

NIRD; RKVY Monitoring Unit

Analytical Report on Maharashtra SAP

1. Name of the State
Maharashtra

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?

The SAP sets physical targets for various agriculture & allied sectors during 11th Five Year Plan (FYP) using total proposed outlay of Rs 30490.47 crore, which also includes a proposed budget outlay of Rs 12318.59 crore (about 40%) under RKVY. Though the SAP lists all RKVY projects along with their funding details for the FYP, it misses to give targets specifically using the RKVY assistance. Further, the SAP mentions that since most districts have not provided physical targets in terms of schemes contemplated in their respective C-DAPs, the growth in area, production and productivity of crops at district-level has not been estimated; therefore, the figures/estimates provided by the State Department of Agriculture and Allied Sectors are used for the analysis.

The SAP gives targets for the FYP vis-à-vis actual base-year values (year 2006-07) for various agricultural & allied sectors. For example, it sets production targets (in lakh tones) of 125.41, 29.51, 154.92, 54.07, 712.00 and 77.25 during 11th FYP for *total cereals, total pulses, total foodgrains, total oilseeds, sugarcane and cotton* crops as compared to their base-year production levels (in lakh tones) of 105.89, 23.05, 128.94, 37.25, 662.77 and 46.18, respectively; the crop-production is to be augmented by increasing yields (in Kg/ha) of *total cereals, total pulses, total foodgrains, total oilseeds, sugarcane and cotton* crops from 1101, 602, 959, 965, 78 and 253 in 2006-07 to 1393, 775, 1209, 1281, 84 and 375, respectively during the FYP. The targeted increase in the production of cotton and soybean crops is very high. Productivity and area under cultivation of *cotton* crop are targeted to increase by 48.51 per cent and 12.62 per cent, respectively enabling the production to rise by 67.30 per cent in 2011-12 over the base-year. An increase in area from 25.21 ha to 30.00 ha and yield from 1147 kg/ha to 1493 kg/ha is expected to increase the production of *soybean* crop by 54.93 per cent from 28.92 lakh tones to 44.80 lakh tonnes in 2011-12 vis-à-vis the base-year.

Under *horticulture* sector, production (in lakh tones) of *fruits, vegetables, open flower and garden house flower* are targeted to reach 127.69, 59.24, 1.04 and 0.11, respectively in 2011-12; base-year production of *fruits* and *vegetables* being 103.24 and 58.38 lakh tones, respectively. Increase in production of *fruits* is to be achieved through both increase in area (from 1394.9 to 1623.8 thousand ha) and yield (from 7402 to 7864 tons/ha). However, significant reduction in area under the major vegetable crop *onion* planned during the FYP is expected to lower its production from 2812.4 to 2192.7 thousand tons, despite a targeted increase in the yield from 12236 to 14464 tons/ha; area under cultivation for all remaining major vegetable crops are targeted to be raised. Area under cultivation for vegetable crops is targeted to be lowered from 474.0 to 435.1 thousand ha; however, yield is targeted to be increased from 12315 to 13616 tons/ha; in 2011-12 vis-à-vis the base-year.

Under *animal husbandry and dairy* sector, the production of *milk* (in 000MT), *eggs* (in Crore) and *meat* (in 000MT) is targeted to increased from 6977, 340 and 243 in 2006-07 to 8434, 455 and 305, respectively in 2011-12. Though the SAP does not formally state target for the *fisheries* sector

during FYP, it does highlight the potential of increasing annual fish production from present level of 5.9 to 7 lakh tones through mariculture, coastal aquaculture, freshwater aquaculture and reservoir fisheries.

