

APPENDICES

APPENDIX I - TABLE 1 TAMIL NADU SUGARCANE ECONOMY

Year	No. of Mills	Average duration of crushing season (Days)	Cane crushed in '000 M. Tonnes	Sugarcane Acreage ('000 Hectares)	Sugarcane production ('000 M. Tonnes)
1950-51	12	150	942	50	92
1951-52	12	74	1,163	51	101
1952-53	13	80	221	29	80
1953-54	3	219	305	32	28
1954-55	3	160	621	51	57
1955-56	4	199	618	49	55
1956-57	4	168	723	47	64
1957-58	5	182	793	58	69
1958-59	5	187	825	55	75
1959-60	5	213	929	59	85
1960-61	8	143	1,459	81	131
1961-62	9	141	1,240	76	116
1962-63	9	185	1,051	55	99
1963-64	10	202	—	73	210
1964-65	12	190	2,360	43	224
1965-66	14	134	2,643	101	173
1966-67	15	124	1,943	88	182
1967-68	15	240	2,083	112	330
1968-69	15	202	4,169	172	288
1969-70	15	192	3,656	135	229
1970-71	16	168	3,282	135	299
1971-72	15	190	4,008	117	331
1972-73	16	226	5,287	144	443
1973-74	16	169	4,556	186	384
1974-75	16	90	1,970	160	182
1975-76	17	147	3,792	128	322
1976-77	16	172	5,458	155	466
1977-78	19	174	5,768	167	492
1978-79	20	122	4,078	154	367
1979-80	20	142	4,997	149	433
1980-81	21	209	8,518	136	755

Source: Indian Sugar, October 1982.

TABLE 2 MADURA SUGARS LIMITED, BANDIARAJAPURAM - PROGRESS OF THE MILL

Year ended 31st July	Crushing capacity	No. of crushing days	Cane crushed tonnes	Sugar produced tonnes	Recovery %	Average cane crushed per day tonnes	Average sugar produced per day tonnes
1950	244	103	12,142	975	8.03	118	9
1951	244	228	36,691	2,724	7.42	161	12
1952	244	295	52,234	3,696	7.07	177	12
1953	244	134	15,384	901	5.85	115	7
1954	244	133	12,371	1,125	9.09	169	15
1955	244	237	44,397	4,099	9.23	205	19
1956	244	215	46,536	4,257	9.15	216	20
1957	244	243	53,915	4,691	8.70	222	19
1958	244	223	55,986	4,887	8.73	249	22
1959	244	199	52,942	4,846	9.15	266	24
1960	244	176	47,013	4,315	9.18	267	23

(Contd.)

TABLE 2 (Contd.)

Year ended 31st July	Crushing capacity	No. of crushing days	Cane crushed tonnes	Sugar produced tonnes	Recovery %	Average cane crushed per day tonnes	Average sugar produced per day tonnes
1961	244	291	76,146	6,735	8.85	262	23
1962	244	262	68,996	6,445	9.34	263	25
1963	244	222	57,196	5,252	9.18	258	24
1964	244	250	62,733	5,443	8.67	251	22
1965	244	282	71,841	6,426	8.94	255	23
1966	244	260	61,084	4,951	8.11	235	19
1967	244	187	45,403	4,208	9.27	243	22
1968	244	158	40,097	3,599	8.98	254	23
1969	244	226	58,897	4,757	8.08	261	21
1970	244	294	78,798	5,687	7.22	268	19

(Contd.)

TABLE 2 (Contd.)

