

NIRD; RKVY Monitoring Unit, Delhi

Analytical Report on Haryana SAP

1. Name of the State

Haryana

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?

According to the SAP, the State, using RKVY assistance during 11th Five Year Plan, decides to increase the productivity of agriculture & allied sectors by 4 per cent, reduce water consumption by 10 per cent in rice-wheat cropping system and reduce energy consumption in agriculture by 10 per cent. The SAP gives crop-wise targets to be achieved under RKVY in terms of increase in *Productivity* and *Area* at district-level only for all the 20 districts in the State (reference year missing). For example, the SAP targets to raise the productivity of rice crop in districts *Sonapat, Faridabad, Ambala* and *Karnal* from 25.2 q/ha, 23.95 q/ha, 26.7 q/ha and 46.98 q/ha at present to 35.5 q/ha, 37 q/ha, 41.6 q/ha and 52.0 q/ha in 2011-12. These targets are not given at the State level.

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 about the method used for the preparation of SAP. Though, the SAP describes the methodology for the preparation of the C-DAPs, yet it is silent in its own case for the same. However, the SAP states that the CCS Haryana Agricultural University Hisar, identified as the *Technical Support Institute* (TSI), has been instrumental in the preparation of the SAP under the guidance of Director, Extension Education. The SAP is not stating anything on the methodology used for the integration of C-DAPs and prioritizing major interventions to prepare the SAP.

However, the SAP seems to have taken into consideration the uniqueness of the districts while proposing various projects. For example, the project on *Seed production of wheat and paddy*, takes note of thrust area/issue of seed production identified in the C-DAP of *Mewat* district. Similarly, other thrust areas/issues of the *Mewat* district like rain water harvesting, reclamation of saline/sodic soils, laser leveling, green manuring and water management, are included in projects mentioned in the SAP like *Rain water harvesting, Amelioration of water logged & saline soils, Reclamation of alkali soils, Laser leveling, and Improving soil health through Green Manuring*.

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 SWOT analysis covering agro-climatic conditions, natural resources, infrastructure, institutions, technologies, manpower etc. The SAP presents separate SWOT analysis for the agriculture, horticulture, natural resources, animal husbandry, and fisheries sectors. The main strengths include, a large area (80 per cent of the State's total geographical area of 4.42 m ha)

under cultivation – irrigated area being 84 per cent of the cultivated area; a high cropping intensity of 181 per cent; a good network for an assured input availability; a good network of adequate agricultural extension services; suitable agro-climatic conditions for cultivation of wheat, paddy, sugarcane, Arhar, Cotton, Raya, fruits and vegetables; proximity and well-established connectivity of the State with the huge market of *Delhi*; abundance of solar energy, round the year; fertile and easy to manage light soils; ample marketing avenues of animal husbandry products and by-products; expanding poultry enterprise with promising income generation; predominant rearing of world fame *murrah* buffalo; viable milk marketing network through co-operative societies, private agencies and individual milk traders; round the year green fodder production; well-established network of Government veterinary, health and A.I. facility with wide coverage; and Fisheries sector seeing greater people participation and generation of employment opportunities especially for landless and marginal farmers with fish production, productivity and acreage increasing over the years on the back of technical, financial and marketing assistance by Government agencies, for matching the vast unfulfilled demand for fish and its easy market accessibility. The main weaknesses include, shrinking and degrading natural resource base of agriculture that provides for sustainable production, affecting production capacity; about 62 per cent area of the State is underlain with poor quality water; rising problems of declining water tables, soil salinity/alkalinity, soil health and stagnating crop productivity; upto 65 per cent of the soils are affected with varying degree of salinity/sodicity in various agricultural zone; rapid diversion of cultivated lands for non agricultural uses due to proximity of area to the national capital region of Delhi; decreasing organic carbon in soils; increasing deficiency of micronutrients; lack of awareness on conservation technologies; low adoption level of FYM, green manuring and vermi-composting and crop/farm residue management, inadequate availability of quality hybrid seeds of various crops; and lack of integrated approach on NRM, INM and IPM by the farmers. The main opportunities include, raw material availability for food processing enterprises; established and up-coming marketing, agro-processing and ware-housing/godown facilities; establishment of commodity-based and /or technology-based farmers' association; good marketing infrastructure and excellent rail/road connectivity; good information and communication system; ; network of co-operatives; rising demand for milk and milk products, vegetables, flowers; scope for diversification towards horticulture/vegetables and dairying; and proximity to national capital offers excellent marketing opportunities to the national and international markets. The threats include, alarming depletion of ground water in some regions; declining factor productivity and rising cost of cultivation especially in pre-dominant paddy-wheat cropping system; degrading soil fertility especially with declining status of potash and micronutrients; disenchantment among young farmers towards agriculture as an occupation; inefficient and less transparent marketing of fruits & vegetables with monopoly of traders and multiple level of intermediaries; poor post harvest management and modern marketing facilities like cold storage/chains, pre-cooling and waxing centers; general ignorance, casual approach towards degrading soil fertility and depleting water table; imbalanced fertilizer-use creating soil health problem and decrease in productivity; indiscriminate usage of irrigation water leading to alarming decline of water table and soil salinity and water logging; and shrinking pasture land.

