NIRD; RKVY Monitoring Unit
Analytical Report on Meghalaya SAP

1. **Name of the State**
   Meghalaya

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 targets a growth rate of 4.7 per cent for the agriculture sector during 11th Five Year Plan (FYP). However, the SAP is not explicit on whether the target(s) that have been decided are based on using RKVY assistance exclusively. The mentioned growth is suggested to be achieved through extensive cultivation by bringing about 42,000 ha of waste-land under cultivation. Further, the SAP gives district-wise details of physical and financial targets planned to be achieved during FYP under various agriculture and allied sectors, such as *soil and water conservation, crop husbandry, horticulture, livestock* and *fisheries.* For example, the *soil and water conservation* sub-sector entails financial targets of Rs 113.92 crore, Rs 31.05 crore, Rs 56.57 crore, Rs 1.59 crore and Rs 5.65 crore for *soil conservation, water harvesting, land reclamation, afforestation* and *cash crop development* schemes, respectively, aiming to achieve the proposed physical targets (mentioned at district-level), under *District-sector* schemes; the *State-sector* schemes include *development of five Jhum (shifting cultivation) villages* (Rs 3.00 crore) and *strengthening 3 soil testing labs* (Rs 0.30 crore). Similarly, the *crop husbandry* sub-sector is targeted to achieve a *seed replacement rate* of 33.3 per cent and increase area under high-yielding variety of *Boro* rice by 8,000 ha; the related interventions are categorized into the *heads* of *crop development, irrigation development* and *land development* that cost Rs 405.94 crores, Rs 144.41 crore and Rs 46.56 crore respectively. For the *horticulture* sub-sector, the proposed district-level physical targets form part of schemes under *crop development* (Rs 486.42 crore)*, irrigation infrastructure* (Rs 7.09 crore), *machinery and equipment* (Rs 117.42 crore), *marketing infrastructure* (Rs 24.69 crore) and *other infrastructure* (Rs 199.44 crore). The *livestock* sub-sector is targeted to develop across districts in the State 180 units for *Piggery* (Rs 17.53 crore)*,* 225 units for *Goatery* (Rs 2.63 crore)*,* 235 units for poultry (Rs 17.86 crore), 540 dairy units for *cattle* (Rs 22.19 crore)*,* 490 *individual dairy units* (Rs 5.64 crore) and 38 *community dairy units* (Rs 4.79 crore)*,* during the FYP period*.* In addition, the *livestock* - sub-sector targets strengthening of existing institutions and establishment of new veterinary institutions (Rs 63.20 crore) through *upgrdation of 64 Aid Centres*, *strengthening 27 Dairy Co-operatives, strengthening 40 dairy SHGs, 2 pig breeding farms, 2 new veterinary dispensaries, support to 1 existing pig farm, 1 poultry breeding farm and strengthening 1 cattle breeding farm.* For the *fisheries* sub-sector, the SAP targets 730 *individual fish ponds,* 101 *community fish ponds,* 286 *fish development lakes,* 21 *hatcheries,* 24 *soil and water analysis kits* and *139.6* ha of land under *integrated fish farming,* at a total cost of Rs 47.78 crore.

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 hints about adopting a participatory and bottom up approach in its preparation; it mentions of assessing the village level potentials, problems and gaps, and incorporating them in the *Plan.* Due to absence of *Panchayati Raj* system in the State, the allocations and the project

identifications are carried out at the *Block*-level, under *Block* plans. The *Block* plans are aggregated into the district plan. Further, the SAP states that the *vision document* is based on analysis of the secondary and the primary data collected at the village level. The SAP states that the broad *objectives* of the Plan (the SAP) are same as that of C-DAP (Comprehensive District Agricultural Plans): *a minimum growth rate of 4.0 per cent per annum in the agricultural sector, reduction of intra-district inequalities in the levels of development,* and *making the growth sustainable.*

However, the SAP is not explicit on the type of method (Method 1 or Method 2) used for its preparation. It is not explicit on the integration (methodology) of C-DAPs and the prioritization of major interventions to prepare the SAP. That is to say that the SAP does not make it explicit that 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).

