

NIRD; RKVY Monitoring Unit Analytical Report on Assam SAP

1. Name of the State

Assam

2. What target the State decided to achieve using RKVY assistance during 11th Five Year Plan (FYP) for the agriculture sector as a whole and for the sub sectors?

During 11th Five Year Plan, the State targets an annual growth rate of 2 per cent for the agriculture sector as a whole, using RKVY assistance. This is to be achieved through expansion in area of principal crops as well as increase in productivity with greater emphasis on fertilizer-consumption, irrigation, mechanization, enhancing SRR and strengthening agricultural extension. Various interventions are expected to raise the production of dominant rice crop from present level of 41 lakh MT to 64 lakh MT by the end of 11th FYP. Though the SAP states about having similar production targets for jute, sugarcane, pulses, oilseeds and horticultural crops in the State by the end of 2011-12, it misses to provide quantitative estimates. For the *Animal Husbandry & Veterinary* sector, the SAP intends to fulfill the estimated shortfall of milk (1227 million litres), meat (141 thousand tonnes) and eggs (1954 million eggs per year) during 11th FYP by focusing on areas such as artificial insemination, feed & fodder development, strengthening of government farms for poultry, duck, goat and pig, infrastructure development of veterinary dispensaries, and dairy development. During year 2009-10, under RKVY project, 100 *Dairy Cooperative Societies/Self Help Groups* will be provided high yielding 2000 cattle to achieve additional 20,000 litres of milk per day, to be collected at 41 of *milk collection centers*; all *milk collection centers* shall be provided 2 Milk Cans each for milk-procurement. For the *Fisheries* sector, the SAP proposes a production target of 2.78 lakh tones over the 5-year-period from 2007-08 (production 1.90 lakh tones). It also states the minimum annual nutritional demand of 3.20 lakh tonnes against the present annual fish production of 2.06 lakh tonnes (2008-09) in the State. It targets to achieve a growth rate of 8 per cent over the 5-year Plan period (as against the national average of 7.5 per cent during 10th Plan, for inland fisheries) from the present growth rate of 3 per cent, in the fisheries sector, by taking up effective development and management measures. The SAP intends to increase the average fish productivity of 38,800 ha of pond and tank fisheries in the State from 1.5 tonnes/ha/year to 4.0 tonnes/ha/year; and increase the productivity of beel fisheries, covering 1.0 lakh ha, from 173 kg/ha/year to 1.0 to 1.5 tonne/ha, during the 11th FYP.

3. Which method (Method 1 or Method 2) is used for the preparation of SAP? How integration (methodology) of C-DAPs and prioritizing major interventions was done to prepare SAP?

The SAP is not explicit on the method followed for its preparation. The SAP does not make it clear whether the State *Nodal Agency/Agriculture Department* has taken the draft DAPs from the districts at the first instance to ensure appropriate capture of the State's priorities w.r.t. agriculture and allied sectors in the C-DAPs so that their integration in to the SAP meet priorities, targets and resources of the State (Method 1), or that it has conveyed to the districts in the first instance, the State's priorities, targets and resources that ought to be reflected in the respective district plans (Method 2). However, the SAP states that it is prepared

on the basis of the C-DAPs of all 27 districts of the State; each C-DAP being formulated through decentralized Planning Structure in the light of the Government of India guidelines so that to involve Panchayati Raj Institutions (PRIs) as well as local bodies at the district/block/panchayat level, in the process.

The SAP is silent on the methodology of integration of the C-DAPs as well as on how prioritizing major interventions has been done to prepare the SAP. But the SAP accepts the importance of critical issues identified in the C-DAPs for achieving future targets by describing them in comprehensive terms as the areas for focus. They are classified under broad heads like, *Productivity, Resource availability, Credit, Nutrition, Plant Protection, Research, Knowledge transfer/capacity building, Integrated planning for optimizing production/productivity, Soil health and fertility, and Diversification of Agriculture.*

4. Whether SAP has critically analyzed and clearly stated the agricultural situation of the state vis-à-vis its districts through a SWOT analysis covering agro-climatic conditions, natural resources, infrastructure, institutions, technologies, manpower etc

