

/

PROJECT COMPLETION REPORT  
386-0471 - FERTILIZER PROMOTION PROJECT

### Introduction

Over the Fifth Plan period (1974/75 - 1978/79) fertilizer consumption in India had grown from about 2.6 million tons to 5.1 million tons in nutrient terms, representing an annual compound growth rate of about 18.4 percent. India's domestic production of plant nutrients, however, grew from the level of 1.5 million tons to 2.9 million tons only during the same period. The gap between production and consumption, therefore, had to be bridged by an aggressive policy of fertilizer imports. The need for pursuing the same policy in the Sixth Plan period was equally great. The Sixth Plan set a target of 4 percent annual growth of agricultural production, which was to be realized through massive investment in irrigation development, expansion of area under high yielding varieties of foodgrains and sustaining the tempo of fertilizer consumption. Planned investment in fertilizer plants was estimated to provide no more than 65-70 percent of the estimated requirement of fertilizer. To fulfill the planned targets, therefore, India had no option other than to continue the policy of large annual imports of fertilizer, and the purpose of India-Fertilizer Promotion Project (386-0471) was to support the continuation of that policy.

Although fertilizer use had been increasing from year to year in an impressive way since the introduction of the High Yielding Varieties Program in the mid-sixties, the emerging pattern of consumption had some distressing features. While the innovations introduced in the fertilizer distribution system in the early seventies, - such as expansion of dealer registration and increase of private retail outlets - had broadened the system, the consumption pattern continued to be highly skewed.

In 1977-78, for instance, 63 out of 380 districts accounted for 53 percent of the total fertilizer consumed; 149 districts accounted for about 80 percent of fertilizer consumption that year. Given the government's concern for equity, it was clear that the distribution system needed to be further improved and made more broad-based. The Project was initiated with the understanding that the GOI would develop and carry out certain programs in this area.

## The Project

The Project involved a loan financing by AID for fertilizer imports by the Indian government to the extent of \$150 million spread over three years to support a series of GOI activities for broadening the base of fertilizer consumption. Because of AID's policy decision to discontinue resource transfer projects and to concentrate more on technology transfer, the Project was amended in 1982 to limit loan financing to only \$101 million.

A total amount of \$101 million was obligated under the project in three tranches. Obligation and expenditure data is provided below:

<u>Loan No.</u>	<u>Obligations *</u>		<u>Disbursement as of 9/30/85 (\$) *</u>	<u>Unliquidated balance (\$)</u>
	<u>Amount (\$)</u>	<u>Date</u>		
T-226	22,000,000	9/28/79	22,000,000.00	0
T-226A	44,000,000	5/27/80	44,000,000.00	0
T-226B	<u>35,000,000</u>	12/15/80	<u>34,998,606.75</u>	<u>1,393.25</u>
TOTAL	101,000,000		100,998,606.75	1,393.25

PACD expired 12/31/84. All payments must be completed within 9 months of PACD expiry.

The unliquidated balance of \$1,393.25 is to be deobligated/decommitted. There is also an amount of \$20,512.10 which is to be refunded to USAID by the GOI representing claims by the GOI and settled by the shipowners towards shortlanded/damaged cargo under loan No. T-226. Mission is following up with the GOI to refund this amount to USAID.

As part of this Project, GOI's plans to broaden the base of fertilizer consumption included (a) the continuation and extension of its Intensive Fertilizer Promotion Campaign to a total of 104 districts, (b) increasing the number of retail outlets and (c) development of a suitable incentive system to ensure that fertilizer was delivered to the block headquarters.

Studies had shown that top districts in respect of fertilizer consumption had a high proportion of cultivated area under irrigation, but not all districts with relatively large irrigated area were top districts with relatively high fertilizer consumption. The latter obviously had a high potential for fertilizer use.

Out of this realization, came the Intensive Fertilizer Promotion Campaign which was introduced in 1976-77 in some 75 districts; the experience gained in this campaign indicated that large increases in aggregate fertilizer consumption were possible in many districts, through strengthening of the infrastructure of fertilizer distribution. However, the skewed fertilizer consumption pattern could not be wholly explained by differential development of irrigation alone; there were some physical and financial constraints as well. Physical constraints related to the areas of transportation and distribution of fertilizer while financial constraints included the distribution margin, among other things.