Year ended 30th September	Crushing capacity	No. of crushing days	Cane crushed tonnes	Sugar produced tonnes	Recovery %	Average cane crushed per day tonnes	Average sugar produced per day tonnes
1971	244	188	53,195	4,607	8.66	283	25
1972	244	188	55,217	5,107	9.25	294	27
1973	244	234	69,375	5,489	7.91	296	23
1974	400	266	94,640	7,399	7.82	356	28
1975	600	115	65,251	4,793	7.35	567	42
1976	600	41	21,943	1,942	8.85	535	47
1977	600	81	44,420	3,436	7.73	548	42
1978	600	149	83,282	7,360	8.84	559	49
1979	600	202	1,07,818	8,457	7.84	534	42
1980	800	157	1,03,321	8,154	7.89	658	52
1981	800	228	1,51,731	10,360	6.83	665	45

Source: Annual Report of Madura Sugars Limited, 1982.

TABLE 3 THE NATIONAL CO-OPERATIVE SUGAR MILLS LTD. A. 2734, ALANKANALLUR, MADURAI DISTRICT - PROGRESS OF THE MILL

Year	Membership Number of Members	Shares (Rs. in Lakhs)	Crushing Season		Cane crushed (In tonnes)	Recovery %	Sugar Production (In tonnes)	Cane Price		Average price of sugar per bag Rs.	Profit/Loss	
			Beginning From	Ending				Central Govt. Price	MILL- Cane- Price		Current Year	Cumulative Profit/ Loss
1965-66	3473	43.32	4-09-66	8-09-66	366,331	4.18	5,200	--	--	--	--	--
1966-67	3307	45.53	23-12-66	11-02-67	4,109,630	71.9	212,100	56.50	56.50	144.15	-32.45	--
1967-68	3680	44.16	22-01-68	10-04-68	16,716,607	8.83	1,535,100	73.70	73.70	237.24	-20.62	-53.07
1968-69	4244	46.44	22-12-68	15-09-69	2,02,842,791	7.50	14,766,500	73.70	90.00	176.77	-20.46	-73.53
1969-70	6004	52.67	15-12-69	14-06-70	1,98,128,073	7.32	14,532,400	73.70	73.70	135.47	-32.42	-105.95
1970-71	7223	58.16	28-12-70	8-05-71	1,16,626,231	9.90	11,540,400	73.70	73.70	132.92	-12.44	-118.39
1971-72	8146	71.81	27-12-71	4-05-72	96,665,807	10.03	9,706,000	79.00	85.00	154.23	+12.63	-105.74
1972-73	8437	74.74	7-12-72	2-07-73	1,62,922,179	8.63	14,046,300	95.00	100.00	181.13	+32.04	-73.70
1973-74	9448	79.50	15-11-73	12-08-74	2,58,818,474	8.40	21,751,400	86.60	109.50	193.85	+64.21	-9.49
1974-75	10933	94.26	5-12-74	14-05-75	1,44,419,848	8.94	12,509,700	90.00	115.00	202.13	+10.79	+1.30
1975-76	11176	96.20	18-01-76	12-03-76	51,919,565	10.06	5,233,100	92.00	107.00	245.57	-2.28	-2.28
1976-77	12053	93.83	17-11-76	16-03-77	1,86,052,977	8.39	15,394,300	101.00	116.00	212.80	-26.97	-29.25
1977-78	12608	92.24	23-11-77	30-06-78	2,17,233,554	8.99	19,312,600	87.00	116.00	212.44	-36.10	-65.35
1978-79	13076	91.51	19-11-78	17-06-79	2,39,272,003	8.48	20,308,800	114.10	114.10	204.82	-96.48	-161.83
1979-80	13764	91.30	14-12-79	20-05-80	1,84,779,768	9.33	17,255,900	130.90	152.51	318.59	+30.86	-130.97
1980-81	14838	104.25	11-12-80	17-05-81	2,00,700,203	9.12	18,291,600	143.80	193.50	377.94	+35.70	-95.27
1981-82	15227 (Up to July '82)	148.41 (Up to July '82)	26-11-81	30-06-82	3,08,295,083	9.41	29,006,800	143.80	182.50 + 10.00	352.98 Up to July '82	--	--

Source: 7th General Body Annual Report of National Co-operative Sugar Mills Limited, Alankanalur.

