers and nutritional security taking in the following aspects,
 - Efficiency and effectiveness of NHM interventions across agro-climatic zones in terms of input use, production and productivity
 - Reduction in post-harvest losses and input and output prices
 - Employment generation
- Cost-benefit analysis of major investment activities like Post harvest management, nurseries, protected cultivation
- Demand and supply analysis of various interventions/components including the budget requirements for the next five years
- Strengths and weakness of various interventions
- Suggestions for new interventions or modification of existing interventions with physical and financial aspects across agro-climatic zones
- Intended and actual convergence of the NHM to other developmental programmes of the Central and the State Governments
- Examining the end-to-end holistic approach covering production, post-harvest management, processing and marketing to assure appropriate returns to growers/producers.
- Road map for meeting the SDG 2 on "End Hunger"

The Impact analysis of NHM programme should be helpful to the implementing agencies / departments to take corrective measures for improving the efficacy of the National Horticulture Mission. Further the study should immensely be useful not only for NHM of Karnataka, but also for DAC & FW to fine-tune the terms and conditions to make MIDH programme more effective in all respects to achieve the stated outputs and outcomes. This will aid the policy makers to roll-out future developmental programmes with lesser defects.

The following issues need to be factored into the objectives of the study:

- Procedure for identification of beneficiaries
- Socio-economic characteristics of beneficiaries like social category, occupation, income level, education level, etc.
- Operational holdings of the beneficiaries, status of irrigation and cropping pattern
- Area cultivated under horticultural crops, production realised and productivity level achieved
- Estimate the gap between the potential area to be covered based on the cropping pattern and resource availability including the budgetary requirements
- Soil health practice and soil test
- Farmers opinion on quality of services and inputs provided by service providers and department
- Investment made by the farmers (own and credit) and the subsidy received
- Net income earned on account of NHM assistance
- Extent of employment opportunities provided to farming personnel
- Generation of self-employment through skilled manpower
- Assessment of unintended positive impacts, extraordinary accomplishments and other replicable possibilities in other potential area
- Gap analysis on utility and coverage of investments and providing suitable recommendations
- Marketed and Marketable surplus including details on own consumption and to whom the produce was sold including export potential.
- Quantification of crop diversity and extent of convergence of components and programmes
- Assessment of comparative advantage of core components in each district and regions to propose reforms
- Participation in capacity building activities - adoption and its impacts
- Review and diagnosis of technical constraints in the implementation of programme and components
- Assessment of demand driven production vis-à-vis technology driven production in key production, protection, PHM and marketing components
- Level of satisfaction/usefulness with reasons

- Conduct of case study analysis to identify good adoption practices for future implementation needs
- Assessing component impacts across districts in formulating recommendations in line with state/national policies and priorities
- All the above aspects should be analysed individually for each of the components that were included under NHM scheme. Within every component, the analysis should consider the specific characteristics of every component using suitable KPIs. Finally, the study should also include way forward and on continuance of the schemes with proper justification.

Component-wise impact indicators of major interventions to be considered (note that this list is not exhaustive) is as under:

- **Area Expansion:** Area Coverage under Different Crop Categories; Survival Rate and Reasons for low survival; Sources and quality of planting material; Productivity; Integration with other components; Opinion on Coverage of additional crops; In case of new area, road connectivity facility availability
- **Rejuvenation:** Area covered under rejuvenation and type of land considered for rejuvenation; Survival Rate and Reasons for low survival; Sources and quality of planting material; Productivity; Net income; Integration with other components; Reasons for plant loss in old (senile) plantations; Beneficiaries who have carried out rejuvenation
- **Protected Cultivation:** Distribution of Protected Cultivation Structures; Area under Protected cultivation structures; Crop-wise Total Area; Sources and Quality of Planting Material; Productivity; Net Income
- **Nurseries:** Type of nurseries established; Area covered; Demand, Production of planting materials; Employment generation, Net Income; Accreditation of nurseries; Water use efficiency in the nursery
- **Promotion of IPM and INM:** Area covered under IPM/INM; Beneficiaries opinion on Quality of material supplied; Plant survival, yield and Productivity; Net income
- **Pollination support through Bee keeping:** Beneficiaries' Perspective; Cost and Subsidy; Type of bee introduce, Production and Net Income; Opinion on increase in crop production due to beekeeping
- **Creation of Water Resources:** Irrigated Area; Type of water lifting device used; Crops and returns under water resource interventions; Usefulness of water resource interventions; Water use efficiency through micro irrigation
- **Horticulture Mechanisation:** Mechanization Types; Current status of equipment; Performance of the equipment; Usage of implements; Income from hiring out of implements

