

7

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE  
(2014-2015)

SIXTEENTH LOK SABHA

MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE  
(DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE  
AND CO-OPERATION)

'RASHTRIYA KRISHI VIKAS YOJANA—  
AN EVALUATION'

*[Action Taken by the Government on the Observations/Recommendations contained in the  
Sixty-first Report (Fifteenth Lok Sabha) of the Committee on Agriculture (2013-2014)]*

SEVENTH REPORT



सत्यमेव जयते

LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT  
NEW DELHI

March, 2015/Phalguna, 1936 (Saka)



SEVENTH REPORT

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE  
(2014-2015)

( SIXTEENTH LOK SABHA )

MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE  
(DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE AND  
CO-OPERATION)

‘RASHTRIYA KRISHI VIKAS YOJANA —  
AN EVALUATION’

*[Action Taken by the Government on the Observations/Recommendations  
contained in the Sixty-first Report (Fifteenth Lok Sabha) of the  
Committee on Agriculture (2013-2014)]*

*Presented to Lok Sabha on 17.03.2015  
Laid on the Table of Rajya Sabha on 17.03.2015*



LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT  
NEW DELHI

*March, 2015/Phalguna, 1936 (Saka)*

**C.O.A. No. 314**

*Price* : Rs. 38.00

© 2015 BY LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT

Published under Rule 382 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha (Fifteenth Edition) and Printed by National Printers, New Delhi-110 028.

## CONTENTS

	PAGE
COMPOSITION OF THE COMMITTEE .....	(iii)
INTRODUCTION .....	(v)
CHAPTER I Report .....	1
CHAPTER II Observations/Recommendations which have been accepted by the Government .....	9
CHAPTER III Observations/Recommendations which the Committee do not desire to pursue in view of the Government's replies .....	17
CHAPTER IV Observations/Recommendations in respect of which replies of the Government have not been accepted by the Committee .....	18
CHAPTER V Observations/Recommendations in respect of which final replies of the Government are still awaited .....	21

### ANNEXURES

I. Minutes of the Eighth Sitting of the Committee held on 13 November, 2014 .....	24
II. Minutes of the Fourteenth Sitting of the Committee held on 15 January, 2015 .....	26
III. Minutes of the Eighteenth Sitting of the Committee held on 4 March, 2015 .....	29

### APPENDICES

Analysis of Action Taken by the Government on the Recommendations contained in the Sixty-First Report (Fifteenth Lok Sabha) of the Committee on Agriculture (2013-2014) .....	31
---	----

COMPOSITION OF THE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE  
(2014-2015)

Shri Hukm Deo Narayan Yadav — *Chairperson*

MEMBERS

*Lok Sabha*

2. Shri Sanganna Amarappa
3. Prof. Ravindra Vishwanath Gaikwad
4. Shri Nalin Kumar Kateel
5. Md. Badaruddoza Khan
6. Shri C. Mahendran
7. Dr. Tapas Mandal
8. Shri Janardan Mishra
9. Shri Ajay Nishad
10. Shri Dalpat Singh Paraste
11. Shri Nityanand Rai
12. Shri Mukesh Rajput
13. Shri Konakalla Narayana Rao
14. Shri C.L. Ruala
15. Shri Arjun Charan Sethi
16. Shri Satyapal Singh
17. Shri Virendra Singh
18. Shri Kadiyam Srihari
19. Shri Jai Prakash Narayan Yadav
20. Shri Dharmendra Yadav
21. Shri B. S. Yeddyurappa

*Rajya Sabha*

22. Shri A.W. Rabi Bernard
23. Shrimati Renuka Chowdhury
24. Sardar Sukhdev Singh Dhindsa
25. Shri Janardan Dwivedi
26. Shri Vinay Katiyar
27. Shri Mohd. Ali Khan
28. Shri Rajpal Singh Saini
29. Shri Ram Nath Thakur
30. Shri Shankarbhai N. Vegad
31. Shri Darshan Singh Yadav

SECRETARIAT

1. Shri Abhijit Kumar — *Joint Secretary*
2. Smt. Abha Singh Yaduvanshi — *Director*
3. Shri C. Vanlalruata — *Deputy Secretary*

## INTRODUCTION

I, the Chairperson, Committee on Agriculture (2014-15), having been authorized by the Committee to submit the Report on their behalf, present this Seventh Report on action taken by the Government on the Observations/Recommendations contained in the Sixty-first Report (Fifteenth Lok Sabha) of the Committee on Agriculture (2013-14) on 'Rashtriya Krishi Vikas Yojana—An Evaluation' pertaining to the Ministry of Agriculture (Department of Agriculture and Cooperation).

2. The Sixty-first Report (Fifteenth Lok Sabha) of the Committee on Agriculture (2013-14) on 'Rashtriya Krishi Vikas Yojana—An Evaluation' of the Ministry of Agriculture (Department of Agriculture and Cooperation) which was presented to the Hon'ble Speaker on 15 March, 2014 and Lok Sabha on 10 June, 2014 by the Secretary General under Direction 71A(6) of the Directions by the Speaker, Lok Sabha and laid on the Table of Rajya Sabha on 11 June, 2014. The Action Taken Notes on the Report were received on 10 June, 2014.

3. The Committee at their Sitting held on 13 November, 2014 decided to hear the views of Ministry of Agriculture (Department of Agriculture and Cooperation) and Government of Haryana before finalizing their Action Taken Report. Accordingly, the Committee took evidence of representatives of Ministry of Agriculture (Department of Agriculture and Cooperation) and Government of Haryana at their Sitting held on 15 January, 2015.

4. The Report was considered and adopted by the Committee at their Sitting held on 4th March, 2015.

5. An analysis of the action taken by the Government on the Observations/Recommendations contained in the Sixty-first Report (Fifteenth Lok Sabha) of the Committee is given in **Appendix**.

NEW DELHI;  
13 March, 2015  

---

22 Phalgun, 1936 (Saka)

HUKM DEO NARAYAN YADAV,  
Chairperson,  
Committee on Agriculture.