TABLE 4 SUGAR PRICING POLICY IN DIFFERENT YEARS

Year	Policy	Levy %	Free Sale %
1950-51	Partial Control		
1951-52	Partial Control		
1952-53	Decontrol		
1953-54	Decontrol		
1954-55	Decontrol		
1955-56	Decontrol		
1956-57	Decontrol		
1957-58	Decontrol		
1958-59	Control		
1959-60	Control		
1960-61	Control		
1961-62	Decontrol		
1962-63 ¹⁰	Decontrol		
1963-64	Control		
1964-65	Control		
1966-66	Control		
1966-67	Control		
1967-68	Partial Control	60	40
1968-69	Partial Control	70	30
1969-70	Partial Control	70	30

(Contd.)

TABLE 4 (Contd.)

Year	Policy	Levy %	Free Sale %
<u>1970-71</u>			
(a) 1.10.70 to 24.5.71	Partial Control	60	40*
(b) 25.5.71 to 30.9.71	Decontrol	--	--
<u>1971-72</u>			
(a) 1.10.71 to 31.12.71	Decontrol	--	--
(b) 1.1.72 to 30.6.72	Scheme of voluntary distribution		
(c) 1.7.72 to 30.9.72	Partial Control	60	40*
1972-73	Partial Control	70*	30
1973-74	Partial Control	70	30
1974-75	Partial Control	65	35
1975-76	Partial Control	65	35
1976-77	Partial Control	65	35
<u>1977-78</u>			
(a) 1.10.77 to 15.8.78	Partial Control	65	35
(b) 16.8.78 onwards	Complete Decontrol (also discontinuance of monthly release mechanism)		

(Contd.)

TABLE 4 (Contd.)

Year	Policy	Levy %	Free Sale %
<u>1978-79</u>			
(a) 1.10.78 to 4.6.79	Complete Decontrol (also discontinuance of monthly release mechanism)		
(b) 5.6.79 onwards	Monthly release mechanism reintroduced by Government		
(c) 12.9.79 onwards	Government introduced full price control.		
<u>1979-80</u>			
(a) 1.10.79 to 16.12.79	Full price control		
(b) 17.12.79 onwards	Partial Control	65	35
1980-81	Partial Control	65	35
1981-82	Partial Control	65	35

^①Decontrol for a part of season.

*3.5% for export.

Source: Indian Sugar, Vol. 22, No. 7, October 1982, p. 488.

TABLE 5 AREA UNDER SUGARCANE IN PALANI TALUK
1960-61 TO 1980-81

Year	Area (in hectares)	Registered Cane Area under X_A° (in hectares)
1960-61	661	177
1961-62	736	224
1962-63	573	118
1964-64	693	126
1964-65	751	195
1965-66	1661	232
1966-67	1466	238
1967-68	1509	135
1968-69	1509	95
1969-70	1679	207
1970-71	1346	184
1971-72	1230	261
1972-73	1060	335
1973-74	1110	704
1974-75	1775	639
1975-76	1250	627
1976-77	1656	363
1977-78	1670	474
1978-79	1522	453
1979-80	1596	317
1980-81	2420	435

Source: Records of Amaravathi Co-operative Sugar Mills Ltd.,
Amaravathinagar.

* X_A - Amaravathi Co-operative Sugar Mills Ltd.

Marginal Variation Trends:

The Marginal Variation Chart given above shows the various possibilities of marginal variation among a_t , a_r and a_j . There are nine possibilities in all.

- 1) An increase of 10 per cent in a_t completely absorbed by a_r . No variation in a_j .
- 2) A decrease of 10 per cent in a_t is caused by a 10 per cent fall in a_r . No variation in a_j .
- 3) An increase of 10 per cent in a_t is equally shared by a_r and a_j .
- 4) A decrease of 10 per cent in a_t is equally caused by a_r and a_j .
- 5) a_r increases by 10 per cent, which causes by 5 per cent increase in a_t and 5 per cent being diverted from a_j .
- 6) a_t falls by 5 per cent while a_r increases by 5 per cent, and therefore a_j declines by 10 per cent.
- 7) a_j increases by 10 per cent, drawing 5 per cent through a_t and another 5 per cent from a_r .