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 misses to critically analyze and clearly state the agricultural situation of the state through a formal SWOT analysis covering agro-climatic conditions, natural resources, infrastructure, institutions, technologies, manpower etc. However, SWOTs are discernable from text of the SAP. Major strengths include, high-level of rainfall (2500 mm per annum) spread over 120 days supports agriculture of the State that has poor status of irrigation; dominance of high-value horticultural crops in the hill-State enhances farmers' income; agricultural income per hectare (ha) of *net area sown* is higher for the State (Rs 47,401) than the national average (Rs 36,615); a high agricultural growth rate (4.57 per cent per annum) during period 1999-00 to 2006-07); rice production (major staple crop) is increasing at an annual growth rate of 3.3 per cent per annum on the back of a rise in the yield; and a high work participation rate for female in the Sate (23.7 per cent) than at national level (14.7 per cent). The weaknesses include, the *per capita net domestic product* and the *state domestic product from agriculture per rural person* for the State are lower than the national average by 18.5 per cent and 6.3 per cent, respectively, as per information available for year 2004-05; poor road infrastructure, State's road density of 34.4 kilometers (kms) per 100 square kilometer (sq. km) is lower than the national average of 91.7 kms per 100 sq. km; proportion of workers depending on agriculture is higher in the State (65.8 per cent) than at the national level (58.2 per cent); lower level of urbanization (19.6 per cent); poor state of irrigation despite heavy rain-fall; practice of shifting-cultivation; and poor state of middle/higher education despite satisfactory literacy rate. The opportunities include, the agro-climatic conditions in the hill State are supportive to cultivation of a wide range of horticultural crops - the temperature varies from 2^0C to 362^0C depending on the altitude (300 to 2000 meters above sea-level); large tracts of waste-land provide opportunity for extensive cultivation – the State targets to bring 42,000 ha of waste-land under cultivation; the *net sown area* has increased from 8.1 per cent (of reported area) in 1980-81 to 9.8 per cent in 2004-05; and promotion of high value *plantation* crops and *model villages* (under RKVY) are expected to limit the practice of shifting-cultivation. The threats include, socio-cultural support for shifting-cultivation presents challenge to the governmental efforts for checking the practice (it is practiced in 41,000 ha of land by 50,000 households (HHs), accounting

for 12.6 per cent of the rural HHs); the gap between State production of rice (2.17 lakh MT per annum, 2007-08) and the estimated demand (3.60 lakh MT per annum) presents a food-security threat for the State having population growth rate higher than the national-average; and satellite imagery captures a decline in the quality of forests.

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. However, it gives two instances referring to the convergence. In one instance, it expresses its intention to establish convergence between fisheries, irrigation and animal husbandry sectors for enhancing *fish-production*. The SAP gives another instance of convergence when it states that a State sector scheme of *model village* is planned for eradicating shifting cultivation. Land under shifting cultivation of some villages is suggested to be used for the development of horticultural crops under the scheme (Rs 0.60 crore). This scheme is to be implemented as convergence between MGNREGS and RKVY; the departments of soil and water conservation, horticulture and Panchayat Raj and Rural Development are the partners in the implementation of this scheme. No other reference with respect to convergence is explicit in the SAP. The SAP is not explicit that 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?**
   There is no clear indication that suggests that the experience of on-going CSS and State schemes has been studied and lessons learnt have been incorporated in SAP/C-DAPs for replication/expansion/modification in uncovered areas. However, the SAP mentions an instance of planning a scheme of *model Village* for eradicating shifting cultivation, after discovering the ineffectiveness of an existing scheme under *watershed programme* due to lack of a holistic approach.

7. **Whether the yield gaps and returns in different crops/livestock/fisheries have been estimated?**
   The SAP gives yields by sectors/crops/districts. It also compares the highest yield in the State with yields in other districts and regions, for various crops/non-crop products. Further, the SAP mentions about adopting a participatory and bottom up approach in its preparation; assessing the village level potentials, problems and gaps, and incorporating them in the *Plan;* and analysis of the secondary and the primary data collected at the village level. All of these support the view that the yield gaps and returns in different crops/livestock/fisheries have been considered.

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, we anticipate the role of the exercises stated in the SAP that are involved in its preparation, for identifying the technological and agronomic gaps contributing to yield gaps. The SAP states about adopting a participatory and bottom up approach in its preparation; mentions of assessing the village level potentials, problems and gaps, and incorporating them in the *Plan;* and basing the *vision document* on the analysis of the secondary and the primary data collected at the village level.

