Annual Performance Evaluation Report of RFD of RSCs i.e. Institutions for the year 2013-2014

Name of the Division : Crop Science Division
Name of the Institution : National Bureau of Agriculturally Important Insects, Bengaluru
RFD Nodal Officer : Dr. N.Bhaktavatsalam

S.No	Objectives	Weight	Actions	Success Indicators	Unit	Weight	Target / Criteria Value** Excellent 100%	Very Good 90%	Good 80%	Fair 70%	Poor 60%	Consolidated Achievements	Raw score	Weighted Score	Percent achievements against Target values of 90% Col.*	Reasons for shortfalls or excessive achievements, if applicable
1	**Augmentation of genetic resources of agriculturally important insects*.**	**48**	[1.1]. Collection and characterization of agriculturally important insects	[1.1.1] Insect collections made	Number	**20**	850	765	680	595	510	**837**	**98.4**	**19.68**	**109.41**	
				[1.1.2] Insect specimens identified	No,	**18**	11000	9900	8800	7700	6600	**14470 $**	**100**	**18**	**146.16**	**$**
				[1.1.3] GenBank accessions, gene sequences & Barcodes developed	No.	**10**	555	500	450	400	350	**577**	**100**	**10**	**115.4**	
2	**Conservation, evaluation, utilization and supply of agriculturally important insects.**	**30**	[2.1] Ex situ conservation	[2.1.1] Insect species conserved	No.	**12**	500	450	400	350	300	**517**	**100**	**12**	**114.88**	
			2.2] Evaluation of Bioagents	[2.2.1] Evaluation experiments conducted	No.	**10**	150	135	120	105	90	**158**	**100**	**10**	**117.03**	
			2.3] Supply	[2.3.1] Insect species supplied	No.	**8**	550	495	440	385	330	**539**	**98**	**7.84**	**108.88**	
3	**Capacity building and dissemination of technology**	**10**	[3.1] Impartation of training on insects & dissemination of technology	[3.1.1] Trainings conducted/organised	No.	**10**	15	13	11	10	9	**27#**	**100**	**10**	**207.69**	**#**

$ More number of collections was made in greater frequency due to invasive threats.
# More number of trainings were conducted based on the demand for the management of pests of coconut, invasive pests and mass rearing techniques

Continued......................

S.No	Objectives	Weight	Actions	Success Indicators	Unit	Weight	Target / Criteria value					Consolidated Achievements	Raw score	Weighted Score	Percent achievements against Target values of 90% Col.*	Reasons for shortfalls or excessive achievements, if applicable
							Excellent 100%	Very Good 90%	Good 80%	Fair 70%	Poor 60%					
	Efficient functioning of RFD		[4.1] Timely Submission of draft RFD (2014-15) for approval	[4.1.1] On-time submission	Date	2	March 23 2014	March 26 2014	March 27 2014	March 28 2014	March 29 2014	0	0	0	0	
			[4.2] Timely submission of RFD results (2013-14)	[4.2.1] On -time submission	Date	1	May 1 2014	May 2 2014	May 3 2014	May 4 2014	May 5 2014	0	0	0	0	
	Administrative Reforms	**12**	[4.3] Implement ISO 9001	[4.3.1] Prepare an ISO 9001 action plan	Date	1	June 4 2014	June 5 2014	June 6 2014	June 7 2013	June 8 2014	0	0	0	0	**Action plan initiated**
				[4.3.2] Implementation of ISO 9001 action plan	Date	2	**100**	**95**	**95**	**85**	**80**	0	0	0	0	**Implementation would take another six months**
			[4.4] Implement mitigating strategies for reducing potential risk of corruption	[4.4.1] % implementation	%	2	100	95	90	85	80	100	100	2	100	
	Improving internal efficiency /responsiveness .service delivery of Ministry Department		[4.5] Implementation of Sevottam	[4.5.1] Independent Audit of Implementation of Citizens Charter	%	2	100	95	90	85	80	100	100	2	100	
				[4.5.2] Independent Audit of Implementation of Public Grievance redressal system)	%	2	100	95	90	85	80	100	100	2	100	

Total composite score   : 91.52

Rating :   Very Good

* **Percent of Achievable Targets = Consolidated Achievements /Targets under 90% Column * 100**

Procedure for computing the Weighted and Composite Score

1. **Weighted Score of a Success Indicator = Weight of the corresponding Success Indicator x Raw Score / 100**

2. **Total Composite Score = Sum of Weighted Scores of all the Success Indicators.**

3. **Raw score for achievement = Obtained by comparing achievement with agreed target values. Example : Values between 80% (Good) and 70% (Fair), the raw score is 75%.**

Departmental rating	Value of Composite score
Excellent	100-96%
Very Good	95-86%
Good	85-76%
Fair	75-66%
Poor	65% and below