# Krishi Vigyan Kendra, Lada, Samastipur-II Dr. Rajendra Prasad Central Agricultural University, Pusa

VIII<sup>th</sup> Extension Education Council Report (April, 2023 to March, 2024)

#### A. Profile of KVK

KVK, Name	-	LADA	
Latitude	-	25.8692° N	staturers (minimum di Alterative di Tannal (P Farlagi di Parmeter (DATM) Mala di angeni angeni ang
Longitude	-	86.1387° E	nots Strike Discourse of Control
Farm Area (ha)	-	10	Laxonna Methoda Southara Methoda Autochara Methoda Southara Methoda Southara Methoda Southara Methoda Southara Methoda Southara Methoda Southara Kaona Methoda Southara Methoda Southara
District	-	SAMASTIPUR	Landers up in the second secon

#### **B. Staff Strength**

SI.	Post	Group	Grade Pay	Sanctioned	Filled	Vacant
No.		_				
1.	Head	А	9000	01	0	1
2.	SMS-6	А	5400	06	4	2
3.	Farm Manager	В	4200	01	0	1
4.	Programme Asst. (Computer)	В	4200	01	0	1
5.	Programme Asst. (Lab Tech.)	В	4200	01	0	1
6.	Assistant	В	4200	01	0	1
7.	Stenographer	С	4200	01	0	1
8.	Supporting Staff -1&2	С	1800	02	1	1
9.	Jeep Driver	С	2000	01	1	0
10.	Tractor Driver	С	2000	01	0	1
				16	6	10

## C. Soil Samples Analyzed: (From KVK, Birauli)

Number of Soil Samples	Number of Soil Samples	Soil Health Card
Collected	Analyzed	Distributed
200	200	200

#### D. Status of revolving fund as on 31.03.2024

Opening balance	Total fund received	Expenditure (Rs.)	Balanced amount	Cash kind to
(Rs.) on 01.04.2023	(Rs.) up to 31.03.2024	up to 31.03.2024	(Rs.) up to 01.04.2024	( <b>Rs.</b> )
78,864.00			3,17,300.00	12,00,000.0

# E. Achievements of Training Programmes (Give only numbers):(i) Practicing Farmers/Farm Women.

SI.	Discipline	Target	Achiev	Ν	o. of Ben	eficiarie	S	Total
No.			ement	Male		Female		
				Others	SC/ST	Others	SC/ST	
1.	Crop production (Agro/ Plant	24	25	465	92	98	36	683
	Breeding/ Soil Sci./ Extn.)							
2.	Plant Protection	24	24	506	112	88	28	734
3.	Home Science	24	25	147	9	379	31	566
4.	Agricultural Engineering	24	24	454	51	96	04	605
	Total	96	<b>98</b>	1572	264	661	99	2588

#### (ii) Rural Youth:

SI.	Discipline	Targe	Achiev	Ν	o. of Ben	eficiarie	S	Total
No.		t	ement	Male		Female		
				Others	SC/ST	Others	SC/ST	
1.	Crop production (Agro/ Plant Breeding/ Soil Sci./ Extn.)	4	4	59	10	25	11	105
2.	Plant Protection	4	5	107	19	22	7	155
3.	Home Science	4	4	1	0	102	8	111
4.	Agricultural Engineering	4	4	62	7	2	2	73
	Total	16	17	229	36	151	28	444

#### (iii) Extension Functionaries:

SI.	Discipline	Targ	Achieve	No. of Beneficiari			s	Total
No.		et	ment	Ma	ale	Female		
				Others	SC/ST	Others	SC/ST	
1.	Crop production (Agro/ Plant Breeding/Soil Sci./ Extn.)	4	4	69	17	16	6	108
2.	Plant Protection	4	5	88	37	31	9	165
3.	Home Science	4	4	0	0	67	21	88
4.	Agricultural Engineering	4	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Total	16	13	157	54	114	36	361

# (iv) Other Sponsored Training Programme:

SI.	Discipline	Achievement	l	No. of Beneficiaries				
No.			Ma	ale	Female			
			Others	SC/ST	Others	SC/ST		
1.	Plant protection	01	12	6	7	0	25	
() 17	· · · ·	•						

### (v) Vocational Training:

SI.	Discipline	Achievement	ľ	No. of Ben	eficiaries		Total
No.			Male		Female		
			Others	SC/ST	Others	SC/ST	
1.	NA						

#### F. i) Seed Produced:

Sl.	Crop	Variety	Area	Type of				
No.			(ha)	Seed	Quantity		Sold to	
					Produced	University	Farmers	Non Seed
1.	Rice	Rajshree	8	F/S & C/S	182.7	✓		
2.	Wheat	HD2967	5	C/S	62.5	✓		
3.	Ragi	BR-407	1	F/S	3.9	✓		
4.	Mustard	R. suflam	2	T/L	12.5	✓		
5.	Lentil	IPL 220	1	F/S	6.0	✓		
		Total	17	-	267.6			