## CHAPTER I

### REPORT

This Report of the Committee on Agriculture deals with the action taken by the Government on the Recommendations contained in the Sixty-First Report (Fifteenth Lok Sabha) of the Committee on Agriculture (2013-14) on 'Rashtriya Krishi Vikas Yojana – An Evaluation' pertaining to the Ministry of Agriculture (Department of Agriculture and Cooperation) which was presented to the Hon'ble Speaker on 15 March, 2014 and Lok Sabha on 10 June, 2014 by the Secretary General under Direction 71A(6) of the Directions by Speaker, Lok Sabha and laid on the Table of Rajya Sabha on 11 June, 2014.

1.2 The Government have furnished Action Taken Replies in respect of all the 10 Observations/Recommendations contained in the Report. These have been categorised as under:—

- (i) Observations/Recommendations that have been accepted by the Government:

Recommendation Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7 and 8

Chapter - II  
Total : 07

- (ii) Observations/Recommendations which the Committee do not desire to pursue in view of the Government's reply:

-Nil-

Chapter - III  
Total : Nil

- (iii) Observations/Recommendations in respect of which action taken replies of the Government have not been accepted by the Committee:

Recommendation Nos. 5 and 10

Chapter - IV  
Total : 02

- (iv) Observations/Recommendations in respect of which final replies of the Government are still awaited:

Recommendation No. 9

Chapter - V

Total : 01

**1.3 The Committee trust that utmost importance would be given to implementation of the Observations/Recommendations accepted by the Government. In cases where it is not possible for the Government to implement the Recommendations in letter and spirit for any reason, the matter should be reported to the Committee with reasons for non-implementation. The Committee desire that further Action Taken Notes on the Observations/Recommendations contained in Chapter-I and Chapter-V of this Report be furnished to them at an early date.**

1.4 The Committee will now deal with the action taken by the Government on some of the Recommendations in the succeeding paragraphs.

### **Reduction in yield gaps in important crops**

#### **Recommendation (Para No. 1)**

1.5 The primary objectives of launching Rashtriya Krishi Vikas Yojana (RKVY) in the 11th Plan, among other things, were to reduce the yield gaps in important crops and to ensure that States increase their plan allocation to the agriculture and allied sector, as the gross capital formation in the sector was unsatisfactory. The Committee find that not much headway has been made in this regard during the 11th Plan. Admittedly, there are huge yield gaps across the country and in certain crops the gaps are bigger than in other crops. Presently, the Department of Agriculture and Cooperation (DAC) has no data about growth in private investment as compared to public investment in agriculture and allied sector. In the absence of relevant data, the Committee are not in a position to assess the performance of RKVY. The Committee desire that data regarding yield gaps in major crops and quantum of private investment in agriculture and allied sector at the beginning of the 11th Plan and achievements during the plan period be collected and furnished

to the Committee at the earliest to enable an objective assessment about the achievements under RKVY. The Committee also urge the DAC to initiate concrete measures to ensure that yield gaps in important crops are reduced as aimed in RKVY.

1.6 The Department in the Action Taken Note have stated that average annual growth rate of yield during the period 2007-08 to 2012-13 has been 2.7% for foodgrains, 3.8% for pulses and 2.2% for oilseeds. In absolute terms, there has been significant rise in yield in respect of rice, wheat, pulses and oilseeds from pre-XI Five Year Plan to post-XI Five Year Plan period. Yield, measured in terms of kg/ha, has increased from 2131 to 2462 for rice, 2708 to 3119 for wheat, 612 to 786 for pulses and 916 to 1169 for oilseeds between 2006-07 to 2012-13. Contribution of private sector in Gross Capital Formation (GCF) in agriculture and allied sectors has increased from Rs. 75,496 crore in 2006-07 (before XI Plan period) to Rs. 195,756 crore in 2011-12 (terminal year of XI Plan period). In relative terms, contribution of private sector in GCF has increased from 74.6% (2006-07) to 83.56% by the end of XI Plan period (2011-12). For sustaining capital investment under RKVY, revised Guidelines of RKVY have mandated at least 35% of State's allocation for implementing infrastructure and asset projects.

Various sub-schemes have been introduced under RKVY with focused objective to reduce the yield gaps in principal crops. Notable among these schemes are Bringing Green Revolution in Eastern India (BGREI) targeting higher rice production, 60,000 pulse villages for enhancing productivity of pulses, Initiative for Nutritional Security through Intensive Millets Promotion (INSIMP) etc. For bringing more focus in bridging yield gaps at State level, revised Guidelines of RKVY has introduced 'inverse of yield gaps between state average yield and potential yields' as one of the parameters for determining inter-State allocation of RKVY funds. From 2014-15 onward, States having lesser yield gaps will have relative advantage in accessing more funds under RKVY.

**1.7 The Committee had noted that since its inception in the Eleventh Plan, Rashtriya Krishi Vikas Yojana (RKVY) has contributed towards increased yield for rice, wheat, pulses and oilseeds as well as increased contribution of private sector in Gross Capital Formation (GCF) in agriculture and allied sectors. However, they would like to caution the Government**

**that a lot still remains to be done before RKVY achieves its objectives. The Committee, therefore, reiterate their earlier recommendation that Department of Agriculture and Cooperation (DAC) should initiate concrete measures to ensure that yield gaps in important crops are reduced further.**

#### **Discontinuation of Services of National Institute of Rural Development (NIRD)**

##### **Recommendation (Para No. 5)**

1.8 In a note submitted to the Committee, the DAC stated that the services of NIRD were discontinued as it did not have the desired level of in depth examination and assessment as required by the DAC. The Secretary, DAC was, however, candid in his deposition on 12.2.14 that NIRD conducted evaluation efficiently and the document brought out through it was of great help in bringing back the focus on to the implementation issues of RKVY. The Committee, however, fail to understand why then the services of NIRD, which made an objective evaluation, were discontinued. The Committee would await an explanation in this regard.