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 (Method 1 or Method 2) in its preparation. It is not explicit 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 are also ought to be reflected in the respective district plans (Method 2). However, the methodology stated in the SAP highlights C-DAP as a useful document to prepare the SAP. It mentions of using quantitative data from secondary sources and qualitative data in form of observations and discussions held with the officers of agriculture and allied departments, for preparing the SAP. But there is no mention of following a bottom-up approach in the preparation of the SAP, i.e. involving village and block levels in the process of collecting primary data. In other words, there is no mention of planning at the village and block levels. The SAP further underlines the intensive discussion/several meetings with officers of the Department of Agriculture and Allied sector at State level on the draft plan for getting useful inputs and suggestions as well as conducting a SWOT for systematic and scientific planning. These activities may have contributed in integration of C-DAPs and prioritizing major interventions to prepare the SAP. Otherwise, it is not explicit that how integration (methodology) of C-DAPs and prioritizing major interventions is done to prepare SAP.

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 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 major strengths include, topography and agro-climatic conditions conducive for promoting horticulture and facilitate diversification into high-value horticultural crops; large population in urban areas (42 per cent) that has concentration of financial and industrial activity – *industrial sector supports agricultural sector through forward and backward linkages as it provides a ready market for agricultural commodities and manufactures and supplies of inputs like seeds, machinery etc to agriculture*; large production of fruit & vegetable (onion, mangoes, grapes, pomegranates, oranges etc.) present tremendous export potential; investment in onion storage infrastructure/onion *chawls* for storing onions and avoiding distress sales by farmers; installed *Vapor Heat Treatment Facility* prevents fruitfly and helps promote exports of mangoes; *Agri Export Zones* for grapes, grapewine, pomegranate, onions, mangoes etc.; close proximity to international and sea ports; large number of agro-processing units; infrastructure to support the growing floriculture industry; major producer of milk (7.4 million tones), eggs and poultry meat; long cost-line of 720 kms. facilitates fishing; and a strong road network of 2,37,668 kms road length that connects 97 per cent villages. The weaknesses include, predominantly rain-fed agriculture (only 18 per cent of Gross Cropped Area is irrigated); scattered rainfall across regions with one-third area receiving scanty rainfall – *State has 24 per cent of drought-prone area of the country*; well-irrigation accounts for 65 per cent of State's

gross irrigated area; and despite heavy investments in surface irrigation, unsatisfactory irrigation potential created and delay in project-completions. The opportunities include, rising demand for horticulture products as consumption pattern shifts in favour of fruits & vegetables; huge urban population can serve as a driver of State's agricultural and horticultural development by providing ready markets; large-scale production of grape-varieties with high demand at world-level presents export opportunities; being largest producer of fruits in the country, food-processing units have great scope, as a ready market exists due to huge urban population; and floriculture provides scope of high-income generation to farmers due to huge demand for flowers in urban areas and presence of export-market. The threats include, scarcity of water for irrigation as well-irrigation is the major source of irrigation and a number of districts have experienced depleting water tables; cultivation of water intensive crops has led to water logging; natural calamities such as cyclones, erratic rainfall, long dry spells lead to huge farm losses; inadequate infrastructure like roads, markets, communications and electricity to support horticultural growth; and high pesticide residues in crops is resulting in export consignments being rejected in some cases.

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 is not explicit about the attempts towards convergence. The extent of convergence is not explicit in the SAP. It is not explicit whether all potential options for convergence have been identified and explored.

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 is not explicit whether the experience of on-going CSS and state schemes have been studied and lessons learnt have been incorporated in SAP/C-DAPs for replication/ expansion/ modification in uncovered areas. Though the SAP states about implementation of two CSS schemes in the State, namely *National Food Security Mission* and *National Horticulture Mission*, yet it does not indicate how the experience of the mentioned schemes have been incorporated into the SAP/C-DAPs.

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

It is not explicit from the SAP that the yield gaps and returns in different crops/livestock/fisheries are estimated while preparing the SAP/C-DAPs. Further, the SAP mentions that since most districts have not provided physical targets in the light of schemes contemplated in their respective C-DAPs, the growth in area, production and productivity of crops at district-level has not been estimated; therefore, the figures/estimates provided by the State department of agriculture and allied sectors are used for the analysis. However, the SAP gives target yields for year 2010-11 for all major crops (including horticulture crops) and animal husbandry & dairying products vis-à-vis actual yields for the base-year 2006-07, mentioning the *Office of the Commissioner of Agriculture, Government of Maharashtra* as the source. But it misses to give the target yields in case of fisheries and sericulture sectors. The SAP also gives a table on yield gaps for some major horticultural crops in terms of expected and actual yields, but these figures differ from the actual and target yields given separately, though both are sourced from the *Office of the Directorate of Horticulture*.

