

PROJECT APPRAISAL REPORT (PAR)

PAGE 1

|   |   |                            |                                     |
|---|---|----------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 1. PROJECT NO.<br><b>386-11-110-366.6</b> | 2. PAR FOR PERIOD:<br><b>7/1/71</b> TO <b>9/30/72</b> | 3. COUNTRY<br><b>India</b> | 4. PAR SERIAL NO.<br><b>FY 73-1</b> |
|---|---|----------------------------|-------------------------------------|

5. PROJECT TITLE  
**TERMINAL PAR  
 Agricultural Production (Mysore)**

|   |                                       |                                |                                     |
|---|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 6. PROJECT DURATION: Began FY <b>1967</b> Ends FY <b>1973</b> | 7. DATE LATEST PROP<br><b>6/24/69</b> | 8. DATE LATEST PIP<br><b>-</b> | 9. DATE PR. OR PAR<br><b>9/7/71</b> |
|---|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------------------------|

|                  |  |   |   |
|------------------|--|---|---|
| 10. U.S. FUNDING | a. Cumulative Obligation <b>FY 1972</b> Thru Prior FY: \$ <b>713,000</b> | b. Current FY Estimated Budget: \$ <b>-</b> | c. Estimated Budget to completion After Current FY: \$ <b>-</b> |
|------------------|--|---|---|

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

|   |  |
|---|--|
| a. NAME<br><b>University of Tennessee</b> | b. CONTRACT, PASA OR VOL. AG. NO.<br><b>AID/nesa-318</b> |
|---|--|

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 |  |  |
|               |       |      | <b>All efforts to get Indian participation in in-depth evaluation failed. However, we have copies of the requested summary of team activities.</b> | <b>No action as the project terminated as of September 30, 1972.</b> |

|   |                           |
|---|---------------------------|
| D. RE-PLANNING REQUIRED   | E. DATE OF MISSION REVIEW |
| REVISED OR NEW: <input type="checkbox"/> PROP <input type="checkbox"/> PIP <input type="checkbox"/> PPO AG <input type="checkbox"/> PIO/T <input type="checkbox"/> PIO/C <input type="checkbox"/> PIO/P | <b>1/22/73</b>            |

|  |  |
|--|--|
| PROJECT MANAGER: TYPED NAME, SIGNED INITIALS AND DATE<br><b>Ervin T. Bullard</b> <i>ETB</i> <b>1/22/73</b> | MISSION DIRECTOR: TYPED NAME, SIGNED INITIALS AND DATE<br><b>Howard E. Houston</b> |
|--|--|

|                                   |                                 |                                      |                  |                           |
|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------------------------|------------------|---------------------------|
| AID 1020-25 (10-70)<br>PAGE 2 PAR | PROJECT NO.<br>386-11-110-366.6 | PAR FOR PERIOD: 7/1/71<br>TO 9/30/72 | COUNTRY<br>India | PAR SERIAL NO.<br>FY 73-1 |
|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------------------------|------------------|---------------------------|

**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 |   |   | 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

The performance was highly satisfactory. It was due to the development of good programs in the fields of extension training, plant protection, soil testing and fertilizer in close cooperation with the UAS and the Department of Agriculture. During the period under review, American team members turned over almost all responsibilities to their Indian counterparts to carry out the objectives of the program.

|                         |  |  |  |  |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |   |  |
|-------------------------|--|--|--|--|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|---|--|
| 4. PARTICIPANT TRAINING |  |  |  |  | X |  |  |  |  |  |  | X |  |
|-------------------------|--|--|--|--|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|---|--|

Comment on key factors determining rating

Five FY 70 and FY 71 participants returned during this period after receiving training in the U.S.A. The selection of FY 72 trainees was completed but because of suspension of training program in December 1971, training programs planned were cancelled.

|                |  |  |  |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |   |  |
|----------------|--|--|--|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|---|--|
| 5. COMMODITIES |  |  |  | X |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | X |  |
|----------------|--|--|--|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|---|--|

Comment on key factors determining rating

The maintenance and use of commodities was satisfactory. All non-expendable equipment has been turned over to the UAS and Department of Agriculture for use in the on-going activities.

|                        |              |  |  |  |  |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |   |
|------------------------|--------------|--|--|--|--|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|---|
| 6. COOPERATING COUNTRY | a. PERSONNEL |  |  |  |  | X |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | X |
|                        | b. OTHER     |  |  |  |  | X |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | X |

Comment on key factors determining rating

The relationships between the University of Agricultural Sciences and the Department of Agriculture were further improved during this period. The leadership and Indian associates were competent and cooperative in developing the program. The State Department of Agriculture and the UAS plan to carry forward most of the programs started by the APP team.

|                 |                |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|-----------------|----------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| 7. OTHER DONORS | Not Applicable |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|-----------------|----------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|

(See Next Page for Comments on Other Donors)

|                    |                                 |                                      |                  |                           |
|--------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------------------------|------------------|---------------------------|
| AID 1020-25(10-70) | PROJECT NO.<br>386-11-110-366.6 | PAR FOR PERIOD:<br>7/1/71 to 9/30/72 | COUNTRY<br>India | PAR SERIAL NO.<br>FY 73-1 |
|--------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------------------------|------------------|---------------------------|