Sl. No.	Сгор	Variety/Species	Quantity Produced	S	old to
				Govt.	Farmers
1.	Cauliflower	HYV	4001	-	150
2.	Cabbage	HYV	6682	-	230
3.	Tomato	HYV	1348	-	103
4.	Brinjal	HYV	2035	-	105
5.	Chilli	HYV	1423	-	105
6.	Others vegetables	HYV	10906	-	158
	Total	-	26425	-	746

ii) Planting Material/Spawn/Varmicompost/Bio-Pesticide/Fingerlings/Chicks Production

#### G. FLD:

Crop	Variety/	Season	Are	No. of	Pro	oduction	q/ha	Local	Incre-	BC
	Tech demo.	Kharif/ Rabi	a (ha)	Farmer s	Н	L	Α	check (q/ha)	ase in yield%	ratio
Mango	Fruit fly trap in Mango Orchard	Kharif	4	25	160	145	152.5	130	10	3.45
Brinjal	Demonstration of Pheromone trap in brinjal field against fruit and shoot borer	Rabi	1	25	270	210	240	190	28	2.45
Mushroo m	Oyster Mushroom	Rabi	0	25	10	4	7	6	16.7	2.88
Nutrition Garden	Bag Method	Rabi	0	25	6	4.5	5.25	4.5	16.7	4.90
Wheat	Ragendra Gehun-3	Rabi	2.5	7	46.2	36.1	39.8	31.7	25.6	2.21
Barley	DWRB 137	Rabi	2.5	7	35.0	27.1	29.0	23.3	31.1	1.86
Rice	R. Neelam	Kharif	2.5	7	46.9	38.4	41.2	35.9	18.1	2.16
Wheat	Rice wheat seeder	Rabi	2	25	45.4	35.7	37.9	30.4	24.6	1.9
Maize	Dibbler	Rabi	5	25	Ongoing					
		Total	19.5	171	619.5	500.8	552.65	451.8	170.8	21.81

# H. CFLD on Pulses:

Сгор	Variety/	<u>Season</u>	Area	No. of	Prod	uction	q/ha	Local	Incre	BC
	Tech demo.	Kharif/ Rabi	(ha)	Farmers	Н	L	A	check (q/ha)	ase in yield %	ratio
Pigeon pea (2022-23)	R. arhar	kharif	20	87	16.7	12.6	14.7	10.2	44.1	3.11
Lentil (2022- 23	IPL526	Rabi	20	50	11.4	9.3	10.4	7.8	33.3	2.03
Field Pea (2022-23)	IPFD-10- 12	Rabi	10	54	18.4	14.6	16.5	11.1	48.6	2.86
Chick Pea (2022-23)	PUSA 3043+	Rabi	20	101	15.7	13.9	14.8	11.7	26.4	2.84
Black gram (2022-23	T9	Summer	10	33	10.4	8.7	9.8	7.6	25.6	3.08
Green gram (2022-23)	Virat	Summer	20	78	8.6	7.0	7.8	5.9	32.2	2.75
Lentil (2023-24)	IPL316, IPL526	Rabi	16	43	12.2	8.6	10.3	8.1	27.2	2.33
		Total	116	446	93.4	74.7	84.3	62.4	237.4	19

#### I. CFLD on Oilseed:

Crop	Variety/	Season	Area	No. of	Prod	luction	q/ha	Local	Incre	BC
	Tech demo.	Kharif/ Rabi	(ha)	Farmers	Н	L	A	check (q/ha)	ase in yield %	ratio
Soybean (2023- 24)	P1241, PS1225	Kharif	20	52	17.2	13.5	15.5	11.4	35.9	2.36
Rapeseed & Mustard (2023- 24)	DRMR- 150-35	Rabi	60	152	18.1	12.7	15.1	10.6	42.4	2.89
		Total	80	204	35.3	26.2	30.6	22	78.3	5.25

# J. Projects:

# (i) CRA Project: NA

Crop	Variety/	Season		Prod	uction	q/ha	Local	Incre	BC	
	Tech demo.	Kharif/ Rabi	(ha)	Farmers	Н	L	A	check (q/ha)	ase in yield %	ratio

## (ii) ARYA Project: NA

SI.	Name of Activities	Number of	l	No. of Ben	eficiaries	Total	
No.		Activities	Male		Female		
			Others	SC/ST	Others	SC/ST	
1.	NA						

#### (iii) NARI Project/Poshan Vatika

SI.	Name of Activities	Number of	1	No. of Ben	eficiaries		Total
No.		Activities	Ma	Male		Female	
			Others	SC/ST	Others	SC/ST	
1.	Training	6	8	6	114	4	132
2.	Field Day	2	3	1	36	4	46
3.	Other Extension Activity	6	6	0	29	7	50
	Total	14	17	07	179	15	228

# (iv) NICRA Project: NA

SI.	Name of Activities	Number of	I		Total				
No.		Activities	Male		Male		Female		
			Others	SC/ST	Others	SC/ST			
1.									

