<u> પરિશિષ્ટ–૧</u>

કૃષિ વિજ્ઞાન કેન્દ્રો માટે અહેવાલ અને પ્રેઝન્ટેશનનો પ્રફોર્મા

| Table 1: Front Line Demonstration (FLD) |
|---|
|---|

| S. | Technology | No. of | Area | Y | ′ield (q/h: | a) | Local check | % | |
|----|--------------------------------|---------|------|-----------|-------------|----------|--------------|-----------|--|
| N. | | farmers | (ha) | Highest | Lowest | Average | yield (q/ha) | increased | |
| • | | | | Crop Pro | duction | | | | |
| 1 | Paddy- GR 17 | 25 | 5 | 28.20 | 25.05 | 27.48 | 22.10 | 24.34 | |
| 2 | Finger millet- CFMV 2(Gira) | 25 | 5 | 16.35 | 13.40 | 14.57 | 9.95 | 46.43 | |
| 3 | Chickpea GJG 3 | 25 | 5 | 12.40 | 10.45 | 11.61 | 8.64 | 34.38 | |
| • | Horticulture | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | Mango (Kesar) | 50 | 5 | | 7 | 9% Succe | ess rate | | |
| 2 | Okra | 25 | 2.5 | 108 | 90 | 98.36 | 96.34 | 2.09 | |
| 3 | Indian been GNIB 22 | 5 | 0.50 | 38 | 32 | 36 | 28.00 | 28.51 | |
| • | | | | Plant Pro | tection | | | | |
| 1 | Bittergourd (Cue lure trap) | 25 | 5 | 92 | 87 | 89.76 | 79.32 | 13.24 | |
| 2 | Cashewnut (Beauveria) | 25 | 5 | 12.1 | 11.5 | 11.78 | 9.40 | 25.80 | |
| 3 | Mango (Fruit fly trap) | 25 | 5 | 62 | 58 | 60.44 | 51.86 | 16.65 | |

| S. | Technology | No. of | F | Y | íield (q/ha | a) | Local check | | | |
|----|----------------------------------|---------|------|-----------|-------------|---------|--------------|-----------|--|--|
| N. | Demonstrated | farmers | (ha) | Highest | Lowest | Average | yield (q/ha) | increased | | |
| • | | | | Crop Pro | duction | | | | | |
| 1 | Paddy- GR 17 | 25 | 15 | 31.38 | 24.10 | 27.92 | 21.98 | 27.02 | | |
| 2 | Pigeon pea- GT 105 | 25 | 5 | 14.45 | 12.90 | 13.63 | 10.36 | 31.56 | | |
| • | Horticulture | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | Brinajal GNRB 1 | 40 | 0.4 | 36 | 31 | 33.15 | 30.77 | 7.73 | | |
| 2 | Indian been GNIB 22 | 14 | 1.4 | 39 | 31 | 34.64 | 26.57 | 3.32 | | |
| 3 | Natural Farming in Green gram | 12 | 1.2 | 4.9 | 5.70 | 5.40 | 5.91 | -8.71 | | |
| • | | | | Plant Pro | tection | | | | | |
| 1 | Mango (Fruit fly trap) | 60 | 30 | 62 | 58 | 60.48 | 52.02 | 16.36 | | |
| • | • Extension Education | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | Napier grass | 25 | 1.25 | 1420 | 1240 | 1330 | 820 | 62.19 | | |
| 2 | Vermicompost@ 5 t/ha | 20 | 1.50 | 20.65 | 20.31 | 20.48 | 16.30 | 25.64 | | |

FLDs under other schemes (Other than KVK-ICAR Budget): (Adaptive trial)

Note: Napier grass: 3 nodes Stem or root cuttings of Napier grass are planting in 50 x 50 cm Vermicompost@ 5 t/ha: Effect of Vermicompost on Yields of Green Gram

