

3860368 (185/PS)  
 A.I.D. REPORT U-446

PROJECT APPRAISAL REPORT (PAR)

Reference Center  
 PD-ADD: 117-E1

PAGE 1

1. PROJECT NO. 386-11-120-368.2	2. PAR FOR PERIOD: 1/1/70 TO 6/30/71	3. COUNTRY India	4. PAR SERIAL NO. FY 72-11
------------------------------------	---	---------------------	-------------------------------

5. PROJECT TITLE

Soil and Water Management (Uttar Pradesh)

6. PROJECT DURATION: Began FY 1970 Ends FY 1974	7. DATE LATEST PROP 6/17/69	8. DATE LATEST PIP 12/28/70	9. DATE PRIOR PAR 12/31/1969
---	--------------------------------	--------------------------------	---------------------------------

10. U.S. FUNDING	a. Cumulative Obligation Thru Prior FY: \$ 298,000	b. Current FY Estimated Budget: \$ 127,000	c. Estimated Budget to completion After Current FY: \$ 133,000
------------------	--	--	--

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

a. NAME Soil Conservation Service	b. CONTRACT, PASA OR VOL. AG. NO. PASA
--------------------------------------	---

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. Project team leader to: (a) Obtain schedules of participant candidate selection meeting. (b) Submit names of candidates having known high potential to Selection Committee. (c) Propose necessary instructions to participants which emphasize importance of complete information on application proforma. (d) Assist candidates in compiling proformas needed.	August 1972
x2		x1	2. Earlier plan submission by State Government and provisional financial sanction by GOI.	March 1972
x			3. The project manager will undertake a detailed review of his project reporting and information gathering system 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.	December 31, 1971

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"/> PRO/T <input type="checkbox"/> PIO/C <input type="checkbox"/> PIO/P	10/14/71

PROJECT MANAGER: TYPED NAME, SIGNED INITIALS AND DATE Elwin D. Butler	MISSION DIRECTOR: TYPED NAME, SIGNED INITIALS AND DATE Howard E. Houston
--	---

AID 1020-25 (10-70)	PROJECT NO.	PAR FOR PERIOD:	COUNTRY	PAR SERIAL NO.
PAGE 2 PAR	386-11-120-368.2	TO 1/1/70 - 6/30/71	India	FY 72-11

**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			OUTSTANDING		LOW		MEDIUM		HIGH	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	
1. Soil Conservation Service					X								X
2.													
3.													

Comment on key factors determining rating

There has been an excellent understanding of the project purpose by the action agent staff. Relations with host nationals has also been superior.

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

Comment on key factors determining rating

The selection of trainees with highest potential has been an unsatisfactory aspect of the participant training program. USAID project staff were not given adequate opportunity to advise on trainee selection. Supervisor receptiveness to post training has been excellent.

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

Comment on key factors determining rating

In general, the performance of commodity inputs has been satisfactory with the exception that some U.S. procured commodities were considerable delayed in arrival.

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

Technical skills of personnel assigned to the project are outstanding. Counterparts, also display a high degree of project acceptance and association with project purpose. Action as related to needed legislative changes to further project purpose has been good. Resolution of bureaucratic problem which slow decisions and cause irritation is a primary negative factor.

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

AID 1020-25(10-70)	PROJECT NO. 386-11-120-368,2	PAR FOR PERIOD: 1/1/70 to 6/30/71	COUNTRY India	PAR SERIAL NO. FY 72-11
PAGE 3 PAR				

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)					
		CUMU- LATIVE PRIOR FY	CURRENT FY		FY 72	FY 73	END OF PROJECT
			TO DATE	TO END			
1. 16,000 acre project Work Plan.	PLANNED	100%	-	-	-	-	100%
	ACTUAL PERFORM- ANCE	75%	25%				
	REPLANNED						
2. 16,000 acre project soil survey reports.	PLANNED	25%	25%	-	25%	25%	100%
	ACTUAL PERFORM- ANCE	10%	70%				
	REPLANNED			-	10%	10%	-
3. 27 field demonstrations and 3 group demonstrations of cropping systems and efficient irrigation.	PLANNED	3	6	-	10	11	30
	ACTUAL PERFORM- ANCE	3	7				
	REPLANNED			-	-	10	-
4. 8 demonstrations of water distribution improvements.	PLANNED	3	4	-	1	-	8
	ACTUAL PERFORM- ANCE	1	5				
	REPLANNED			-	2	-	-
B. QUALITATIVE INDICATORS FOR MAJOR OUTPUTS		COMMENT:					
1.							
2.		COMMENT:					
3.		COMMENT:					