1.9 In their Action Taken Note, the Department of Agriculture and Cooperation have stated that the agreement entered into with NIRD by the Department of Agriculture and Cooperation (DAC) for monitoring and evaluation of implementation of RKVY was on year to year basis which was not renewed after 2010-11 as NIRD failed to comply with terms and conditions especially in respect with conducting field visits and timely furnishing of reports.

**1.10 The divergent views of the Secretary, Department of Agriculture and Cooperation and as furnished in the action taken notes by Department of Agriculture and Cooperation in regard to the discontinuation of the services National Institute of Rural Development (NIRD) baffles the Committee. They are unable to comprehend as to how an agency that had failed to comply with the terms and conditions, especially, in respect of conducting of field visits and timely furnishing of reports be able to conduct an efficient evaluation of the RKVY Scheme and bring out a document that was of great help in bringing back the focus on the implementation issues of RKVY. Strongly deprecating this lack of clarity on the part of the Department on this issue, they urge the Department in the first instance to reconcile this**

**issue amongst themselves and then furnish a comprehensive and correct reply to the Committee.**

**Delay in submission of report by Agriculture Development and Rural Transformation Centre (ADRTC)**

**Recommendation (Para No. 6)**

1.11 Another Institute engaged by the DAC for evaluating RKVY over the 11th Plan period is Agriculture Development and Rural Transformation Centre (ADRTC) under the Institute for Social and Economic Change (ISEC), Bengaluru. ARDC was expected to give its first report by March, 2013 and final report by June, 2013. It has not, however, submitted its report even seven months after the deadline. As the 11th Plan period was over almost two years ago, the Committee desire that ADRTC should complete its task without further delay to enable an objective assessment of RKVY. The Committee would also like to know the methodology being followed by ADRTC to evaluate RKVY.

1.12 The Department in their Action Taken Note have stated that the Institute of Social and Economic Change (ISEC), Bengaluru has been engaged for impact evaluation study of RKVY implementation during 11th Plan period. Salient features of the methodology followed by ISEC for this study are as under:—

- (a) All States and Union Territories will be covered under the study following a standard statistical sampling technique.
- (b) Implementation of major components and activities will be incorporated in the study.
- (c) ISEC shall lead the study but will have several institutions as partners to support it across States. The partner-institutions will be selected by following a transparent process.
- (d) ISEC shall prepare the template, guidelines, questionnaires and software packages for the study.
- (e) ISEC shall consolidate the report of all partner-institutions, integrate them and prepare a consolidated

report for Department of Agriculture and Cooperation (DAC).

- (f) Infrastructural and individual project silos shall be analyzed in the sectoral reports whereby major infrastructure and individual projects will be considered based on total expenditure/allocation share.
- (g) ISEC shall use a variety of data sources including Detailed Project Report (DPR) for the schemes, total allocation, objectives, implementing agency and the progress achieved, impact and outcome of the project at macro level.

ISEC, Bengaluru has already submitted its first report.

**1.13 The Committee are appalled at the inordinate delay on the part of Agriculture Development and Rural Transformation Centre (ADRTC) in submitting its First Report, which has consequently delayed the submission of its Final Report. Being of the considered view that this ordinate delay greatly reduces the efficacy of the work done by ADRTC as we are past the halfway stage of the Twelfth Plan period, the Committee urge upon the Department to be proactive in the matter and ensure in the future that before engaging a third party for evaluation of any scheme deadlines set up with mutual consent are strictly adhered to and such instances are not repeated. The Committee would like to be intimated of the findings of the final report of ISEC.**

#### **Misuse of Central Subsidy by Government of Haryana**

##### **Recommendation (Para No. 10)**

1.14 Another allegation made in the representation relates to purchase of seeds at high cost with Government subsidies. It has been stated in this connection that there has been no mis-utilisation or mis-appropriation of subsidy under RKVY. According to the Secretary, Agriculture, under the Government of India Scheme, the subsidy rate is fixed. Irrespective of the cost of the seed, the subsidy outgo from the Government is the same. However, since the seeds were purchased under limited tender at very high rate, the entire matter is stated to have been referred

to the Central Vigilance Commission for appropriate action. The Committee further desire that the DAC should ensure that open and competitive tenders are floated where central money is spent and that no specific brand name(s) for seeds or insecticides are specified in tender enquiries. In case private producers are prohibited from participating in a tender enquiry, the DAC should ensure that the seeds supplied are produced/co-produced by the eligible Government agency and certification of the seeds supplied is in its own name. The Central money spent on subsidizing the cost of seeds purchased from Government/Cooperative agencies in restrictive of limited tenders where private seed producers were ineligible to bid, but the seeds supplied were not certified in the name of the supplying Government/Cooperative agency should be recovered from the State Government.

The DAC should take adequate steps to ensure that the benefit of Central subsidies reach the farmers.

1.15 In their Action Taken Note, the Department have stated under RKVY, concerned State Governments undertake the activities of production and distribution of certified/quality seeds through State Department of Agriculture, State Seeds Corporation, State Seed Farms, etc. However, subsidy level or pattern of assistance mandated for this purpose under various Central Government schemes/programmes has to be adhered to. State Governments, if they so desire, are free to add their own funds to provide increased subsidy to farmers. To further ensure that technical requirements and financial norms (cost norms and pattern of assistance) of States' proposal are consistent with relevant Central Government/State Government schemes, the revised guidelines of RKVY has stipulated that all project proposals will have to be screened by State Level Project Screening Committee (SLPSC) before they are placed before State Level Sanctioning Committee (SSLC) for approval.

**1.16 The Committee are not satisfied with the reply of the Government, as the issues raised by the Committee in their original report have not been addressed to. They, therefore, reiterate their earlier recommendation that**

Department of Agriculture and Cooperation take adequate steps to ensure that misuse of Central subsidies do not take place, thereby ensuring that the benefit of Central subsidies reach the farmers. The Committee would await the Government's response on the concerns expressed by them.