- **Integrated Post-Harvest Management:** Major Interventions under the component; Type of beneficiaries under PHM- individual and group; Storage Capacity; Capacity Utilization Business Models; Reduction in Post-Harvest Losses, Net Annual Income; Level of group Participation
- **Creation of Market Infrastructure:** Volume handled and Net Income; Status of Market Infrastructure and their Utility; Number of FIGs, FPOs and FPOs business models, FPOs Turnover

Other Components

- Other components include adoption of organic farming, mushroom/ Spawn production units and its production capacity, market demand, training of farmers, certification, innovative, IPM infrastructure, mushroom, certificate of excellence, FLD, Mission management, seminar/workshops, tissue culture units, vegetable seed production, vermicomposting units, seed infrastructure

5. Sampling and Evaluation methodology

Analysis of secondary data

- Data of 2005-06 to 2013-14 & 2014-15 to 2018-19 to compared to know the impact
- Average Annual Growth Rate (AAGR) of key indicators such as productivity and area under horticultural crops.
- Changes with respect to total production and gross value of horticultural crops before and after implementation of NHM would be compared.
- Proportion of area under horticultural crops to the total cropped area would also be an important key factor that needs consideration for assessing the impact of NHM and HMNEH programme.
- Rationale for fund allocation, release and efficiency of fund utilisation should be looked into understand the fund related issues of NHM programme.
- Physical and financial information during different years of NHM implementation

All these indicators should be analysed at taluk and district level.

Analysis of primary data from beneficiaries

The sampling methodology for farm household survey should be designed in such a way that the field survey would spread over geographic sub-areas, population sub-groups and social groups (SC and ST). The primary data from 4816 beneficiaries shall be collected using multi-stage stratified random sampling as given in the Table 1 below.

In the first stage, one district having highest number of beneficiaries from each of the agro-climatic zone shall be selected totalling to 10 districts covering 4814 beneficiaries. Beneficiaries under Technology dissemination through demonstration have not been figured in the sample districts and hence Bangalore Rural was selected to cover that component only. Thus, all the components of NHM implemented in Karnataka are covered. Centre of excellence of Bagalkot and Kolar should be considered in the sample.

By following this procedure, the total sample beneficiaries would become 4816 which forms around 2.4% of the total beneficiaries/ population (i.e 203433). The total sample is estimated at 99% confidence level and 0.018 margin of error. In addition to sample beneficiaries, special care should be taken to select the comparable representative control sample of 10% of the sample beneficiaries (i.e 482) across components/activities in order to estimate the impact.

ECO should use mobile-based, near real-time and geo-tagged data collection and validation tools should be done to ensure efficiency and accuracy in data collection.

Estimation of Impact: (i) Before receipt of the benefit VS After receipt of the benefit in the case of beneficiaries; (ii) With benefit (Beneficiaries) VS Without Benefit (control households). Results should be presented district-wise by type of components, farm categories and Social group (SC/ST/Others). Consultants should propose the statistically accepted methodology or improvements to the suggested methodology to realise the larger goals of the evaluation study.

Table 1: Distribution of beneficiaries: 2015-16 to 2018-19

District	Davanager	Dakshina	Kolar	Shivamogga	Vijavapura	Kalburg	Bidar	Dhenwa	Mandya	Hasan	Bangalore	Begaluru	Total
	CDZ	CZ	EDZ	HZ	NDZ	NEDZ	NETZ	NTZ	SDZ	STZ	Rural	EDZ	NDZ
Individual Beneficiaries													
1. Establishment of New Gardens	48	91	73	92	50	69	38	57	33	98	0	0	649
2. Rejuvenation & Replanting of senile plantation	5	23	68	14	121	0	1	0	1	90	0	0	323
3. Creation of Water resources	15	2	5	4	31	10	3	7	4	4	0	0	85
4. Protected Cultivation	9	0	113	14	14	45	15	4	26	48	0	0	286
5. INM/IPM	559	236	92	873	12	30	15	28	202	309	0	0	2356
6. Organic Farming	2	70	1	2	2	2	2	1	3	2	0	0	87
7. HRD in Horticulture	42	29	55	224	16	81	25	50	58	42	0	0	622
8. Beekeeping	0	81	0	45	0	0	0	0	6	5	0	0	137
9. Horticulture Mechanisation	2	4	5	6	28	3	3	4	10	5	0	0	70
10. Technology dissemination through demonstration	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Total	682	536	412	1274	274	240	102	151	343	603	1	0	4518
Infrastructure & Asset Beneficiaries													
11. Production and Productivity Improvement	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
12. Production and Distribution of Planting Material	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	5
13. Mushroom Production	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
14. Centre of Excellence for Horticulture	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2
15. IPHM	26	0	7	9	59	15	7	6	22	6	0	0	157
16. Creation of Market Infrastructure	17	0	0	5	0	0	1	4	4	0	0	0	31
Total	44	0	9	15	59	15	9	14	26	6	0	1	198
Total	726	536	421	1289	333	255	111	165	369	609	1	1	4816

