

ENHANCING ROLE OF FARMERS IN DECENTRALIZED PLANNING IN AGRICULTURE

A learning workshop on Rashtriya Krishi Vikas Yojana

Brief introduction

RKVY is a tool to achieve decentralized planning in agriculture. Besides, it also aims at increasing growth rate in agriculture through filling the yield gaps and encourages increased public investment in agriculture by the state governments. Started as a resolution of the NDC, in the Eleventh Five Year Plan as an additional centrally sponsored scheme, it sought to increase the growth rate in agriculture to 4% (from existing below 2% during the tenth five year plan), and provide flexibility to the states in agriculture investment. Planning Commission came up with a detailed guideline for RKVY. The budget layout for the RKVY was INR 25000 crore which has been increased to INR 63, 246 crore in the 12th FYP.

Major objectives of the RKVY

The RKVY seeks to achieve 4% growth rate in agriculture. The main objectives of the scheme are as follows:

- To incentivize States so as to increase public investment in agriculture and allied sectors;
- To provide flexibility and autonomy to States in the process of planning and executing agriculture and allied sector schemes;
- To ensure preparation of Agriculture Plans for districts and States based on agro-climatic conditions, availability of technology and natural resources;
- To achieve the goal of reducing yield gaps in important crops through focused interventions;
- To maximize returns to farmers in agriculture and allied sectors;
- To ensure that local needs/crops/ priorities are better reflected in agricultural plans of States;
- To bring about quantifiable changes in production and productivity of various components of agriculture and allied sectors by addressing them in a holistic manner.

Decentralized Agricultural Planning and Experience of the RKVY during the 11th FYP¹

The agriculture component of this decentralized planning was put in place as Comprehensive District Agriculture Plan (C-DAP). All the states were also sanctioned an amount of INR 1000,000 per district to develop C-DAP. C-DAP was expected to be a comprehensive agricultural plan of a district involving agriculture, horticulture, animal husbandry and allied agricultural activities in a sustainable framework. This was also expected to be based on the people's needs and aspirations for development and prepared comprehensively through participatory bottom up approach with 'Gram Sabhas' as the basic unit of planning, taking into account the resources (natural, human and financial) available and by covering all the sectoral agricultural programmes and schemes operational in the district.

In most of the States, the responsibility of providing guidance for formulation of C-DAPs was assigned to the Technical Support Institutions (TSI). Unfortunately the TSIs instead of providing guidance and building capabilities of the sectoral heads and PRI functionaries at the district and below, themselves

¹ Based on the report of the Working Group on Decentralized Planning in Agriculture for 12th Plan, Planning Commission, Govt of India

prepared the C-DAPs without the participation of the stakeholders. Therefore, the quality was not up to the mark. The primary and secondary data required to prepare the C-DAPs was not maintained properly in the sectoral departments at the district and lower levels and therefore the shelf of projects prepared by the sectoral heads has become a wish-list and it has no relationship with the needs and available resources. The feasibility, viability, and sustainability of the projects have not been examined through appropriate appraisal techniques and therefore the expected outcomes and impacts of the projects have not been achieved. The Department of Agriculture has been alleged to have a lion's share of the total funding while other allied sectors fail to get even 20% of their budgetary requirements.

Preparedness in terms of competence and confidence to formulate the projects was inadequate and in some cases it was completely absent, resulting unrealistic project formulation. The coordination at the district level has been found to be weak as some of the heads of the allied sectors happen to be senior to the head of the nodal agency. Even though the district collector is the chairman of the nodal agency, because of his/her preoccupation with existing responsibilities he/she is unable to find the requisite time to coordinate with the heads of the sectoral departments. Therefore to overcome this problem, the head of the nodal agency should be senior to all other heads of the sectoral departments under the overall supervision of the district collector.

Monitoring of the progress of C-DAP formulation showed that States poorly handled the basic requirements in formulating C-DAP, which pertaining to the constitutional and quality aspect of C-DAPs formulation, which carried the spirit of decentralization. States did not care to implement process of decentralized participatory bottom up approach and internalize it. Operationalization part of C-DAP has also remained unattended. States were mostly slow in putting in place the institutional arrangement suggested.

RKVY in Uttar Pradesh

The RKVY portfolio in the state has increased from little over INR 100 crore in 2007-08 to INR 757 crore (2011-12), which again declined to INR 500 crore in 2013-14, in the year the actual release was INR 285 crore. Till 2013-14, Uttar Pradesh received INR 3065.14/2834.37 crore through RKVY.

Table 1: Year wise allocation, release, expenditure, unspent balance, UC received and UC pending

Year	Allocation	Release	Expenditure	Unspent balance	UC received	UC pending
2007-08	116.15	103.90	103.90	0.00	103.90	0.00
2008-09	316.57	316.57	316.57	0.0	316.57	0.0
2009-10	390.97	390.97	390.97	0.00	390.97	0.00
2010-11	635.92	695.36	695.36	0.00	695.36	0.00
2011-12	757.26	762.83	762.83	0.00	762.83	0.00
2012-13	432.26	294.52	294.52	0.00	294.52	0.00
2013-14	500.99	285.65	285.65	0.00	285.65	0.00
As on 27/1/14						