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

The SAP is not explicit on how the technological and agronomic gaps are identified to contribute to yield gaps. However, it mentions of using quantitative data from secondary sources and qualitative data in the form of observations and discussions held with the officers of agriculture and allied departments, as well as a SWOT analysis during preparation of the SAP. Moreover, the SAP cites references from a number of research publications to base its arguments. These may have played a role in identifying the technological and agronomic gaps to contribute to yield gaps.

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 is not explicit on how the identified constraints are adjudged responsible for low crop productivity. However, we believe the role of the activities involved in the preparation of the SAP such as collection of quantitative data from secondary sources and qualitative data through discussions with officers of agriculture and allied departments, and SWOT analysis, as well as reference to a number of published researches used in the SAP, contributing in adjudging the identified constraints responsible for low crops productivity. But empirical basis is not explicit in the SAP.

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

It is not explicit in the SAP that how the interventions are identified to bridge the gaps in productivity levels. However, we again believe the role of activities involved in the preparation of the SAP such as collection of quantitative data from secondary sources and qualitative data through discussions with officers of agriculture and allied departments, and SWOT analysis, as well as reference to a number of published researches used in the SAP, in identifying interventions to bridge the gaps in productivity levels. The crop-specific interventions to bridge the yield gaps are given only in case of major horticulture crops, like mango, pomegranate, banana, cashew nut, citrus, grapes and onion.

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?

Both the formal description of strategies and their systematic prioritization are not explicit in the SAP. Also, an empirical basis for appropriate strategies is not explicit. The extent to which the strategies are obtained through a consultative process with all the relevant stake holders is not explicit in the SAP. However, the fact that qualitative information is gathered through observations and discussions held with the officers of agriculture and allied departments during the SAP preparation suggests involvement of a consultative 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 strategies into schemes/projects by sectors and years along with their funding details for each project under RKVY. Though, it misses to mention the objectives, targets and output for the mentioned RKVY projects, yet it provides a snapshot of the *physical* targets & achievements for some of these projects at the end of August 2010 under

heading of *Status of Projects under RKVY at the end of August 2010*. The SAP is not explicit whether it has considered the viability of projects to achieve the expected output.

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 low agricultural productivity in the State, particularly in districts of drought-prone/rain-fed and backward regions like *Marathawada* and *Vidarbha*, through special projects. For example, *Establishing Fruit & Vegetable Processing Laboratory at Amravati district* (Rs 1.24 crore), *Comprehensive Crop Insurance Scheme including Vidarbha Package* (Rs 76.48 crore), *Assistance to Tribal Farm Families to bring them above poverty line* (Rs 72.75 crore), *Tribal Sub Program* (Soil & Water Conservation Dept. Rs 70.10 crore), *Marathawada Panlot Mission* (Rs 88.87 crore), and *Vidarbha Panlot Mission* (Rs 174.84 crore).

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 gives year-wise proposed budget (both under RKVY and overall SAP) for the FYP period as well as the sanctioned-budget for years 2007-08, 2008-09, 2009-10 and 2010-11 (as on August 2010). The SAP proposes budget of Rs 1441.00 crore, Rs 1757.95 crore, Rs 1795.13 crore, Rs 3782.21 crore and Rs 3542.30 crore for years 2007-08, 2008-09, 2009-10, 2010-11 and 2011-12, respectively under the RKVY (total budget for the FYP being Rs 12318.59 crore). The *Statement showing Project-wise sanction by SLSC and amount released by GoM to implementing agencies* in the SAP gives the amount sanctioned by SLSC for years 2007-08 (Rs 152.10 crore), 2008-09 (Rs 331.76 crore), 2009-10 (305.49 crore) and 2010-11 (Rs 180.91) that aggregates to Rs 970.26 as on end of August 2010. There is significant gap of Rs 1288.9 crore (89.4 per cent), Rs 1426.2 crore (81.1 per cent), Rs 1489.6 crore (83.0 per cent) and Rs 3601.3 crore (95.2 per cent) between the proposed and the sanctioned funds for years 2007-08, 2008-09, 2009-10 and 2010-11 (sanctioned amount as on end of August 2010), respectively. For the four year-period 2007-08 to 2010-11 (for which figures of sanctioned funds are given), there is a gap of Rs 7806 crore (88.9 per cent) between the proposed fund of Rs 8776.29 crore (for first four years under FYP) and sanctioned amount of Rs 970.26 crore. This huge mismatch is expected to seriously affect the targets, expected outputs/outcomes/growth impact.