Note: CDZ-Central Dry Zone; CZ-Central Zone; EDZ-Eastern Dry Zone; HZ-Hilly Zone; NDZ-Northern Dry Zone; NEDZ-North Eastern Dry Zone; NETZ-North Eastern Transition Zone; NTZ-Northern Transition Zone; SDZ-Southern Dry Zone; STZ -Southern Transition Zone; Taluks falling under respective zone shall be selected; **Primary data from farmer beneficiaries of Infrastructure & Assets should be collected from at least 1% or 30 beneficiaries using pre-tested structured questionnaire in addition to 4816 sample beneficiaries and 482 non-beneficiaries.**

Analysis of stake holders involved in implementation of NHM

The NHM programme had involvement of various stake holders:

- Various councils and committees that were created to monitor the activities of NHM;
- State Level Executive Committee(s) (SLEC) under the Chairmanship of Agriculture Production Commissioner (APC) or Principal Secretaries which comprised of representatives from SAUs, ICAR Institutes, Growers' Associations/ FPOs and so on;
- Similarly, at District Level, the mission had created District Mission Committee (DMC) for grass root level assistance, monitoring and implementation of NHM components
- At Gram Panchayat Level, both District Planning Committee and Panchayat Raj Institution (PRI) were involved in implementing the programme;
- Structured conduct of focused group discussions, case studies and in-depth interviews

Stakeholders played a major role in creating backward and forward linkages so as to have an effective implementation of NHM components at grassroots level and helped, in their own way to attain NHM objectives.

The stakeholders are key players in implementation of capital-intensive interventions. Hence, interaction with these stake holders is crucial for this study. Following are the important aspects that should be covered in the course of discussion and also in the questionnaire:

- Perception of the stake holders about NHM programme and its impact
- Ranking of components by stakeholders based on impact of MIDH in their state or district
- Issues relating to fund allocation, fund release and fund utilisation
- Innovative interventions that were taken up by implementing authorities at all levels
- Potential components for development in the future
- Major problems encountered while implementing of MIDH in their respective operational jurisdiction

Information from the stakeholders involved in NHM implementation and institutions benefitted from NHM should be collected. The details are given below:

Taluk level officers	District level officers	State level officers	Banks/ Cooperative s	FGDs	FPOs	Others like system integrators, etc.	Case studie s
30 (1/taluk)	10 (1/district)	2	10 (1/district)	10 (1/District)	10	10	20*

Note: *20 case studies should cover all components and agro-climatic zones

6. Deliverables and time Schedule

The concerned department implementing the scheme and KEA will provide the necessary information pertaining to the study and also co-operate with the consultant organization in completing the assignment task within the stipulated time period. It is expected to complete the present study in 6 months' time line, excluding the time taken for approvals at KEA. The exercise is expected to be completed in an elapsed time of six calendar months from date of agreement.