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

Not Applicable

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   |        | FY ____ | FY ____ | END OF<br>PROJECT |
|   |  |   | TO DATE      | TO END |         |         |                   |
| Trained staff<br>P-Participants (US trained)<br>L-Local staff | PLANNED  | P-21  | P-4          |        |         | P-25    |                   |
|   | ACTUAL PERFORM-<br>ANCE                                  | L-1600<br>P-11  | L-800<br>P-1 |        |         | L-2400  |                   |
|   | REPLANNED  | L-800   | L *          |        |         |         |                   |
| Field tests and<br>demonstrations                             | PLANNED  | 1700  | 900          |        |         |         |                   |
|   | ACTUAL PERFORM-<br>ANCE                                  | 1480  | *            |        |         |         |                   |
|   | REPLANNED  |   |              |        |         |         |                   |
| Field Problem Units   | PLANNED  | 6   | 4            |        |         |         |                   |
|   | ACTUAL PERFORM-<br>ANCE                                  | 6   | 2            |        |         |         |                   |
|   | REPLANNED  |   |              |        |         |         |                   |
| High level meetings   | PLANNED  | 36  | 1            |        |         |         |                   |
|   | ACTUAL PERFORM-<br>ANCE                                  | 36  | 0            |        |         |         |                   |
|   | REPLANNED  |   |              |        |         |         |                   |
| B. QUALITATIVE INDICATORS<br>FOR MAJOR OUTPUTS                |  | COMMENT:  |              |        |         |         |                   |
| 1.  | Prompt identification and<br>solution of field problems. | The team continued to identify problems and seek their solutions. Technical assistants and agriculture offers were utilized in reporting farmers' problems and carrying back information to them. Lines of communication between research agencies, field staff and private industry have been fairly well developed.           |              |        |         |         |                   |
| 2.  | Field Problem Units.                                     | The U.S. technicians in collaboration with their Indian counterparts undertook effective programs for developing local threshing machine and seed drill, and training agriculture workers in best planting time for local maize, correcting zinc deficiency in rice fields and dissemination of new HYVs and research findings. |              |        |         |         |                   |
| 3.  | High level coordination                                  | Good coordination existed between the research staff and extension agency. This was ensured by frequent meetings among themselves and periodic meetings of the High Level Coordination Committee.   |              |        |         |         |                   |

IV. PROJECT PURPOSE

A. 1. Statement of purpose as currently envisaged.

2. Same as above, slightly reworded.

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

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <p>B. 1. Conditions which will exist when above purpose is achieved.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. High level coordination exists among agricultural development institutions.</li> <li>2. Qualified researchers and field staff assigned.</li> <li>3. Agricultural research program oriented towards problems regarding foodgrain production.</li> </ol> | <p>2. Evidence to date of progress toward these conditions.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <del>Coordination between the Univ. of Agr. Sciences, the Dept. of Agriculture and the State Govt. has been strengthened by holding high level meetings. The field problem units also met quite frequently.</del></li> <li>2. The Univ. of Agr. Sciences is staffed with qualified researchers and the Dept. of Agriculture has reasonably well trained extension workers. The Indian members of the Field Problem Units were well qualified and competent.</li> <li>3. Increasing attention is now being paid to the development and testing of new varieties, and the solution of such problems as fertilizer use in relation to soil fertility, control of insect pests, diseases and weeds, soil and water management and proper packages of cultural practices for important crops.</li> </ol> |
|---|---|

Contd. . . . page 4A

V. PROGRAMMING GOAL.

A. Statement of Programming Goal

Achieve continuing rapid growth in agricultural production in **Myore**.

B. Will the achievement of the project purpose make a significant contribution to the programming goal, given the magnitude of the national problem? Continued success and progress in agricultural development of the state is to be expected through the coordinated efforts of the University of Agricultural Sciences, and the Department of Agriculture in the fields of research, training and extension. High-yielding varieties of rice, corn and sorghum are well accepted, their area in 1971-72 being 225,000 hectares, 105,000 hectares and 225,000 hectares respectively. Field demonstrations in fertilizers were effective in raising fertilizer (nutrient) consumption to the level of 166,800 tonnes.

B. 1. CONDITIONS WHICH WILL EXIST WHEN ABOVE PURPOSE IS ACHIEVED

2. EVIDENCE TO DATE OF PROGRESS TOWARD THESE CONDITIONS

4. Established lines of communication among related research agencies, field staff and private industry.

4. The lines of communication between the two major agencies, the Univ. of Agricultural Sciences and the Department of Agriculture are now fairly well established. There is a good working relationship between the research and field staff for organizing training programs of extension workers and farmers, conducting field trials and demonstrations, preparation of publications and leaflets, etc. Industry also cooperated in the development of farm implements.

5. Systematic interpretation of and testing of research conclusions.

5. All research results are thoroughly tested on government farms and farmers' fields before they are recommended to farmers. Under this program cooperative trials of new varieties of hybrid finger millet, rice and wheat, trials of new bullock-powered and other implements, approved practices, control measures of insect pests and diseases, were conducted.

6. Dissemination to farmers of tested research conclusions and farmers' acceptance of recommended practices.

6. Dissemination of information was carried out through village meetings, demonstrations, training of farmers, and publication and distribution of leaflets and bulletins. Sets of coloured slides on important subjects such as harmful and beneficial insects, crop diseases, weeds, stored grain pests were exhibited at important gatherings of field workers and farmers. A manual entitled "Field Crop Pests" and another on "Soil Fertility Evaluation to serve Indian farmers" and a factsheet on grain storage were prepared by the U.S. technicians in cooperation with their Indian associates.