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

Many projects/schemes are large enough to make visible (impact) in the sectors. For example, *A.I Delivery system* (Rs 204.40 crore), *Strengthening/Modernization of Existing Veterinary Dispensaries (Grade-I)*, *Mini polyclinics & District Veterinary Polyclinics* (147.36 crore), *Integrated Dairy Farm Park* (Rs 952.86 crore), *Accelerated Dairy Development Programme* (Rs 850 crore), *Modernization of Govt. Dairies & DSI* (Rs 175 crore) and *Development of fishing Harbors CSS-50:50* (Rs 124.86 crore).

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

The SAP does not explicitly mention *Flagship programmes*, but some mentioned schemes/projects involve large amounts of proposed funds and may be considered as the Flagship programmes. For example, *A.I Delivery system* (Rs 204.40 crore), *Strengthening/Modernization of Existing Veterinary Dispensaries (Grade-I)*, *Mini polyclinics & District Veterinary Polyclinics* (147.36 crore), *Integrated Dairy Farm Park* (Rs 952.86 crore), *Accelerated Dairy Development Programme* (Rs 850 crore), *Modernization of Govt. Dairies & DSI* (Rs 175 crore) and *Development of fishing Harbors CSS-50:50* (Rs 124.86 crore).

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

The sectoral allocation of funds broadly conforms to equitable and optimal distribution of resources. Of the total proposed budget of Rs 30490.47 crore for the FYP, *Water Conservation* sector has been allotted the highest share of 29.98 per cent (Rs 9140.81 crore), followed by 21.75 per cent for *Minor Irrigation* (Rs 6632.89 crore), 14.85 per cent for *Horticulture* (Rs 4527.83 crore), 11.84 per cent for *Agriculture* (Rs 3609.47 crore), 5.38 per cent for *Dairy Development* (Rs 1641.52 crore), 4.46 per cent for *Animal Husbandry* (Rs 1360.66 crore), 3.90 per cent for *Co-operation & Marketing* (Rs 1190.60), 2.33 per cent for *Social Forestry* (Rs 711.91 crore), 1.52 per cent for *Sericulture* (Rs 464.64 crore) and 1.52 per cent for *Fisheries* (Rs 462.73 crore). High allocations of 29.98 per cent and 21.75 per cent for *Water Conservation* and *Minor Irrigation* sectors are justifiable. The State has a low and erratic rainfall along with a poor status of irrigation (18 per cent). According to the SAP, the poor state of irrigation is a significant contributor to the low agricultural productivity of the State. *Minor Irrigation* is crucial for efficiently using the scarce water resource in the State. *Horticulture* presents a big scope for increasing the earnings of farmers who practice subsistence agriculture due to water-scarcity in a State whose climate is conducive for cultivating the horticultural crops; hence the third highest allocation share of 14.85 per cent for the sector. *Agriculture* sector has been given a share of 11.84 per cent in total allocations as the majority of farmers in the State are engaged in subsistence farming which involves low-value and low-risk cultivation of food-grains (particularly low value coarse cereals like *jowar*); the SAP targets to raise the yields of all food-grain crops substantially to ensure both higher earnings to farmers and strengthening food security. The *Dairy development* and *Animal Husbandry* sectors, with proposed allocation shares of 5.38 per cent and 4.46 per cent, respectively, entail great scope in terms of providing additional income and employment to farmers depending on less remunerative subsistence farming. *Cooperation & marketing* sector is also given due importance by allocating a share of 3.90 per cent as the development of marketing infrastructure complements the efforts undertaken to develop the agriculture & allied sectors, enabling fast growth of agriculture sector in general and horticulture sector in particular. However, the *Fisheries* sector seems to have received relatively a lower allocation of 1.52 per cent vis-à-vis its potential as the State has a long coast-line which is suitable for the development of the marine fisheries.