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 identifies constraints responsible for the low crop productivity on several occasions, while recommending further research/studies on others where it is not clear. But, the SAP is not explicit on how the identified constraints are adjudged responsible for the low crop productivity. Except for a reference in the SAP of involving participatory and bottom up approach in its preparation involving assessment of village level potentials, problems and gaps, and incorporating them in the *Plan* along with an analysis of the secondary and the primary data collected at the village level, there is no mention of involving an empirical basis. Therefore, the SAP gives an impression of adjudging the identified constraints responsible for low crop productivity, more on the opinion-basis than on the empirical-basis.

10. **How the interventions are identified to bridge the gaps in productivity levels?**
    Though the SAP discusses interventions to bridge the gaps in productivity levels, yet it is not explicit on the basis for their identification. However, the SAP mentions of involving participatory and bottom up approach in its preparation involving assessment of village level potentials, problems and gaps, and incorporating them in the *Plan* along with an analysis of the secondary and the primary data collected at the village level; these mentioned exercises may be anticipated to contribute to the process of identifying interventions 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 discusses agricultural strategy for the eleventh FYP of the Meghalaya State. Although, the text of the SAP gives an impression of prioritization of the strategies, yet it misses to provide evidence for their scientific and systematic prioritization. The SAP gives instances suggesting involvement of empirical basis for appropriate strategies. Examples include, it stresses on the strategy of mechanization of agriculture in the State at a rapid rate owing to the poor state of agricultural mechanization in the State (0.0345 hp per ha) vis-à-vis that at all-India level (1 hp per ha); and strategies on minor irrigation and designing rain water harvesting structures for high rainfall and high altitude areas, as the State lacks irrigation and is unable to take advantage from a very high rainfall of about 4088 mm. Though the SAP is not explicit on how far the strategies have been obtained/decided through a consultative process with all the relevant stake holders, yet it mentions of adopting a participatory and bottom up approach in its (the SAP) preparation; assessing the village level potentials, problems and gaps, and incorporating them in the *Plan;* and basing the *vision document* on the analysis of the secondary and the primary data collected at the village level, indicating towards role of consultative process with relevant stakeholders.

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 seems to attempt translating the strategies into schemes by sectors with clear cut objectives and targets and funding for the full five year Plan-period. However, it misses to provide the same on annual basis. Also, it misses to give output and outcome. Further, it misses to specify

the source of funding from RKVY or other sources. 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?**
    Yes, the SAP addresses the problem of *jhum* (shifting) cultivation in the State through the scheme of *model Village.* Land under shifting cultivation of some villages is suggested to be used for the development of horticultural crops under the scheme (Rs 0.60 crore). This scheme is to be implemented as convergence between MGNREGS and RKVY. The SAP mentions a *State-sector* scheme under *soil and water conservation* sub-sector as *development of five Jhum (shifting cultivation) villages* (Rs 3.00 crore) that targets *jhum* cultivation.