- 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 clearly states that convergence- inter and intra department/programmes- has been attempted. The SAP gives a list of 33 priority areas of RKVY which, according to it, are converged with MGNREGA and other schemes for attaining targeted growth rate of agriculture sector in the State. The list includes priority areas, such as *strengthening of training infrastructure at KVK/block level; strengthening of training labs/veterinary hospitals; amelioration of water logged & saline soils; rain water harvesting; reclamation of alkali soils; improving soil health through Green Manuring; Seed production, IPM and INM; agro forestry & horticulture; mechanization in agriculture; value addition through intercropping; etc.* However, the SAP misses to give convergence in terms of share of funds allocated under RKVY vis-à-vis MGNREGA and other schemes to each of these priority areas.

But, the SAP does give a glimpse of convergence in terms of funds-allocation for one district (Sonapat) in *Annexure I*. It shows convergence of RKVY with MGNREGA through the *Rain water harvesting* project under *agriculture* sector, through the project on *construction of community tanks* in case of *horticulture* sector, and through the project on *construction of new ponds and renovation of existing ponds* in case of *fisheries* sector. In the *Rain water harvesting* project, 50 water harvesting structures per year are to be constructed in each of the three years from 2009-10 to 2011-12. The project cost **per structure** is Rs 1,10,000 while labour cost **per structure** is Rs 35,000, for each of the three years. The SAP states that the expenditure of *labour component* shall be met under MGNREGS/*other schemes*. Another RKVY project on *Construction of Panchayati Pucca Rasta* involves cost of Rs 7,53,000 per year for each of the three years from 2009-10 to 2011-12. The labour cost component of Rs 2,68,000 per year for each of the three years shall be met under MGNREGS and *Haryali* (IWDP) scheme. Similarly, labour-component of the *Plantation* project, having annual project cost of Rs 3,79,000 for each of the three years, shall be met under MGNREGS. For the RKVY project *Construction of community tanks* with project cost of Rs 25,76,460 per annum for three years, the labour cost shall be met under MGNREGS. For the RKVY scheme on construction of new ponds at a cost of Rs 30,00,000 per year for three years and renovation of ponds at a cost of Rs 3,00,000 per year for three years, 50 per cent each of the total labour-cost shall be borne by MGNREGA and SGRY (*Sampoorna Grameen Rozgar Yojana*). In the proposed budget for XIth Plan, the SAP proposes an outlay of 82,186.59 lacs under head *Specific projects for Convergence of MGNREGA & Other Schemes with RKVY*, further details of which are not given. It is 36 per cent of the total proposed allocation of Rs 229274.57 Lacs for the Plan.

However, it is difficult to comment on the exact extent of convergence. Also, it is not explicit from the SAP whether all potential options for convergence have been identified and explored. This is because, all given examples in the SAP (*Annexure I*) pertaining to convergence of RKVY with other schemes are limited to sharing only the *labour-component* of the total project.

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?

The SAP does not make it explicit 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. It does not mention the CSS and state schemes (except those under the RKVY) running in the State. However, the SAP exhibits a good grasp of the agricultural situation of the State. It provides a detailed sector-wise SWOT analysis, sets thrusts and recommends interventions for the agriculture & allied sectors.

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

A systematic estimation of yield gaps (in terms of potential yield vis-à-vis average yield) and returns in different crops/livestock/fisheries is not explicit in the SAP. However, the SAP does give district-wise targets of yields to be achieved by 2011-12 for various crops in agriculture and horticulture sectors, and livestock products. But the methodology used for arriving at the target-yields is not explicit.