# (v) SC-SP Programme:

SI.	Name of Activities	Number of	1	No. of Ben	eficiaries		Total	
No.		Activities	Ma	Male		Male Female		
			Others	SC/ST	Others	SC/ST		
1.	Training	04	0	145	0	35	180	
2.	Field Day	02	0	44	0	34	78	
3.	Other Extension Activity	04	0	19	0	31	50	
	Total	10	0	208	0	100	308	

## (vi) TSP Programme: NA

SI.	Name of Activities	Number of	1	No. of Ben	eficiaries		Total
No.		Activities	Male		Female		
			Others	SC/ST	Others	SC/ST	
1.							

Note: Impact of programme and any one success story with photograph.

## (vii) CSISA Programme: NA

SI.	Name of Activities	Number of	1	No. of Ben	eficiaries	Total	
No.		Activities	Male		Female		
			Others	SC/ST	Others	SC/ST	
1.							

# (viii) DAMU Programme: NA

SI.	Name of Activities	Number of	I	No. of Ben	eficiaries	Total	
No.		Activities Male		Male		Female	
			Others	SC/ST	Others	SC/ST	
1.							

#### (ix) Seed Hub Programme: NA

SI.	Name of Crop	Variety of	Area	Number of	Total Seed	Total Seed
No.		Crop	(ha.)	Farmers	procured (q.)	Sale (q.)
1.						

#### (x) Skill Development Programme:

SI.	Name of Activities	Number of			eficiaries		Total
No.		Activities			Female		
			Others	SC/ST	Others	SC/ST	
1.	Small Mushroom Grower (2022-23)	1	18	2	5	0	25
	Total	01	18	2	5	0	25

# K. On Farm Trial

# <u>On Farm Trial – 01</u>

Discipline	: Plant Protection
Title	: Assessment of bio-intensive management practices for major pests in Tomato
Crop	: Tomato
No. of Trials	: 07
Area	: 0.2 ha
Treatment	Technology
Farmers	Use of chemical pesticides
Practice	
Tı	<ul> <li>Application of Bio consortia of IIHR (Soil application)</li> <li>Seed treatment by P. fluorescens@10 g/kg</li> <li>Nursery bed treatment by P. fluorescens@20 g/ m2</li> <li>Soil application P. fluorescens@5 kg/ha mixed with 500 kg vermi-compost/ha at 30 days after transplanting</li> <li>Spray of HNPV @ 250 LE /ha</li> </ul>
T <sub>2</sub>	<ul> <li>Soil application of Bio consortia of IARI</li> <li>Seed treatment by Trichoderma viride @10 g/kg</li> <li>Nursery bed treatment by Trichoderma viride @50 g/ m2</li> <li>Soil application Trichoderma viride @5 kg/ha mixed with 500 kg vermi-compost/ha at 30 days after transplanting</li> <li>Spray of HNPV@ 250 LE /ha</li> </ul>

#### Result

Thematic	Technology options with	Area (ha in crop & Fodder)/ Nos (in livestock)		Yield	Cost of cultivation	Gross return	Net return	BC	
area	detailed treatments	Proposed	Actual	(q/ha)	(Rs./ha)	(Rs/ha)	(Rs./ha)	ratio	
Assessment	FP	0.07	0.07	271.90	41845.12	163140.54	121295.42	2.89	
of bio-	TO1	0.07	0.07	315.89	54952.23	252712.33	197760.11	3.59	
intensive management practices for major pests in Tomato	TO2	0.07	0.07	350.61	58982.76	280488.34	221505.58	3.75	
*Rs8/Kg Sale rate									
*Rs 6/Kg Sale	erate (FP)								



Seed treatment and soil treatment



Experimental plot

#### **Conclusion:**

- Fruit yield of tomato (L-37 a susceptible hybrid against most of the diseases) was found maximum in T2 (350.61 q/ha) and T1 (315.89 q/ha) as compared to Farmers' practice (271.90 q/ha).
- Disease incidence of Late blight and Early Blight was found minimum in T2 (1.76) and T1 (2.55) as compared to farmers' practice (7.51) and for early blight T2 (3.93) and T1 (6.09) and farmers' practice (11.86).
- Infestation of Fruit Borer (H. armigera) was also found minimum in T2 (5.95) and T1 (7.53) as compared to farmers' practice (8.03).
- Where as Disease incidence of (ToLCV) was found minimum in Farmers' practice (7.02) as compared to T1 (8.19) and T2(10.15).
- Similarly infestation of Sucking pest (Aphids and whiteflies) was found minimum in Farmers' practice (30.51) as compared to T1 (35.91) and T2 (41.65) as no specific control measures were used against this pest, while in the farmers practice spraying of imidacloprid was done which was found more effective.

#### <u>On Farm Trial – 02</u>

Discipline Title Crop No. of Trials Area	<ul> <li>: Plant Protection</li> <li>: Assessment of management practices for Red banded caterpillar in Mango</li> <li>: Mango</li> <li>: 07</li> <li>: 0.5 ha</li> </ul>
Treatment	Technology
Farmers	Spray of chlorpyriphos as and when symptoms appear
Practice	
T <sub>1</sub>	Collection and destruction of all fallen fruits • Spray deltamethrin 0.0028 % (deltamethrin 2.8 EC@ 1ml/lit) at marble size and repeat after two weeks
<b>T</b> <sub>2</sub>	Two sprays of thiacloprid 21.7 SC 0.04 % (@ 2ml/lit) at 25-30 days interval.