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 a total plan allocation of Rs 2234.99 crore under the Eleventh FYP. However, it is not explicit whether the given plan allocations are entirely proposed to be funded under RKVY or not. Otherwise also, it does not give share of RKVY funding in the given total plan allocations. Further, it misses to provide break-up of the total plan allocations (2007 to 2012) into yearly allocations. It presents difficulty in adjudging the mismatch between the estimated and the approved budgets (as approved budgets are available on yearly basis for period 2007-08 to 2010-11 in the RKVY website).
    The total cost of projects approved during years 2007-08 to 2010-11 is Rs 53.59 crore. Assuming that the total plan allocations worth Rs 2234.99 crore for the Eleventh FYP are proposed under the RKVY, the mismatch comes out to be Rs 2181.40 crores or 97.6 per cent of the total plan allocation. The huge mismatch is expected to severely 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?**
    The SAP mentions names of schemes (under various agriculture sectors) along with their physical and financial targets at the district-level. However, the SAP does not mention projects. The mentioned schemes are specific and it is not explicit whether or not they involve projects under them. Some of the mentioned schemes are large enough. For example, *erosion control in jhum lands* (22.28 crore) in *East Garo Hills* district; two different schemes of *soil and water conservation in river valleys* (Rs 24.51 crore and Rs 15.70 crores) in *West Garto Hills* district; *paddy seed replacement* (Rs 123.61 crore), *maize seed replacement* (Rs 23.83 crore), *pulses seed replacement* (16.10 crore) and *jute seed replacement* (Rs 10.27 crore) in *West Garo Hills* district; and *Horticulture development* of *areca nut* (Rs 90.43 crore), *cashew nut* (Rs 16.28 crore) and *pineapple* (Rs 36.35 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 the term *Flagship programmes*. However, a number of schemes under *soil and water conservation, crop husbandry* and *horticulture* sectors are extensive to cover large part of the State and larger area. For example, various *soil conservation* schemes (Rs 113.92 crore) cover all the districts; *crop development* schemes (Rs 405.94 crore) promoting crops such as paddy, maize and oilseed crops cover major part of the State; and schemes for *horticulture* crops such as *horticulture development* (Rs 486.42 crore), irrigation infrastructure (Rs 7.09 crore, *machinery and equipment* (Rs 117.42 crore), *marketing infrastructure* (24.69 crore), and *other infrastructure* (Rs 199.44 crore) are very extensive.

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

The SAP seems to attempt an equitable and optimal distribution of resources by sectors. It proposes largest share of funds to the tune of Rs 835.91 crore, which is 37.4 per cent of total proposed allocations, to the *horticulture* sector. It is well understandable, as the hill-State has a tremendous scope for the development of high-value horticultural crops – *the SAP highlights the advantageous position of the State with respect to cultivation of horticultural crops when it bases the reason for higher agricultural income per ha of net sown area in the State (Rs 47,401 for the State vis-à-vis Rs 36,615 for all-India) on dominance of high valued horticultural crops in the State. Crop husbandry* sector has been proposed second largest allocation share of 26.7 per cent (Rs 596.90); the SAP underlines State's priority for the food security – *for the major staple crop rice, gap exists between production (2.17 lakh MT per annum during triennium ending 2007-08) and estimated demand (3.60 lakh MT per annum) and an additional production of 57,000 MT is required by the end of five years to keep the gap constant.* The *irrigation* sector gets third highest share of 18.1 per cent (Rs 405.05 crore) in proposed allocations as the State is un-irrigated and falls short of taking irrigation advantage from huge rainfall it receives due to lack of irrigation-infrastructure. *Soil & water conservation* is given a share of 9.5 per cent (Rs 212.09 crore) as the hill-topography is supposed to be more susceptible for soil-erosion; and there is scope for extensive cultivation through development of vast tracts of waste-land. The SAP allocates 6.0 per cent share to *animal husbandry* sector, possibly due to low consumption and demand of milk in the State. The *fisheries* and *sericulture* sector gets 2.2 per cent share in proposed allocations as existing water-reservoirs/ponds and huge rainfall present an opportunity for the development of in-land fisheries in the land-locked State. The *sericulture* sector has been given a share of 0.1 per cent.

However, spatial allocation of funds among seven districts of the State may be said to be falling short of equitable and optimal distribution of resources, though positive correlation (+0.43) is found to exist between the district-wise proposed allocations and the respective district-populations. Major aberrations include, *Ri Bhoi* district (allocations share: 6.4 per cent, population share: 12.8 per cent); *East Khasi Hills* district district (allocations share: 9.2 per cent, population share: 28.5 per cent); *West Garo Hills* district (allocations share: 48.3 per cent, population share: 22.4 per cent); and *South Garo Hills* district (allocations share: 10.3 per cent, population share: 4.4 per cent).

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

The SAP does not mention *innovative* projects. However, many mentioned schemes involve an innovative nature. For example, *model Village* scheme under which land under shifting cultivation

of some villages is suggested to be used for the development of horticultural crops (Rs 0.60 crore); *establishment of nurseries or horticulture hubs* in all the districts (cost of Rs 0.5 crore per district) is expected to enhance the availability of seedlings thereby facilitating accelerated horticultural development*; integrated fish farming* scheme (Rs 3.08 crore), aiming to integrate fish production with the important piggery activity, is expected to reduce the fish-feed cost since pig waste is useful as feed to fish; and *supply of soil and water analysis kits* (Rs 0.08 crore) shall be useful in augmenting growth of fish that depends on the chemical composition of soil and water.