FLD on Other Enterprise

| Category | Category Thematic N | | No. of | No. of | Yield (Kg) | | % change | Economics of demonstration (Rs./ha) | | | |
|---------------------|------------------------|----------------------------------|--------|-----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------|--|-----------------|---------------|--------------|
| and Crop | area | technology demonstrated | Farmer | Units | Demo | Check | in yield | Gross Cost | Gross Return | Net Return | BCR (R/C) |
| Plant Protection | Mushroom production | Oyster musroom cultivation | 60 | 60 | 10 Kg/ 1 Kg spawn | - | - | 300 | 1600 | 1300 | 5.3 |

| S. | Technology | No. of | Area | Y | Yield (q/h | a) | Local check | % | |
|----|--------------------|---------|------|---------|------------|---------|--------------|-----------|--|
| N. | Demonstrated | farmers | (ha) | Highest | Lowest | Average | yield (q/ha) | increased | |
| • | Crop Production | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | Pigeon pea- GT 104 | 50 | 20 | 8.35 | 7.15 | 7.80 | 5.25 | 48.48 | |
| 2 | Black gram - GU 3 | 50 | 20 | 15.02 | 12.45 | 13.74 | 10.02 | 37.13 | |

FLDs under other schemes (Other than KVK-ICAR Budget): (CFLD)

FLD on Farm Implements and Machinery

| Name of the | Сгор | Technology demonstrate | No. of | Are | Major | obser | led vation ıt/man ur) | % change in major | | bor reduct | ion (man da | r days) Cost reduction (Rs./ha or Rs./Unit | | | | |
|---------------------------------|----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------|------|---|------------|--------------------------------|----------------------|---------|------------|-------------------------|---|------------|---------------------|--|------|
| implement | | d | Farmer | (ha) | hal | parameter | Land prepar ation | Sowing | Weeding | Total | Land preparati on | Labour | Irrigation | Total | | |
| Hand weeder (Adaptive trial) | Kitche n garden, pulses | Drudgery reduction technology | 50 | 50 | Labour requirement man hour/ha | 74 Hour | 126 Hour | 70.27 | | | 6.5 Days* | 6.5 Days* | | 389 x 6.5 = 2528 | | 2528 |

* One day is equal to 8 hours and labour cost is Rs. 389/Day/Person

FLD on Livestock

| Sr. no. | Thematic area | Name of the technology | No. of Farmer | No. of Units (Animal/ Poultry/ | lit/cow/day change | | parameters lit/cow/day | | Econo | | demons Rs.) | tration* | Ec | | s of chee s.) | ck |
|------------|-------------------------|---|------------------|---|--------------------|---------------|---------------------------|---------------|-------|---------------|----------------|----------|-------|---------------|------------------|----|
| | | demonstrated | | Birds, etc) | Demo | narameter | | Gross Cost | | Net Return | BCR** (R/C) | | | Net Return | BCR (R/C) | |
| 1. | Fodder management | Introduction of new variety of Fodder Sorghum " CSV 21 F" | 20 | 20 | 318 (q/ha) | 276 (q/ha) | 15.22 | 26000 | 79500 | 53500 | 3.05 | 27000 | 69000 | 42000 | 2.55 | |
| | | | | | | Adaptiv | ve trial | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. | Fodder management | sorghum GFS-6 | 108 | 13.5 ha | 322 | 265 | 21.51 | 26000 | 80500 | 54500 | 3.09 | 27000 | 66250 | 39250 | 2.45 | |
| 2. | Fodder management | sorghum GFS-6/CSV- 21F | 28 | 3.5 ha | 310 | 257 | 20.62 | 26000 | 77500 | 51500 | 2.98 | 27000 | 64250 | 37250 | 2.37 | |
| 3. | Nutrition management | Mineral mixture | 50 | 50 | 6.3 | 5.4 | 16.67 | 2300 | 5670 | 3370 | 2.46 | 2200 | 4860 | 2660 | 2.06 | |

N.B.: The proforma can be modified and used as per ICAR.

