<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/ha	n)	Local	%
N.	Demonstrated	farmers	(ha)	Highest	Lowest	Average	check yield (q/ha)	increased
•	Crop Production							
1	Paddy GR 18 (Devli Kolam)	26	13	22.40	20.92	21.45	18.94	13.26
2	Little millet GNV 4	25	5	14.20	11.75	13.18	11.03	19.49
3	Finger millet GNN 9 (Gira)	25	5	12.80	10.75	12.04	9.89	21.74
4	Pigeon pea GT 105	26	5.2	13.75	12.30	13.19	10.35	27.44
5	Gram GJG 3	25	5	12.95	11.95	12.42	9.30	33.56
6	Black gram GU 3	25	5	8.20	6.85	7.51	5.44	38.02
•				Horticu	lture			
2	Mango (Kesar)	100	10		Su	rvival rate	70-75%	
3	Indian bean GNIB 22	26	2.6	39	31	34.69	28.15	23.46
•		,		Plant Pro	tection			
1	Psudomonas (Finger millet)	25	5	13.5	11	12.26	9.69	26.91
2	Pheromone trap (Paddy)	25	5	23	21	22.18	18.40	20.58
3	Fruit fly trap (Mango)	25	5	55	50	52.46	40.88	28.60

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

S.	Technology	No. of			/ield (q/ha		Local check	%
N.	Demonstrated	farmers	(ha)	Highest	Lowest	Average	yield (q/ha)	increased
•	Crop Production							
1	Paddy GNR 7	50	25	22.96	21.04	21.80	19.30	12.98
2	Paddy GNR 9	25	12	22.50	20.72	21.63	18.98	13.94
•	Horticulture							
1	Mango (Kesar)	100	10		Su	rvival rate	70-72%	
2	Mango (Kesar)	60	6		Su	rvival rate	70-75%	
3	Mango (Sonpari)	40	4	Survival rate 67-72%				
•	Extension Education							
1	Napier grass Coimbtour 3	25	1.25	9.57	8.15	8.86	7.60	17.42

FLD on Other Enterprise

1 22 011	ounce Em	er prise									
Category	Thematic	Name of the	No. of	No.	Yield (l spa	Kg/1 kg wn)	% change	Ecoi	Economics of demonstratio (Kg/1 kg spawn)		tion
and Crop	area	technology demonstrated	Farmer	Units	Demo	Check	in yield	Gross Cost	Gross Return	Net Return	BCR (R/C)
Plat protection	Mushroom production	Mushroom	125	125	8 kg	-	-	300	1600	1300	5.3

FLD on Livestock

	D on Livest	UCK														
				No. of		ajor meters	%	Economics of demonstration*		Ec	onomic	s of che	ck			
Sr.	Thematic area	Name of the technology		Units (Animal/ Poultry/	lit/cow/day change		'			(1	Rs.)			(R	s.)	
		demonstrated		Birds,	Demo	Check	in major	Gross	Gross	Net	BCR**	Gross	Gross	Net	BCR	
				etc)			parameter	Cost	Return	Return	(R/C)	Cost	Return	Return	(R/C)	
1.	Nutrition management	Mineral Mixture	30	30	8.4	7.2	16.67	5600	2300	3300	2.43	4600	2200	2400	2.09	

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

Table 2: On Farm Trail (OFT)

1. Varietal assessment of finger millet (3rd year)

Treatment	Technology Assessed	Yield (Q/ha)	BCR
T	Farmers Practices (Local varieties)	8.51	2.81
T_{2}	GNN 8	10.48	3.00
T_{3}	CFMV 2 (Gira)	12.54	3.59

2. Varietal assessment of chickpea (2nd year)

Treatment	Technology Assessed	Yield (Q/ha)	BCR
T	Farmer variety (Local Varieties)	9.91	3.30
T ₂	GJG 6	13.43	3.78

3. Varietal assessment of Indian bean in the Dangs district (2nd year)

Treatment	Technology Assessed	Yield (Q/ha)	BCR
T ₁	Farmers practices (Katargam)	28.25	1.95
T ₂	GNIB 21 (2014)	31.75	2.24
T ₃	GNIB 22 (2017)	33.25	2.34

4. Varietal assessment of Brinjal in the Dangs district (1st year)

Treatment	Technology Assessed	Yield (Q/ha)	BCR
T	Farmers practices (Palanpuri)	180.83	1.98
T ₂	GNRB 1	195.16	2.16

5. Assessment of management of Fruit & Shoot borer in Okra (3rd year)

Treatment	Technology Assessed	Yield (Q/ha)	BCR
T ₁	Farmers practice	130	3.66
T_{2}	Installation of Pheromone trap	143	3.69
T ₃	Spray Azadirachtin (Neem oil based) 1500 ppm	145	4.08

6. Assessment of pheromone trap for the management of fruit & shoot borer in Brinjal $(2^{nd}$ year)

Treatment	Technology Assessed	Yield (Q/ha)	BCR
T_{1}	Farmers Practices	157.16	3.17
T ₂	Installation of pheromone traps @ 40 traps/ha (AAU,Anand)	170.83	3.41
T ₃	Remove the infected shoot and fruit + Installed pheromone traps @ 12/ha (TNAU,TN)	172.33	3.69

7. Use of Chelated minerals in the diet of crossbred HF cows (2nd year)

Treatment	Technology Assessed	Yield (Lit/day)	BCR
T ₁	Farmer's practice – feeding of locally available feeds and fodders	6.0	2.10
T ₂	T ₁ + Chelated minerals @ 30 gm/cow/day for 120 days	7.3	2.40
$T_{\overline{3}}$	T ₁ + T ₂ + Bol. Fenbendazol @ 5-7.5 / kg body weight	7.8	2.55

8. Effect of Fresh Azolla as a Feed Supplementation on Milk Yield and Fat Percentage in Dairy Cattle (1st year)

Treatment	Technology Assessed	Yield (Lit/day)	BCR
T ₁	Farmer's practice – feeding of locally available feeds and fodders	7.5	2.62
T_{2}	T ₁ + 1.5kg fresh Azolla/day/cattle as nutrient supplement for 90 days	83	3.26

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

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

S.N.	Farmers' problems/Farmers' feedback//Researchable issues etc.
1.	Demand for trustable indigenous varieties of paddy higher among farmers.
2.	Farmers want rabi groundnut varieties.
3.	GR 18 (Devli colam) is popular among farmers community due to their excellent quality.
4.	Fruit fly trap in mango give excellent control.
5.	Need NAU hybrid in Okra.
6.	GNIB 22 gave higher yield and become popular among the farmers.
7.	Need variety in okra and Bitter gourd which suitable for Natural Farming and give comparable yield against hybrid variety.
8.	Supplementation mineral mixture can lead to better reproductive efficiency & reduced calving interval.