## **CHAPTER II**

### **OBSERVATIONS/RECOMMENDATIONS WHICH HAVE BEEN ACCEPTED BY THE GOVERNMENT**

#### **Reduction in yield gaps in important crops**

##### **Recommendation (Para No. 1)**

The primary objectives of launching Rashtriya Krishi Vikas Yojana (RKVY) in the 11th Plan, among other things, were to reduce the yield gaps in important crops and to ensure that States increase their plan allocation to the agriculture and allied sector, as the gross capital formation in the sector was unsatisfactory. The Committee find that not much headway has been made in this regard during the 11th Plan. Admittedly, there are huge yield gaps across the country and in certain crops the gaps are bigger than in other crops. Presently, the Department of Agriculture and Cooperation (DAC) has no data about growth in private investment as compared to public investment in agriculture and allied sector. In the absence of relevant data, the Committee are not in a position to assess the performance of RKVY. The Committee desire that data regarding yield gaps in major crops and quantum of private investment in agriculture and allied sector at the beginning of the 11th plan and achievements during the plan period be collected and furnished to the Committee at the earliest to enable an objective assessment about the achievements under RKVY. The Committee also urge the DAC to initiate concrete measures to ensure that yield gaps in important crops are reduced as aimed in RKVY.

##### **Reply of the Government**

Average annual growth rate of yield during the period 2007-08 to 2012-13 has been 2.7% for foodgrains, 3.8% for pulses and 2.2 % for oilseeds. In absolute terms, there has been significant rise in yield in respect of rice, wheat, pulses and oilseeds from pre-XI five year plan to post-XI five year plan period. Yield, measured in terms of kg/ha, has increased from 2131 to 2462 for rice, 2708 to 3119 for wheat, 612 to 786 for pulses and 916 to 1169 for oilseeds between 2006-07 to 2012-13.

Contribution of private sector in Gross Capital Formation (GCF) in agriculture and allied sectors has increased from Rs. 75,496 crore in 2006-07 (before XI Plan period) to Rs. 195,756 crore in 2011-12 (terminal year of XI Plan period). In relative terms, contribution of private sector in GCF has increased from 74.6% (2006-07) to 83.56% by the end of XI Plan period (2011-12). For sustaining capital investment under RKVY, revised guidelines of RKVY have mandated at least 35% of State's allocation for implementing infrastructure and asset projects.

Various sub-schemes have been introduced under RKVY with focused objective to reduce the yield gaps in principal crops. Notable among these schemes are Bringing Green Revolution in Eastern India (BGREI) targeting higher rice production, 60,000 pulse villages for enhancing productivity of pulses, Initiative for Nutritional Security through Intensive Millets Promotion (INSIMP) etc. For bringing more focus in bridging yield gaps at State level, revised Guidelines of RKVY has introduced 'inverse of yield gaps between State average yield and potential yields' as one of the parameters for determining inter-State allocation of RKVY funds. From 2014-15 onward, States having lesser yield gaps will have relative advantage in accessing more funds under RKVY.

[Ministry of Agriculture (Department of Agriculture and Co-operation), F. No.6-3/2014-RKVY dated the 10 June, 2014]

### **Comments of the Committee**

For comments of the Committee please refer to Para No. 1.7 of Chapter I of this Report.

### **Increased growth rate in agriculture**

#### **Recommendation (Para No. 2)**

Other objective of Rashtriya Krishi Vikas Yojana (RKVY) are to incentivize the States to increase their plan allocation to the agriculture and allied sector, to ensure preparation of district and State agriculture plans and to achieve the national target of 4 per cent growth in agriculture and allied sector during the 11th and 12th plan periods. The Committee note that the first two objectives were made prerequisites for availing funds by the States under RKVY. The Committee are glad to learn that despite two major droughts, the overall growth of the agriculture and allied sector during the 11th plan is in the vicinity of 4.1 per cent

surpassing the target of 4 per cent. The Committee would, however, like to caution the Government that there should be no complacency in sustaining the growth momentum achieved in the 11th plan and all efforts be made to further accelerate the agricultural growth during the 12th plan.

### **Reply of the Government**

Agriculture and Allied sector grew at a rate of 4.7% during 2013-14. Department of Agriculture and Cooperation (DAC) will continue to strive for sustaining growth momentum during 12th Plan period.

[Ministry of Agriculture (Department of Agriculture and Co-operation), F. No.6-3/2014-RKVY dated the 10 June, 2014]

### **Major issues raised by States regarding criteria prescribed for apportionment of funds**

#### **Recommendation (Para No. 3)**

The Committee have been informed that the States had major issues in regard to the criteria prescribed for apportionment of funds under RKVY. The criteria relate to percentage share of net un-irrigated area in a State to the net un-irrigated area; projected growth rate and increase in the total plan expenditure in agriculture and allied sectors. It has been stated that in order to address the grievances of States, the number of criteria was increased so that a State which falls short of one criteria can make ground in other criteria to gain additional funds. The additional criteria for apportionment of funds include, average area under oilseeds and pulses, increase in expenditure on animal husbandry, dairying and fisheries and reduction in yield gap. The Committee hope that allocation of funds under RKVY will be just and equitable to all States without room for perceived injustice.

### **Reply of the Government**

Department of Agriculture and Cooperation would like to assure the Committee that allocation of funds under RKVY will adhere to scheme guidelines and will be just and equitable to all States without room for perceived injustice.

[Ministry of Agriculture (Department of Agriculture and Co-operation), F. No.6-3/2014-RKVY dated the 10 June, 2014]

## **Findings of National Institute of Rural Development (NIRD)**

### **Recommendation (Para No. 4)**

According to the findings of the National Institute of Rural Development (NIRD), Hyderabad which was commissioned in 2008 by the DAC to undertake concurrent evaluation of RKVY during the 11th plan period, the States have not been able to balance investments in growth oriented projects and projects for development of agricultural Infrastructure. Infrastructure development, if any by the States was not found to be based on any definite vision or plan. Further, there has been thin spread of RKVY resources across all sectors and amongst all districts of the States. The Committee would urge the DAC to look into the issues brought out by the NIRD in the implementation of RKVY and take necessary action to ensure that there are no such deficiencies in future.