Thematic area	Technology options with detailed treatments	Area (ha & Fodder (in lives Proposed	r)/ Nos	Yield (q/ha)	Cost of cultivation (Rs./ha)	Gross return (Rs/ha)	Net return (Rs./ha)	BC ratio
Assessment of	FP	20	20	156.21	73245	489234	415989	5.67
management	TO1	20	20	245.51	71262	601459	530197	7.44
practices for Red banded caterpillar in Mango	TO2	20	20	201.15	81349	573824	492475	6.05

VIII<sup>th</sup> Extension Education Council 2024



Spraying in the farmers plot and experimental plot

**Conclusion:** The most destructive stage of this pest was larval stage. The red and white alternate bands on the body were the characteristic feature of this pest. This pest attacked the mango fruit from the pea sized till the maturity of the fruit causing boring of the fruits through several tunnels by the larvae. The matured instar larvae reached the seed yet to harden and tunneled them, excreted inside and exposed the fruits to the secondary infestation by micro pathogens. Pupation occurred in the soil inside a brownish cocoon or in the dry twigs of the branches. It has been found that (TO1) spraying of deltamethrin 0.0028 % (deltamethrin 2.8 EC@ 1ml/lit) at marble size at two weeks interval was found to be more effective in controlling the pest as compared to (TO2) thiacloprid 21.7 SC 0.04 % (@ 2ml/lit) at 25-30 days interval and FP i.e. spray of chlorpyriphos as and when symptoms appear. we found that TO1 resulted in the highest B:C ratio (7.44) as compared to TO2 and FP even the yield attributes was found to be best in TO1 as compared to TO2and FP.

#### <u>On Farm Trial – 03</u>

Disciplir Title	ee : Crop production : Improvement of Nitrogen use efficiency in wheat
Crop No. of T	: Wheat rials : 07
Area	: 0.2 ha
Treatment	Technology
Farmers	RDF (100:40:20) Kg/ha
Practice	
<b>T</b> <sub>1</sub>	50% of RDN & 100% PK + Nano urea @4ml/lt. water (Single spray at 35 DAS).
<b>T</b> <sub>2</sub>	50% of RDN & 100% PK + 2 sprays of Nano Urea at (35 DAS) and (60-65DAS) @ 4
	ml/lt water.

Thematic area	Technology options with	Area (ha in crop & Fodder)/ Nos (in livestock)		Yield (q/ha)	Cost of cultivation (Rs./ha)	Gross return (Rs/ha)	Net return (Rs./ha)	BC ratio
	detailed treatments	Proposed	Actual					
	FP	0.07	0.07	38.8	37079	82450	45371	2.23
Nutrient management	TO1	0.07	0.07	37.5	37659	79688	42029	2.14
management	TO2	0.07	0.07	39.03	38770	82936	44166	2.18



Spraying of nano urea

VIII<sup>th</sup> Extension Education Council 2024



Matured stage

**Conclusion:** It has been found that 2 sprays of Nano urea (TO2) have resulted in statistically at par growth and yield of wheat crop in this region. After consideration of economics analysis, we found that farmers practice resulted in the highest B:C ratio (2.23) due the higher labour cost for foliar fertilization than broadcasting of MOP. Although yield and economic benefits were also not availed by using nano-urea, sporadic availability and subsequent hike in price of urea granules enhances the cost of cultivation in farmers practice. In addition, timely availability of nano-urea could help the farmers particularly during peak season of wheat, Moreover, subsidy on urea granule is hidden fact which is not taken into consideration during the economic analysis which surely could made the spraying of nano-urea economically viable.

#### <u>On Farm Trial – 04</u>

Disciplin	ne : Crop Production
Title	: Improvement of Nitrogen use efficiency in rice.
Crop	: Rice
No. of T	rials : 07
Area	: 0.2 ha
Treatment	Technology
Farmers	RDF (100:40:20) Kg/ha
Practice	
<b>T</b> <sub>1</sub>	50% of RDN & 100% PK + nano urea @4ml/lt. water (Single spray at pre flowering
	stage)
<b>T</b> <sub>2</sub>	50% of RDN & 100% PK + 2 sprays of Nano Urea at (25 to 30 days) and (60-65
	days) @ 4 ml/lt water

Thematic area	Technology options with detailed treatments	Area (ha & Fodder (in lives Proposed	r)/ Nos	Yield (q/ha)	Cost of cultivation (Rs./ha)	Gross return (Rs/ha)	Net return (Rs./ha)	BC ratio
Nutriant	FP	0.07	0.07	42.8	39880	93432	53552	2.34
Nutrient management	TO1	0.07	0.07	39.2	40590	85574	44984	2.11
	TO2	0.07	0.07	40.9	41360	89285	47925	2.16



First spraying of nano urea

2<sup>nd</sup> spraying of nano urea

Matured stage of rice

VIII<sup>th</sup> Extension Education Council

**Conclusion:** It has been found that 2 sprays of Nano urea (TO2) have resulted in statistically at par growth and yield of rice crop in this region. After consideration of economics analysis, we found that farmers practice resulted in the highest B:C ratio (2.34) due the higher labour cost for foliar fertilization than broadcasting of MOP. Although yield and economic benefits were also not availed by using nano-urea, sporadic availability and subsequent hike in price of urea granules enhances the cost of cultivation in farmers practice. In addition, timely availability of nano-urea could help the farmers particularly during peak season of rice, Moreover, subsidy on urea granule is hidden fact which is not taken into consideration during the economic analysis which surely could made the spraying of nano-urea economically viable.