The SAP attempts to critically analyze and clearly state the agricultural situation of the state through a systematic SWOT analysis covering agro-climatic conditions, natural resources, infrastructure, institutions, technologies, manpower etc. Apart from the systematic SWOT analysis provided for the *Agriculture* and the *Animal Husbandry & Veterinary* sectors, the SWOTs may also be discerned in the text of the SAP. The main strengths include, richness in fauna and flora resources, abundant water resources for assured irrigation, potential to increase cropping intensity to 200 per cent, large riverine tracks with high productivity potentials for wheat, pulses and oilseeds, good technological support network (AAU and ICAR), most suitable climate for majority of horticultural crops, organic cultivation by default, situations supportive to growth of the animal husbandry sector like immense natural resources, technically qualified manpower, availability of land and infrastructure, traditional knowledge of farmers with livestock farming and age old practice of composite farming in livestock, crop, fishery etc. The main weaknesses include, low per capita holding (1.15 hectare) restricting investment capacity, deteriorating soil health, inadequate availability of quality inputs, low level of farm mechanization and lack of irrigation facility, lack of post harvest, processing and marketing facilities, dependence on imported seeds for wheat and pulses, inadequate credit for agricultural operations, high cost of infrastructure maintenance due to recurring floods, low seed replacement rates. In case of animal husbandry sector, the weaknesses include, low productivity, efficiency of livestock, low thrust on extension, environmental issues, lack of policies on services, age old infrastructure – poor service delivery facilities, lack of designing/planning capabilities, poor market information, lack of cold-chain system for transportation of livestock products, poor availability of feed and fodder, and shortage of veterinarians and para-veterinarians. The main opportunities include, huge potential for horticultural production, availability of new technologies and farming practices, rising demand for diversified agriculture and horticulture products, agriculture sector under greater focus of the Central and State Governments, improving communication infrastructure, availability of vast mono-crop area with ground/surface water available for double cropping, commercialization of agriculture. Opportunities in animal husbandry sector include considerable potential for generating additional employment through milk, meat and eggs production, enhancement of productivity through advance technologies and high demand for animal husbandry products. The threats include, natural calamities, deteriorating soil health and ground water, high humidity – low shelf-life, high cost of cultivation, competition from

other States/countries, shortage of labour, pressure of urbanization and infrastructural development. Threats in case of animal husbandry sector include occurrence of diseases due to climate, environment and natural calamities, lack of organized supply, collection and distribution system of livestock products and institutional weaknesses.

5. Whether Convergence- inter and intra department/programmes- been attempted and what is the extent of convergence? Have all potential options for convergence been identified and explored?

The SAP, in general, does not refer to convergence of inter and intra department/programmes. However, we do find the intention of the SAP to achieve convergence in case of the *Dairy Sector*. For dairy development, the SAP keeps objective of carrying out all existing or new schemes/projects in synchronization with each other, irrespective of the source of fund. It intends to tag the project components of one programme with another component of a different programme to give a supportive role and to make each programme sustainable and successful. The SAP substantiates this by an instance in which the activity of cattle induction to dairy farmers of the *Dairy Cooperative Societies (DCS)* formed under EAP project AACP of nine mentioned districts are in progress under RKVY during 2008-09, so that to enhance the existing cattle rearer's overall milk production capacity. Besides this, we do not find any other reference to convergence in the SAP. The SAP is not explicit about the extent of convergence. We cannot make out whether all potential options for convergence have been identified and explored.

However, the *Physical and Financial Programme proposed under CDAP during XI Plan* provide instances of projects enumerating proposed contribution under RKVY vis-à-vis total project cost. For example, the *Physical and Financial Programme proposed under CDAP during XI Plan* of the Cachar district gives amount required under RKVY vis-à-vis the total project cost, for all the projects, such as the *power tiller* project under agricultural mechanization with a total cost of Rs 112.5 lakhs with contribution of Rs 56.25 under RKVY.

6. Has the experience of on-going CSS and state schemes been studied and lessons learnt have been incorporated in SAP/C-DAPs for replication/ expansion/ modification in uncovered areas?

It is not explicit in the SAP whether the experience of on-going CSS and state schemes has been studied and the lessons learnt have been incorporated in SAP/C-DAPs for replication/ expansion/ modification in uncovered areas.