Although railroads move the bulk of fertilizers (about 70 percent of total fertilizer distributed) from the port and/or manufacturing centers to the consumption centers, they move fertilizer only upto the railheads. Given the high cost of road transportation, the retail sales outlets tend to cluster around the railheads which are most unevenly dispersed in space. There are areas without a railhead within a radius of 160 miles or more in as many as 2900 development blocks. To remedy the situation, the GOI had taken some important steps before the Project began. First, a number of road points in remote and hill areas were declared as railheads to cover the cost of transportation to these road points; second, a road-subsidy scheme was introduced in 1978. As part of the Project, the GOI decided to introduce a scheme of delivery of fertilizer to the block headquarters. It called for the fixation of an equated average transport cost for moving fertilizers from railheads to block headquarters which would be deducted from the payment made by institutional agencies for fertilizers they purchased.

## Project Results

### 1. Fertilizer Imports and Consumption:

Table 1 in the Annex shows the annual production, import and consumption of fertilizer in nutrient terms in India since 1980/81. Briefly, domestic production of N and P increased from 3.0 million tons in 1980/81 to about 5.3 million tons in 1984/85, indicating an annual compound rate of growth of 14.6 percent; India does not produce any potassic fertilizer; it is all imported. Imports of fertilizer N, P and K increased from 2.7 million tons in 1980/81 to 3.6 million in 1984/85 - a compound growth rate of 7 percent per year (Annex Table 1). The total quantity of plant nutrients imported from 1981/82 to 1984/85 (both years inclusive) was 8.1 million tons. Fertilizer imported under the Project between 1981 and 1985 was about 2.79 percent of India's total imports in terms of nutrients. The year-wise breakdown of fertilizer imported under the project was as follows:

1981	206,878.67	tons of DAP
	14,967.3	tons of Urea
1984	117,447.396	tons of DAP
1985	13,000.0	tons of DAP

Total amount of nutrients consumed between 1981/82 and 1984/85 was of the order of 28.4 million tons, which represented an annual rate of growth of about 10.4 percent since 1980/81.

Mission had conducted several field visits to the warehouses of various authorized distribution agents in order to determine the status of utilization of AID financed fertilizers. In the first review of USAID fertilizers, very little quantity had moved out in case of the total quantity handled by one distributor, the Food Corporation of India (FCI). Mission had taken this matter up with the GOI. As a result of persistent efforts by the Mission, the GOI had transferred the stocks of FCI to other distribution agencies. These were sold out subsequently. Also, GOI did not allocate any quantity to the FCI out of the subsequent purchases made by GOI utilizing AID loans. Only agencies with proven performance in distribution were used. Mission's field reviews indicated that all USAID financed fertilizers were sold out.

## 2. Block Delivery Scheme

The main objective of the scheme was to make available a minimum stock of fertilizer in each block so that the farmers did not have to travel a long distance to get their requirement and could purchase fertilizer as and when needed. The scheme was made applicable to all nitrogenous and complex fertilizers, and it functioned in the following way.

In accordance with the guidelines framed by the Central Government, the state governments developed block-wise supply plans in consultation with the manufacturers and handling agencies of the pool fertilizer operating in the state. Next, they determined the weighted average lead distance for each supplier on the basis of the distance to the block headquarters from his nearest supply point. The average kilometer per ton rates prevalent in the state was applied to the lead distance for each supplier and the weighted average transport cost to be incurred by the supplier was determined. This cost per Km/Ton was then passed on by the manufacturers to the institutional agencies for the fertilizer supplied by them upto the block headquarters. For private retailers the suppliers operated a system of transport rebate based on a distance slab. Finally, the transport cost worked out for each supplier was reimbursed by the government with appropriate adjustment in the freight subsidy scheme.

The scheme was so designed as not to disturb the existing distribution and marketing arrangements developed by the fertilizer industry over the years. Movement to blocks was governed by the existing marketing set-up consistent with a rationalized marketing zone concept and by the need for avoiding cross movements of the same type of fertilizer within the state. Where a manufacturer

already had a well-developed system of direct supply of fertilizer within the blocks or of defraying transport expenses incurred for this purpose, the scheme did not disturb those existing arrangements.