AID 1020-25(10-70) PAGE <del>1000</del> 3a	PROJECT NO. 386-11-120-368.2	PAR FOR PERIOD: 1/1/70 to 6/30/71	COUNTRY India	PAR SERIAL NO. FY 72-11
---	---------------------------------	--------------------------------------	------------------	----------------------------

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
		CUMU- LATIVE PRIOR FY	CURRENT FY		FY 72	FY 73	
			TO DATE	TO END			
5. 320 acres of land leveling demonstrations.	PLANNED	16	64	-	160	80	320
	ACTUAL PERFORMANCE	0	32				
	REPLANNED			-	180	108	-
6. 2 drains and 20 acres of land reclamation demonstrations.	PLANNED	0	20%	-	60%	20%	100%
	ACTUAL PERFORMANCE	0	0				
	REPLANNED			-	-	40%	-
7. A technical guide and standards for soil and water management practices.	PLANNED	10%	15%	-	45%	30%	100%
	ACTUAL PERFORMANCE	10%	15%				
	REPLANNED			-	-	-	-
8. 100 soil and water management technicians trained.	PLANNED	-	25	-	25	50	100
	ACTUAL PERFORMANCE	-	25				
	REPLANNED			-	-	-	-
B. QUALITATIVE INDICATORS FOR MAJOR OUTPUTS	COMMENT: The State of U.P. decided to carry out the program with State funds and has appointed a training officer and deputed instructors. A training syllabus has been prepared and is undergoing review prior to assignment of the next class. This will be supplemented by GOI funds.						
1. Effective soil and water management training program.							
2.	COMMENT:						
3.	COMMENT:						

AID 1020-25 (10-70)	PROJECT NO.	PAR FOR PERIOD:	COUNTRY	PAR SERIAL NO.
PAGE 4 PAR	336-11-120-368.2	1/1/70 - 6/30/71	India	FY 72-11

IV. PROJECT PURPOSE

A. 1. Statement of purpose as currently envisaged.

2. Same as in PROP?  YES  NO

To develop the capability of U.P. State agencies (Soil Conservation and Soil Chemist Divisions of the Department of Agriculture and the Irrigation Department and Department of Forestry) to conduct an effective soil and water management program.

B. 1. Conditions which will exist when above purpose is achieved.

2. Evidence to date of progress toward these conditions.

1. Revised State Soil Conservation Act to include programs of soil and water management on irrigated land.
2. Reorganized State Soil Conservation Division to carry out broadened responsibilities for soil and water management on irrigated lands.
3. Application of integrated program for soil and water management on irrigated land by the State Soil Conservation Division.
4. Cadre of trained personnel to staff soil and water management units.
5. Technically sound procedures employed in soil surveys and in the development of guides, standards and specifications for soil and water management practices.
6. Training center established and in operation to provide a continuing supply of qualified staff.

1. Needed revisions supplied to Additional Director of Agriculture (Soil Conservation). Legislative Committees now reviewing revisions.
2. Plan of reorganization furnished to Additional Director of Agriculture (Soil Conservation). Plan undergoing review and awaiting legislative action.
3. Evidence in the field of the application of soil and water management practices directly benefiting cultivators farms has been noted as a result of activities of Irrigation Dept. and Division of soil conservation.
4. 23 technicians locally trained. 2 technicians posted in key positions after training in U.S. 2 additional technicians presently undergoing training in U.S. 2 soil survey teams technically upgraded.
5. New modern procedures employed in detailed mapping and classification of soils on the Pilot Project, has provided basic standards for developing irrigation guides and other management and cropping specifications affecting broad areas.
6. Training officer assigned and instructors appointed. Syllabus undergoing revision after trial. Handbooks, bulletins and training materials on hand. Training of 20 technicians per session.

V. PROGRAMMING GOAL

A. Statement of Programming Goal

Continuing rapid growth in agricultural 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.

Since the application of modern programs of soil and water management are recognized as an important factor in continued agricultural growth, achieving the project purpose will make a significant contribution to the programming goal. Pilot project demonstrations have provided evidence that modern programs of soil and water management increase yields and profits. Among these are improved cropping systems, land leveling and channel linings for water control. Indirectly legislative actions and training programs are contributing to the project purpose and thereby support the programming goal.