7. Whether the yield gaps and returns in different crops/livestock/fisheries have been estimated?

The SAP does not provide evidence towards estimating yield gaps (yield gap analysis) and returns, presumably for year 2008-09. However, it does mention yield gaps in rice (493 kg), wheat (1408 kg) and oilseeds (521 kg) between State and the national average.

8. How the technological and agronomic gaps were identified to contribute to yield gaps?

The SAP categorically states that it is prepared on the basis of the C-DAPs of 27 districts. It also mentions that the C-DAPs reflect the interventions necessary for change to achieve 2 per cent targeted growth rate in agriculture & allied sector. The SAP states the significance of addressing in comprehensive terms the critical issues identified in the C-DAPs for achieving future targets, while presenting them as focused areas. However, the SAP does not explicitly throw light on how the technological and agronomic gaps are identified to contribute to yield gaps. The SAP

mentions constraints such as small and fragmented land holding, share tenancy system, inadequate availability of quality seeds of improved genotype, inadequate irrigation facilities, low fertilizer consumption, flood, and low credit availability.

9. How the identified constraints are adjudged responsible for low crop productivity in general and specific crops in particular? Is it an opinion or stated on the empirical basis?

It is not explicit in the SAP that how the identified constraints are adjudged responsible for low crop productivity in general. However, it misses to give constraints for the specific crops. It is not clearly explicit that whether adjudging the identified constraints, responsible for low crop productivity is an opinion or stated on the empirical basis. But, we may not consider it purely based on opinion as the SAP supports the given constraints by providing statistics such as consumption of fertilizers in the State is 60.56 kg vi-a-vis the national average of 117 kg; 75 per cent of loss due to flood is accounted by crop damage; and irrigation in Assam is restricted to 27.6 per cent of gross cropped area and 39.6 per cent of net cropped area.

10. How the interventions are identified to bridge the gaps in productivity levels?

The facts that the SAP mentions about integrating the C-DAPs for its preparation and that the C-DAPs reflect the interventions necessary for change to achieve 2 per cent targeted growth rate in agriculture & allied sector, implicitly highlight the role of inputs taken from the C-DAPs in identifying interventions to bridge the gaps in productivity levels, in the SAP.

11. Whether the right strategies have been prioritized to bridge the yield gaps in crop/livestock/fisheries and maximize returns to farmers have been clearly spelt out? Whether the empirical basis for appropriate strategies provided? How far they have been obtained/decided through a consultative process with all the relevant stake holders?

The SAP gives thrust on raising agricultural productivity and attempts to suggest strategies towards it, such as flood control, drainage management, improvement of irrigation facilities, and input delivery systems supported by adequate agricultural credit and extension services. However, we do not find evidence of a systematic prioritization of the strategies. There is no explicit evidence of providing the empirical basis for appropriate strategies. The SAP is not clear about the extent of involvement of consultative process with all the relevant stake holders for obtaining/deciding the given strategies though it makes explicit that each C-DAP is formulated through decentralized Planning Structure in the light of the Government of India guidelines so that to involve Panchayati Raj Institutions (PRIs) as well as local bodies at the district/block/panchayat level, in the process.

12. Whether the prioritized strategies have been translated into programmes/projects/activities by sectors and years with clear cut objectives, targets, output, outcome, funding (RKVY, other sources) for each project? Whether the viability of each project to achieve the expected output considered?

The SAP attempts to translate the given strategies into programmes/projects/activities by sectors and years with clear cut objectives, targets (both physical and financial), and funding (RKVY, other sources) for each project, at the district level, for all the districts. The SAP provides this information for each district for the last three years of the XIth Plan (2009-10, 2010-11 and 2011-12) under the heading *Physical and Financial Programme proposed under*

CDAP during XI Plan. It is not explicit whether viability of projects to achieve the expected output is considered.

13. Have border areas/ insurgent areas/problem areas (mining, acidic soils etc) have been addressed by formulating any specific projects?

Despite the rich water resources in form of rivers (that give rise to floods due to heavy rains in the State, *17.1 per cent of Net Cropped Area under chronically flood prone area*), the irrigation level in the State is low at 27.6 per cent of Gross Cropped Area and 39.6 per cent of Net Cropped Area. There are many schemes pertaining to canal/surface irrigation and rain water harvesting proposed under the XIth Plan in the C-DAPs of many districts, as provided in the SAP. Similarly, the problem of acidic soils in the State is proposed to be tackled through soil reclamation/liming activities in the C-DAPs.