8) A decrease of 10 per cent in a_r is equally shared between a_t and a_j .

9) A decrease of 10 per cent in a_t is completely drawn out of a_j ; a_r remains constant.

The Marginal Variation Chart has been drawn on two main assumptions that $a_t = a_r + a_j$; and that shifting of area takes place only between a_t , a_r and a_j . But, in practice, a small percentage of cane production is also going for other purposes such as chewing and cane-juice making. As this is only very marginal and also because data are not available for such canes, all the 'non-factory canes' are put under the category of jaggery-canes.

APPENDIX IIICane Development Subsidies and Other Steps Taken by the National Co-operative Sugar Limited since 1970-71:

Certain facts and figures are available with regard to the effects taken by the National Co-operative Sugars Ltd. (X₁₁) for developing particular varieties of canes in its registered area and also to get more areas registered. The details are given below:

- 1970-71 A subsidy of Rs.3-00 per tonne offered to those who supplied the new variety of canes introduced by the mill.
- 1971-72 Free transportation for sending cane sets from the factory to the field and a subsidy of Rs.1-30 per tonne for the supply of new variety canes.
- 1972-73
- 1) Free transportation for sending cane sets.
 - 2) Rs.100 per acre (Rs.247 per hectare) offered to those who started cultivation of canes earlier than the usual schedule.
 - 3) A cane development subsidy of Rs.3-00 per tonne for the supply new variety canes.
 - 4) Transportation charges completely borne by the mill for canes coming from beyond 25 miles.
 - 5) A subsidy of Rs.200 per acre (Rs.494 per hectare) offered to those who started cultivation in the special season indicated by the mill.

- 1973-74
- 1) Free transportation for sending cane sets.
 - 2) Rs.100-00 per acre offered to those who started cane cultivation earlier than the usual schedule.
 - 3) Rs.200-00 per acre offered for cultivating canes in the special season.
- 1974-75
- 1) Free supply of cane sets offered to those who started cultivation during the months of October, November, and December 1974.
 - 2) Free supply of pesticide (Agalal).
 - 3) 50 per cent of the spraying cost of Entrin (pesticide) borne by the mill.
- 1975-76
- 1) Free supply of canes offered to those who started cultivation of canes during October, November and December 1975, and January 1976.
 - 2) Free supply of Aritten (pesticide)
 - 3) A transport subsidy of Rs.8/- per km. beyond 25 km. and Rs.5/- per km. within 25 km. was offered.
- 1978-79
- Rs.375/- per acre offered to those who started cane cultivation in November, December 1978.
- 1979-80
- Rs.400/- per acre offered to those who started cultivation in November-December 1979 and January 1980.
- 1980-81
- 1) Rs.671/- per acre offered to those who started cultivation in October, November and December 1980 and January 1981; and Rs.500/- per acre to those who started cultivation in February, March, April and July 1981.
 - 2) Special subsidy of Rs.500/- offered to those who raised recommended cane varieties.

The purpose of offering such cane development and special season subsidies is to see that the mill is able to get adequate canes for crushing during the crushing season and also to avoid over dumping of canes beyond the crushing capacity in the season.