Since the SAP gives district-wise both the current level of and the targeted level of area, production and yield of various crops, the yield-gaps at district-level can be arrived at by subtracting the current yields from the targeted yields. However, the same information is not available in the SAP at the State level.

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

The SAP states in its *methodology for the preparation of C-DAPs* that the *Participatory Rural Appraisal* (PRA) techniques are used for collecting primary data at village level. Further, while enumerating various constraints in agriculture, the SAP states that the constraints are identified by the participatory approach. This implies that the PRA techniques may have been used in identifying technological and agronomic gaps contributing to the yield-gaps. Besides this, the SAP does not make explicit that how the technological and agronomic gaps are identified to contribute to the yield gaps. The SAP divides the State into three zones based on the agro-eco-situations. It describes in detail the factors/constraints leading to the yield-gaps by crops/sectors separately for the three zones.

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?

The SAP does not make it explicit that how the identified constraints are adjudged responsible for low crop productivity in general and specific crops in particular.

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

The SAP categorically states that *the study and analysis of the prevailing agri-economic scenario have paved the way for the recommended interventions*. It means that the SWOT analysis and the data collection through PRA techniques might have been instrumental in identifying the interventions to bridge the gaps in productivity levels. Besides this, the SAP is not explicit that how the interventions are identified to bridge the gaps in productivity levels.

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 clearly spells out strategies to bridge the yield gaps in crop/livestock/fisheries and maximize returns to farmers, but there is no explicit evidence for their systematic prioritization in the SAP. The strategies to bridge the yield gaps have been provided for various crops/sectors, separately for the three zones of the State. Any empirical basis for the appropriate strategies is not explicit in the SAP. Since the SAP admits that the PRA techniques have been used for collecting data while preparing the C-DAPs, we may also expect the contribution of PRA in obtaining/deciding the strategies. Besides this, it is not explicit that how far they have been obtained/decided through a consultative process with all the relevant stake holders. However,

the SAP does identify important issues, required to be taken up on priority, for the three zones separately.

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 strategies provided in the SAP are **not** translated into programmes/projects/activities by sectors and years with clear cut objectives, targets, output, outcome, funding (RKVY, other sources) for each project. Also, it is not explicit whether viability of projects to achieve the expected output is considered. However, the SAP does enumerate major projects *common to the State* for the agriculture & allied sectors. Separately, it also mentions district-wise targets on area, production and yields for various crops/sectors for the full five-year plan period; but it misses to give the same at the State level.

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

The SAP addresses the problem of alkaline/saline soils in the State by formulating projects such as *amelioration of water logged & saline soils, reclamation of alkali soils and improving soil health through Green Manuring.*

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 an outlay of Rs 2,292.75 crores for the five-year plan period (2007-08 to 2011-12) for the State. The proposed outlay for years 2007-08 and 2008-09 is Rs 412.65 crores and Rs 501.99 crores, respectively. The approved budget (as per the *Physical and Financial Statement* of the State) for years 2007-08 and 2008-09 is Rs 15.92 crores and Rs 35.41 crores, respectively. The approved budget for years 2007-08 and 2008-09 is 3.9 per cent and 7.1 per cent of the proposed budget, respectively. These two years represent a mismatch of 96.1 per cent and 92.9 per cent, respectively. This huge mismatch is expected to significantly impact the proposed targets, expected outputs/outcomes/growth.

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 does not provide project-wise proposed budget outlays. Therefore, we cannot comment on the size of the projects. However, the SAP enumerates the major projects proposed under agriculture & allied sectors. They include, *strengthening of Training Centre at District/Block level, strengthening of training labs/veterinary hospitals; amelioration of water logged & saline soils; rain water harvesting; reclamation of alkali soils; improving soil health through Green Manuring; Seed production of wheat and paddy; laser leveling; conservation of Murrah buffalo by supplying bulls; supplementing mineral mixture for livestock; etc.*

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

The SAP does not identify Flagship programmes. It does not mention programmes of a large magnitude which may be qualified as the *Flagship programmes*. The SAP also does not give proposed allocations by programme/project/activities that may be useful in identifying large /flagship programmes. However, the SAP does mention some projects that it calls as the “major projects” which include *strengthening of Training Centre at District/Block level, strengthening of training labs/veterinary hospitals; amelioration of water logged & saline soils; rain water harvesting; reclamation of alkali soils; improving soil health through Green Manuring; Seed production of wheat and paddy; laser leveling; conservation of Murrah buffalo by supplying bulls; supplementing mineral mixture for livestock; etc.*