Source: Based on the information from RKVY Homepage

Observations on RKVY in Uttar Pradesh

1. The project portfolio tells us that the maximum expenditure has gone to irrigation (773.07/2834.37), which is equal to 27.28% of the entire RKVY expenditure. The net irrigated area in the state has

increased little in the last decade (2001-2010), from 12.40 million ha to 13.45 million ha.² Despite the huge investment, state is still largely dependent on irrigation through private tube-wells (68.57 per cent area) as compared to other sources including *canal* (20.52 per cent), causing stress on under-ground water resources.³ Furthermore, only 64.5 per cent of the created potential is being utilized. Ground water situation is alarming in UP yet statistics show that the net irrigated area by canal is decreasing in UP while that from tube-wells and tanks is increasing.⁴ At the time of preparing SAP, 37 blocks were over-exploited, 13 blocks were critical and 88 blocks were semi-critical.⁵ As in 2012, 76 blocks in UP have been identified as "over exploited", while 32 have been marked as "critical" blocks.⁶

2. After irrigation the maximum investment has gone to seeds, which is little less than 10% of the entire RKVY investment (INR 279.67 crore). However, still SRR in the state remains one of the lowest in the country.⁷ It is generally alleged that the investment in seed has mainly gone to promote seed companies and providing them subsidies. It is followed by crops which have consumed INR 225 crores.
3. Surprisingly, minimum attention has been paid to marketing and post harvest management, which has received a negligible investment of INR 5.5 crore over a period of 7 years. Another important area agriculture research has been equally neglected with an investment of only INR 8.04 crore, with five agri universities in UP sharing this frugal amount. Organic farming and dairy development, which are coming up sectors in ag have been treated with equal scorn with minimal investments of INR 56.58 crore and 74.62 crore respectively. According to statistics quoted by the National Centre of Organic Farming, the area under organic certification in UP has gone up 36 times between 2005-06 to 2011-12 from 3,034 hectares to 111,644 hectares.⁸ Integrated pest management, agriculture mechanization and fisheries too have been given no attention.

Table 2: All Projects under RKVY in Uttar Pradesh in numbers and costs till fin year 2013-14

Projects	No.	Costs (in crores)
Crops	28	225.98
Horticulture	18	170.37
Sericulture	8	60.76
Animal Husbandry	40	176.47
Other/innovative programmes	9	342.38
Fisheries	27	37.39
Cooperative	3	64.72
Integrated Pest mgmt.	9	24.73
Seed	30	279.67
Fin mgmt.	11	220.57
Ag mechanization	7	36.82
Extension	17	140.60
Market including post harvest mgmt.	1	5.51
Non fin mgmt	1	3.00
Information Tech	6	23.45

² http://eands.dacnet.nic.in/Land_Use_Statistics-2010/s5.pdf

³ <http://rkvy.nic.in/download/compendium/UttarPradesh.pdf>

⁴ http://eands.dacnet.nic.in/Land_Use_Statistics-2010/s5.pdf

⁵ UP,SAP, 2007

⁶ TOI, 2012

⁷ <http://rkvy.nic.in/download/compendium/UttarPradesh.pdf>

⁸ HT, 2013

Ag Research	4	8.04
NRM	11	159.64
Irrigation	17	723.04
Organic farming	10	56.58
Dairy development	5	74.62
Total	262	2834.37

Source: Based on the information from RKVY homepage

Conclusion

The state registered a growth rate of 3.2% in the XIth FYP against an envisaged growth of 5.7 %. Which is better than growth rate in ag and allied sectors in the previous plans. The growth rate in the eighth, ninth, tenth plan was merely 2.7%, 0.8, and 2.1% respectively.⁹ The state has also utilized almost 90% of the allocation under RKVY. However, there are some concerns with regard to performance of agriculture and with RKVY. Agriculture and allied area contributes to 30% of the GSDP, while the share of agriculture in the state budget has been less than 9%.¹⁰

As far as RKVY is concerned, the preparation of the CDAPs and monitoring have been the main concerns. The TSI did not follow the process given by the guideline for the formation of the CDAPs, which were made in a top down order without public participation, which meant that local needs and responses could not be reflected in the CDAPs and finally the SAP.¹¹ Now, it's a good time to revisit the CDAPs, which might provide a key to the stalled agricultural growth. This is true for many of the states in the country.

The RKVY has faced problems with monitoring. The monitoring committee under Prof. RP Singh reported in 2009 that allocation of funds to various departments have been made in SLSC but detailed information on the district where activity/scheme has been started/implemented and how much funds have been actually spent on such schemes in each district by each department is not available. Apparently, the monitoring format given by DAC is not followed and the agencies are not familiar. Since the implementation of the scheme, no study on ratio of seed replacement/requirement has so far been conducted. The convergence of schemes has not been properly understood even at the state level. In fact, it is not possible to assess the impact of this project at the field level due to lack of relevant information to verify. Arrangement for internal monitoring of the projects under RKVY seems to be very weak. Another monitoring visit by Mr. R N Hegde in 2010 recommended that at present UPDASP does not submit the sector wise allocations and progress made in each sector which makes difficult for monitoring. Hence, it is suggested that separate projects indicating district wise physical and financial targets for each sector may be submitted.

Workshop on monitoring RKVY on the ground

CECOEDECON along with local civil society organizations and in collaboration with Oxfam India, proposes to organize a workshop to track RKVY and monitor the progress on the ground. The workshop will have CSOs working with RKVY projects, other CSOs, academicians, researchers and institutions who have engaged in monitoring of the RKVY. It is expected that the workshop will contribute to enhance contribution of farmers and civil society in the agricultural growth and performance of the RKVY.

⁹ <http://agriculture.up.nic.in/>

¹⁰ <http://agriculture.up.nic.in/>

¹¹ http://rkvy.nic.in/Evaluation_of_SAPs/Evaluation_SAP_UP.PDF