#### <u>On Farm Trial – 05</u>

Disciplir Title	ne : :	Agril. Engg. Assessment of low-cost Mulching in Vegetable Crop Production
Crop	:	Tomato
No. of T	rials :	07
Area	:	0.1 ha
Treatment		Technology
Farmers	No mulch	
Practice		
<b>T</b> <sub>1</sub>	Banana leaves	
<b>T</b> <sub>2</sub>	Paddy straw	

Thematic area	Technology options with detailed treatments	Area (ha & Fodder (in lives Proposed	r)/ Nos	Yield (q/ha)	Cost of cultivation (Rs./ha)	Gross return (Rs/ha)	Net return (Rs./ha)	BC ratio
Crop	FP	0.14	0.14	284.3	43150	112500	69350	2.61
residue	TO1	0.14	0.14	314.3	48250	152350	104100	3.15
management	TO2	0.14	0.14	352.9	46150	153500	107350	3.32

VIII<sup>th</sup> Extension Education Council 2024



OFT at farmers' field



Mulching done by KVK, Lada

**Conclusion:** Low cost mulching techniques for crop residue management were experimented on farmers' field and the treatments were compared. The three treatments were farmers' practice (no mulch), mulching with banana leaves and paddy straw mulch. Fruit yield dependent parameter for all the independent parameters was found to be statistically significantly different from each other, where null hypothesis was rejected and alternate hypothesis was accepted and further Duncan post-hoc tests were carried out to find out the independent parameters, among which the dependent values were found to be significantly different at 5% level of significance or 95% confidence interval (p<0.05). Highest BC ratio was found for TO2 (paddy straw mulch), which can be adopted easily due to its abundant presence and would also address the paddy straw burning issues.

#### <u>On Farm Trial – 06</u>

Discipline	:	Agril. Engg.					
Title	:	Assessment of different weeding tools in paddy crop					
Crop	:	Paddy					
No. of Trials	:	07					
Area	:	0.1 ha					
Treatment		Technology					
<b>Farmers Practice</b>	Khur	pi					
T <sub>1</sub>	Grub	ber					
<b>T</b> <sub>2</sub>	Brush	Brush cutter operated power weeder					

Thematic area	Technology options with detailed treatments	Area (ha & Fodder (in lives Proposed	r)/ Nos	Yield (q/ha)	Cost of cultivation (Rs./ha)	Gross return (Rs/ha)	Net return (Rs./ha)	BC ratio
Drugry	TO1	0.14	0.14	44	53050	74800	21750	1.41
reduction	TO2	0.14	0.14	45.5	48955	77350	28395	1.58



OFT at farmers' field

**Conclusion:** Different weeding techniques for paddy crop were experimented on farmers' field and the treatments were compared. The three treatments were farmers' practice (khurpi), weeding using grubber and weeding using brush cutter with weeding attachment. The field capacity for the brush cutter operated weeder was highest (0.5 ha/h), whereas plant damage was negligible. The labours involved for farmers practice was highest and for the brush cutter operated weeder was lowest. The cost economics was also evaluated and it was found that there was a reduction in cost of cultivation for both the technological options. The brush cutter operated weeder was recommended for practice for its highest field capacity, higher yield, low labour cost, low cost of operation and therefore resulting in higher benefit cost ratio.

#### <u>On Farm Trial – 07</u>

Disciplin	e :	Home Science			
Title	:	Assessment of the effectiveness of Mittens for soybean harvesting			
Crop	:	Soybean			
No. of T	rials :	07			
Area	:	0.2 ha			
Treatment	Technology				
Farmers	Soybean harvesting is performed manually with the help of sickle				
Practice					
<b>T</b> <sub>1</sub>	Using locally available gloves for cutting, collecting and bundling plants manually.				
T <sub>2</sub>	Using protective mittens developed by AICRP FRM, College of Home Science,				
	VNMKV Pa	arbhanifor soybean harvesting			

#### Table: 1 Work output of Soybean harvesting with traditional and improved method (n=10)

Name of Activity	Parameters for Observation	Farmer Practice	TO1	TO2	Percentage change between Farmer Practice &TO2	Percentage change between TO1&TO2
Cutting soybean plants with Sickle	Work done/ unit time (sq.mt./30 min.)	146.95±8.96	154.25±2.34	177.4±8.09	20.97	15.01
Collecting	Work	62.2±6.25	72.7±8.16	100.3±13.03	72.03	31.87