The following statement indicates the quantity of fertilizer moved to block headquarters each year under the scheme:

Quantity moved to Block Headquarters (in thousand tons)

<u>Year</u>	<u>Indigenous</u>	<u>Imported</u>	<u>Total</u>
1981-82	4155	2524	6679
1982-83	6642	1235	7877
1983-84	6280	2502	8782
1984-85	6141	3788	9929
1985-86*	6787	4386	11173

\* Estimated

Source: Ministry of Agriculture, Government of India

### 3. Intensive Fertilizer Promotion Campaign

Total number of districts selected for the Intensive Fertilizer Promotion Campaign (IFPC) was 104, of which 61 districts had predominantly rainfed agriculture. To begin with, a lead manufacturer was identified for each selected district. Before the start of the campaign, the lead manufacturer prepared a bench-mark survey of the district providing essential information on area under assured irrigation, area under assured rainfall, area under Command Area Development Program, area under high yielding crop varieties, areas covered by the Small Farmers Development Agency, and the prevailing level of fertilizer use for various crops. The gap between prevailing and optimum levels of fertilizer use was identified and attainable levels of fertilizer doses for different crops were determined. On the basis of this exercise, aggregate targets for blocks and districts were fixed.

Under the guidelines, the lead manufacturer was to prepare a promotional plan and to undertake promotional activities in the district, such as, organizing block demonstrations, training farmers and dealers, organizing farm festivals, advising farmers on soil testing, distributing technical literature to field staff and farmers, opening additional retail outlets and setting up fertilizer warehouses at village or block level.

IFPC did not have any provision for financial or substantive input from the Central Government. The role of the Center was to provide guidelines and to coordinate and monitor the program at the national level. The State Government had the responsibility for ensuring supplies of inputs other than fertilizer - certified high yielding varieties of seeds, chemicals and farm credit. Progress of the campaign was reviewed twice a year before kharif and rabi seasons at tripartite meetings between Central Government, State Government and fertilizer manufacturers.

Table 2 in the Annex shows the results of the IFPC in terms of increase in fertilizer consumption in 1984-85 over 1981-82 in each of the IFPC districts. The total increase in fertilizer consumption during the period in the IFPC districts works out at 51.3 percent. Maximum increase in fertilizer consumption was registered in Nellore district, Andhra Pradesh. In 10 districts fertilizer consumption fell during the period; the reasons could be constraints on the supply of inputs other than fertilizer, or simply a failure on the part of the lead manufacturers in these districts to organize effective promotional activities. It seems likely that the quality of the campaign was not uniform over all districts.

Table 3 in the Annex shows the increase in the number of retail shops in the IFPC districts in 1984-85 over 1981-82. About 11793 additional retail outlets were set up in these districts, which represents an increase of about 46 percent. However, in nine districts the number of retail outlets actually declined.

#### 4. Distributors' Margin

The fertilizer distribution margin fixed by the Government of India in 1975 varied by the type of fertilizer and also by the type of distributor. Thus, the margin for urea was fixed at Rs. 115/ton in the case of institutional suppliers (cooperatives) and Rs. 105/ton in the case of private dealers. The margin for DAP was Rs. 140/ton for the cooperatives and Rs. 125/ton for private dealers. There has been no change in this differential distribution margin scheme. However, the government revised and raised the margins in 1981 and again in 1983. The margins for distributing urea and DAP by the institutional agencies, after 1983 revision, stand at Rs. 150/ton and Rs. 210/ton respectively; the corresponding figures for private retailers are Rs. 130/ton and Rs. 190/ton (Annex Table 4).

#### 5. Conclusions

- a. The purpose of this Project was to support the Government of India (GOI) Fertilizer Import Policy for sustaining growth of fertilizer consumption and at the same time supporting the GOI's efforts to improve the fertilizer distribution system.
- b. A.I.D.'s total contribution of 225,807 metric tons of nutrients was approximately 2.79% of a total of 8.154 million metric tons of nutrients imported by GOI during the life of the Project (1981-85). Although the import of fertilizer under the Project was small in comparison with India's total fertilizer import, the achievement in line with the Project's purpose has been substantial in relation to the infrastructure of fertilizer distribution.