Under *State level proposal* schemes, a project on *Mineral mixture plant* aims to supplement the deficiency of micro & macro minerals in soil caused due to heavy rainfall & erosion of land. It has a project cost of Rs 1.30 crores.

14. What is the mismatch (difference between estimated budget in SAP/C-DAP and the approved and used budget) between the projections and funding in SAPs/C-DAPs and the projects (difference between planned projects in SAP/C-DAP and approved projects and funding being implemented)? How this mismatch affects the targets, expected outputs/outcomes/growth impact?

The SAP proposes total financial outlays of Rs 1236.02 crores, Rs 1142.99 crores, and Rs 1164.51 crores for years 2009-10, 2010-11 and 2011-12, respectively, as per C-DAPs for the XIth Plan. As per the statement on *Review of Implementation of RKVY for Assam State*, dated 10th November, 2009, provided by the State Government, the State was not released any funds for year 2007-08 due to its ineligibility for assistance under RKVY during that year. However, the State became eligible for assistance under RKVY in year 2008-09 and was subsequently allotted an amount of Rs 142.62 crores in that year against the proposed 38 projects costing Rs 142.62 crore. Therefore, for 2008-09, it is cent per cent matching. However, the allotted amount (Rs 80.00 crores) in 2009-10 is much less than the proposed outlay (Rs 1236.02 crores) for the same year. There is a mismatch of Rs 1156.02 crores (93.52 per cent of the proposed outlay) between the proposed and the estimated budget for year 2009-10. The huge mismatch is expected to severely affect targets, expected outputs/outcomes/growth of projects proposed under all agricultural & allied sectors.

15. Are the projects/programmes large enough, instead of being small and prolific pilot type schemes, to make a visible (impact) in the sectors?

The SAP informs about large projects at the district level under *Physical and Financial Programme proposed under CDAP during XI Plan* for various districts. For example, it proposes purchase of 1602 power tillers (project cost Rs 26.14 crores), STW irrigation equipment (project cost Rs 50.07 crores), demonstrations: *Sali* paddy HYV Demo. (project cost Rs 13.76 crores), early *Ahu* HYV Demo. (project cost Rs 25.09 crores), mustard field Demo. (project cost Rs 16.54 crores) for the *Barpeta* district; STW irrigation equipment (project cost Rs 7.02 crores) and construction of new fishery pond (project cost Rs 3.10 crores) for the *Darrang* district; land development/micro irrigation (project cost Rs 6.57 crores), assistance of farmers for enrichment of crop residue with urea treatment (project cost Rs 7.00 crores) and formation of SHG on

Piggery (project cost Rs 4.50 crores) for *North Cachar* district; and purchase of 323 power tillers (project cost Rs 4.85 crores) for the *Hailakandi* district.

16. Has the SAPs identified Flagship programmes (extensive to cover large part of the state and larger area)?

The SAP does not mention the Flagship programmes. However, it puts forth some *State Level Proposals* in *Agriculture* and *Animal Husbandry & Veterinary* sectors. Programmes/projects under *Agriculture* sector include, the *soil nutrient mapping* scheme covering 31.40 lakh hectares in 10 districts (in first phase) (budget Rs 1.29 crores); and the *Farm Sector Employment* scheme that involves government support for self-employment to the educated rural youths, belonging to households having at least 10 bighas of land – 500 youth from each of the 27 districts shall be benefitted (budget Rs 8.10 crores). Programmes/projects under *Animal Husbandry & Veterinary* sector include a number of schemes/projects with a total budget of Rs 27.25 crores, such as *Improvement of Institute of Farm Management, Rani* scheme (budget Rs 13.30 crores), *Meat processing plant – pigs/goats* (budget Rs 550 crores), *Mineral mixture plant* (budget Rs 1.30 crores), *Strengthening of Government Livestock Farm at Khanapara* (budget Rs 1.30 crores), *Strengthening of Duck cum Fish farm at Darrang* (budget Rs 1.25 crores), and *Strengthening of 7 Vocational Training Centres* (budget Rs 4.60 crores).