						2024
and Bundling of soybean	done/unit time (Kg/30 min.)					
plants	Drudgery Score	4.3±3.02	3.1±0.67	1.2±0.73	70.37	59.16
Overall Discomfort rate	VAD Scale*	8.5±1.08	6.1±1.31	1.0±0.81	88.26	83.06

\*VAD- Visual Analogue Discomfort Scale, 0- No Discomfort, 10- Extreme Discomfort

#### Table: 2 Musculoskeletal problems of hand in Soybean harvesting

dy rts	Upper	r arm		Lower	r arm		Wrist			Palm			Finge	rs	
Typ e of M SD	FP	TO 1	<b>TO</b> 2	FP	TO 1	TO 2	FP	TO 1	TO 2	FP	TO 1	<b>TO</b> 2	FP	TO 1	TO 2
Pain *	3.77 ±0.9	3.1 ±0.	1.2 ±0.	4.0± 0	3.6 ±0.	1.3 ±0.	4.44 ±0.5	3.1 ±0.	1.1 ±0.	4.66 ±0.5	2.9 ±0.	1.1 ±0.	4.44 ±0.5	3.7 ±0.	1.4 ±0.
	±0.9 7	±0. 73	±0. 42	0	±0. 51	±0. 48	±0.5 2	±0. 73	±0. 31	±0.5	±0. 73	±0. 31	±0.5 2	±0. 67	±0. 51
Num	1.0±	1.4	1.3	3.44	1.5	1.2	2.77	2.6	1.1	3.88	2±0	1.3	3.66	3.2	1.1
bness	0	±0.	±0.	±0.5	±0.	±0.	±0.6	±0.	±0.	±0.6	.66	±0.	±0.7	±0.	±0.
*		69	48	2	52	42	6	51	31	0		48	0	91	31
Stiff	1.55	2.3	1.1	3.66	2.4	1.2	3.22	1.9	1.1	3.44	2.6	$1\pm0$	4.11	3.6	1.1
ness*	±0.7	±0.	±0.	±0.5	±0.	±0.	±0.6	±0.	±0.	±0.5	±0.		±0.7	±0.	±0.
	2	82	31		69	42	6	73	31	2	84		8	84	31
Tingl	2.22	2.6	1.2	3.0±	2.5	1.1	2.55	2.2	1.1	3.11	2.9	1±0	4.22	2.8	1±0
ing*	±0.9	±0.	±0.	1.22	±1.	±0.	±0.5	±0.	±0.	±0.7	±0.		±0.6	±0.	
Sens	7	69	42		08	31	2	78	31	8	56		6	78	
ation															
Wea	3.0±	3.8	1.2	3.33	2.5	1.3	3.66	1.8	1.4	2.88	2.9	1.2	4.22	3.1	1±0
kness	0.70	±0.	±0.	±0.7	±0.	±0.	±0.5	±0.	±0.	±1.0	±0.	±0.	±0.6	±0.	
*		78	42	0	84	48		63	51	5	56	42	6	99	
Redn	1.22	2.2	1.2	4.11	2.8	1.5	2.77	1.8	1.2	4.33	2.8	1.2	4.77	3±0	$1\pm0$
ess*	±0.4	±0.	±0.	±0.7	±0.	±0.	±0.4	±0.	±0.	±0.7	±0.	±0.	±3.8		
	4	91	42	8	78	52	4	78	42	0	78	42	9		

\*All the parameters are estimated by Five Point Scale, 5- Very Severe, 4- severe, 3- Moderate, 2- Mild & 1- Very Mild (n=10)



**Conclusion:** An On-farm trial for Assessment of the effectiveness of Mittens for soybean harvesting was conducted in 10 different locations in Samastipur district of Bihar. The Result showed that TO1(Using locally available gloves for cutting, collecting and bundling plants manually) reduced the discomfort by 59.16 percent whereas TO2(Using protective mittens developed by AICRP FRM, College of Home Science, VNMKV Parbhanifor soybean harvesting) reduced the discomfort by 70.37

13 Directorate of Extension Education percent. Overall Discomfort also reduced with the use TO1 (83.06%) and further reduced with the use of TO2 (88.26%). Farmers faced various types of musculoskeletal problems like Pain, Numbness, tingling sensation, Weakness & Redness while performing the activity without any technological assistance. TO1 were helpful in reducing the discomfort. ButTO2 were highly effective in reducing their musculoskeletal problems. Technologies also helped in increasing the efficiency of soybean harvesting. It was observed that there was remarkable increase in the soybean harvesting efficiency by using TO2 (20.97%) followed by locally available TO1 (15.01%).

Soybean Harvesting is a Drudgery prone Activity when performed without any technological intervention. Technologies like TO1 and TO2 were provided to the farmers for reducing their discomfort. Among both the technologies, TO2were better in every aspect as it was helpful in reducing the drudgery, overall discomfort and musculoskeletal problem of the farmers. It also increased the efficiency of soybean harvesting.