During the project period, the number of retail fertilizer outlets in the country increased from 25,717 to 37,510 or by 46%; overall fertilizer consumption in 94 out of 104 selected districts increased substantially from 1.2 million tons to 1.9 million tons (58% increase) and the quantity of fertilizer moved to block headquarters increased by about 67%.

- c. A.I.D. has determined that in the immediate future it is not likely to support a "Resource Transfer" type of Project in India. However, it should be noted that disbursements on this Project were made ahead of the projected schedule and the achievement of Project purpose was quite successful.
- d. All of the A.I.D. funds (about \$101 million) have been disbursed. The GOI contribution (\$4.45 Billion) has been provided and projected stream of benefits has been achieved per the objectives of the Project.

## 6. Recommendations

- a. Post-project A.I.D. monitoring is not required since the Project has been successfully completed, its purpose and objectives have been achieved, all funds have been disbursed, the GOI contribution has been provided and the benefit stream has been achieved.
- b. Evaluation of this Project, in terms of probable future A.I.D. programs in India, will not serve any purpose since A.I.D. has determined that it should discontinue the financing of "Resource Transfer" type projects in India.

:8:

**ANNEX TABLES**

1. Production, Imports and Consumption of Fertilizer since 1980/81
2. Fertilizer Consumption in IFPC Districts
3. Retail Fertilizer Outlets in IFPC
4. Distribution Margin and Maximum Sale Prices of Urea and DAP

TABLE 1

PRODUCTION, IMPORTS AND CONSUMPTION OF FERTILIZERS (000 TONS)

<u>YEAR</u>	<u>FERTILIZER</u>	<u>PRODUCTION</u>	<u>IMPORTS</u>	<u>CONSUMPTION</u>
1980/81	Nitrogenous (N)	2220.8	1510.4	3678.1
1981/82				4068.7
1982/83				4224.2
1983/84				5204.4
1984/85				5486.1
1980/81				Phosphatic (P <sub>2</sub> O <sub>5</sub> )
1981/82	1322.3			
1982/83	1435.9			
1983/84	1730.3			
1984/85	1886.4			
1980/81	Potassic (K <sub>2</sub> O)*			
1981/82				676.2
1982/83				726.5
1983/84				775.4
1984/85				838.5
1980/81				TOTAL (NPK)
1981/82	6067.2			
1982/83	6386.6			
1983/84	7710.1			
1984/85	8211.0			

India does not produce any potassic fertilizer

Source: Fertilizer Association of India

TABLE 2

FERTILIZER CONSUMPTION IN INTENSIVE FERTILIZER  
PROMOTION CAMPAIGN DISTRICTS

NAME OF THE STATE/ DISTRICT (1)	LEAD MANUFACTURER (2)	FERTILIZER CONSUMPTION (TONNES)		%AGE INCREASE/ DECREASE IN 84- 85 OVER 81-82 (5)
		1981-82 (3)	1984-85 (4)	
<u>Karnataka</u>				
1. Dharwar	Zuari	26647	50803	90.7
2. Tumkur	Zuari	12629	16707	32.3
3. Raichur	IFFCO	42652	63982	50.0
4. Bangalore	FACT	20678	28620	38.5
5. Kolar	SPIC	14019	16844	20.2
6. Bidar	RCF	6245	9154	46.1
7. Hassan	MFL	17734	19952	12.5
<u>Tamil Nadu</u>				
8. Dharampuri	MFL	9394	10321	9.8
9. Salem	MFL	22782	37070	62.7
10. Ramnad	SPIC	26094	21021	- 19.4
11. Kanyakumari	SPIC	5621	8016	42.6
12. Tirunelveli	SPIC	37741	39602	4.9
13. Pudukotai	FACT	11048	17635	59.6
<u>Kerala</u>				
14. Mallapuram	FACT	6966	8784	26.1
15. Cannanore	FACT	7960	7716	- 3.0
16. Quilon	FACT	7787	13937	78.9