### **Reply of the Government**

Issues brought out by NIRD regarding implementation of RKVY in the States have already been shared with States for initiating remedial measures. Further, to ensure that RKVY funds are adequately utilized for developing agricultural infrastructure, the revised RKVY guidelines that have come into effect from 01.04.2014, have mandated that at least 35% of State's allocation should be utilized for implementing infrastructure and asset development projects.

Besides, the revised guidelines have also mandated that States will draw up a State Agriculture Infrastructure Development Programme (SAIDP) for identifying resource gaps and effectively utilizing RKVY as well as other Central funds for bridging the gaps.

[Ministry of Agriculture (Department of Agriculture and Co-operation), F. No.6-3/2014-RKVY dated the 10 June, 2014]

## **Delay in submission of report by Agriculture Development and Rural Transformation Centre (ADRTC)**

### **Recommendation (Para No. 6)**

Another Institute engaged by the DAC for evaluating RKVY over the 11th Plan period is Agriculture Development and Rural Transformation Centre (ADRTC) under the Institute for Social and Economic Change (ISEC), Bengaluru. ARDC was expected to give its first report by March 2013 and final report by June 2013. It has not, however, submitted its

report even seven months after the deadline. As the 11th Plan period was over almost two years ago, the Committee desire that ADRTC should complete its task without further delay to enable an objective assessment of RKVY. The Committee would also like to know the methodology being followed by ADRTC to evaluate RKVY.

### **Reply of the Government**

Institute of Social and Economic Change (ISEC), Bengaluru has been engaged for impact evaluation study of RKVY implementation during 11th Plan period. Salient features of the methodology followed by ISEC for this study areas under:—

- (a) All States and Union Territories will be covered under the study following a standard statistical sampling technique.
- (b) Implementation of major components and activities will be incorporated in the study.
- (c) ISEC shall lead the study but will have several institutions as partners to support it across States. The partner-institutions will be selected by following a transparent process.
- (d) ISEC shall prepare the template, guidelines, questionnaires and software packages for the study.
- (e) ISEC shall consolidate the report of all partner-institutions, integrate them and prepare a consolidated report for Department of Agriculture and Cooperation (DAC).
- (f) Infrastructural and individual project silos shall be analyzed in the sectoral reports whereby major infrastructure and individual projects will be considered based on total expenditure/allocation share.
- (g) ISEC shall use a variety of data sources including Detailed Project Report (DPR) for the schemes, total allocation, objectives, implementing agency and the progress achieved, impact and outcome of the project at macro level.

ISEC, Bengaluru has already submitted its first report.

[Ministry of Agriculture (Department of Agriculture and Co-operation), F. No.6-3/2014-RKVY dated the 10 June, 2014]

## **Comments of the Committee**

For comments of the Committee please refer to Para No. 1.13 of Chapter I of this Report.

### **Preliminary findings of Agriculture Development and Rural Transformation Centre (ADRTC)**

#### **Recommendation (Para No. 7)**

According to the preliminary findings of ADRTC, there is a strong co-relation between RKVY spending and private gross capital formation. The Committee note that the Public Private Partnership for Integrated Agriculture Development (PPPIAD) launched under RKVY recently envisages facilitating large scale integrated projects led by private sector players in the agriculture and allied sector. Each project is to target at least 5,000 farmers with an average investment of Rs. 1 lakh per farmer through a project cycle of 3 to 5 years. The intervention to include mobilizing farmers into producer groups, technology infusion, value addition and marketing solutions. The Committee would like the Government to ensure that PPPIAD does not in any way result in exploitation of farmers.

#### **Reply of the Government**

The guidelines of Public Private Partnership for Integrated Agriculture Development (PPPIAD) has mandated that State Government should appoint an independent monitoring agency to closely track the performance of the project implemented under PPPIAD. In addition, Small Farmers' Agri-Business Consortium (SFAC), under Dept. of Agriculture and Cooperation will examine State's proposal from technical viewpoint before proposing for funding to the concerned State. These safeguards will ensure that PPPIAD does not in any way result in exploitation of farmers.

[Ministry of Agriculture (Department of Agriculture and Co-operation), F. No.6-3/2014-RKVY dated the 10 June, 2014]

### **Monitoring Implementation of RKVY**

#### **Recommendation (Para No. 8)**

Monitoring the implementation of RKVY is an area of concern. At the central level, there is hardly any monitoring except taking stock of

the progress and receiving utilization certificate at the time of release of second installment of allocation. According to the Secretary, Agriculture, the difficulty in RKVY's monitoring is that the projects are so diverse in nature, it is difficult to group them together. It has further been stated that a web based management information system containing upto date and authenticated data on RKVY projects is available for access in the public domain. In Committee's view, it is the responsibility of the DAC to ensure that the projects/schemes for which funds are made available to the states are monitored and coordinated properly to ensure timely and effective implementation and that there is no misuse or diversion of funds for unintended purposes. The Committee desire that the DAC should immediately devise a suitable mechanism for effective co-ordination and monitoring under intimation to the Committee. The Committee in this connection draw the attention of the Government to a representation received by the Committee alleging misuse of subsidy given under RKVY for purchase of pesticides and seeds. The issues raised in the representation are discussed in the succeeding paragraphs.

### **Reply of the Government**

Acknowledging the need for better co-ordination and monitoring, the revised RKVY guidelines have mandated that at twenty five per cent (25%) of the projects sanctioned by the State each year under the three streams *e.g.* RKVY (production growth), RKVY (Infrastructure and Assets) and RKVY (Sub-schemes) shall have to be compulsorily taken up for third party monitoring and evaluation by the implementing States. In addition, it has also been stipulated that action plan for monitoring and evaluation will be chosen by SLSC every year in its first meeting based on project cost, importance of the project, etc. preferably covering all sectors.

At central level, DAC will engage suitable agency for conducting State specific/Pan India periodic implementation monitoring and/or concurrent evaluation of the scheme.

