

386 0366 (28)

PROJECT APPRAISAL REPORT (PAR)

PD-AAD-108-E1

PAGE 1

1. PROJECT NO. 386-11-110-366.7	2. PAR FOR PERIOD: 7/1/1971 TO 6/30/1972	3. COUNTRY India	4. PAR SERIAL NO. FY 73-3
------------------------------------	---	---------------------	------------------------------

5. PROJECT TITLE

TERMINAL PAR
Agricultural Production - Maharashtra

6. PROJECT DURATION: Began FY 1967 Ends FY 1972	7. DATE LATEST PROP 6/24/69	8. DATE LATEST PIP -	9. DATE PRIOR PAR 9/13/71
---	--------------------------------	-------------------------	------------------------------

10. U.S. FUNDING	a. Cumulative Obligation Thru Prior FY: \$ 652,000	b. Current FY Estimated Budget: \$ -	c. Estimated Budget to completion After Current FY: \$ -
------------------	--	--------------------------------------	--

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

a. NAME	b. CONTRACT, PASA OR VOL. AG. NO.
— Pennsylvania State University	AID/nema-295

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		
			In-depth evaluation could not be carried out because of the non-participation of GOI. However, we have copies of the requested summary of team activities.	No action as the project phased out as of June 30, 1972.

6. 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"/> PIC/P	E. DATE OF MISSION REVIEW 1/21/73
------------------------	--	--------------------------------------

PROJECT MANAGER: TYPED NAME, SIGNED INITIALS AND DATE Ervin T. Bullard 773 1/9/73	MISSION DIRECTOR: TYPED NAME, SIGNED INITIALS AND DATE Howard E. Houston
--	---

AID 1020-23(10-70) PAGE 3 PAR	PROJECT NO. 386-11-110-366.7	PAR FOR PERIOD: 7/1/71 to 6/30/72	COUNTRY India	PAR SERIAL NO FY 73-3
----------------------------------	---------------------------------	--------------------------------------	------------------	--------------------------

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

NA

III. KEY OUTPUT INDICATORS AND TARGETS

A. QUANTITATIVE INDICATORS FOR MAJOR OUTPUTS		TARGETS (Percentage/Rate/Amount)					
		CUMU- LATIVE PRIOR FY72	CURRENT FY		FY ____	FY ____	END OF PROJECT
			TO DATE	TO END			
High level coordination meetings	PLANNED	13					13
	ACTUAL PERFORM- ANCE	12					
	REPLANNED						
Field Problem Units	PLANNED	4					
	ACTUAL PERFORM- ANCE	4					
	REPLANNED						
Training of Indian staff P-Participants(U.S.trained) L-Local staff	PLANNED	P-11 L-1200					P-11 L-1200
	ACTUAL PERFORM- ANCE	P-7 L-924					
	REPLANNED						
B. QUALITATIVE INDICATORS FOR MAJOR OUTPUTS		COMMENT: Three specialists were on board to start with. Two of them left on July 9, 1971 and January 28, 1972 respectively. The third technician on Soil & Water Management contd. up to the end of the project. The state took over the activities started by FPU's in Agricultural Implements, Seed Production, Plant Protection, and Soil & Water Management.					
	1.	Field Problem Units					
	2.	Coordination of high level staff					
3.	Training in land and irrigation development						

AID 1020-25 (10-70)	PROJECT NO. 386-11-110-366.7	PAR FOR PERIOD: 7/1/71 to 6/30/72	CCOUNTRY India	PAR SERIAL NO. FY 73-3
---------------------	---------------------------------	--------------------------------------	-------------------	---------------------------

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 HYV and associated inputs and farm level adoption of recommended practices.

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.	1. The meetings of the High Level Coordination Committee were held regularly to review progress and resolve problems.
2. Qualified researchers and field staff are assigned.	2. The state established two agricultural universities at Rahuri & Akola during this period. The top research officers are well qualified and have excellent experience, but their number is limited. However, well-qualified persons were assigned as counterparts of U.S. technicians under the project.
3. Agricultural research program oriented towards problems retarding foodgrain production.	3. The APP team members were involved in such research activities as will have a bearing on food production: Good soil testing, soil salinity and soil moisture laboratories have been integrated and started functioning. Research on water requirements of crops, efficient use of irrigation water, reclamation of sodic and saline soils, development of new varieties, cultural practices, implements, control of pests, & seed certification program etc. is in progress.

Contd..... Page 4A

V. PROGRAMMING GOAL

A. Statement of Programming Goal

Assist Maharashtra to achieve continuing rapid growth in foodgrain production.

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.

With the rapid increase in the area under HYV of millet and wheat, the production of these foodgrains has substantially increased. While rice shows marginal increase, the production of the most important crop of the state viz. sorghum has declined due to lack of rain and attack of shoot fly on the new hybrids. The overall production situation, however, does not truly reflect the degree of success of this project in a state like Maharashtra where more than 9/10th of the area is dependent on the vagaries of rainfall. The benefits of the activities started in respect of Soil and Water Management, soil testing, rat control, seed production, demonstrations, training and plant protection have vast potential with their incorporation in the programs of the department.

B.1. Conditions which will exist when above purpose is achieved.	2. Evidence to date of progress toward these conditions.
4. Established line of communication among related research agencies, field staff and private industry.	4. The staff of the Agricultural Department and universities meet occasionally to discuss and plan joint programs. The yearly research program is decided in the annual meetings, the land and water development project at one of the state farms and the seed certification and enforcement work have been instrumental in strengthening the lines of communication between various agencies.
5. Systematic interpretation and testing of research conclusions.	5. There are numerous Trial-Cum-Demonstration farms in the state, one of their major objectives being the testing of new recommendations, such as varieties, implements etc., before they are included in the recommended package of practices. Drainage, reclamation trials are also carried on at some of the farms in areas facing this problem.
6. Dissemination of tested research conclusions to farmers and farmers acceptance.	6. Thousands of farmers were trained in seed improvement, agricultural implements, water use, control of rats and other pests etc. Distribution of popular leaflets in local language, holding meeting with farmers and arranging demonstrations at farmer's gatherings and in their fields is now a common feature. Substantial increase in the use of new inputs, such as HYV seeds, fertilizers, pesticides, improved implements, etc. is taking place.