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
<b>Andhra Pradesh</b>					
17.	Srikakulam	Coromandel	16086	21830	35.7
18.	Vishakhapatnam		8211	10822	31.8
19.	Cuddapah		24453	23007	- 5.9
20.	Vijayanagram	RCF	11067	15410	39.2
21.	Adilabad	RCF	13538	9575	- 29.3
22.	Nalgonda	Zuari	20780	49237	137.0
23.	Modak	FACT	14085	24848	76.4
24.	Chittoor	MFL	22732	30344	33.5
25.	Nellore	SPIC	21784	66443	205.0
<b><u>Gujarat</u></b>					
26.	Mehsana	IFFCO	20495	31702	54.4
27.	Ahmedabad	IFFCO	14157	24617	73.9
28.	Bharuch	GNFC	9439	7647	- 19.0
29.	Bulsar	GNFC	10049	15675	56.0
30.	Gandhinagar	GSFC	2769	2720	- 1.8
31.	Banaskantha	GSFC	10682	18187	70.3
32.	Panchmahal	GSFC	7440	13734	84.6
<b><u>Rajasthan</u></b>					
33.	Bhilwara	IFFCO	4055	8422	107.7
34.	Jhalwar	IFFCO	1923	3941	104.9
35.	Ganganagar	IFFCO	30710	51843	68.8
36.	Jaipur	Shriram	8555	17960	109.9
37.	Ajmer	Shriram	1195	3382	183.0
38.	Chittorgarh	Shriram	8483	18487	117.8
39.	Kota	Shriram	16571	24984	50.8

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
40.	Udaipur	GSFC	3282	5534	68.6
41.	Banswara	GSFC	2499	5792	131.7
42.	Bharatpur	NFL	5481	6038	10.2
43.	Alwar	NFL	5437	6422	18.1

**Maharashtra**

44.	Pune	RCF	34879	33148	5.0
45.	Parbhani	RCF	10884	12835	17.9
46.	Akola	RCF	14912	14588	2.2
47.	Bhandara	RCF	9115	15206	66.8
48.	Satara	RCF	21507	28176	31.0
49.	Nanded	Zuari	14787	27382	85.2
50.	Osmanabad	Zuari	13092	9770	- 25.4
51.	Aurangabad	IFFCO	19394	22863	17.9

**Madhya Pradesh**

52.	Hoshangabad	IFFCO	6365	13713	115.4
53.	Vidisha	IFFCO	4729	5552	17.4
54.	Bilaspur	IFFCO	10648	18503	73.7
55.	Rajnandgaon	HFC	5753	7024	22.1
56.	Tikamgarh	HFC	6060	11668	92.5
57.	Raipur	DMCC	23291	24922	7.0
58.	Morena	DMCC	12459	21661	73.9
59.	Shajapur	Shriram	4567	6920	51.5
60.	Damoh	FCI	958	1435	49.8
61.	Sagar	GNFC	3137	5513	75.7
62.	Durg	DMCC	7277	12630	73.6

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
<b><u>Assam</u></b>					
63.	Dibrugarh	HFC	1066	1284	20.5
<b><u>Bihar</u></b>					
64.	Purnea	HFC	6142	NA	NA
65.	Saharsa	HFC	5016	NA	NA
66.	West Champaran	HFC	7982	NA	NA
67.	Bhagalpur	HFC	10325	NA	NA
68.	Aurangabad	FCI	4507	10403	130.8
69.	Darbhanga	FCI	2921	3677	25.9
70.	Patna	FCI	11515	23086	100.5
71.	East Champaran	FCI	19709	12759	35.3
72.	Samastipur	IFFCO	6825	19671	188.2
<b><u>Orissa</u></b>					
73.	Dhenkanal	FCI	2180	3777	73.3
74.	Sundergarh	FCI	2343	4528	93.3
75.	Ganjam	IFFCO	12896	17656	36.9
76.	Phulbani	HFC	820	NA	NA
77.	Sambalpur	Coromandel	21307	35682	67.5
<b><u>West Bengal</u></b>					
78.	West Dinajpur	HFC	11389	21592	89.6
79.	Birbhum	HFC	19377	27103	39.9
80.	24-Parganas	IFFCO	24855	42935	72.7