All of these will be over and above online monitoring through web-based Management Information System (MIS) that provides authenticated data on outputs, outcome and contribution of RKVY projects in the public domain (<http://www.rkvy.nic.in>). Through this system, States will continue online submission/updating of project data on a regular basis.

RKVY revised guidelines also suggest that assets created under this scheme should be captured digitally and mapped on a GIS platform for future integration onto National-GIS system for bringing more transparency and accountability.

[Ministry of Agriculture (Department of Agriculture and Co-operation), F. No.6-3/2014-RKVY dated the 10 June, 2014]



### **CHAPTER III**

OBSERVATIONS/RECOMMENDATIONS WHICH THE COMMITTEE  
DO NOT DESIRE TO PURSUE IN VIEW OF THE  
GOVERNMENT'S REPLIES

-NIL-

## **CHAPTER IV**

### **OBSERVATIONS/RECOMMENDATIONS IN RESPECT OF WHICH REPLIES OF THE GOVERNMENT HAVE NOT BEEN ACCEPTED BY THE COMMITTEE**

#### **Discontinuation of Services of National Institute of Rural Development (NIRD)**

##### **Recommendation (Para No. 5)**

In a note submitted to the Committee, the DAC stated that the services of NIRD were discontinued as it did not have the desired level of in depth examination and assessment as required by the DAC. The Secretary, DAC was, however, candid in his deposition on 12.2.14 that NIRD conducted evaluation efficiently and the document brought out through it was of great help in bringing back the focus on to the implementation issues of RKVY. The Committee, however, fail to understand why then the services of NIRD, which made an objective evaluation, were discontinued. The Committee would await an explanation in this regard.

##### **Reply of the Government**

The agreement entered into with NIRD by the Department of Agriculture and Cooperation (DAC) for monitoring and evaluation of implementation of RKVY was on year to year basis which was not renewed after 2010-11 as NIRD failed to comply with terms and conditions especially in respect with conducting field visits and timely furnishing of reports.

[Ministry of Agriculture (Department of Agriculture and Co-operation), F. No.6-3/2014-RKVY dated the 10 June, 2014]

##### **Comments of the Committee**

For comments of the Committee please refer to Para No. 1.10 of Chapter I of this Report.

## **Misuse of Central Subsidy by Government of Haryana**

### **Recommendation (Para No. 10)**

Another allegation made in the representation relates to purchase of seeds at high cost with Government subsidies. It has been stated in this connection that there has been no mis-utilisation or mis-appropriation of subsidy under RKVY. According to the Secretary, Agriculture, under the Government of India Scheme, the subsidy rate is fixed. Irrespective of the cost of the seed, the subsidy outgo from the Government is the same. However, since the seeds were purchased under limited tender at very high rate, the entire matter is stated to have been referred to the Central Vigilance Commission for appropriate action. The Committee further desire that the DAC should ensure that open and competitive tenders are floated where central money is spent and that no specific brand name(s) for seeds or insecticides are specified in tender enquiries. In case private producers are prohibited from participating in a tender enquiry, the DAC should ensure that the seeds supplied are produced/co-produced by the eligible Government agency and certification of the seeds supplied is in its own name. The Central money spent on subsidizing the cost of seeds purchased from Government/Cooperative agencies in restrictive of limited tenders where private seed producers were ineligible to bid, but the seeds supplied were not certified in the name of the supplying Government/Cooperative agency should be recovered from the State Government.

The DAC should take adequate steps to ensure that the benefit of Central subsidies reach the farmers.

### **Reply of the Government**

Under RKVY, concerned State Governments undertake the activities of production and distribution of certified/quality seeds through State Department of Agriculture, State Seeds Corporation, State Seed Farms, etc. However, subsidy level or pattern of assistance mandated for this purpose under various Central Government schemes/programmes has to be adhered to. State Governments, if they so desire, are free to add their own funds to provide increased subsidy to farmers.

To further ensure that technical requirements and financial norms (cost norms and pattern of assistance) of States' proposal are consistent with relevant Central Government/State Government schemes, the revised guidelines of RKVY has stipulated that all project proposals will have

to be screened by State Level Project Screening Committee (SLPSC) before they are placed before State Level Sanctioning Committee (SSLC) for approval.

[Ministry of Agriculture (Department of Agriculture and Co-operation), F. No.6-3/2014-RKVY dated the 10 June, 2014]

### **Comments of the Committee**

For comments of the Committee please refer to Para No. 1.16 of Chapter I of this Report.

## CHAPTER V

### OBSERVATIONS/RECOMMENDATIONS IN RESPECT OF WHICH FINAL REPLIES OF GOVERNMENT ARE STILL AWAITED

#### Usage of non-approved Pesticide by Government of Haryana

##### Recommendation (Para No. 9)

One of the allegations made in the representation was that the Government of Haryana had misused central subsidy under RKVY by purchasing the pesticide RAXIL for non-approved use on the basis of a recommendation made by Haryana Agriculture University (HAU) that treatment of wheat seeds with RAXIL 2% DS is effective against Karnal Bunt disease. According to the Secretary, Agriculture, it is a fact that this particular pesticide was tested by the HAU on wheat and found to be effective and included in the package of practices in 2002. The results were, however, not submitted to the Registration Committee as required under the Insecticides Act. No pesticides can be used on any crop unless it is permitted to be so used by the Registration Committee. Though this matter has since been taken up with all the States and the research institutions to prevent recurrence of such lapses, the Committee would like to stress that since pesticides are potentially hazardous chemicals and have significant bearing on human and environmental health, no laps whatsoever in this regard can be condoned. The Central Insecticides Board and Registration Committee (CIB&RC) is reportedly inquiring into the matter. The Committee desire that inquiry should *inter-alia*, cover the following points:—

- Reasons why the Chaudhary Charan Singh Haryana Agriculture University, Hisar recommended Tebuconazole fungicide by specific brand name of RAXIL to farmers in its Package of Practices forum approved treatment of Karnal Bunt disease in wheat crop.
- Propriety and legality of the action of M/s Bayer Crop Science India publishing the recommendation of some State Agriculture Universities in its advertisements wherein RAXIL's effectiveness in treating Karnal Bunt disease in wheat crop is claimed.