#### <u>On Farm Trial – 08</u>

Disciplin Title Crop No. of Ti Area	<ul><li>Development and quality evaluation of honey based carrot candy</li><li>Carrot candy</li></ul>				
Treatment	Technology				
Farmers	Children consume fresh carrot as such as vegetables or juice.				
Practice					
<b>T</b> <sub>1</sub>	Preparation of Carrot candy Honey- 750g + carrot-1000g				
<b>T</b> <sub>2</sub>	Honey-1000g + carrot-1000g				

Table: 1 Effect of hone	v composition on Senso	ry quality of honey	v -based carrot candv
Tublet I Bliett of Holle	j composition on Senso	i y quanty of noney	bused currer curray

Treatments	Colour*	Flavour*	Taste*	Texture*	Overall acceptability
Farmers Practice	$7.2 \pm 0.42$	$7.2 \pm 0.42$	$7.3\pm0.48$	7.2 ±0.63	$7.22\pm0.05$
T1	8.9 ± 0.31	$8.7 \pm 0.48$	$8.7\pm0.48$	$8.8\pm0.42$	$8.7\pm0.09$
T2	$7.4\pm0.69$	$7.8\pm0.63$	$7.7\pm0.67$	$7.8\pm0.78$	$7.6\pm0.18$

\*All the parameters are estimated by Nine Point Hedonic Scale



Preparation and Intervention of Carrot Candy at KVK

#### L. TV Talk/Radio Talk:

SI.	Topic of the talk	Name of Scientist	TV/Radio talk station	Date of
No.				Recoding
1.	Mushroom	Dr.Kumari Amrita Sinha	TV Doordarshan Kendra,	29/05/2023
	Production in Kharif		Patna	
	Season			
2.	Vegetable Gardening	Dr. Abhishek pratap Singh	TV Doordarshan Kendra,	29/05/2023
	in the Off Season		Patna	

## M. Other Special programme/ salient achievement/activities conducted at KVK:

SI.	Particulars	Date	No. of
No.			Participants
1.	Live broadcasting programme of PM Kisaan Samman Nidhi	27-07-2023	105
2.	Pradhan Mantri Kisan Samman Nidhi (PM-KISAN)	15-11-2023	30
3.	PM Live on VBSY	16-12-2023	23
4.	PM Live on VBSY	28-12-2023	26
5.	Farmers-scientists interface meeting	21-03-2024	100
6.	Swachhata Abhiyan	03-10-2023	49
7.	Swachhata Abhiyan (School)	03-10-2023	58
8.	Mission on Lifestyle on Environment	27-05-2023	55
9.	Climate resilient agriculture	30-05-2023	31
10.	Climate resilient agriculture on Mission on Lifestyle on	04-06-2023	76
	Environment		
11.	Awareness Programme	31-05-2023	29
12.	95 <sup>th</sup> ICAR Foundation Day	16-07-2023	70
13.	Technology Day	18-07-2023	71
14.	Farmers-scientists interaction (ATMA)	25-08-2023 to	46
		26-08-2023	
15.	World Soil Day	05-12-2023	26
16.	Awareness programme on millet cultivation and value	12-09-2023	28
	added products		
17.	International Women's Day	08-03-2024	78
18.	Poshan Pakhwada	01-04-2023	42

#### N. SAC conducted at KVK:

SI. No.	Particulars	Date	No. of Participants
1.	4 <sup>th</sup> SAC Meeting	08/08/2023	62

#### **O.** List of visitor at KVK:

Date	Name & Designation	Purpose of visit
22/06/2023	Honorable Ari Birendra Prasad, MLA, Rosera,	Visit to KVK office, farm and
	Samastipur	interacted with staffs

# P. Participation in National Conference, Sumer/Winter School, Workshop, Training Programme etc.

Name of Programme	Nature of Programme Attended	Date
National Conference		
Summer/Winter School		
Workshop		
Training Programme	Collaborative Online Training	13 /06/2023 to15/06/ 2023
	Programme on "Value Chain Extension"	
Seminar/Symposium		
Others		

## Q. Other Extension activities

Sl.	Name of Ext. Activities	No. of		Beneficiari	es
No.		Activities	Male	Female	Total
1.	Kisan Mela	3	4321	2727	7048
2.	Kisan Gosthi	19	1480	490	1970
3.	Field Day	17	134	180	314
4.	Farmers Visit to KVK	28	1033	679	1712
5.	Scientist Visit of farmers field	49	1055	704	1759
6.	Animal Health Camp	0	0	0	0
7.	Exposure Visit	1	23	2	25
8.	Lecture Delivered as Resource Person	64	2503	279	2779
9.	Number of Agro Advisories (By Phone)	600	2500	485	2985
10.	Number of SMS Advisories sent	0	0	0	0
11.	Number of Agro Metrological Advisories	0	0	0	0
12.	Any other (Pl. specify)	_	-	-	-
	Total	781	13049	5546	18595