17. Whether sectoral and spatial allocation of funds conforms to equitable and optimal distribution of resources?

The sectoral allocation of funds conforms to equitable and optimal distribution of resources. The *Agriculture & horticulture* sector receives highest share of 59.30 per cent (Rs 2101.19 crores) of the total proposed allocations of Rs 3543.52 (as per CDAPs for XIth Plan under RKVY). Agriculture is the major source of livelihood in the State, besides providing food security. The agricultural working force comprises 53 per cent of the total working force in the State. Hence, the high share of proposed allocation towards agriculture is justified. *Animal Husbandry* sector bags second highest share of 10.36 per cent (Rs 366.98 crores) in proposed allocations. The SAP highlights the significant importance of the livestock sector in the State, being major source of supplementary income for most rural households, in particular the landless, marginal and small holders. The *Fisheries* sector has been proposed a share of 7.49 (Rs 265.36 crores) per cent. It is quite correct as the sector entails great growth and employment potential in the State with high-level of fish consumption. *Irrigation* sector receives a share of 4.35 per cent (Rs 154.3 crores) in the proposed allocations. The State is largely un-irrigated despite a high irrigation potential owing to the water-rich river-systems, hence the sector needs due focus. *Handloom/Khadi gramudyog* sector has been proposed an allocation share of 4.29 per cent (Rs 151.94 crores). The sector seems to be important from the State's point of view as a source of employment for the rural population and thus part of inclusive development, although the SAP misses to focus on it in a relatively sense. The *Dairy Development* sector receives a proposed allocation share of 4.01 per cent (Rs 141.95 crores). The contribution of the dairying in the income generation of the rural masses is far lower than the potential. It is due to the lack of scientific dairy farming; improved technology in dairy is anticipated to increase employment opportunities and incomes in the rural areas. *Sericulture*, which receives share of 3.74 per cent (Rs 132.60 crores) is a traditional sector that involves 1.85 lakh households in the State. Soil erosion caused by various reasons is found to affect the productive potential of the fertile lands

in the State. Therefore, the sector is well-recognized by proposing 3.27 per cent (Rs 115.77 crores) in the total allocations.

Though not fully, the spatial allocation of funds does conform to equitable and optimal distribution of resources as the district-wise proposed allocation of funds and the respective district populations, for all the districts, are moderately positively correlated (0.43). Major aberrations include, the high allocation shares of 12.87 per cent, 6.57 per cent, 7.01 per cent, 8.66 per cent and 11.85 per cent for Barpeta, Jorhat, Kokrajhar, Udalguri and Nagaon districts having low proportionate population share of 5.69 per cent, 3.45 per cent, 3.13 per cent, 2.63 per cent and 8.00 per cent, respectively; and the low allocation shares of 2.18 per cent, 3.09 per cent, 0.72 per cent, 2.63 per cent and 1.06 per cent for Darrang, Dhubri, Hailakandi, Kamrup - rural and Karimganj districts having high proportionate population share of 5.20 per cent, 5.66 per cent, 1.88 per cent, 8.71 and 3.48 per cent, respectively. There may be some real good reasons for such deviations, but not stated in the SAP.

18. Are there any innovative projects? If so, how do they contribute to fulfill the special needs outside ongoing programs?

The SAP does not specifically mention the innovative projects. However, many projects given under the *State Level Proposals* and the *Physical and Financial Programme proposed under CDAP during XI Plan* for all districts, are of innovative nature. *State Level Proposals* include projects on *soil nutrient mapping* scheme covering 31.40 lakh hectares in 10 districts (in first phase) (budget Rs 1.29 crores) and *Farm Sector Employment* scheme that involves government support for self-employment to the educated rural youths, belonging to households having at least 10 bighas of land – 500 youth from each of the 27 districts shall be benefitted (budget Rs 8.10 crores). The projects proposed under *Physical and Financial Programme proposed under CDAP during XI Plan* include *rain water harvesting tank, construction repairing of earth canal from natural resource, seed villages, HYV Demo., earth worm unit, fruit & vegetable processing centre, bio-fertilizers & bio-pesticide application, vermin compost, training on silk up gradation & silk worm rearing* etc. are innovative projects.