- Has any study been carried out regarding the infestation of loose smut, flag smut or Karnal bunt disease in wheat crop in Haryana before mandating the use of RAXIL fungicide in Rabi 2010-11. Was such a study carried out afterwards?
- Propriety and legality of the State Agriculture Department of Haryana spending Central money on RAXIL, a specific brand of M/s Bayer Crop Science India, for unapproved treatment.

### **Reply of the Government**

Government of India has advised State Governments and Agricultural Universities to desist from permitting use of pesticides which run contrary to their terms of registration. All State Agriculture Universities have also been advised to review the package of practices devised by them. Any recommendation for use of any pesticide that is in contravention of Central Insecticides Board and Registration Committee (CIB&RC) approvals should be withdrawn forthwith.

State Government of Haryana has been separately apprised about the details of legal/regulatory framework in relation to registration of pesticides and the need to respect the system for the sake of safety of human, animals and environment.

In addition, State Government of Haryana has been requested to conduct investigation and fix accountability for non-approved usage of pesticide in the State, particularly with regard to recommendation for use of RAXIL 2% DS for seed treatment in wheat against Karnal Bunt. Government of Haryana has also been asked to issue clear instruction to all concerned authorities to desist from making recommendation of pesticide usage which is not approved by CIB&RC.

CIB&RC has set up a Sub-Committee under Assistant Director General, ICAR to investigate any possible wrongdoing on the part of M/s Bayer Crop Science Limited (Bayer) in the sale of RAXIL 2% DS for control of Karnal Bunt when such label claim was not approved. This Sub Committee, *inter-alia* will also look into following issues:—

- Why the Chaudhary Charan Singh Haryana Agriculture University, Hisar recommended Tebuconazole fungicide by specific brand name of RAXIL to farmers in its Package of Practices for treatment of Karnal bunt disease in wheat crop?

- Propriety and legality of the action of M/s Bayer Crop Science India in publishing the recommendation of some State Agriculture Universities in its advertisements wherein RAXIL's effectiveness in treating Karnal Bunt disease in wheat crop is claimed.
- Whether any study been carried out, before and/or afterwards, regarding the infestation of loose smut, flag smut or Karnal bunt disease in wheat crop in Haryana before mandating the use of RAXIL fungicide in Rabi 2010-11?
- Propriety and legality of the State Agriculture Department of Haryana spending Central Government money on RAXIL, a specific brand of M/s Bayer Crop Science India, for unapproved treatment.

[Ministry of Agriculture (Department of Agriculture and Co-operation), F. No.6-3/2014-RKVY dated the 10 June, 2014]

NEW DELHI;  
13 March, 2015  

---

22 Phalguna, 1936 (Saka)

HUKM DEO NARAYAN YADAV,  
Chairperson,  
Committee on Agriculture.

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE  
(2014-15)

MINUTES OF THE EIGHTH SITTING OF THE COMMITTEE

The Committee sat on Thursday, the 13th November, 2014 from 1100 hrs. to 1315 hrs. in Committee Room No. 53, Parliament House, New Delhi.

PRESENT

Shri Hukm Deo Narayan Yadav — *Chairperson*

MEMBERS

*Lok Sabha*

2. Md. Badaruddoza Khan
3. Shri Konakalla Narayana Rao
4. Shri C.L. Ruala
5. Shri Arjun Charan Sethi
6. Shri Satyapal Singh
7. Shri Virendra Singh
8. Shri Jai Prakash Narayan Yadav

*Rajya Sabha*

9. Sardar Sukhdev Singh Dhindsa
10. Shri Janardan Dwivedi
11. Shri Vinay Katiyar
12. Shri Mohd. Ali Khan
13. Shri Rajpal Singh Saini
14. Shri Ram Nath Thakur



15. Shri Shankarbhai N. Vegad

16. Shri Darshan Singh Yadav

SECRETARIAT

1. Smt. Abha Singh Yaduvanshi — *Director*
2. Shri C. Vanlalruata — *Deputy Secretary*

2. At the outset, the Chairperson welcomed the Members of the Committee to the Sitting. The Committee then took up for consideration Memorandum No.2 regarding request of the Government of Haryana for an opportunity of hearing in connection with the 61st Report of the Committee on 'Rashtriya Krishi Vikas Yojana – An Evaluation'. After some deliberation, the Committee decided to accede to the request of the State Government, subject to approval by Hon'ble Speaker. They further decided that the representatives of Department of Agriculture and Cooperation may also be asked to appear before the Committee simultaneously.

- |         |     |     |     |     |
|---------|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| *3. *** | *** | *** | *** | *** |
| *4. *** | *** | *** | *** | *** |
| *5. *** | *** | *** | *** | *** |

*The Committee, then, adjourned.*

---

\*\*\* Matter not related to this Report.

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE  
(2014-15)

MINUTES OF THE FOURTEENTH SITTING OF THE COMMITTEE

The Committee sat on Thursday, the 15th January, 2015 from 1500 hrs. to 1640 hrs. in Committee Room '139' Parliament House Annexe, New Delhi.