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

The SAP proposes a budget of Rs 2,292.75 crores for RKVY under the XIth Plan. The *Agriculture* sector gets the highest share of 40 per cent in the total proposed allocations, amounting to Rs 917.77 crores. The budget head of *innovative schemes/specific projects for convergence of MGNREGA & other schemes with RKVY* receives the second highest share of 36 per cent (amounting to Rs 821.87 crores) while the *allied* sectors together gets a share of 23 per cent (amounting to Rs 525.44 crores), in the total proposed allocations. Finally, the budget head *Women in Agriculture* receives a share of 1.20 per cent (Rs 27.67 crores). *Since the proposed budget allocation for the allied sector for some districts of zone 3 is given together instead of separate figures for the constituent horticulture, forestry and animal husbandry sectors, the sectoral analysis of the budget allocations considers all the allied sectors together.*

The SAP attempts an equitable and optimal distribution of resources across sectors. *Agriculture* sector is most dominant among all agriculture & allied sectors in the State, having cropping systems like *Rice-Wheat, Cotton-Wheat* and *Bajra-Wheat*. The State, having 80 per cent of its geographical area (4.42 million hectares) under cultivation and a high cropping intensity of 181 per cent, produces 13 million tonnes of food-grains. The highest share of 40 per cent assigned to the *agriculture* sector can be seen in this light. The second highest share of 36 per cent assigned to the *innovative schemes/specific projects for convergence of MGNREGA & other schemes with RKVY* highlights the SAP’s efforts towards achieving convergence of RKVY with other schemes. The *Allied* sector supplements income and creates employment for farmers, and contributes in achieving a high growth rate in agriculture & allied sector. It rightly deserves the given share of 23 per cent in the total proposed allocations. Considering the important role of women in agriculture, the SAP gives a share of 1.20 per cent for *women in agriculture*.

However, the spatial allocations of funds look to be far from equity as the coefficient of correlation between the proposed allocation of funds to districts and their respective district population is low at 0.18 (though positively correlated). Districts like Faridabad, Gurgaon, Hisar, Jhajjar, Jind, Panchkula, Sirsa and Sonapat receive lower share of 3.9 per cent, 4.9 per cent, 4.9 per cent, 3.9 per cent, 4.9 per cent, 1.2 per cent, 4.7 per cent and 5.2 per cent in the total proposed allocation vis-à-vis their higher population share of 10.4 per cent, 7.9 per cent, 7.3 per cent, 4.2 per cent, 5.6 per cent, 2.2 per cent, 5.3 per cent and 6.0 per cent, respectively. On the other hand, districts like Kurukshetra, Rewari, Rohtak and Yamunanagar receive higher allocation share of 7.2 per cent, 5.4 per cent, 10.8 per cent and 7.2 per cent in the total

proposed allocation vis-à-vis their lower population share of 3.9 per cent, 3.6 per cent, 4.4 per cent and 4.9 per cent, respectively. Part of the discrepancy may be because more industrialized/urbanized districts like Faridabad and Gurgaon have a disproportionately higher level of population, while the SAP caters mainly to the rural/agricultural areas.

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

The SAP makes proposed budget allocation under the *innovative schemes*, but it does not specify the *innovative schemes/projects*. However, some of the projects mentioned in the SAP may be considered as *innovative*, like *amelioration of water logged & saline soils, rain water harvesting, reclamation of alkali soils, improving soil health through Green Manuring, laser leveling, conservation of Murrah buffalo by supplying bulls, supplementing mineral mixture for livestock, etc.*

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

Since the SAP does not specify the projects planned for the State as a whole from the mentioned list of projects, the question of stating the basis of planning projects for the State as a whole and how they get monitored does not arise. However, it does name a project *Monitoring and Evaluation* under the Stream I project.

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

The SAP is not explicit on the basis of sectoral fund allocation. It is not clear from the SAP whether sectoral fund allocation is based on expected marginal contributions. There is no mention of the viability analysis.