The scheme on *soil nutrient mapping* shall be useful in getting information on fertilizer requirement in crop fields and specific management of crop and soil. The scheme on *Farm Sector Employment* shall help increase agricultural/livestock production and income of the beneficiaries ease the unemployment problem and enable transition of subsistence agriculture to diversified and commercial agriculture. The projects under *Physical and Financial Programme proposed under CDAP* shall contribute in overall development of agriculture by enhancing the irrigation potential, promoting HYV seeds, improving soil health/reclamation, diversification to high-value crops etc.

19. What is the basis of planning certain projects for the State as a whole and how do they get monitored?

The SAP plans certain projects for the State as a whole as *State Level Proposals*. For example, *soil nutrient mapping* scheme covering 31.40 lakh hectares in 10 districts (in first phase) (budget Rs 1.29 crores); the *Farm Sector Employment* scheme that involves government support for self-employment to the educated rural youths, belonging to households having at least 10 bighas of land – 500 youth from each of the 27 districts shall be benefitted (budget Rs 8.10 crores); *Improvement of Institute of Farm Management, Rani* scheme (budget Rs 13.30 crores), *Meat*

processing plant – pigs/goats (budget Rs 550 crores), Mineral mixture plant (budget Rs 1.30 crores), Strengthening of Government Livestock Farm at Khanapara (budget Rs 1.30 crores), Strengthening of Duck cum Fish farm at Darrang (budget Rs 1.25 crores), Strengthening of 7 Vocational Training Centres (budget Rs 4.60 crores), Dairy Inservice & Farmer's Training at Kamrup and Jorhat and establishment of Zonal Milk Testing Laboratory at Dibrugarh, Dhubri, Tezpur, Silchar and Diphu.

However, the basis of planning the above projects for the State as a whole is not explicit in the SAP. In general, it is also not explicit in the SAP that how the projects get monitored. However, with reference to the project on *Farm Sector Employment*, the SAP states about using computers for maintaining basic information of beneficiaries, their current performance, production level of agricultural/livestock commodities and disbursement position of monthly incentives etc. in each district, considering the complex nature and quantum of the information to be handled under the project.

20. What is the basis of sectoral fund allocation? Is it based on expected marginal contributions? Any viability analysis is made?

The basis of sectoral fund allocation is not explicit in the SAP. It is not explicit whether it is based on expected marginal contributions. Any viability analysis is not explicit in the SAP. However, we find the importance of data collection/SWOT analysis while preparing respective C-DAPs in identifying the sectoral budget outlay requirements. For example, *Jorhat* district proposes high-level of investment of Rs 59.35 crores in *handloom/Khadi* sector, with 26 per cent of the total proposed allocations for the district, unlike many other districts.

21. Whether the allocations across years were right? What was the basis for yearly allocations?

The SAP proposes outlays of Rs 1236.02 crores (34.88 per cent), 1142.99 crores (32.26 per cent) and 1164.51 crores (32.86 per cent) for years 2009-10, 2010-11 and 2011-12, respectively. The total outlay for these three years is Rs 3543.52 crores. The SAP misses to give proposed outlay for the overall Plan period along with annual proposed outlays for the first two years (2007-08 and 2008-09) of the Plan. The State was ineligible in the first year, though became eligible in 2008-09, it fails to provide the proposals and their importance in the overall context of the SAP as well as the total 11th FYP. Since information for the first two year is not given, it is difficult to answer whether allocations across years are right. The basis for yearly allocations is not explicit in the SAP. Generally, lowest allocation is made for the first year when fund requirements and utilization are expected to be low, being project-planning stage. The allocation size is then expected to increase in the second and third years of the Plan owing to higher investment needs for project implementation. The allocations are expected to be decline during the last year of the Plan, being the culminating stage for most projects.

22. Is the SAP in line/ tune with overall agricultural strategy and goals of the country/ state?

Yes, the SAP seems to be in line/ tune with overall agricultural strategy and goals of the country/ state. The programme/Projects mentioned under *State Level Proposals* as well as *Physical and Financial Programme proposed under CDAP during XI Plan* for various districts, are attempts to realize the overall agricultural strategy and goals of the country/ state. Though, the SAP mentions a surprisingly lower target of 2 per cent growth in agriculture & allied sector, the C-

DAPs target a 4 per cent growth rate. For example, the *Golaghat* district targets a growth rate of 4 per cent for the agriculture & allied sector. This is in line with the country's goal of attaining 4 per cent growth rate during the XIth five-year Plan.