Table 2: On Farm Trail (OFT)

1. Varietal assessment of finger millet

| | seessine of high himse | | |
|----------------|-------------------------------------|--------------|------|
| Treatment | Technology Assessed | Yield (Q/ha) | BCR |
| T | Farmers Practices (Local varieties) | 9.26 | 3.70 |
| T ₂ | GNN 8 | 11.39 | 3.80 |
| T ₃ | CFMV 2 (Gira) | 13.68 | 4.56 |

2. Varietal assessment of chickpea

| Treatment | Technology Assessed | Yield (Q/ha) | BCR |
|----------------|----------------------------------|--------------|------|
| T ₁ | Farmer variety (Local Varieties) | 10.71 | 2.68 |
| T ₂ | GJG 6 | 12.81 | 3.71 |

3. Varietal assessment of Indian bean in the Dangs district

| Treatment | Technology Assessed | Yield (Q/ha) | BCR |
|----------------|------------------------------|--------------|------|
| T ₁ | Farmers practices (Katargam) | 28.16 | 2.01 |
| T ₂ | GNIB 21 (2014) | 31.66 | 2.31 |
| T ₃ | GNIB 22 (2017) | 33.33 | 2.42 |

4. Assessment of management of Fruit & Shoot borer in Okra

| Treatment | Technology Assessed | Yield (Q/ha) | BCR |
|----------------|---|--------------|------|
| T | Farmers practice | 131 | 3.69 |
| T ₂ | Installation of Pheromone trap | 143.6 | 3.71 |
| T ₃ | Spray Azadirachtin (Neem oil based) 1500 ppm | 140.6 | 3.96 |

5. Assessment of pheromone trap for the management of fruit & shoot borer in Brinjal

| Treatment | Technology Assessed | Yield (Q/ha) | BCR |
|----------------|---|--------------|------|
| T | Farmers Practices | 157.1 | 3.17 |
| T ₂ | Installation of pheromone traps @ 40 traps/ha (AAU,Anand) | 173.3 | 3.46 |
| T ₃ | Remove the infected shoot and fruit + Installed pheromone traps @ 12/ha (TNAU,TN) | 169.5 | 3.63 |

N.B. : The proforma can be modified and used as per ICAR.

New OFT

1. Varietal assessment of Brinjal in the Dangs district

2. Effect of Fresh Azolla as a Feed Supplementation on Milk Yield and Fat Percentage in Dairy Cattle

Not conducted due to lack of grant

1. Use of Chelated minerals in the diet of crossbred HF cows

 Table 3: Farmers' problems/Farmers' feedback/Researchable issues etc.

| S.N. | Farmers' problems/Farmers' feedback//Researchable issues etc. |
|------|---|
| 1. | Paddy variety GR 17 found more number of tillers than other improved and local |
| | varieties in dang. |
| 2. | GU 3 variety of black gram gave good yield in compare of local varieties during |
| | summer season. |
| 3. | GNRB 1 variety gave more yield compare to other variety. |
| 4. | GNIB 22 produce high quality pods compare to local variety. |
| 5. | Required good quality & affordable price of pheromone trap from NAU. |
| 6. | Fruit fly trap in mango & vegetable showing good result. |
| 7. | Feeding of chelated Mineral Mixture along with deworming resulted in increased milk |
| | production & overall good health. |
| 8. | Use of chaff cutter resulted in to prevention of wastage in fodder feeding. |
| 9. | Planting Napier grass in secondary and marginal land protected erosion of soil by |
| | heavy rainfall |
| 10. | Feeding chopped Napier alone or along with dry paddy grass have increased milk |
| | production in cattle |
| 11. | Vermicompost prevent soil degradation and enhance soil fertility status. |
| 12. | Twin wheel hoe reduced the cost incurred for weeding as well enhanced the yield apart |
| | from reducing the drudgery of farm women in weeding operation. |