

PROJECT APPRAISAL REPORT (PAR)

PAGE 1

|                                    |   |                     |                                 |
|------------------------------------|---|---------------------|---------------------------------|
| 1. PROJECT NO.<br>386-11-110-281.4 | 2. PAR FOR PERIOD:<br>1/1/1970 TO 6/30/1970 | 3. COUNTRY<br>India | 4. PAR SERIAL NO.<br>FY 72-1 7p |
| 5. PROJECT TITLE                   |   |                     |                                 |

Agricultural Universities Development: Punjab Agricultural University

|   |                               |                            |                               |
|---|-------------------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------------|
| 6. PROJECT DURATION: Began FY 1964 Ends FY 1973 | 7. DATE LATEST PROP<br>6/8/71 | 8. DATE LATEST PIP<br>None | 9. DATE PRIOR PAP<br>11/12/70 |
|---|-------------------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------------|

|                  |  |  |  |
|------------------|--|--|--|
| 10. U.S. FUNDING | a. Cumulative Obligation Thru Prior FY: \$ 1,993,000 | b. Current FY Estimated Budget: \$ 471,000 | c. Estimated Budget to completion After Current FY: \$ -0- |
|------------------|--|--|--|

11. KEY ACTION AGENTS (Contractor, Participating Agency or Voluntary Agency)

| a. NAME                   | b. CONTRACT, PASA OR VOL. AG. NO. |
|---------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| The Ohio State University | AID/ness-147                      |
|                           |                                   |
|                           |                                   |

I. NEW ACTIONS PROPOSED AND REQUESTED AS A RESULT OF THIS EVALUATION

| A. ACTION (X) |       |      | B. LIST OF ACTIONS   | C. PROPOSED ACTION COMPLETION DATE |
|---------------|-------|------|--|------------------------------------|
| USAID         | AID/W | HOST |  |                                    |
| X             |       |      | The project manager will review the content of currently available project information and, if necessary, revise the contractor reporting requirements and other information gathering systems to provide more adequate information and data for improving the basis for measuring progress in attaining outputs and conditions at end of project as set forth in the Project Logical Framework. | December 31, 1971                  |

|                        |  |  |  |  |  |  |                                     |
|------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|-------------------------------------|
| D. REPLANNING REQUIRES | <input type="checkbox"/> REVISED OR NEW: <input type="checkbox"/> PROP <input type="checkbox"/> PIP <input type="checkbox"/> PRO AG <input type="checkbox"/> PIO/T <input type="checkbox"/> PIO/C <input type="checkbox"/> PIO/P |  |  |  |  |  | E. DATE OF MISSION REVIEW<br>9/3/71 |
|------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|-------------------------------------|

|  |   |         |
|--|---|---------|
| PROJECT MANAGER: TYPED NAME, SIGNED INITIALS AND DATE<br>D. B. Datta | MISSION DIRECTOR: TYPED NAME, SIGNED INITIALS AND DATE<br>Howard E. Houston | 9/13/71 |
|--|---|---------|

|                     |                  |                                  |         |                |
|---------------------|------------------|----------------------------------|---------|----------------|
| AID 1020-28 (10-70) | PROJECT NO.      | PAR FOR PERIOD:                  | COUNTRY | PAR SERIAL NO. |
| PAGE 2 PAR          | 386-11-110-281.4 | Jan. 1, 1970<br>TO June 30, 1971 | INDIA   | FY 72-1        |

**II. PERFORMANCE OF KEY INPUTS AND ACTION AGENTS**

| A. INPUT OR ACTION AGENT<br>CONTRACTOR, PARTICIPATING AGENCY OR VOLUNTARY AGENCY | B. PERFORMANCE AGAINST PLAN |   |              |   |   |             |   | C. IMPORTANCE FOR ACHIEVING PROJECT PURPOSE (X) |   |        |   |      |  |
|--|-----------------------------|---|--------------|---|---|-------------|---|---|---|--------|---|------|--|
|  | UNSATISFACTORY              |   | SATISFACTORY |   |   | OUTSTANDING |   | LOW   |   | MEDIUM |   | HIGH |  |
|  | 1                           | 2 | 3            | 4 | 5 | 6           | 7 | 1   | 2 | 3      | 4 | 5    |  |
| 1. The Ohio State University   |                             |   |              |   | X |             |   |   |   |        |   | X    |  |
| 2.   |                             |   |              |   |   |             |   |   |   |        |   |      |  |
| 3.   |                             |   |              |   |   |             |   |   |   |        |   |      |  |