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
<u>Haryana</u>					
81.	Rohtak	NFL	9197	15505	68.6
82.	Mohindergarh	NFL	6578	9914	50.7
83.	Jind	NFL	16096	23445	45.7
84.	Gurgaon	NFL/IFFCO	4986	7552	51.5
85.	Hissar	IFFCO	29996	41222	37.4
<u>Punjab</u>					
86.	Ropar	NFL	18017	25217	40.0
87.	Hoshiarpur	NFL	27141	31625	16.5
<u>Uttar Pradesh</u>					
88.	Bahraich	IFFCO	23007	35304	53.4
89.	Mirzapur	IFFCO	15752	22219	41.0
90.	Badaun	IFFCO	28254	54972	94.6
91.	Fatehpur	IFFCO	14057	31221	122.1
92.	Unnao	FCI	15885	32073	101.9
93.	Banda	FCI	5520	10477	89.8
94.	Pauri Garhwal	FCI	283	579	104.6
95.	Rai Bareilly	FCI	17651	32800	85.8
96.	Hardoi	IEL	19088	38183	100.0
97.	Almora	IEL	677	1013	49.6
98.	Etah	Shriram	16495	NA	NA
99.	Agra	GNFC	19586	37006	88.9

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
<u>Himachal Pradesh</u>				
100. Sirmur	NFL	1043	1288	23.5
101. Solan	NFL	1586	1710	7.8
102. Kangra	NFL	3608	5556	54.0
<u>Jammu &amp; Kashmir</u>				
103. Anantnag	IFFCO	2685	NA	NA
104. Kathua	NFL	<u>591</u>	<u>1557</u>	<u>163.5</u>
	TOTAL	234258	1866857	51.3

NA: Not available

TABLE 3

RETAIL OUTLETS IN THE INTENSIVE FERTILISER PROMOTION  
CAMPAIGN DISTRICTS

NAME OF THE STATE/ DISTRICT (1)	LEAD MANUFACTURER (2)	NO. OF RETAIL OUTLETS		INCREASE/ DECREASE IN 84- 85 OVER 81-82 (5)
		1981-82 (3)	1984-85 (4)	
<u>Karnataka</u>				
1. Dharwar	Zuari	783	1326	543
2. Tumkur	Zuari	310	510	200
3. Raichur	IFFCO	505	341	- 164
4. Bangalore	FACT	387	504	117
5. Kolar	SPIC	212	520	308
6. Bidar	RCF	324	249	- 75
7. Hassan	MFL	NA	341	NA
<u>Tamil Nadu</u>				
8. Dharampuri	MFL	323	458	135
9. Salem	MFL	1049	1195	146
10. Ramnad	SPIC	759	1124	365
11. Kanyakumari	SPIC	453	465	12
12. Tirunelveli	SPIC	941	1455	514
13. Pudukotai	FACT	354	425	71
<u>Kerala</u>				
14. Mallapuram	FACT	NA	467	NA
15. Cannanore	FACT	NA	445	NA
16. Quilon	FACT	NA	678	NA

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
17.	Srikakulam	Coromandel	155	459	304
18.	Vishakhapatnam		163	261	98
19.	Cuddapah		179	276	97
20.	Vijayanagram	RCF	153	319	166
21.	Adilabad	RCF	111	153	42
22.	Nalgonda	Zuari	284	462	178
23.	Modak	FACT	177	422	245
24.	Chittoor	MFL	NA	383	NA
25.	Nellore	SPIC	224	325	101

### Gujarat

26.	Mehsana	IFFCO	593	697	104
27.	Ahmedabad	IFFCO	330	387	57
28.	Bharuch	GNFC	219	346	127
29.	Bulsar	GNFC	236	226	10
30.	Banaskantha	GSFC	268	438	170
31.	Gandhinagar	GSFC	40	46	6
32.	Panchmahal	GSFC	196	371	175

### Rajasthan

33.	Bhilwara	IFFCO	278	269	9
34.	Jhalwar	IFFCO	206	207	1
35.	Ganganagar	IFFCO	800	871	71
36.	Jaipur	Shriram	NA	442	NA
37.	Ajmer	Shriram	NA	270	NA
38.	Chittorgarh	Shriram	NA	364	NA

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
39.	Kota	Shriram	174	566	392
40.	Udaipur	GSFC	89	349	260
41.	Banswara	GSFC	112	192	80
42.	Bharatpur	NFL	59	132	73
43.	Alwar	NFL	97	275	178