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 schemes for the State as a whole as the *State sector* schemes. Also, there are some schemes which are not mentioned as *State sector* schemes but cover all the districts, and therefore may be considered as schemes planned for the State as a whole. Schemes stated as *State sector schemes* include, *strengthening 3 soil testing labs.* (Rs 0.30 crore) and *development of five jhum villages* (Rs 3.00 crore), under *soil and water conservation* sector; *refer vans* (Rs 0.60 crore) and *cool rooms/pre-coolers* (Rs 0.24 crore) under *horticulture* sector; *assistance to private feed producers* (Rs 0.54 crore) and *capacity building for 8000 beneficiaries at Rs 860 per trainee* (Rs 0.69 crore), under *fisheries* sector; and *development of two market centres* for *sericulture* sector. The scheme for *establishment of nurseries or horticulture hubs* is not stated as the *State sector scheme,* but covers all the districts (cost of Rs 0.5 crore per district) in the State.

The SAP is not explicit on the basis of planning certain projects for the State as a whole and how they get monitored.

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

The SAP does not make explicit the basis of sectoral fund allocation. However, we may attempt to discern the basis from text of the SAP. The SAP states that the State has much higher land productivity (agricultural income per ha of net area sown) than the national average due to pre-dominance of high-value horticultural crops in the hill-State. Further, the State enjoys a high rainfall and climate conducive to cultivation of horticultural crops. The relatively higher expected marginal contribution in the *horticulture* sector may have prompted highest fund allocation (37.4 per cent) for the *horticulture* sector. The SAP highlights the importance of *crop husbandry* sector by giving top priority to the State's food security concerns; hence second highest share of 26.7 per cent for the sector. It is not explicit in the SAP whether sectoral fund allocation is based on expected marginal contributions. There is no reference to any viability analysis.

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

Since the SAP does not provide year-wise allocations, we cannot comment on the same.

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 SAP targets to raise the agricultural growth rate to 4.7 per cent. It makes substantial allocations to *horticulture* sector aiming to generate higher income from agriculture and expedite the growth rate. Being a hilly region, the State has less scope for industrial growth. Therefore, the thrust on high-value crops shall be instrumental in augmenting the growth of income and employment in the State. Further, the SAP gives importance to State's/country's priority for food security through development of *crop husbandry* sector. The SAP gives thrust to the development

of *irrigation* infrastructure, key for rapid agricultural growth. Also, the SAP seems to contribute towards country 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?

No, the SAP is not explicit on mechanisms for planning, baseline information collection, monitoring, documentation and regularly reporting progress. However, the SAP states that its preparation has involved participatory and bottom up approach; assessment of village level potentials, problems and gaps, and incorporating them in the *Plan;* and analysis of the secondary and the primary data collected at the village level. These indicate about existence of mechanisms for planning, baseline information collection, monitoring, documentation and regularly reporting progress.

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 SAP should specify planned allocation under RKVY and provide year-wise break-up of planned allocation for the five-year Plan period. This will facilitate accurate determination of mismatch between proposal and allocation. Further, the mismatch between proposal and allocation 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 specifically provide State-level target for agriculture & allied sectors / sub-sectors, planned to be achieved using RKVY funding during the five-year Plan period, vis-à-vis the base-year values.

(x) The SAP should provide systematic yield-gap estimates, 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

In general, the preparation of the SAP is a good attempt. The SAP states physical and financial targets under various agriculture & allied sector schemes; district-wise yields for crops and non-crop agricultural products along with the yield gaps; and strategies for agricultural growth. The SAP presents in-depth analysis of the State's characteristics and SWOTs at district and region levels. However, it misses to make explicit that whether the stated physical and financial targets pertain to RKVY funding exclusively or not. The lack of information on share of RKVY funding prevents in analyzing the extent of convergence of RKVY schemes with the other existing CSS. Further, it is not explicit about conducting a systematic yield-gap analysis. A systematic SWOT analysis is also missing in the SAP. The SAP does not give year-wise break-up of total plan funding for the eleventh FYP. This hinders in assessing the mismatch between proposed and approved funds. 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 12^{th} FYP.