Comment on key factors determining rating Of the eleven factors rated, the Contractor was satisfactory or outstanding in all but recruitment of U.S. personnel which was unsatisfactory during the first half of the 18 months period. This was partially due to the lack of available qualified personnel and difficulty encountered in getting the host country to provide sufficient lead time for recruitment. Currently performance is superior.

| 4. PARTICIPANT TRAINING | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|-------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
|                         |   |   |   |   |   | X |   |   |   |   |   | X |

Comment on key factors determining rating

Competent staff members have been selected for training and are utilized effectively when they return to the University upon completion of training.

| 5. COMMODITIES | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|----------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
|                |   |   |   |   |   | X |   |   |   | X |   |   |

Comment on key factors determining rating

| 6. COOPERATING COUNTRY | a. PERSONNEL | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|------------------------|--------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
|                        | b. OTHER     |   |   |   |   |   |   | X |   |   |   |   |   |

Comment on key factors determining rating

The State of Punjab continued to provide strong support to PAU. Middle and top level PAU personnel are providing outstanding leadership, developing an excellent model of a service oriented agricultural university which is aggressively taking part in the research and extension programs of Punjab.

Note: This rating relates primarily to the performance of the Agricultural University and Punjab State Government. Actions of the Central Government have been rather slow and cumbersome, partially contributing to the recruitment problem, noted above.

| 7. OTHER DONORS | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|-----------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
|                 |   |   |   |   | X |   |   |   | X |   |   |   |

|                                  |                                 |   |                  |                             |
|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|---|------------------|-----------------------------|
| AID 1020-25(10-70)<br>PAGE 3 PAR | PROJECT NO.<br>386-11-110-281.4 | PAR FOR PERIOD: Jan. 1<br>1970 to June 30, 71 | COUNTRY<br>INDIA | PAR SERIAL NO.<br>FY 1972-1 |
|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|---|------------------|-----------------------------|

II. 7. Continued: Comment on key factors determining rating of Other Donors

The Ford Foundation has provided assistance for the Agricultural Engineering College.

### III. KEY OUTPUT INDICATORS AND TARGETS

| A. QUANTITATIVE INDICATORS<br>OF MAJOR OUTPUTS                                    |  | TARGETS (Percentage/Rate/Amount) |                |               |            |            |                   |
|---|--|----------------------------------|----------------|---------------|------------|------------|-------------------|
|   |  | CUMU-<br>LATIVE<br>PRIOR FY      | CURRENT FY 71  |               | FY 72      | FY 73      | END OF<br>PROJECT |
|   |  |                                  | TO DATE        | TO END        |            |            |                   |
| *1. Participants:<br>a. OSU/USAID<br>b. PAU<br>c. Other<br>(PAU staff totals 580) | PLANNED  | -                                | 10,5,10        | 10,5,10       | 11,5,5     | 5,5,5      | 74,40,45          |
|   | ACTUAL PERFORM-<br>ANCE  | 48,25,25                         | 10,5,10        |               |            |            |                   |
|   | REPLANNED  |                                  |                | -             | -          | -          | -                 |
| *2. Graduates:<br>a. B.Sc.<br>b. M.Sc.<br>c. Ph.D.                                | PLANNED  | -                                | -              | slight annual |            | increase   |                   |
|   | ACTUAL PERFORM-<br>ANCE  | 1895,<br>973,61                  | 365,<br>107,19 |               |            |            |                   |
|   | REPLANNED  |                                  |                | -             | -          | -          | -                 |
| 3. Research:<br>Projects started &<br>completed<br>(total active projects: 829)   | PLANNED  | -                                | 400            | 400           | 400        | 400        |                   |
|   | ACTUAL PERFORM-<br>ANCE  | -                                | 400            |               |            |            |                   |
|   | REPLANNED  |                                  |                |               |            |            |                   |
| 4. Extension:<br>1. Training Sessions<br>2. Field Demonstrations                  | PLANNED  | -                                | 95<br>225      | 95<br>225     | 95<br>225  | 95<br>225  | -<br>-            |
|   | ACTUAL PERFORM-<br>ANCE  | -                                | 131<br>230     |               |            |            |                   |
|   | REPLANNED  |                                  |                | 110<br>230    | 115<br>230 | 120<br>230 | -<br>-            |
| B. QUALITATIVE INDICATORS<br>FOR MAJOR OUTPUTS                                    | COMMENT: Many pertinent elements of a long range academic plan have been in existence for some time but have not been consolidated effectively. PAU states it will complete a consolidated plan by 1973, but progress is slow. However, even in the absence of a consolidated long range plan, developments have been quite significant. |                                  |                |               |            |            |                   |
| 1. Long Range Plan:   |  |                                  |                |               |            |            |                   |
| 2. One trust fund rupee project per long term specialist:                         | COMMENT: During this 18 months evaluation period, this output was achieved with excellent results.   |                                  |                |               |            |            |                   |
| 3. Buildings and physical facilities per plan:                                    | COMMENT: Construction is proceeding very well, meeting PAU needs, although an academic plan has not been prepared as basis for construction plan.  |                                  |                |               |            |            |                   |