23. Whether mechanisms for planning, baseline information collection, monitoring, documentation and regularly reporting progress are clearly spelt out?

The mechanisms for planning, baseline information collection, monitoring, documentation and regularly reporting progress are not spelt out in the SAP. However, under *Physical and Financial Programme proposed under CDAP during XI Plan* for various districts, there are provisions related to the monitoring and evaluation.

Directions for 12th FYP

1. Whether the planning, monitoring and evaluation mechanisms exist, functional and made use of to fulfill the expectation and bridge the gaps? If not, what is the plan for strengthening PME mechanisms and making them functional during the remaining years of 11th FYP and 12th FYP when it gets launched? Whether the baseline information is maintained for comparison of performance of the project later?

It is not explicit in the SAP whether the planning, monitoring and evaluation mechanisms exist, functional and made use of to fulfill the expectation and bridge the gaps. However, under *Physical and Financial Programme proposed under CDAP during XI Plan* for various districts, there are provisions related to the monitoring and evaluation.

The SAP is not explicit on the plan for strengthening PME mechanisms and making them functional during the remaining years of 11th FYP and 12th FYP when it gets launched. Again, it is not explicit whether the baseline information is maintained for comparison of performance of the project later.

2. Whether the mid-term evaluation by the external agency is done for change of the targets and inter-sectoral resource adjustments?

It is not mentioned.

3. Is social audit done to facilitate publicity on status of the implementation and maintenance of transparency?

It is not mentioned.

4. What are the major lessons from RKVY implementation in the State for the 12th FYP?

(i) The SAP should mention all the projects under RKVY at the State level, giving clear-cut objectives, targets, output, outcome and funding (RKVY, other sources) for each project, along with the given details of existing C.S.S. schemes, for the five-year plan period. It will be useful in analyzing the extent of convergence of existing schemes with the RKVY. The SAP should consider 2008-09 proposals in continuity with others during 11th FYP.

(ii) The main experiences of implementing CSS/State schemes should be summarized and whether/how they are made use of to prepare SAP for replication, expansion etc should be stated.

(iii) Prioritization of strategies/interventions needs to be attempted using standard objective methods.

- (iv) The project proposals should emanate from Districts preferably Zilla Parishads on the basis of C-DAPs.
- (v) There should be rigorous filtering of project proposals by an expert Committee earlier and in SLSC meetings later.
- (vi) There should be a dedicated PM&E mechanism at the State level for facilitating project screening, database management, monitoring, evaluation and reporting of RKVY projects. It should facilitate mid-term evaluation by external agency and also social audit to facilitate publicity and maintenance of transparency.
- (vii) The SAP should give systematic and more information on State-level target for agriculture & allied sectors / sub-sectors to be achieved using RKVY funding during the five-year Plan period, vis-à-vis the base-year values.
- (viii) The SAP should provide systematic yield-gap estimates, both at State and district-level, for major crops and other enterprises.
- (ix) The SAP should enumerate the methodology used in its preparation.

Overall conclusion

The State Agriculture Department has made satisfactory attempt to prepare the SAP. It gives *Executive Summary* that briefly describes main points under the SAP; general description of the State covering agriculture, geography, and climate; issues/constraints in agriculture & allied sectors and SWOT analysis; state level project proposals; sector-wise annual proposed fund allocations for each district; and year-wise physical & financial targets for each project proposed under the C-DAPs for all the districts. It has not considered 2008-09 approved projects in relation to SAP. The SAP seems to be weak in aspects of coherence, systematic presentation of facts and sufficient details on required information. It misses to mention all the projects under RKVY at the State level, giving clear-cut objectives, targets, output, outcome and funding (RKVY, other sources) for each project, along with the given details of existing C.S.S. schemes, for the five-year plan period. This obstructs in analyzing the extent of convergence of existing schemes with the RKVY. It also does not provide information on yield gap analysis and returns for major crops in the State. It fails to adopt a systematic prioritization of strategies and interventions. A dedicated PM&E mechanism at the State level for facilitating project screening, database management, monitoring, evaluation and reporting of RKVY projects does not seem to be in place. The 12th FYP exercise has to focus on these points.