Prima-facie, the spatial allocation of funds across districts does not seem to conform to equitable and optimal distribution of resources as the value of the *coefficient of correlation* between district-wise proposed budget outlays and the respective district populations is quite low at + 0.11. The major aberrations include relatively higher share in proposed allocations for *Beed* (6.13 per

cent), *Osmanabad* (7.01 per cent) and *Parbhani* (6.45 per cent) districts, vis-à-vis their lower population shares of 2.1 per cent, 1.4 per cent and 1.4 per cent, respectively; and lower share in proposed allocations for *Pune* (3.83 per cent) and *Thane* (2.06 per cent) districts, vis-à-vis their higher population shares of 8.5 per cent and 9.6 per cent, respectively. However, we should see it in the light of the fact that some districts in the State involve a high level of industrialization and consequently large proportion of their urban population is employed in the industrial/services sectors. For example, *Thane* and *Pune* districts have high urban population.

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

The SAP proposes a number of as *innovative* projects under RKVY. The SAP allocates 33 per cent of the total proposed allocations of Rs 12,318.59 crore under RKVY to the innovative projects. It mentions 21 innovative projects under *Agriculture* sector such as *Quality control laboratories and residual testing laboratories* (Rs 20.83 crore), *Agriculture mechanization* (Rs 17.56 crore), *Distribution of seeds under PM package* (Rs 20.00 crore), *Development of village-wise fertility index Map* (Rs crore 49.03 crore), *Special initiative for enhancing pulses and oilseed production in dry land areas* (Rs 51.00 crore) and *Community farming* (Rs 50.00 crore). Similarly, it mentions 10 innovative projects under *horticulture* sector, 3 under *fisheries* sector, 2 projects under *Minor Irrigation*, 26 innovative schemes under *Animal husbandry*, 7 under *Dairy Development*, 5 under *Fisheries*, 17 under *Cooperation and Marketing* and 8 under *Social Forestry*. Besides, the SAP also states that a number of innovative schemes are also included in district plans. The innovative projects/schemes are expected to complement the ongoing programs, raise yields and contribute to rapid growth of agriculture & allied sectors during the 11th FYP.

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

The SAP states the basis of planning certain projects for the State as a whole. According to it, though the district-wise outlay is proposed in the district agricultural plan, keeping in mind the potential, strength, comparative advantage and needs of the district, yet it is possible that some schemes may not have been captured in the district plans but are needed to be implemented especially to strengthen the infrastructure for the agricultural sector; thus, state planning department has prepared separate outlay for such schemes.

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. However, we infer the role of activities involved in the preparation of the SAP (such as collection of quantitative data from secondary sources and qualitative data from the officers of agriculture and allied departments), the SWOT analysis, and use of mentioned published research outputs in the SAP, in forming basis for sectoral fund allocation. It is not explicit whether sectoral fund allocation is based on expected marginal contributions. Also, any viability analysis made in the SAP.

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

Out of the total proposed allocation of Rs 30490.47 crores for the 11th FYP, the allocation-share for years 2007-08, 2008-09, 2009-10, 2010-11, 2011-12 are 3.6 per cent (Rs 1110 crore), 10.8 per cent (Rs 3280 crore), 25.5 per cent (Rs 7770 crore), 30.2 per cent (Rs 9200 crore) and 29.9 per cent (Rs 9130 crore), respectively. The allocations across years broadly look to be rational, as they seem to follow a normal fund utilization trend. Minimum allocations are proposed for the first year, as it

involves planning stage for the project/s and there are comparatively less investment capacity in that year. The allocation amounts rise in the intermediate years as subsequent years demand higher investments for the execution of the planning. The allocation declines in the last year because having invested sufficiently in the in-between years, the fund requirements again become low in the last year of the plan-period.