PRESENT

Shri Hukm Deo Narayan Yadav — *Chairperson*

MEMBERS

*Lok Sabha*

2. Prof. Ravindra Vishwanath Gaikwad
3. Dr. Tapas Mandal
4. Shri Ajay Nishad
5. Shri Dalpat Singh Paraste
6. Shri Nityanand Rai
7. Shri Mukesh Rajput
8. Shri Konakalla Narayana Rao
9. Shri Satyapal Singh
10. Shri Kadiyam Srihari
11. Shri Jai Prakash Narayan Yadav
12. Shri Dharmendra Yadav

*Rajya Sabha*

13. Sardar Sukhdev Singh Dhindsa
14. Shri Janardan Dwivedi

15. Shri Vinay Katiyar
16. Shri Mohd. Ali Khan
17. Shri Ram Nath Thakur
18. Shri Shankarbhai N. Vegad

SECRETARIAT

1. Shri Abhijit Kumar — *Joint Secretary*
2. Smt. Abha Singh Yaduvanshi — *Director*
3. Shri C. Vanlalruata — *Deputy Secretary*

WITNESSES

**Ministry of Agriculture  
(Department of Agriculture and Cooperation)**

1. Shri Ashish Bahuguna — Secretary
2. Shri R.L. Jamuda — Special Secretary
3. Shri Narendra Bhooshan — Joint Secretary
4. Shri Utpal Kumar Singh — Joint Secretary
5. Shri Rajesh Kumar Singh — Joint Secretary
6. Shri J.S. Sandhu — Agriculture Commissioner

**Ministry of Agriculture  
(Department of Animal Husbandry, Dairying and Fisheries)**

- Shri Rajbir Singh Rana — Joint Secretary

**Government of Haryana**

1. Shri D.S. Dhese — Chief Secretary
2. Shri Dhanpat Singh — Additional Chief Secretary
3. Shri Ramesh Krishan — Director General
4. Dr. B.S. Duggal — Managing Director

2. At the outset, the Chairman welcomed the Members of the Committee and the representatives of the Ministry of Agriculture (Department of Agriculture and Cooperation) and Government of Haryana to the Sitting and apprised the witnesses of the provisions of the Directions 55(1) and 58 of the Directions by the Speaker.

3. After the customary introduction, the Committee heard the views of the representatives of the Ministry of Agriculture and State Government of Haryana on the Subject 'Rashtriya Krishi Vikas Yojana – An Evaluation'.

4. The Committee after deliberating upon the Subject under consideration decided to close the matter and accordingly prepare the Action Taken Report on the recommendations of the Committee contained in their 61st Report (15th Lok Sabha).

A verbatim record of the proceedings has been kept separately.

*The Committee then adjourned.*

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE  
(2014-15)

MINUTES OF THE EIGHTEENTH SITTING OF THE COMMITTEE

The Committee sat on Wednesday, the 4th March, 2015 from 1430 hrs. to 1500 hrs. in Chamber of the Chairperson, Committee on Agriculture, Room No. 138 (Third Floor), Parliament House, New Delhi.

PRESENT

Shri Hukm Deo Narayan Yadav — *Chairperson*

MEMBERS

*Lok Sabha*

2. Prof. Ravindra Vishwanath Gaikwad
3. Shri Nalin Kumar Kateel
4. Md. Badaruddoza Khan
5. Dr. Tapas Mandal
6. Shri Janardan Mishra
7. Shri Ajay Nishad
8. Shri Dalpat Singh Paraste
9. Shri Nityanand Rai
10. Shri Mukesh Rajput
11. Shri C.L. Ruala
12. Shri Satyapal Singh
13. Shri Jai Prakash Narayan Yadav

*Rajya Sabha*

14. Shrimati Renuka Chowdhury
15. Shri Janardan Dwivedi
16. Shri Mohd. Ali Khan
17. Shri Ram Nath Thakur

SECRETARIAT

1. Shri Abhijit Kumar — *Joint Secretary*
2. Smt. Abha Singh Yaduvanshi — *Director*
3. Shri C. Vanlalruata — *Deputy Secretary*

2. At the outset, Chairperson welcomed the Members to the Sitting of the Committee. Then, the Committee took up for consideration the following:—

\* (i)   \*\*\*                   \*\*\*                   \*\*\*                   \*\*\*                   \*\*\*  
         \*\*\*                   \*\*\*                   \*\*\*                   \*\*\*                   ; and

- (ii) Memorandum No. 5 pertaining to the draft Report on the Action Taken by the Government on the Observations/ Recommendations contained in the 61st Report (15th Lok Sabha) of the Committee on Agriculture (2013-14) on 'Rashtriya Krishi Vikas Yojana—An Evaluation' of the Ministry of Agriculture (Department of Agriculture and Cooperation).

3. After some deliberations, the Committee approved the categorization of action taken replies as shown in the Memoranda and adopted the draft Reports without any modification. They authorized the Chairperson to present these Reports to Parliament after getting them factually verified from the concerned Departments.

*The Committee then adjourned.*

---

\* Matter not related to this Report.

## APPENDIX

(Vide Para 4 of Introduction of the Report)

### ANALYSIS OF ACTION TAKEN BY GOVERNMENT ON THE SIXTY-FIRST REPORT (15TH LOK SABHA) OF COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE (2013-14)

- |       |  |                                |
|-------|--|--------------------------------|
| (i)   | Total number of Recommendations  | 10                             |
| (ii)  | Observations/Recommendations which have been Accepted by the Government<br>Para Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7 and 8                              | Total : 07<br>Percentage : 70% |
| (iii) | Observations/Recommendations which the Committee do not desire to pursue in view of the Government's replies                             | Total : NIL<br>Percentage : 0% |
| (iv)  | Observations/Recommendations in respect of which replies of the Government have not been accepted by the Committee<br>Para Nos. 5 and 10 | Total : 02<br>Percentage : 20% |
| (v)   | Observations/Recommendations in respect of which Final replies of the Government are still awaited<br>Para No. 9                         | Total : 01<br>Percentage : 10% |





---

---

“All Parliamentary Publications including DRSC Reports are available on sale at the Sales Counter, Reception, Parliament House (Tel. Nos. 23034726, 23034495, 23034496), Agents appointed by Lok Sabha Secretariat and Publications Division, Ministry of Information and Broadcasting, CGO Complex, Lodhi Road, New Delhi (Tel. Nos. 24367260, 24365610) and their outlets. The said information is available on website ‘[www.parliamentofindia.nic.in](http://www.parliamentofindia.nic.in)’.

The Souvenir Items with logo of Parliament are also available at Sales Counter, Reception, Parliament House, New Delhi. The Souvenir items with Parliament Museum logo are available for sale at Souvenir Shop (Tel. No. 23035323), Parliament Museum, Parliament Library Building, New Delhi. List of these items are available on the website mentioned above.”

---

---