|                                   |                                 |   |                  |                             |
|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------|---|------------------|-----------------------------|
| AID 1020-25 (10-7U)<br>PAGE 4 PAR | PROJECT NO.<br>386-11-110-281.4 | PAR FOR PERIOD:<br>Jan. 1, 1970 to<br>June 30, 1971 | COUNTRY<br>INDIA | PAR SERIAL NO.<br>FY 1972-1 |
|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------|---|------------------|-----------------------------|

IV. PROJECT PURPOSE

A. 1. Statement of purpose as currently envisaged.

2. Same as in PROP?  YES  NO

Establishment and development of service-oriented State Agricultural Universities to the point where they have the capacity for planning and administering fully integrated State-wide programs in agricultural teaching, research and extension education.

| B. 1. Conditions which will exist when above purpose is achieved.                           | 2. Evidence to date of progress toward these conditions.  |
|---|---|
| 1. Adequate physical plant per plan.  | Comment: Construction is proceeding very well, meeting PAU needs, although an academic plan has not been prepared as basis for construction plan. |
| 2. Integration of Extension, Research and Teaching is operating on department level.        | Integration is already operating at department level.   |
| 3. Long Range Development Plan used as basis for program implementation.                    | Plan not yet prepared but PAU states it will complete a plan by 1973.   |
| 4. Public financial support is adequate.  | Adequate; the best in India.  |
| 5. University staffed with adequately trained personnel.<br><br>(please see attached sheet) | Staff is already adequately trained.<br><br>(please see attached sheet)   |

V. PROGRAMMING GOAL

A. Statement of Programming Goal

Assist India to achieve continuing rapid growth in agriculture.

B. Will the achievement of the project purpose make a significant contribution to the programming goal, given the magnitude of the national problem? Cite evidence.

Punjab farmers have given keen attention to extension workers of PAU. PAU research has largely been geared to problems raised by farmers. PAU and Department of Agriculture have agreed on package of practices, leading to farmer confidence in modern technology. Through these means, PAU has contributed to the Green Revolution in Punjab. This contribution should continue and increase as PAU improves during the next decade.

(Continued from Page 4 PAR)

---

| B. 1. Conditions which will exist when above purpose is achieved.                            | 2. Evidence to date of progress toward these conditions   |
|--|---|
| 6. Curriculum is relevant to needs of students.  | Curriculum is leading to employment of most graduates, especially of M.Sc. and Ph.D. students.  |
| 7. Effective administrative performance.   | Administration is very good at top and middle levels, with some outstanding men. Some friction among colleges.  |
| 8. University program is responsive to needs of State.                                       | University programs are closely related to the needs of the cultivator. The Green Revolution in Punjab is partially attributed to PAU.  |
| 9. Functional professional linkages with other Indian and foreign agricultural institutions. | This is a weakness of Indian agricultural universities. The Association of Indian Agricultural Universities is weak. Good links exist with OSU which should continue if financing is available. |

|                                  |                                 |                                      |                  |                           |
|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------------------------|------------------|---------------------------|
| AID 1020-25(10-70)<br>PAGE 3 PAR | PROJECT NO.<br>386-11-110-366.6 | PAR FOR PERIOD:<br>1/1/70 to 6/30/71 | COUNTRY<br>India | PAR SERIAL NO.<br>FY 72-3 |
|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------------------------|------------------|---------------------------|