APPENDIX IVMAHALINGAM'S MODEL

	As per 1978-79	As per Strategy Explained			
		A	B	C	D
65					
1. LAND RESOURCES:					
(a) Area under cultivation (in lakh hectares)	1653	1653	1653	1653	1653
(b) Area under sugarcane (in lakh hectares)	30.88	30.88	30.88	30.88	30.88
(c) Percentage of area under sugarcane to net area under cultivation	1.87	1.87	1.87	2.00	2.00
2. PRODUCTION OF SUGARCANE (in lakh tonnes)	1517	1517	1853	2645	3306
3. YIELD OF SUGARCANE PER HECTARE (in tonnes)	50.2	50.2	60	80	100
4. Number of Sugar Factories	299	299	350	400	400
5. Recovery of Sugar % Cane	9.78	9.78	9.78	9.78	9.78
6. Molasses % Cane	4.29	4.30	4.30	4.30	4.30
7. UTILISATION OF SUGARCANE (in lakh tonnes)					
(a) For production of white sugar by sugar factories	597	666	834	1230	1561
(b) For manufacture of low purity sugar (jaggery)	736	400	500	738	936

(Contd.)

VALU LINGAM'S MODEL (Contd.)

	As per 1978-79	As per Strategy Explained			
		A	B	C	D
(c) For production of alcohol from sugarcane juice	--	267	334	492	624
(d) For seeds, etc.	184	184	185	185	185
Total (a+b+c+d)	1517	1517	1853	2645	3306
8. PRODUCTION					
(a) Sugar (in lakh tonnes)	58.42	65.13	81.57	120.29	152.67
(b) Molasses (in lakh tonnes)	25.64	28.64	35.86	52.89	67.12
(c) Paper (in lakh tonnes)	--	10.66	13.34	19.46	24.98
(d) Alcohol (in million litres)					
i) from Molasses	450	659	825	1354	1544
ii) from sugarcane juice	--	1468	1857	2706	3432
Total (i + ii)	450	2127	2662	4060	4976
9. VALUE OF PRODUCTS (Rs. in crores)					
(a) Sugar (at Rs.5000/- tonne)	2921	3257	4079	6015	7634
(b) Paper (at Rs.5000/- tonne)	--	533	667	973	1243
(c) Alcohol (at Rs.3500/- KL)	135	638	679	1421	1742
(d) Jaggery (at Rs.250/- for produce from a tonne of sugarcane)	1840	1000	1250	1845	2340
Total (a+b+c+d)	4896	5428	6675	10254	12965

(Contd.)

MAHALINGAM'S MODEL (Contd.)

	As per 1978-79	As per Strategy Explained			
		A	B	C	D
10. REVENUE (Rs. in crores)					
(a) Sugar:					
1) Cane Cess & Purchase Tax at Rs.20 per quintal)	116.84	130.26	163.14	240.58	305.34
11) Excise Duty (@ Rs.55 per quintal)	321.31	358.22	448.64	661.00	839.69
(b) Paper (@ Rs.500/- per tonne)	--	53.30	66.70	93.70	124.90
(c) Alcohol (@ Rs.1/litre)	45.00	212.70	266.20	406.00	497.60
(d) Jaggery (@ 5% on value)	92.00	50.00	62.50	92.25	117.00
Total (a + b + c + d)	575.15	804.48	1007.18	1497.98	1884.53

Source: Kisan World, Vol. 8, No. 8, 1983.

APPENDIX VSMALL INDUSTRIES SERVICE INSTITUTE, MADRAS 32AGRO-BASED INDUSTRIAL POSSIBILITIES IN MADURAI DISTRICTI. Coconut-based Industries:

1. Dehulled coconut
2. Extraction of coir fibre from coconut husk
3. Coir ropes making.
4. Coconut shell flour for supply to plastic moulding powder manufacturers.
5. Utilisation of pith for use in board making

II. Tapioca-based Industries:

1. Dried chips
2. Tapioca flour
3. Starch from tapioca
4. Sago from starch
5. Dextrin from starch
6. Tapioca macaroni
7. Glucose syrup
8. Rava from tapioca

III. Industries based on Maize:

1. Dry milling of maize
2. Starch, dextrin and other products from maize.
3. Pop corn from maize
4. Malt food from ragi
5. Liquid glucose from starches (may be from maize, tapioca, etc) for supply to confectionery industries.
6. Cornflakes (breakfast cereals)