1. **Inception Report** in four weeks from commencement on basic understanding of the problem, key issues identified, directions for subsequent stages, detailed work plan, meetings / FGDs planned including names / designations of personnel and schedules, impediments if any to realise the work plan. Inception report is a road map of how the Evaluation Consultant Organization (ECO) intends to proceed with the evaluation work in terms of ToR. It is a road map and action plan for conducting the study, evolved through the study team effort, based on the basic framework provided by the ToR and bring in the study team insights and contributions. It shall be structured into different chapters and headings and contain
 - (1) Evaluation title and background information in brief;
 - (2) Review of Literature
 - (3) Theory of Change/ output outcome framework - input-activities output-outcome-impact
 - (4) Evaluation criteria and framework: purpose, scope, Objectives.
 - (5) Evaluation approach (with-without; before-after), stakeholders involved sampling and limitations, **Evaluation ethics** -ECO must obtain a consent of the Stakeholders before data collection (As per UNEG Guidelines)
 - (6) **Evaluation Framework**- Evaluation criteria - relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability and **Evaluation matrix*****: It sets out the conceptual framework to be used in an evaluation, Main evaluation issues, Key evaluation

Annexure-1

question, Sub-question, Indicator(s), Normative/baseline value, Success threshold, Data sources, Data collection method, Method of data analysis***.

***Note: the evaluation matrix is a six-column table consolidation of the material at Sl. No. 4 to 7. Evaluation criteria at Column 1 added for clarity and follows the REESI format as under. The table is illustrative and not exhaustive.

Evaluation criteria	Key Evaluation Question ^{###}	Specific sub questions ^{###} for each Key Question	Indicators / success standards/ KPI	Data sources	Data collection methods / Analytical tools [#]	Analytical Method / Analysis method
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Relevance						
Organisation objectives & Actual requirements	Key Evaluation Question ^{###}					
	Key Evaluation Question ^{###}					
	Key Evaluation Question ^{###}					
Effectiveness						
Inputs & Process of implementation	Key Evaluation Question ^{###}					
	Key Evaluation Question ^{###}					
Efficiency						
Cost benefit analysis	Key Evaluation Question ^{###}					
Fund utilization and capacity building	Key Evaluation Question ^{###}					
Output produced	Key Evaluation Question ^{###}					
Impact						
Outcomes- immediate	Key Evaluation Question ^{###}					
Outcomes- Short term	Key Evaluation Question ^{###}					

Outcomes-Medium term	Key Evaluation Question ^{###}					
Outcomes--Long Term	Key Evaluation Question ^{###}					
Sustainability						
Sustainability of the project in the long run	Key Evaluation Question ^{###}					

Specific tool and subsection to be referred to / connected

Key Evaluation Questions and sub questions to be derived from the objectives of evaluation in ToR and from pilot study insights

There will and can be many key evaluation questions for each evaluation issue and many sub questions for each key evaluation question. These need to be framed by the study team in question format.

- (7) Data Analysis Techniques- All statistical and Mathematical techniques to be used in data analysis
- (8) Table templates and chapter outline
- (9) field observations from pilot survey
- (10) Work Plan
- (11) Study Team with their contribution details
- (12) List of persons conducting the FGD along with their qualifications and
- (13) Training schedule of field enumerators with the details of trainers.

Appendix

- Questionnaire & Interview Schedules for all stake holders
- Check list for FGD
- List of field Investigators

Evaluation ethics -Evaluation Consultants will be held to the highest ethical standards and are required to sign a code of conduct upon acceptance of the assignment. To be included in MoU,

Timeline for inception report

Briefing of the evaluation team, preliminary PPT presentation to KEA on study methodology proposed by team with data requirements	Details of the secondary data required for the study as perceived to be provided	Within one week of issue of work order
---	--	--

Pilot study completion	Field investigation to prepare and fine tune Inception Report	One week from preliminary meeting with KEA
Submission of detail Pilot study report to KEA	Approval of KEA	4 days from submission of report
Finalization of study tools	Incorporating all changes	1 week
Submission of IR to KEA	Approval of KEA for presentation	2 days after submission
Presentation of IR before KEA	As per time schedule in KEA -	One week
Submission of revised Inception Report	Incorporating the suggestions of KEA	2 days from PPT presentation
Presentation of revised PPT {if necessary}		Within 4 days of submission of revised IR

- II. **Interim Report**, on findings from officers and field respondents and FGDs (covering at least 50% of planned meets and FGDs) at the end of eight weeks, after the inception report, followed by presentation of Interim Report

Interim report should mainly include the progress and initial findings of the evaluation study.

- (1) Evaluation title and background information.
 - (2) Log Frame/Theory of Change/Program Theory as observed in the field.
 - (3) Redesigned evaluation framework: purpose, scope, stakeholders involved, input-output-outcome-impact
 - (4) Analysis of secondary data and findings.
 - (5) Primary data – analysis and Findings based on the 50% of the field work, table templates and chapter outline for the report; and
 - (6) Analysis of case studies and Focus Group Discussions.
- a) **Draft Report** covering all items in the ToR including key issues identified, directions for the future (vision, mission, organisational objectives, organisational form including any that are external to the parent, working / reporting modalities, objectives of all entities, performance criteria ...) within eight weeks from submission of Interim Report.
 - b) **Final Report** within four weeks of approval of Draft Report by Technical Committee.

