

PROJECT APPRAISAL REPORT (PAR)

PD-AAD-107-C1

1. PROJECT NO. <u>386 11 110 366.1</u>	2. PAR FOR PERIOD: TO <u>1/1/70</u> TO <u>6/30/71</u>	3. COUNTRY <u>India</u>	4. PAR SERIAL NO. <u>A.I.D. FY 72-2</u>
---	---	----------------------------	--

Agricultural Production (Tamil Nadu)

Reference Center  
Room 1656 HS

C. PROJECT DURATION: Began FY <u>67</u> Ends FY <u>72</u>	7. DATE LATEST PROP <u>6/24/69</u>	8. DATE LATEST PIP <u>8/12/70</u>	9. DATE PRIOR PAR <u>11/12/70</u>
---	---------------------------------------	--------------------------------------	--------------------------------------

10. U.S. FUNDING	a. Cumulative Obligation Thru Prior FY: \$ <u>501,000</u>	b. Current FY Estimated Budget: \$ <u>19,000</u>	c. Estimated Budget to completion After Current FY: \$ <u>0</u>
------------------	---	--	---

FY 71 KEY ACTION AGENTS (Contractor, Participating Agency or Voluntary Agency)

a. NAME	b. CONTRACT, PASA OR VOL. AG. NO.
<del>University of Tennessee</del>	<del>AID/NESA-319</del>

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		1. Future contracts should be worded to include the purpose, outputs and conditions expected at the end of the project as stated in the logical framework.	June 30, 1972
x			2. The project manager will undertake a detailed review of his project reporting and information gathering systems to assure that more adequate data are being collected, over the next year, to measure the project outputs and conditions expected at the end of the project stated in the logical framework.	February 29, 1972
x			3. Consider assigning a technical staff member to assist the project manager.	ASAP
x			4. Quarterly report from the project manager to the USAID Director on the status of transferring to Tamil Nadu State institutions full responsibility for on-going project programs.	December 31, 1971 March 31, 1972 June 30, 1972
x1	x2		5. Assure implementation of the in-depth evaluation scheduled in the USAID/Delhi FY 1972 Evaluation Plan (TOAID A-487 - page 7).	June 30, 1972

D. REPLANNING REQUIRES	E. DATE OF MISSION REVIEW
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	9/7/71
PROJECT MANAGER: TYPED NAME, SIGNED INITIALS AND DATE	MISSION DIRECTOR: TYPED NAME, SIGNED INITIALS AND DATE

AID 1020-25 (10-70)	PROJECT NO.	PAR FOR PERIOD: 1/1/70	COUNTRY	PAR SERIAL NO.
PAGE 2 PAR	386-11-110-366.1	TO 6/30/71	India	FY 72-2

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

A. INPUT OR ACTION AGENT CONTRACTOR, PARTICIPATING AGENCY OR VOLUNTARY AGENCY	B. PERFORMANCE AGAINST PLAN							C. IMPORTANCE FOR ACHIEVING PROJECT PURPOSE (X)					
	UNSATISFACTORY		SATISFACTORY			OUT-STANDING		LOW		MEDIUM		HIGH	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	
1. University of Tennessee				X									X
2.													
3.													

Comment on key factors determining rating

Have requested team leader to make a concentrated effort in future to have Indian staff take over responsibilities for on-going programs.

Also the practice of getting only one year clearance of technicians has been corrected and two of the three vacant positions were filled with the remaining position being cancelled.

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

Comment on key factors determining rating

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								X

Comment on key factors determining rating

For most part local leadership assigned to this project has been of high quality; however, there was a slight problem because of lack of continuity at highest level. All personnel are quite enthusiastic and hopefully will take over when U.S. inputs are terminated.

7. OTHER DONORS	N.A.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5
-----------------	------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

AID 1020-25(10-70) PAGE 3 PAR	PROJECT NO. 386-11-110-366.1	PAR FOR PERIOD: 1/1/70 to 6/30/71	COUNTRY India	PAR SERIAL NO. FY 72-2
----------------------------------	---------------------------------	--------------------------------------	------------------	---------------------------

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

Not applicable

### III. KEY OUTPUT INDICATORS AND TARGETS

A. QUANTITATIVE INDICATORS FOR MAJOR OUTPUTS		TARGETS (Percentage/Rate/Amount)					END OF PROJECT 72
		CUMU- LATIVE PRIOR FY	CURRENT FY 71		FY 72	FY ____	
			TO DATE	TO END			
Trained Staff P - Participants L - Local staff (AEO's)	PLANNED	P-10 L-1200	P-5 ---Continued---	P-5	P-5		P-20 L-1200
	ACTUAL PERFORMANCE						
	REPLANNED						
Field tests and demonstrations	PLANNED	400	100	100	100		100
	ACTUAL PERFORMANCE		100				
	REPLANNED						
	PLANNED						
	ACTUAL PERFORMANCE						
	REPLANNED						
	PLANNED						
	ACTUAL PERFORMANCE						
	REPLANNED						
B. QUALITATIVE INDICATORS FOR MAJOR OUTPUTS	COMMENT: Immediate recommendations are made for solution of problems as they become known. Otherwise, problems are referred to the Ag. University for incorporation into its research program.						
1. Prompt identification and solution of field problems	(6)						
2. Coordination meetings among high level staff (A)	COMMENT: Quarterly meetings are held between top staff of the Ag. College and Department of Agriculture at which current state agricultural problems and possible responses are discussed and recommendations made for necessary changes in procedures.						
3. 'Field Problems Units' created.	COMMENT: Five 'FPUs' have been created consisting of representatives from Ag. University, Department of Agriculture and USAID, and are operating in high yield variety areas.						

AID 1020-25 (10-71)	PROJECT NO. 386-11-110-366.1	PAR FOR PERIOD: 1/1/70 to 6/30/71	COUNTRY India	PAR SERIAL NO. FY 72-2
---------------------	---------------------------------	--------------------------------------	------------------	---------------------------

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.

*Change - Prop*

B. 1. Conditions which will exist when above purpose is achieved.	2. Evidence to date of progress toward these conditions.
1. High level coordination exists among agricultural development institutions.	1. Regular meetings are held between Secretary of Agriculture, Director of Research (University) etc.
2. Agricultural research program oriented toward problems retarding foodgrain production.	2. Increasing proportion of University's research program is directly tied to current production problems (i.e. new variety trials of wheat, paddy, etc., soil testing correlation studies, crop water requirement tests, etc.).
3. Established lines of communication between related research agencies, field staff, and private industry.	3. Hopefully extension specialists from University will train the state field staffs to keep them current in research findings.
4. Systematic interpretation and testing of research conclusions.	4. All research conclusions go through field testing by state extension agencies.
5. Dissemination to farmers of tested research conclusions and farmers' acceptance of recommended practices.	5. 'Package of Practices' (describing proper production procedures for all state crops) and other pamphlets published and distributed. Indications are that farmers accept recommendations.

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.

This team has had a marked influence in the adoption of improved paddy variety IR-8. The Americans have played a very significant role in increasing the planting of IR-8 to almost 2 million acres and hopefully the Indians will continue to adopt best HYV's. The acreage increase in plantings of IR-8 for 1970-71 was more than 17%. Total paddy production for state in 1970-71 was 5.3 million tons while national production was 42.4 million tons.