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

The SAP allocates Rs 412.65 crores (17.7 per cent), Rs 501.99 crores (21.6 per cent), Rs 472.35 crores (20.3 per cent), Rs 461.99 crores (19.9 per cent), and Rs 476.19 crores (20.5 per cent) in years 2007-08, 2008-09, 2009-10, 2011-12, respectively, as part of the total proposed allocation for the Xth Five-Year Plan. The allocation across years seems to be right. Lowest allocation is made for the first year (17.7 per cent) when fund requirements and utilization are low. The allocation size rise to the maximum-level during second year (21.6 per cent), owing to higher investment needs for project implementation anticipated in the year. Then the allocation declines during subsequent years of the Plan, i.e. 20.3 per cent, 19.9 per cent and 20.5 per cent in the third, fourth and fifth year, respectively, as the fund requirements have peaked in the 2nd year itself.

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. A huge allocation of 40 per cent to the agriculture sector shall help in solving serious problems of water logged & saline soils and alkali soils, besides strengthening lab/units and production of seeds. A substantial allocation of 36 per cent towards *innovative schemes/specific projects for convergence of existing schemes with RKVY* shall be useful in optimizing resource-utilization. The enumerated projects echo the issues emanating from the SWOT analysis. The

implementation of the projects is expected to boost growth of agriculture & allied sectors in the State as envisaged in the SAP and thereby contribute to 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, it has proposed a project (budget line) *Monitoring and Evaluation* under the Stream I project.

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?

The SAP is not explicit on the mechanisms for planning, baseline information collection, monitoring, documentation and regularly reporting progress. However, it has proposed a project *Monitoring and Evaluation* under the Stream I project. There is no mention in the SAP of the plan for strengthening PME mechanisms and making them functional during the remaining years of 11th FYP and 12th FYP when it gets launched. It is not mentioned 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 provide year-wise funding details under various CSS and State-level schemes (including RKVY) for the five-year plan period. If not given, analyzing the extent of convergence of existing schemes with the RKVY will be difficult. Convergent approach within the sector and outside the sector should be attempted, particularly with MGNREGS to avoid duplication in respect of soil and water harvesting and conservation. MGNREGS resources can be tapped for this. The SAP should come out with more interventions to concentrate on cropping and production systems including horticulture, livestock and fisheries in areas that have been developed under watershed and NRM.

(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 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 sectoral allocation of funds and expected outcomes of implementing proposed interventions (schemes) at the State level.

(viii) The SAP should explicitly mention the State-level target for agriculture & allied sectors / sub-sectors to be achieved using RKVY funding during 11th five-year plan, vis-à-vis the base-year values.

(ix) The SAP should provide yield-gap estimates, both at State and district-level, for major crops and other enterprises.

(x) The SAP should briefly state the methodology used (*Method 1* or *Method 2*) for preparation of SAP, the basis of identification of constraints for low productivity, prioritization of strategies and list of innovative projects.

(x) The C-DAPs are well-prepared as per the Planning Commission guidelines.

Overall conclusion

The SAP is a good attempt. It clearly states the methodology for the preparation of the C-DAPs; gives a general description of the State along with the district-wise statistics/information pertaining to land-utilization, area & productivity of major crops and the allied sectors; identifies general constraints in agriculture; gives details of factors/constraints leading to the yield-gaps along with strategies, approach and methodology to fill the gaps, by crops/sectors for the three agro-eco zones; presents a systematic sector-wise SWOT analysis; attempts to give *vision* and set priority/thrusts for the three zones; recommends interventions for the agriculture & allied sectors; enumerates major activities under RKVY which are also converged with MGNREGA and other schemes; and gives district-wise targets of *Area, Production and Productivity* of major crops and allied sectors. The SAP also states district-wise, year-wise proposed budget outlays for all agriculture & allied sectors; identifies constraints and gaps in the development of *women in agriculture*, suggests strategies/activities to overcome the gaps and proposes a separate budget to that end. However, the SAP misses to give specific State-level targets for the various agriculture & allied sectors vis-à-vis base-year information. It does not include a systematic yield-gap analysis. It also does not give programmes/projects/activities by sectors and years with clear cut objectives, targets, output, outcome, funding (RKVY, other sources) for the projects. However, some details of projects are available in C-DAPs. The SAP should enumerate methodology used for the preparation of the SAP and integration of the C-DAPs. The SAP should also mention if it has incorporated into the SAP the lessons learnt by studying experience of other ongoing schemes. The PM&E mechanisms including baseline information collection, documentation and regularly reporting progress need to be planned. These may receive greater attention in the 12th FYP.