## **R. PUBLICATION:**

## (i) Research papers published (01.04.2023 to 31.03.2024)

Name of the author	Year	Title	Name of the	Vol. No. &
(s)			Journal & NAAS Rating	Page No.
Kundu, A., Saha, S.,	2023	Conservation agriculture	J. Crop and	19(2): 126-
Murmu, J., Dey		practices influenced soil water	Weed, 5.95	132.
Sarkar, J. and		retention parameters of		
Bandyopadhyay, P. K.		Inceptisol of lower Gangetic		
		plains.		
Dey Sarkar, J., Kundu,	2023	The disparity in soil organic	West Bengal. J.	19(2): 78-83.
A. and		carbon concentration under	Crop and Weed,	
Bandyopadhyay, P. K.		short-term conservation	5.95	
		agriculture with rice-based		
		cropping systems in a very fine		
		textured soil of lower Indo-		
		Gangetic plain		

(ii) Book Chapters (01.04.2023 to 31.03.2024)

Name of the author (s)	Year	Chapter	Name of Books	Pages	Name of
			& its ISBN No.		Publisher

(iii) Technical bulletins published (01.04.2023 to 31.03.2024)

Name of the Author (s)	Year	Title	Name of Publisher	No. of Pages	No. of Copies Printed	Price
-		-	-		-	-

#### (iv) Popular articles published (01.04.2023 to 31.03.2024)

Name of the Author (s)	Year	Title	Name of the Magazine	Vol. No. & Page Numbers
Sinha, KA, Singh, AP,	2024	ICth ikS/k	Souvenir Kisan Mela 2024	Page no 48
Tiwari, DK &Yadav, RD		mRiknu }kjk	Meia 2024	
		vkRe fuHkZjrk		
		,oa iks'k.k		
		lqj{kk		
Sinha, KA, Gill, JK, &	2024	Stress Among College	Agri. Tech	Volume-1,
Patel, SS		Students and Its	Today	ISSUE - 10
		Management.	Agriculture and	
			allied Science E-	
			Magazine.	

Note: Brief write up and photographs should be inserted wherever necessary. Text for OFT and FLD should be clear and brief and may be given at appropriate place. Separate table for each OFT should be given.



17 Directorate of Extension Education

VIII<sup>th</sup> Extension Education Council 2024



#### ACTION PLAN (April, 2024 to March, 2025)

#### A. Training Programme

#### (i) Practicing Farmers/Farm Women.

SI.	Discipline	Target	No. of Be	Total	
No.			Male	Female	
1.	Crop production (Agro/ Plant Breeding/ Soil Sci/ Extn.)	16	232	168	400
3.	Plant Protection	16	232	168	400
4.	Home Science	16	168	232	400
6.	Agricultural Engineering	16	232	168	400
	Total	64	864	736	1600

#### (ii) Rural Youth:

SI.	Discipline	Target	No. of Be	Total	
No.			Male	Female	
1.	Crop production (Agro/ Plant Breeding/ Soil Sci./ Extn.)	4	75	25	100
3.	Plant Protection	4	75	25	100
4.	Home Science	4	25	75	100
6.	Agricultural Engineering	4	75	25	100
	Total	16	250	150	400

#### (iii) Extension Functionaries:

SI.	Discipline	Target	No. of Be	Total	
No.			Male	Female	
1.	Crop production (Agro/ Plant Breeding/ Soil Sci/ Extn.)	4	75	25	100
3.	Plant Protection	4	75	25	100
4.	Home Science	4	25	75	100
6.	Agricultural Engineering	4	75	25	100
	Total	16	250	150	400

#### (iv) Vocational Training:

SI. No.	Discipline	Target	No. of Beneficiaries		Total
			Male	Female	
1.	-	-	-	-	-

# B. Seed Produced/Planting Material/Spawn/Varmicompost/Bio-Pesticide/ Fingerlings/ Chicks Production.

Sl. No.	Crop	Variety/Species	Area (ha)	Expected Yield/Number
1.	Paddy	R. Neelam	8	240
2.	Wheat	DBW 187/222	8	240
		Total	16	480

# C. FLD:

Season	Variety/ Tech demo.	Area (ha)/No.	No. of Demonstration
Fruit fly trap	1	25	Fruit fly trap
Oyster Mushroom	-	25	Oyster Mushroom
Nutri-garden kit (Bag Method)	-	25	Bag Method
Rajendra Gehu 2	2.5	7	Rajendra gehu 2
Rajendra Neelam	2.5	7	Rajendra neelam
Pheromone trap	4	25	Pheromone trap
Grubber for weeding	1.0	25	Grubber for weeding
Hermetic bag	-	25	Hermetic bag

# (D) Other Extension activities

Sl. No.	Name of Ext. Activities	No. of Activities	Participants
1.	Kisan Mela	3	600
2.	Kisan Gosthi	6	600
3.	Field Day	20	800
4.	Farmers Visit to KVK	35	7000
5.	Scientist Visit of Farmers Field	35	3000
6.	Mobile Services	35	5000
7.	Animal Health Camp	5	500
8.	Exposure Visit	5	600
9.	Lecture Delivered as Resource Person	30	700
10.	Any other (Pl. specify)	3	600
	Total	177	19400

\*\*\*\*