II. 7. Continued: Comment on key factors determining rating of Other Donors

Not applicable

*This is attached to wrong PAR.*

### III. KEY OUTPUT INDICATORS AND TARGETS

| A. QUANTITATIVE INDICATORS<br>FOR MAJOR OUTPUTS              |                            | TARGETS (Percentage/Rate/Amount)   |               |              |              |              |                   |
|--|----------------------------|--|---------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|-------------------|
|  |                            | CUMU-<br>LATIVE<br>PRIOR FY  | CURRENT FY 71 |              | FY 72        | FY 73        | END OF<br>PROJECT |
|  |                            |  | TO DATE       | TO END       |              |              |                   |
| Trained Staff<br>P - Participants<br>L - Local Staff (AEO's) | PLANNED                    | P-9<br>L-800   | P-7<br>L-800  | P-7<br>L-800 | P-5<br>L-800 | P-4<br>L-800 | P-23<br>L-2400    |
|  | ACTUAL<br>PERFORM-<br>ANCE | P-6<br>L-800   | P-7<br>L-800  |              |              |              |                   |
|  | REPLANNED                  |  |               |              |              |              |                   |
| Field Tests and<br>Demonstrations                            | PLANNED                    | -  | 800           | 800          | 900          | 900          | 3280              |
|  | ACTUAL<br>PERFORM-<br>ANCE | 680  | 800           |              |              |              |                   |
|  | REPLANNED                  |  |               |              |              |              |                   |
|  | PLANNED                    |  |               |              |              |              |                   |
|  | ACTUAL<br>PERFORM-<br>ANCE |  |               |              |              |              |                   |
|  | REPLANNED                  |  |               |              |              |              |                   |
|  | PLANNED                    |  |               |              |              |              |                   |
|  | ACTUAL<br>PERFORM-<br>ANCE |  |               |              |              |              |                   |
|  | REPLANNED                  |  |               |              |              |              |                   |
| B. QUALITATIVE INDICATORS<br>FOR MAJOR OUTPUTS               |                            | COMMENT: Immediate recommendations are made when solutions are known otherwise problems are referred to the <u>Mysore</u> ? University of Agricultural Sciences to be incorporated into its research program.  |               |              |              |              |                   |
| 1. Prompt identification and solution of field problems      |                            |  |               |              |              |              |                   |
| 2. Field Problems Units have been created and are operating  |                            | COMMENT: Six FPU's were set up originally however only 4 FPU's for last 6 months of period. Extension Information Advisor requested for total of only 3 years (by state) and Seed Production Advisor position has not been funded. Also awaiting the replacement of Agricultural Engineer. |               |              |              |              |                   |
| 3. Coordinating meetings among high level staff              |                            | COMMENT: Has been improvement in cooperation between top staff of Agricultural University and State Department of Agriculture. Staffs are now holding bi-monthly meetings to plan procedures for solution of agricultural development problems and are now making joint recommendations.   |               |              |              |              |                   |

|                                   |                                 |                                      |                  |                           |
|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------------------------|------------------|---------------------------|
| AID 1020-25 (10-70)<br>PAGE 4 PAR | PROJECT NO.<br>386-11-110-366.6 | PAR FOR PERIOD:<br>1/1/70 to 6/30/71 | COUNTRY<br>India | PAR SERIAL NO.<br>FY 72-3 |
|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------------------------|------------------|---------------------------|

IV. PROJECT PURPOSE

A. 1. Statement of purpose as currently envisaged.

2. Same as in PROP?  YES  NO

Assure continuing identification and solution of production problems resulting from the introduction of high-yielding varieties and associated inputs and the farm level adoption of recommended practices.

| 1. Conditions which will exist when above purpose is achieved.  | 2. Evidence to date of progress toward these conditions.   |
|---|--|
| 1. High level of coordination exists among agricultural development institutions.                         | 1. Bi-monthly meetings to improve program are regularly held with Secretary of Agriculture, State Director of Agriculture and Director of Research (University) attending. Recommendations are being jointly issued by University and Department of Agriculture. |
| 2. Agricultural research program oriented toward problems retarding foodgrain production.                 | 2. Bulk of research program is directed toward resolution of Mysore's agricultural problems, i.e., soil testing correlation problems, insect, disease and weed control, crop water requirement tests, etc.   |
| 3. Established lines of communication among related research agencies, field staff, and private industry. | 3. Extension services request training programs from research agency specialists. Regular meeting at working level to coordinate research planning and field testing.  |
| 4. Systematic interpretation of and testing of research conclusions.                                      | 4. All research recommendations go thru field testing by various agencies.   |
| 5. Dissemination to farmers of tested research conclusions.   | 5. 'Package of Practices' for extension personnel and farmers and other pamphlets published and distributed.   |

V. PROGRAMMING GOAL

A. Statement of Programming Goal

Achieve continuing rapid growth in foodgrain production in India.

B. Will the achievement of the project purpose make a significant contribution to the programming goal, given the magnitude of the national problem? Cite evidence.

Existence of effective research and extension activities and close coordination between these activities are the important ingredients which continue to assure success and progress in agriculturally advanced countries.