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

The SAP seems to be in line/ tune with overall agricultural strategy and goals of the country/ state. The SAP aims to overcome the limitations posed by water-scarcity in the State to the overall agricultural growth by proposing highest budget allocation share of 29.98 per cent and 21.75 per cent. Further, the SAP allocates 14.85 per cent for the promising *horticulture* sector for enabling the agriculture & allied sector in the State to grow at a rapid pace, taking advantage of the climatic conditions favorable for horticulture-crop cultivation. Other areas of high allocation share of 5.38 per cent and 4.46 per cent for the *Dairy Development* and *Animal Husbandry* sectors, respectively complement with the growing demand for livestock products in the State with large urban population, besides being an additional source of earning/employment for the farmers. The State targets to increase the yields of all food-grain crops substantially during the FYP, thereby ensuring food-security in the State besides high-earnings for the farmers. These are expected to contribute towards country's aim of achieving 4 per cent growth rate during 11th FYP.

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

The SAP is not explicit on mechanisms for planning, baseline information collection, monitoring, documentation and regularly reporting progress. However, the SAP allocates a sum of Rs 3.10 crore for preparing the C-DAPs under RKVY.

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 that whether the planning, monitoring and evaluation mechanisms exist, functional and made use of to fulfill the expectation and bridge the gaps. Also, the plan for strengthening PME mechanisms and making them functional during the remaining years of 11th FYP and 12th FYP when it gets launched is not explicit. Further, the SAP is not explicit that 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 give information on all the projects by sectors and years with clear cut objectives, targets, output, outcome, funding (RKVY, other sources) for each project. The SAP should provide funding details under various CSS and State-level schemes (including RKVY). 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. Instead 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 stated whether/how they are made use of to prepare SAP for replication, expansion etc.
- (iii).** Prioritization of interventions needs to be attempted using standard objective methods.
- (iv).** The SAP should attempt to articulate specific programmes/projects/activities along with required budget (RKVY and other sources).
- (v).** The mismatch between budget proposal and allocation sanctioned should be minimum - it can be bridged quite a bit if convergence is attempted as indicated in 4.(i) above.
- (vi).** The project proposals should emanate from Districts preferably Zilla Parishads on the basis of C-DAPs.
- (vii).** There should be rigorous filtering of proposals by an expert Committee earlier and in SLSC meetings later.
- (viii).** 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.
- (ix).** The SAP should be more explicit on its attempts on convergence in the Plan.
- (x).** The SAP should provide yield-gap & return estimates for, both at State and district-level, for major crops and other enterprises.
- (xi).** The SAP should enumerate the methodology used in its preparation.

Overall conclusion

The SAP is well attempted. It is very descriptive in presentation. It attempts to provide physical targets for all agriculture & allied sectors. It enlists all RKVY projects by sectors with year-wise funding details. It gives sector-wise proposed allocation of funds under the Plan with yearly break-ups. It gives a detailed overview of agricultural and allied sectors in the State in terms of agro-climatic conditions and productivities of various agriculture & allied sectors at State and district-level. It presents a detailed SWOT analysis of the State. Along with annual proposed allocations, the SAP also provides year-wise sanctioned allocations for the first four years of the FYP; this enables adjudging mismatch between budget proposal and allocation sanctioned. The SAP also reviews agriculture in the State during Xth FYP. It also provides district-wise proposed allocations in various agriculture & allied sectors. However, the SAP also has some weak points. It misses to give physical targets using RKVY funding. It does not make explicit its attempts towards convergence. There is no mention of taking experience and learning from other CSS for replication/expansion in the SAP. A systematic estimation of yield-gap & returns is not explicit in the SAP. Also, the SAP misses establishment of a dedicated PM&E mechanism at the State level for facilitating project screening, database management, monitoring, evaluation and reporting of RKVY projects. These points require priority attention during 12th FYP.