IV. Paddy-based Industries:

1. Par-boiling of paddy
2. Activated carbon from paddy husk.
3. Rice bran oil from paddy bran.

V. Industries based on Groundnut:

1. Peanut candies for supply to supermarkets & for export
2. Salted peanuts
3. Peanut butter
4. Edible cake flour.
5. Milk from groundnut for supply to hotels (suitable for areas where cattle milk is in short supply) MIL-TONE
6. Protein isolate

VI. Industries based on Bananas:

1. Banana powder (for supply to ice cream manufacturers and also for export
2. Banana juice
3. Banana bar
4. Banana figs.

VII. Other Industries connected with Agriculture:

1. Pickles, curry powders, pappads, etc.
2. De-hydrated vegetables for supply to cities
3. Cattle feed and poultry feeds using maize bran, paddy bran, oil cakes, etc.
4. Energy food, wheat flour + oil cake flour + Bengal Gram flour + Minerals + Vitamins - contains 15 to 25% proteins.
5. Partial de-fatting of groundnut and then using it for edible products manufacture like Lonavala chikkies
6. De-hulling of sun flower seeds and using the same in confectionery and sweets manufacture.
7. De-hulling of Til seeds by chemical treatment.
8. Readymade flours like Instant idly, dosa, vada, etc. for supply to cities.

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR FARMERS

IMPACT OF AGRO-BASED INDUSTRIES ON THE AGRICULTURAL
ECONOMY OF MADURAI DISTRICT WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO
SUGAR INDUSTRY

--	--	--

1. PERSONAL DETAILS:

1.1 Name :

1.2 Age :

1.3 Father's Name :

1.4 Residential Address :

1.5 Family Size:

Earning :

i) Adults Dependent :

ii) Children :

iii) Permanent Servants :

1.6 Educational Level:

i) Uneducated :

ii) Primary level :

iii) Secondary level:

iv) College level :

2. FARM DETAILS:

2.1 Experience as farmer (years) :

- 2.2 Area under cultivation
(in acres) :
- 1) Own :
- ii) Leased in :
- iii) Leased out :
- 2.3 Area under different
crops (in acres)
- 1) Paddy :
- ii) Sugarcane :
- iii) Cotton :
- iv) Banana :
- v) Dry crops :
- vi) Others :
- 2.4 Irrigational facilities :
- 1) Canal :
- ii) Tank :
- iii) Well with Pumpset
 Lift :

3. CANE CULTIVATION DETAILS:

- 3.1 Experience in cane
cultivation (years) :
- 3.2 Irrigation used for cane
cultivation:
- 1) Canal :
- ii) Well with Pumpset
 Lift :
- iii) Tank :
- 3.3 Location of cane
field (Village) :
- 3.4 Distance from the sugar
factory (miles) :

- 3.5 Labourers Employed in the cane field:
- 1) Permanent :
 - ii) Temporary/Seasonal :
- 3.6 Wages Paid: In cash In kind
- 1) Permanent labourers
 - ii) Temporary labourers
- 3.7 Reasons for cultivating sugarcane:
- 1) Ready market :
 - ii) Adequate price :
 - iii) Suitability of soil :
- 3.8 Is the cultivation of sugarcane more profitable than other crops? : Yes / No
- 3.9 Type of cane cultivated in the last five years? :
- 1)
 - 2)
 - 3)
 - 4)
 - 5)
- 3.10 Is it the same variety cultivated in your village? : Yes / No
- 3.11 Problems in cultivating sugarcane:
- 1) Marketing problems :
 - ii) Inadequate price :
 - iii) Crop disease :
 - iv) Increasing cost :
 - v) Other problems :
- 3.12 Other crops cultivated in between two cane seasons :
- 3.13 Are you fully employed throughout the year in cultivating sugarcane? : Yes / No