Maharashtra

44.	Pune	RCF	586	935	349
45.	Parbhani	RCF	329	417	88
46.	Akola	RCF	140	179	39
47.	Bhandara	RCF	222	295	73
48.	Satara	RCF	379	406	27
49.	Nanded	Zuari	350	480	130
50.	Osmanabad	Zuari	242	169	73
51.	Aurangabad	IFFCO	349	283	66

Madhya Pradesh

52.	Hoshangabad	IFFCO	173	261	88
53.	Vidisha	IFFCO	84	147	63
54.	Bilaspur	IFFCO	501	842	341
55.	Rajnandgaon	HFC	119	218	99
56.	Tikamgarh	HFC	128	212	84
57.	Raipur	DMCC	586	508	78
58.	Morena	DMCC	242	316	74
59.	Shajapur	Shriram	114	166	52
60.	Damoh	FCI	46	75	29
61.	Sagar	GNFC	101	184	83
62.	Durg	DMCC	255	415	160

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
<u>Assam</u>					
63.	Dibrugarh	HFC	148	247	99
<u>Bihar</u>					
64.	Purnea	HFC	195	268	73
65.	Saharsa	HFC	34	143	109
66.	West Champaran	HFC	221	173	48
67.	Bhagalpur	HFC	182	224	42
68.	Aurangabad	FCI	75	140	65
69.	Darbhanga	FCI	88	522	434
70.	Patna	FCI	62	133	71
71.	East Champaran	FCI	388	399	11
72.	Samastipur	IFFCO	319	469	150
<u>Orissa</u>					
73.	Dhenkanal	FCI	344	414	70
74.	Sundergarh	FCI	132	206	74
75.	Ganjam	IFFCO	1001	1300	199
76.	Phulbani	HFC	92	129	37
77.	Sambalpur	Coromandel	487	680	193
<u>West Bengal</u>					
78.	West Dinajpur	HFC	437	1091	654
79.	Birbhum	HFC	620	1315	695
80.	24-Parganas	IFFCO	NA	NA	NA

20

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
<u>Haryana</u>					
81.	Rohtak	NFL	197	237	40
82.	Mohindergarh	NFL	100	262	162
83.	Jind	NFL	166	224	58
84.	Gurgaon	NFL/IFFCO	79	178	99
85.	Hissar	IFFCO	332	471	139
<u>Punjab</u>					
86.	Ropar	NFL	236	256	20
87.	Hoshiarpur	NFL	NA	410	NA
<u>Uttar Pradesh</u>					
88.	Bahraich	IFFCO	278	341	63
89.	Mirzapur	IFFCO	321	307	14
90.	Badaun	IFFCO	372	436	64
91.	Fatehpur	IFFCO	231	379	148
92.	Unnao	FCI	266	396	130
93.	Banda	FCI	122	164	42
94.	Pauri Garhwal	FCI	30	79	49
95.	Rai Bareilly	FCI	453	761	308
96.	Hardoi	IEL	308	718	410
97.	Almora	IEL	13	55	42
98.	Etah	Shriram	338	462	124
99.	Agra	GNFC	428	639	211

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
<u>Himachal Pradesh</u>					
100.	Sirmur	NFL	NA	155	NA
101.	Solan	NFL	133	163	30
102.	Kangra	NFL	NA	579	NA
<u>Jammu &amp; Kashmir</u>					
103.	Anantnag	IFFCO	102	NA	NA
104.	Kathua	NFL	<u>NA</u>	<u>NA</u>	<u>NA</u>
		TOTAL	25717	37510	11793

NA: Not available

TABLE 4

DISTRIBUTION MARGIN AND MAXIMUM SALE PRICES OF  
UREA AND DAP

(Rs./Ton)

FERTILIZER (1)	EFFECTIVE FROM (2)	DISTRIBUTION MARGIN			MAXIMUM SALE PRICES (6)
		STATES & COOPS. (3)	PLANTA- TIONS (4)	PRIVATE REGISTERED DEALERS (5)	
Urea (46%N)	7/11/81	115	55	105	2350
	8/15/81	140	70	120	2350
	5/20/83	150	75	130	2350
	6/29/83	150	75	130	2150
DAP (18-46-0)	7/11/81	140	70	125	3600
	8/15/81	165	80	145	3600
	5/20/83	210	105	190	3600
	6/29/83	210	105	190	3350

Source: Fertilizer Association of India