Timelines and deliverables

Inception Report	1 month after signing the agreement
Interim Report	2 months after the date of approval of Inception report
Draft report submission	2 months after Interim Report
Final report	1 Month after approval of the Draft report
Total duration	6 Months

7. Quality expected from the Evaluation Report

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

The evaluation report should generally conform to the United Nations Evaluation Guidelines (UNEG) "Standards for Evaluation in the UN System" and "Ethical Standards of Evaluations".

- a) The results should correspond to the ToR objectives.
- b) With regard to 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. The practicable recommendations should not be lost in the population maze of general recommendations
- c) The report should be complete and logically organized in a clear but simple language. Evaluation report should conform to standard report writing style and structure. Harvard report writing and referencing standard to be adopted.

8. Structure of the report

The following are the points, only inclusive and not exhaustive, which need to be mandatorily followed in the preparation of evaluation report. The report should be complete and logically organized in a clear but simple language. Besides conforming to the qualities covered in the Terms of Reference, report should be arranged in the following order:

- Title and Opening Page
- Index (Table of Contents)
- List of acronyms and abbreviations
- Executive Summary- A standalone section that describes the corporation and its objectives, purpose and scope of evaluation, research design and methodology, key findings, constraints and recommendations.
 1. Background- A section that briefly covers the scenario of the Programme in the State including rationale and importance, operational, physical and financial information, objectives and scope of the evaluation.
 2. Review of literature/past evaluation / study reports
 3. Evaluation Methodology - This should include research design, Log-frame and Evaluation Matrix, Data collection (tools and techniques) and analysis (analytical techniques), quality assurance plan and limitations/constraints in the evaluation study.

4. Findings of the evaluation study arranged in sections and sub sections.
5. Recommendations that flow from the evaluation.

Annexures

- a. Sanctioned Terms of Reference of the study.
- b. Survey tools and questionnaires
- c. List of persons with addresses personally interviewed.
- d. Place, date and number of persons covered by Focus Group Discussion
- e. Compilation of case studies/best practices
- f. Table showing details of major deviations, non-conformities, digressions of the program

9. Administrative arrangements

- Introduction to Department of Horticulture and authorisation to carry out the tasks and meet relevant personnel, facilitating access to stakeholders for meetings / FGDs. Timely response to submissions and presentations by KEA.

10. Professional competences expected to handle the assignment

The core team should comprise of the following technical members and should possess requisite qualification and experience as stated below:

Sl. No.	Subject Experts Requirements	Qualification	Experience
1.	Principal Investigator	Ph.D/ Post Graduate in Agriculture/Horticulture	05 years of experience in field with experience in evaluation of agriculture/horticulture
2.	1 st Core team member	MSc in Agricultural Economics	Should also possess a minimum of 3 years of experience in evaluation of developmental programs related to agriculture / horticulture
3.	2 nd Core team member	Post Graduate in Statistics	Three years' experience in data analysis
4	3 rd Core Team Member	Post Graduate in Social Sciences	Experience in impact evaluation of developmental programs

11. Cost and Schedule of budget releases

The Output based budget release will be as specified in the RFP.

12. Contact person for the details of the study

The Contact person details about the study is as below-

At KEA-

- (i) Dr. Chaya Degaonkar, Additional CEO, 9342331301
- (ii) Dr.A.V.Manjunatha, Director (Evaluation), 9448402848

At Department of Department of Horticulture, Lalbagh, Bangalore.

Name	Designation	Phone no. & Email id
Sri. B. Venkatesh., IFS	Director, Department of Horticulture, Lalbagh, Bangalore	9448999200 horticulturedirector@gmail.com
Sri. K.M. Parashivamurthy	Executive Director, KSHMA, Lalbagh, Bangalore	9448999212 nhmkarnataka@gmail.com

TOR Prepared by:



Dr. A.V. Manjunatha
Director (Evaluation)
Karnataka Evaluation Authority



Shri. G.A. Sudarshan, IFS
Chief Evaluation Officer
Karnataka Evaluation Authority