- 3.14 If not, for how many months in a year you have no work? :
- 3.15 How do you employ yourself during this period? :
- 3.16 When do you start cane cultivation? :
- 3.17 When do you harvest the cane? :
- 3.18 Cost per acre incurred (in the last season) : Rs.
- 3.19 Net income obtained per acre (in the last season) : Rs.
- 3.20 Sources of credit availed:

<u>Source</u>	<u>Amount Borrowed</u>	<u>Balance to be paid</u>
	Rs.	Rs.
1) Personal :		
ii) L.D.B. :		
iii) Co-op. Bank :		
iv) Commercial Bank :		
v) Housing Society :		
vi) Dealers/Agency :		
vii) Sugar factory :		

- 3.21 Are you fully satisfied with the Government's cane price policy? : Yes / No
- 3.22 If not, state the reasons?
- 1) Increasing cost of chemical inputs :
- ii) Increasing cost of sets :
- iii) Increasing cost of irrigation :
- iv) Increasing transport cost :
- v) Increasing labour cost:

3.23 Are you able to dispose of the entire sugarcane you produce? : Yes / No

3.24 Is there any variation in the cultivation of sugarcane in the past ten years? Yes / No

3.25 If yes, state reasons:

<u>Year</u>	<u>Area</u>	<u>Reason</u>
1981		
1980		
1979		
1978		
1977		
1976		
1975		
1974		
1973		
1972		
1971		

4. CONNECTIONS WITH THE FACTORY:

4.1 For how long you are a member of the sugar factory? (years) :

4.2 Cane area registered with the factory :

4.3 Reasons for member of the sugar factory:

<u>Sl. No.</u>	<u>Reasons</u>	<u>Rank</u>
1.	Close proximity	
2.	Provides adequate price	
3.	Provides technical information	
4.	Assured income/price	
5.	Provides technical assistance	
6.	To avoid the uncertainties of the jaggery market	
7.	Provides credit facilities	
8.	Other reasons, if any.	

4.4 Are you regular in supplying cane to the factory? : Yes / No

4.5 If not, state reasons:

- i) Inadequate price :
- ii) Far away from the factory :
- iii) To avail the best opportunity in the gur market :
- iv) Other reasons, if any :

5. IMPACT OF THE SUGAR FACTORY:

5.1 On the asset positions:

<u>Sl. No.</u>	<u>Assets purchased</u>	<u>Year of purchase</u>	<u>Purchase value</u>	<u>Present value</u>	<u>Sources of funds used</u>
1.	Lands				
2.	Buildings				
3.	Well (Constructed/deepened)				
4.	Livestock				
5.	Storages				
6.	Tractor				
7.	Tools				
8.	Others				

5.2 Improvements in the living standards:

<u>Sl. No.</u>	<u>Particulars</u>	<u>Remarks</u>
1.	Change in consumption pattern	
2.	Purchased durable assets	
3.	Able to educate children well	
4.	Increased the savings of the family	

5.3 Improvements in Savings:

<u>Sl.No.</u>	<u>Particulars</u>	<u>Remarks</u>
1.	Cleared off prior debts	
2.	LIC Policy	
3.	Postal savings	
4.	Recurring deposit	
5.	Fixed deposit	
6.	Private lending	
7.	Conducted marriages	
8.	Celebrating annual family functions well	

5.4 Problems faced with the factory:

- i) Delayed payment :
- ii) Cumbersome process :
- iii) Red tapism :
- iv) Inadequate price :
- v) Inadequate technical help :
- vi) Inadequate credit :
- vii) No opportunity to express the views :

6. IMPROVEMENTS EXPECTED:

6.1 (On the factory side in,

- i) Payment systems :
- ii) Technical help :
- iii) Credit :

6.2 On the Government's side in,

- i) Price :
- ii) Credit :
- iii) Price control on chemical inputs :

7. GENERAL REMARKS: