

**COLLABORATIVE WORKSHOP ON SECURING LIVING INCOMES FOR FARM HOUSEHOLDS
Goa, July 31-August 3, 2019**

BACKGROUND

(i) Focusing on Farmer Incomes

India stands at a remarkable juncture. We have 800 million people of employable age, a number that is estimated to reach 1100 million by 2050. Any imagination of India's development ought to include sustainable livelihoods for the billion plus people that help them and their families flourish.

More than 50% of the working population still derives livelihood from agriculture and allied activities, even after the number has reduced in the past two decades. Considering the absence of an employment boom in other sectors, the phenomenon of jobless growth becoming a global trend and the unsustainability of massive rural to urban migration, we need to acknowledge that a large section of our population is likely to remain in agriculture and allied activities, and we should focus our economic policies to improve small farmer livelihoods, rural non-farm livelihoods and ecological sustainability.

How to improve the livelihoods is a matter of discussion, but we can all agree that: *A dignified and secure living income should be the right of every hardworking agricultural household.*

A positive development in recent years is the increased focus on farmer incomes. Many farmer organizations have been demanding the guarantee of a minimum living income for farmer households.

The Union Government made 'Income Security for Farmers' a cornerstone of its Budget presentation in 2016-17 and announced a goal of Doubling the Income of Farmers by 2022. In the past year, state governments have launched Income Support schemes for farmers beginning with Rythu Bandhu in Telangana and KALIA in Odisha, followed by other states like Jharkhand, West Bengal and Andhra Pradesh, and then the Union Government's PM-KISAN scheme. Meanwhile, another approach was indicated by the manifesto promise of a Minimum Income Guarantee scheme by one of the national parties. The Economic Survey of 2017-18 also triggered a debate on Basic Income Support.

(ii) Different Approaches & Lines Of Thought

While there seems to be an emerging consensus that farmer incomes should be the focus, there are diverse viewpoints not only on how to reach the goal but also on what the goal should be. Some of the viewpoints may be described as below, while noting that they are not watertight and there is much overlap.

1) Improving yields and productivity as the key to raising incomes through larger volumes of marketable produce – this is a continuation of the thinking from the Green Revolution and typically emphasizes better seed varieties, expanding irrigation and more intensive agriculture.

2) A Basket of Measures (schemes, technological and policy interventions) should be pursued for higher incomes. This is the approach indicated by the report of the Dalwai Committee on Doubling Farmers' Incomes – which recommends numerous sensible and wide-ranging actions but without time-bound targets and accounting for how it would all add up to the farmer incomes.

3) Direct Income Support – either for subsidizing cultivation costs on per-acre basis as in Telangana's Rythu Bandhu scheme or as income augmentation per household as in Odisha's KALIA, A.P.'s Rythu Bharosa, Centre's PM-KISAN, etc. Key issues here have been whether the support reaches only land-owners with titles or the actual cultivators, and the issue of equity in spending public funds.

4) Income Guarantee with targeted income transfer as last resort – which involves assuring a minimum average income level to farm households, orienting all support systems to achieve this income level, and using cash transfer only for those categories which face a shortfall in a given year.

5) Addressing inequities in agrarian structure as the key measure – by expanding land ownership and access to marginal and landless farmers, and systemic recognition to tenant farmers, women farmers and adivasi farmers, income can be enhanced where it is most needed.

6) Ecological sustainability as the key focus – with the ecological crisis reaching a breaking point with soil depletion, abysmal groundwater levels, damaged farm ecosystem and climate change challenges, there should be a radical shift in the model of agriculture in order to address the issue of farm livelihoods.

7) Universal basic services, rural employment guarantee and universal pensions as the triad of economic support system for rural India instead of direct cash transfers aimed at farmers.

These are not exclusive schools of thought and many of us may be votaries for more than one. Another perspective is that the solutions for farmer household incomes lie in the non-farm sector. And there are many questions and dilemmas to grapple with. Here is a sample:

- How do we establish a regular measurement of farmer incomes and a benchmark index or measure to assess progress? Even with all the emphasis on doubling farmer incomes, we don't have this.
- Should Direct Income Support schemes replace existing support systems such as MSP and subsidies, or is this an augmentation while other support systems should continue and be strengthened?
- What level of income should be targeted? What components should be included in the income?
- Who is a Farmer? Have we analyzed how various policy measures impact different sets of farmers? How should the government identify and reach farmers of all categories, such as tenant farmers, women farmers, adivasi farmers, animal rearers?

(iii) The Collaborative Workshop

It is in this context that this workshop on Farmer Incomes was organized jointly by Bharat Krishak Samaj along with Alliance for Sustainable & Holistic Agriculture (ASHA) with facilitation by Socratus and Fields of View, in Goa, as a 4-day workshop between July 31st (Wednesday) and August 3rd (Saturday) of 2019.

The workshop brought together people of great and diverse experience in grappling with the questions of farmers and agriculture, for thinking collectively on these issues. The participants included people experienced in senior official roles at the Centre and different states, leaders from farmer unions and political organizations, and academic experts and researchers – representing diverse viewpoints, as well as representatives of farmer producer organisations. To a certain extent, the diverse viewpoints are a matter of differences in priorities, but they may also point to different worldviews altogether. The workshop's process was designed specially to engage the deep expertise of its participants and help collect that wisdom into a coherent whole, which requires a real meeting of minds. That, in turn, required methods for evoking knowledge, aligning multiple viewpoints and helping people collaborate in an open space.

The sessions co-designed by Socratus and Fields of View are intended to unlock our collective energies. We will be using a range of creative methods for that purpose, from exercises that help us identify with a diverse range of farmers to the design of artifacts that challenge our imaginative capacities.

At the workshop, participants put their minds together in plenary sessions and small groups to tackle different dimensions of the problem of farmer incomes. As preparatory work, a pre-workshop questionnaire was sent on some of the topics of discussions to elicit views and responses beforehand. As many as 15 members responded to the questionnaire and sent back their views (a compilation of the responses is part of this report).

The workshop chose the following topics and themes for its conversations/dialogues and outputs.

- *Vision on Farmer Incomes:* All participants shared what they would like to see achieved in terms of the incomes and situation of farmers. In the panel sessions on Day 1, each participant also used the opportunity to present a brief, 8-minute summary of their thoughts on how to reach their goal on farmer incomes (their “key pathways” or “package of interventions”).
- *Definition and Diversity of farmers:* The workshop then dwelt on the definition of farmers, the diverse range of farmers in the country, the issues of how to identify and reach them.
- *Resources available:* Participants then discussed budgets and resources pool available, by identifying the budgetary implications of the different measures proposed, and grappling with the trade-offs.
- *Specific topics and interventions:* The main output of the workshop was around 8 topics (other than ‘pathways’ for particular kinds of farmers) – four of these were topics on which seemingly divergent views exist, which also present dilemmas. Four others were policy interventions that are supposed to secure farmer incomes. These eight topics were chosen based on votes by participants.
- *Concrete plans for collaborations:* The last day of the workshop was focused on not just reviewing the processes of the workshop, but also on a few concrete plans for future collaborations, and a 100-day plan for each such proposal.

THIS REPORT

This Report consists of the outputs that came out of various groups including the additional comments that were posted by other participants, plus a summing up attempted by the organisers.

1. INCOME GOALS

The workshop began with a round-robin-formatted articulation on what Income Goals or aspirations does each participant have, for farmers in India. The inquiry was around whether it should be a targeted level based on some rationale/formula, or just a relative target relative to current incomes of farmers, or incomes of an average Indian. The responses were varied, and the following:

- Income goals cannot be just for farmers, and the whole economy should be taken into account, and it is desirable to have “Social Minimum Necessary Income” which will be relative, determined by citizens themselves;
- Living Incomes (for farmers or anyone else) should be more than minimum wage levels – however, to be pragmatic to begin with, they should be at least 25 days X 2 adults X Rs. 350/day/person which is the legally mandated minimum wage in India now. This is around Rs. 17500/month per household;
- Rs. 15000/month/household will be an adequate target for an average farmer at all-India level;
- Having a target of an annual growth rate in incomes is more realistic than fixing living income figures. This could be an 8-10% growth rate which also accounts for about 5% of inflation, and should be a stable annual growth rate;
- The targeted income should be on par with at least non-farm rural employment/jobs to bring in inter-sectoral parity;
- The income levels, to begin with, should be fixed for basic needs, as per Maslow’s Hierarchy of Human Needs. Such a target level should be on par with other sectors or at least minimum in the Pay Commission slabs. However, the spirit of enterprise should not be affected by such income goals;

- It is important to focus on Income from Farming and not on the income of a household from various sources including non-farm. For this, ensuring price realisation at at least 50% over cost of production should be the target;
- The goal of farmer incomes should be such that it ensures "dignified living" (with inter-sectoral parity as only a secondary consideration), and what constitutes such dignified living can easily be evolved. A minimum income plus an incentive, adding up to Rs. 20000 per month per household is desirable as a goal. Within this, at least 10000 per month should be from cultivation;
- A national level "decent living" income can be arrived at and targeted;
- Farmers' incomes should be pegged at Class IV level of state level pay commission slabs, and in addition to this, pensions should also be assured. Such minimum monthly income targets will help farmers take more risk – this should not be seen as a moral hazard to entrepreneurial outlook;
- There should be a Purchasing Power Parity Index evolved based on which income targets should be fixed;
- The target should be Rs.10,000 per month for Income from Farming (not for the household from all sources), keeping in mind 40-50% time of 2 adults of a family being spent on farming, along with capital deployed, maintenance costs etc. If another valuation is taken into account, which is of providing 20-30% of the retail price of the consumer that the food industry collects, with farmers moving up the value chain, the income targets should be fixed at Rs. 20,000/month/household.
- Incomes should be at least equal to the lowest paid government employee. Such incomes might accrue if the number of farmers is reduced;
- Target income should be at least Rs. 18000/-, indexed to CPI; further, price realisation and crop incomes should be at least 50% above comprehensive cost of production (C2);
- Target income level should be Rs. 15000/month at least;
- Minimum rural household income levels should be fixed (it need not be just farm households) – within this, payment of Rs. 1500/child, Rs. 3000/old person and Rs. 3000/woman should be built in;
- While legally fixed minimum wages will add up to Rs 18000/month/household, keeping in mind wage rates in Telangana, the income targets for farmers should be Rs. 24000/month.
- At least legally mandated minimum wage levels, which have been fixed using a formula which is very different and discriminatory against certain categories of households when compared to Pay Commission formula, should accrue to all farm households as income targets – this is anywhere between Rs. 18000 to Rs. 20000/month.

It was clear from the views expressed by all participants that income aspirations held for farmers are not just around 'doubling of farmers' incomes' but a targeted income level that provides 'dignified living', which can be arrived at using a formula of different expenditure components that are needed for a decent living. The average figure, as an average across the targets that different participants quoted, is about Rs. 20,000/month for household at current prices. It was also felt that it is desirable to have a clear sub-target for income goals from farming (cultivation and livestock). Participants felt it was possible to have a good match between the value that can be derived from an average landholding size in India (and how much of that value can go to the farmer) and the level of income needed to meet basic needs.

2. DEFINITIONAL CLARITY ABOUT A "FARMER"

Without clarity on who is a "farmer" or what is a "farm household", operationalising any concept around 'incomes for dignified living' will not be possible. Participants of the workshop dwelled on definitional clarity around who is a farmer or what constitutes a farm household.

The participants, after discussing essential features of a farm household and official definitions of an "agricultural households", concluded that definition should definitely not be linked only to land ownership. Within any definition linking farmers to land, there should be a consideration for commons or CPRs also and not just private land. And within private land, it is not just land title ownership, but operational holdings or possession of land that might be owned by others too.

It was also felt that categorisation of farmers is for a purpose related to interventions that would ensure dignified living and not just for theoretical purposes. It was agreed that having a dynamic and inclusive definition, keeping in mind the different sources of income that a household has, is useful, even as certain kinds of households can be safely kept out (government employment, income tax payee etc.).

Labour investment as well as entrepreneurship should be key features of any definition. Labour is both about manual labour as well as management related labour put in. A certain right over the produce is also a key feature of who gets to be called or considered as a Farmer.

It was agreed that wage-earning agricultural workers are best kept out of the definition of a "farmer" for more focused interventions that are needed for them. Similarly for fishers. However, livestock gatherers as well as households combining forest gathering with some cultivation were included, along with others like bee-keepers etc. The definition of the group of participants in that sense mostly veered towards the 70th Round NSSO survey's definition of an agricultural household. Women from households who work on family-owned land were sought to be visibilised as farmers through a proposal for joint titling of land, while other women farmers will get covered in the inclusive definition given above as livestock rearers, cultivators etc.

It was agreed that the definition should serve the purpose of identifying and extending benefits and support to those who need to be supported for obtaining incomes for dignified living in agriculture. The multiple sources of income, and the proportions from agriculture would be a key to such identification – these are mostly in combination of land + labour outcomes. This session concluded that the key question might not be so much about "what constitutes a farmer household", but more about what are the various categories of farm households without assuming anything about a "typical or average farmer", and what is the differentiated approach that needs to be taken for each category. It is also clear that farmers may move across categories, and that is where a dynamic identification system also is needed.

Identification of Farmer Households:

The need for identifying and registering all farmer households in the country was acknowledged. Here, the inclusion of tenant farmers in Odisha in the KALIA database and the Andhra Pradesh Licensed Cultivators' Act and LEC Identity cards were noted as possibilities. E-crop booking of Andhra Pradesh to record cultivators was also brought up. The FRUITS portal of Karnataka which is a unified database for all farmers in the state, across 5 different departments was discussed as a possible way forward.

3. PANEL PRESENTATIONS ON PATHWAYS FOR INCOME SECURITY

Dr Ramesh Chand, Member, NITI Aayog made a presentation on the Government of India's road map and strategy for improving farmers' incomes. The Panel Presentations of all participants' pathways for income security were captured as sketch notes. Because the workshop was run on Chatham House rules, the same is not being re-captured here. Overall, participants presented an approach of focusing on the most marginalised farmers, and the lowest income states, to double farmers income and make it a doable proposition.

4. PROPOSALS FOR DIFFERENT FARMER GROUPS

Here, what appears in the first set of tables under each topic are the proposals evolved by the group of participants which worked on the topic. In the addendum section under the proposals are comments received from other participants of the workshop either in the form of endorsements, or newer proposals or some concerns raised.

(i) Proposals for Rain-fed Farmers

Sl. No.	Name and Description	
1	Special Mission on Agriculture at State and Centre with 30% Budget (of Total Agri Budget)	
2	Water	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Better use of rainwater- Watershed Development & Recharge of Groundwater Groundwater conservation and better use through borewell sharing, ban new borewells in groundwater-critical areas. Technology for efficient use of water - Micro-Irrigation etc.
3	Suitable Crops	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Incentives for dryland crops- Remuneration Price Support, focus on Protective Irrigation and Soil water retention. Tree cover, Horticulture and Agro-Forestry
4	Diverse sources of Income and Governance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Integrate livestock including dairy, goats, sheep, poultry, piggeries, sericulture Special draught Manual for Rainfed areas and Implementation Timely Measurement of Water Resources and Groundwater - Special agency Focus Research on Rainfed Agriculture Village-level Water Budgeting Weather Advisories

Addendum to Proposals: Provide full automatic crop insurance coverage - Govt. to pay the premium as per cultivation records.

(ii) Proposals for Tenant Farmers

Sl. No.	Name and Description	
1	Model Land Leasing Law to be adopted by all states, over-riding all pre-existing tenancy laws so as to provide assurance to landowner and open the way for legally recognised agreements.	
2	Registration of all tenants as farmers but delinking this record from revenue records. Gram Sabha to be empowered to identify tenant farmer. A special card to be issued	
3	Registered tenant to be entitled to:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Crop Loans Insurance under PMFBY Crop loss compensation under NDRF Subsidy under various govt scheme
4	Strengthening of general welfare schemes for the entire rural population:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Education Health Food
5	Improved infrastructure for:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Rural roads under PMGSY Minor Irrigation

Addendum to Proposals

Proposal Number	Modify	Endorsements	Raise a Flag
1	Model Land Leasing Act needs a big overhaul to give the right to lessees	one	One Flag without comment One Flag with a comment: Land leasing law to be critically reviewed Model Land Leasing Act needs big Overhaul to give the right to lessees
2	Include the registration of tenants as onus on the government in the Act itself	two	Include the registration of tenants as onus on the government in the Act itself
3	Make it illegal for non-cultivating landowners to take crop loans and input subsidies	two	
4		one	
5		one	

(iii) Proposals for Marginal Farmers

Sl. No.	Name and Description	
1	Making small farm viable by:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Incentivising group farming, especially by women and disadvantaged groups (e.g. Kudumbashree), FPOs • Help economies of scale by custom hiring centres, supportive infrastructure
2	Enhanced productivity in sustainable manner:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Diversification, especially in ecologically sustainable crops • high value crops
3	Opportunities for allied activities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Livestock credit, esp. for purchase of animals and birds • Marketing support free from the control of traders and big farmers
4	Expanded support for MGNREGS	
5	Non-farm job opportunities:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dignified and remunerative job opportunities through the year in the vicinity • Skilling and training
6	Better and universal access to social services	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Education • Health • Food security (Eligibility under NFSA)
7	Regular survey of marginal farmers distress	

Addendum to Proposals

Proposal Number	Modify	Endorsements	Raise a Flag
1 to 7		Provide full, automatic insurance coverage-Government to pay the premium as per cultivation records	

(iv) Proposals for Green Revolution (Belt) Farmers

Sl. No.	Name and Description
1	The current system of fertilizer and electricity subsidies be changed to DBT so that more water-guzzling crops are dis-incentivised

2	Stop procurement of paddy in critical blocks (groundwater depletion status to be built in)
3	Better funding of research on oilseeds and kharif pulses, especially for kharif
4	Payment for ecosystem services (PES)
5	Massive use of technology for extension, and investing on low cost extension
6	Improved governance to reduce the use of input-line of pesticides. Traceability, Online Monitoring

Addendum to Proposals: **None**

(v) Proposals for Women Farmers

Sl. No.	Name and Description	
1	Proposal for land titling	This proposal suggests that it should be mandatory for Women's names to be added to the land titles
2	Proposal for Cadre of Women Extension workers	This proposal suggests allocating women as extension staff to increase the proportion to a target of at least 50%
3	Proposal for cash transfer to women farmers	This proposal suggests government cash transfer be made to bank A/C of the female members of farming households

Addendum to Proposals

Proposal Number	Modify	Endorsements	Raise a Flag
1	All land titles should be given ONLY to women	General endorsement	
2			
3	Should be shared between the male and female house heads.		

New Proposals:

- Register all women farmers including Livestock rearers
- Make sure that women farmers are a part of all the FPOs- both at Membership and Governance levels
- Promote technologies that reduce drudgery but do not dislocate women farmers
- Proper identification of women's work including non-economic.

(vi) Proposals for Agri-workers

Sl.	Name and Description	
1	Welfare Board	Agricultural Workers Welfare Board with a corpus fund for contingency expenses, provision of work facilities and child support
2	Green Army	Support Green Army Labour Cooperatives as service providers for all agricultural activities with skills and deployment of appropriate machinery
3	Women Agri-workers Welfare & Protection Act	To ensure Welfare and protection from exploitation and mandatory provisions for pregnant women and children
4	Targeted Animal Husbandry Schemes	Ensure that each Agri worker family can adopt dairy, small ruminants (goats/sheep) or backyard poultry
5	Agri-based Village Industry and Secondary Activities	Using local resources, value addition, etc. for local non-farm related skill development activities

6	Surplus Land Distribution	Scheme for distributing available surplus land and fallow government lands to landless (not common property resources)
7	Free, high-quality health and education services	
8	Proper implementation of NREGS	
9	Pension scheme for all rural families	
10	Initiative to eradicate child labor	
11	Homestead land of 10 cents to every Agri worker family as a right	

Addendum to Proposals

Proposal Number	Modify	Endorsements	Raise a Flag
1	Portability of Government Welfare Schemes for agri workers		
6		One	Implementation Challenge
8	NREGS component should be allowed in cultivation. Social auditing should be properly done.	One	
10	Jail anyone who violates the act to employ child labour	One	
11	Modify - Provide 5 cents (realistically) for homestead	One	

(vii) Proposals for Adivasi Farmers

Sl. No.	Description
1	Full and proper implementation of the Forests Rights Act 2006
2	Coverage under institutional credit, with particular focus on financial activities along with financial literacy
3	Identification and registration of all forest dependant Adivasi farmers so that all entitlements can be accessed by individual farmers
4	Adivasi communities facing acute animal-human conflict can be re-settled into plantation like areas in the vicinity of their origin.
5	Massive mixed forest regeneration using CAMPA funds
6	Periodic socio-economic assessment surveys to be taken (ideally every 5 years)
7	Income guarantee, unconditional, for all households
8	Strengthen the framework of social, economic and environmental assessment, giving due weightage to habitat rights when it comes to "development projects"
9	Improvement in marketing opportunities for minor forest produce including investment on the creation of co-operatives (capacity building and capital) infrastructure, improve MSP for MFP schemes based on the opportunity cost of produce
10	Research that builds on and takes into account the specific community knowledge and conditions of physical and economic existence
11	Nutrition to be improved through agriculture and forest pathways including decentralized food schemes
12	Nutrition guarantee, employment guarantee and income guarantee as a trinity of entitlements

Addendum to Proposals

Proposal Number	Modify	Endorse	Raise a Flag
1	In addition, ensure that the 1927 act is not modified	Endorse : integrated land, income + food security for Adivasi	
2		General endorsement	
3	Should be shared between the male and female house heads.		

(viii) Proposal for Grassroots Farm Managers

Sl. No.	Name and Description	
1	District Knowledge & Value-chain Center/System	
2	Citizen Service Center (Associates - Self-employed/ Revenue via fee) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ACABC (Manager) • Self Certified (Digital Academy) 	Delivers: Higher-order knowledge/services, Market Intelligence, advisories, market linkage/demand matching, product design, professional services, portfolio planning, agro-vet advisory, soil testing, infrastructure, etc.
3	Other Decentralized Services (Single point integration)	

Addendum to Proposals: None

5. "DIFFICULT DIALOGUES" – CONVERSATIONS TO EXPLORE DIVERGENCES AND CONVERGENCES ON SOME ISSUES THAT PERTAIN TO FARMER INCOMES

(i) Dialogue on Price Support and Income Support

1. Price support and income support are both required without compromising on any public welfare schemes
2. In-kind subsidies should be moved to direct cash support to allow farmers to directly purchase inputs based on their needs
3. An unconditional, per hectare payment can be designed, possibly with a cap of 4 hectares per farmer, ensuring equity. The existing input subsidy regime is distorting markets and is environmentally destructive. Shifting to DBT will encourage an agro-ecologically compatible agricultural system.
4. On the output side, a combination of physical procurement and deficit payment must be used for crops with declared MSP. This will be undertaken based on supply and demand in the market and on agri-logistics for that particular crop.
5. At least 25-40% of present production should be brought under the MSP procurement regime
6. For perishable produce, the focus should be two-fold: a. Support under a market intervention scheme; b. Creation of market infrastructure, value chain and processing
7. Three types of payments are proposed:
 - a. Obligatory payments - standard payment for all
 - b. Flexible payment - for incentivization and exigencies
 - c. Transitional payment - to smoothen out the process of shifting in-kind subsidies to cash transfers

Discussion in the Plenary

- Farmers may not invest the money back into agriculture
 - We are proposing that farmers are rational entrepreneurs who have the right to decide where their resources will be invested, and support system should give such freedom of choice.

- We need to work out how the Price Deficiency Payment system can be designed and implemented better to benefit farmers.
- DBT should be made conditional to real cultivators being identified first. Otherwise, the vested interests will be further entrenched capturing all benefits meant for cultivators just by virtue of land ownership, which is both immoral and unaccountable/ineffective.

(ii) Dialogue on Productivity with Sustainability

“Optimal” vs. “Maximum” Productivity – the overarching statement:

- There are multiple pathways that exist for higher profitability for farmers
 - a. Productivity
 - b. Higher price realization
- Farmers are primarily concerned with productivity and better prices but not always about sustainability. They will continue to attempt to maximise yield as they are used to.
- It is the State that is responsible for creating an ecosystem for sustainability
- The onus of ensuring sustainability cannot be left to the private sector and must be the onus of the public sector through research and extension

Parameters that will govern “productivity with sustainability”:

- Technology and policies
- Access to and ownership of technologies
- Interlocking aspects
- Resource availability

Technologies, Practices and Policies

- Technologies and practices do exist to promote sustainability
- Policies need to reallocate financial resources to incentivize sustainable use of natural resources, pulling them away from being “perverse incentives”
- There must be an incremental rationalization of existing public spending, because it is possible to deploy existing sustainable technologies incrementally for optimal use
- More resources are needed for the deployment of “para-extension” personnel (like scouts and extension sub-inspectors or multi-purpose extension officers) as and when needed for extension to emphasise upon sustainability
- Niche markets need to be created for sustainably produced products with separate labels created and supported for the purpose

Ownership of Technology

- The primacy of public interest goals like sustainability exist explicitly in the public sector
- The apparent contradiction between sustainability and productivity can be resolved through public efforts.

The first step towards bridging the current gap between productivity and sustainability has to begin from a deep political will.

Discussion in the Plenary

- Emphasis on productivity alone causes a lack of sustainability.
- If we produce more, incomes fall at the market front.
- What is the timeline for achieving sustainability in agriculture?
- It is important to note that the precautionary principle also has to be applied for certain decisions.
- Different categories of farmers have different terms of trade. It is important to look at productivity and sustainability specifically in the context of smallholders.
- Input use efficiency, like per-unit use of water, needs to be improved.

- It is not just about policy orientation, but the fact that farmers in their own wisdom and desperation, tend to focus on maximising yield – therefore, focusing on profitability becomes important.

(iii) Dialogue on Resources – Are they available for our proposals?

Target

To allocate an additional 2.5 lakh crores in the annual central budget towards agriculture and related items, including irrigation and water management, rural and marketing infrastructure and MGNREGS, apart from other “agriculture and allied sectors” allocations.

Sources

- A wealth tax of 1% designed such that it applies to the top 1% of wealth holders, who own 51% of the wealth in the country, i.e., 300 lakh crores
- Expected revenue: 3 lakh crores
- An additional 0.5% cess on income tax, equivalent to 18,000 crores
- Reallocation from other current priorities in the budget

Discussion in the Plenary

- It is important to tax agricultural incomes of the largest land-owners, at least to put out a symbolic message, even as we acknowledge that this is actually a small amount if implemented.
- A taxation on vacant land kept for speculative purposes should be introduced.
- We should remember that the largest private investment into agriculture actually comes from farmers themselves.
- It is important to have stable policies for investments to flow in. The climate for agricultural investments also varies vastly across states and this also needs to be addressed.
- India already has a complex taxation system and we need to present simple ideas.

(iii) Dialogue on whether Agriculture should be seen as the hub of employment generation, or should people be moved out of agriculture

Premise

- 50% of the population is dependent on 17% of the GDP, which is not viable
 - Increasing the urban population from 30% to 65% is also not viable
- Hence, From Agri – “culture” to Agri – “enterprise” approach**
- Is it possible to have agriculture as an employment generator?
 - Skilling and re-skilling are needed to move people up the value chain from primary production to agri-dependent goods and services
 - Consider expanding the definition of agriculture GDP to include such goods and services that are up the value addition and dependent on primary produce. For example, agro-processing, medicines, textiles, etc.

Three possible modes to address the issue:

1. Vertical integration
 - Value chain intervention that would require increasing the value realized for the existing skills. One example is including value for ecological services
 - Build new skills to generate more value from the primary produce
2. Horizontal integration

Identify new markets that can be in different locations or sectors, and strengthen existing markets for the goods that are outputs of such value addition made by the farmers
3. Network micro enterprises

Policies to facilitate and not to become barriers to FPOs, producer groups and micro-factories

Prosumer model

- Build local ecosystem to improve local inputs, local services that would enable farmers to provide financially viable services
- Agri-enterprises should be enterprises that are small and that would consider people as appreciable assets rather than people as cost and avoid big capital-intensive enterprises with mainly depreciating assets.

Discussion in the Plenary

- Where will the investment resources be secured from? – one lakh crore rupees from angel investors is needed for capitalisation of 10000 FPOs.
- The enterprise model should also focus on production itself, increasing of crop intensity, greater employment and aggregation potential.

6. PROPOSALS FOR PARTICULAR PATHWAYS TO INCOME SECURITY

(i) Proposal for Statutory Income Guarantee For All Farm Households

Amount of Statutory income

Farmer households should have a right to fair income, guaranteeing a minimum income on average

1. The minimum income does not necessarily have to be the 'target income' (living income)
2. The minimum income level was decided to be 10,000 per household

Data Required

- A regular farm income assessment of different categories of farmers in all categories is necessary. This should be annual assessment.
- Identification of all farmer households including land ownership data

Discussion

- A "farmer statutory income commission" should make the assessment and determine the policy measures needed to be taken to ensure the determined minimum income
- The state must first implement all of the measures at its disposal, like procurement, market support, input support, etc. A direct cash transfer is not the main purpose of a minimum income guarantee
- A minimum income guarantee should be based on income deficiency of that category of farmers from the 'minimum income' determined
- Exclusionary criteria used in PM-Kisan should be used

Budget

Calculating NSSO 2012-13 numbers in nominal value for 2019, 2,20,000 crores is the present shortfall in income of farmer households today.

Discussion in the Plenary

- Will such cash payment not disincentivize aspirational households?
 - The income assessment and deficit payment is based on an 'on average' income, so individual farmers would still have an incentive to produce and earn more.
- How did you decide 10,000 rupees to be the minimum income? To add an element of legitimacy to what you have determined as the minimum, it could be tied to MGNREGS wages. For example, 300 rupees * 25 working days a year
 - The 2012-13 average income is approximately 10,000 in nominal terms today. The idea of the scheme is to allow all farmer households to reach an average prescribed income.
- If we are guaranteeing a minimum income to farmers, why not to other categories of workers?

- It might be beyond the scope of our conversation. However, a Minimum Wages Act exists to ensure a minimum income for wage-based workers.

(ii) Proposal for Making Markets Work for Farmers

Two perspectives emerged on increasing income through markets: "Improve the current markets (efficiency driven approach) and Invent the Future Markets (value capture driven)". There needs to be two kinds of interventions:

1. Improve the current state of infrastructure for post-harvest management of produce
 - a) Grading
 - b) Marketing
 - c) Price fixation
 - d) Warehousing and other infrastructure
2. Allow farmers to capture new value:
 - a) Getting farmers' product closer to the end consumer
 - b) Efficiency driven interventions
 - c) Value-Driven intervention: 10,000 FPOs would need six lakh crore of capital investment
 - d) Successful enterprises like Amul enjoyed a large number of professional management services. The challenge is to build capacity around management and other business skills

Each of these interventions would fall on different categories based on the intensity of effort and benefit derived.

Discussion in the Plenary

- What per cent of the consumer price is realized by the farmer? For horticulture crops, it is right now as low as 2-10% and can be improved significantly.
- Were APMC and other government reforms discussed?
 - Yes. But we need to move beyond the thought that only the mandi is the buyer, which limits the space for interventions.
- What happens to the existing middlemen/players, who are many times also small players?
 - Changing the ecosystem will no doubt have an impact on the middlemen but over time they will likely be integrated into the new system as service providers.

(iii) Proposal for Ecologically Sustainable Agriculture

Goal

To move firmly in the direction of ecologically sustainable agriculture, by incorporating diverse models of agro-ecology, with proper phasing out of agro-chemicals (within this, the case against synthetic pesticides is clear and strong) and unsustainable practices

Data

- Mapping of practices and best practices across the world that are applicable to our conditions
- Creating a set of standardized practices for agroecological approaches
- A database of 'master farmers' who are practising ecologically sustainable agriculture who can be used as centres of research and for extension

Institutions

No new institutions would really need to be created, but high-level bodies at the state and central level to plan and coordinate efforts, directly under the Prime Minister and Chief Ministers, whose job is to re-orient all existing institutions (agriculture education, research and extension-related) towards promoting ecologically sustainable agriculture.

Target timeframe

- Implementation should commence immediately
- 10-year timeframe for research, data mapping etc. to be completed

Challenges

- A trust deficiency between state and non-state actors.
- Backlash can be expected from existing research institutions, pesticide lobbies and input providers.

Discussion in the Plenary

- Is this goal achievable?
 - Yes, though the timeframe might be unclear. It will happen through incentivised, insured crop diversification with assured procurement or market support as is happening on a small scale in Haryana. This can happen over a 10 year time scale.
- Is 'traditional agriculture system' the same as agroecological agriculture?
 - No. They are not the same, though traditional systems are a sub-set of overall agro-ecological paradigm.
- Would it not be better to call all agroecological practices as 'organic' or 'natural' farming?
 - 'Natural' farming might not be the most effective intervention in all regions. We need to emphasize on locally applicable agroecological approaches.
 - Sustainable agriculture might not always mean organic agriculture and can be incremental shifts.
- We also need to consider sustainability of livestock rearing and fisheries.

(iv) Proposal for Agriculture Research and Extension

We need to re-define and re-orient agriculture research and extension. It should deliver:

1. Farmer income
 2. Ecological sustainability
 3. Social Justice (or work towards social justice)
- Tonnage should not be looked at as the outcome of agricultural research
 - Land to lab pathways should exist as opposed to just lab to land, to capture the wide body of knowledge with farmers
 - Research should also achieve micro-macro balance
 - Gender justice should be addressed. Technology should address issues of women farmers and farmworkers
 - Agriculture research should support the entire value chain, beyond just productivity.
 - Right now, 0.5 % of the budget, this should increase to at least 2.5%
 - Research needs to be better connect to extension, which is now completely under the control of the state governments
 - Extension systems collapsed completely in the 90s – Green Revolution was successful because of a functional extension system, so a newly strengthened extension system is needed to bring about a new agroecological revolution. There is a need for a 'green army' - a large extension system with a much lower farmer to extension officer ratio
 - Extension officers should also include more women
 - ATMA tries to bring together all departments to deliver to the farmer, but such a system is only on paper and not functional on the ground. Use community level extension officers
 - Timely weather advisories need to be given to farmers
 - The state agricultural budget has 6-7% kept aside for extension work, much of which goes to pay salaries. But 10% of the budget needs to go towards programmatic work

Discussion in the Plenary

- What do you see as the role of KVKs?
 - KVKs work as both research and extension centers locally. There needs to be more money and humanpower going into these institutions.
- How can you decentralize extension to match agroecological zones?
 - A land to lab approach would help address this.

7. COLLABORATIONS ON DISCRETE PROJECTS, GOING FORWARD

This was created as a 100-day plan, led by a “champion” for an idea.

(i) Establishing a Farmers’ Registry in India

- A draft concept note will be written, covering the need and objective, proposed modalities, legal issues involved, procedures, resources required, data/software/technology issues etc.
- The concept note will be finalised within the team and along with others including by studying the FRUITS system of Karnataka.
- Existing databases of farmers in different states will be compiled into a list, and information that they cover. Platform Commons Foundation will deploy an interns’ team to compile the above.
- After concretising the proposal, a workshop will be sought to be organised along with NITI Aayog, by including state governments and other relevant stakeholders into the discussions.

(ii) Identification and Inclusion of Tenants and Lessee Cultivators

- A Paper on “Licensed Cultivators’ Act 2011” of Andhra Pradesh and Telangana will be created, highlighting key features and state of implementation so far.
- Articles that are co-authored will be published on “DBTs will be distortionary if not preceded by identification and recording of real cultivators”.
- KALIA scheme’s inclusion of tenant cultivators will be studied.
- This issue and its relationship with other ideas like “Registry of Farmers” and “Census of Cultivators” will be worked out some more
- A one or two day workshop (along with the proposed workshop on Farmers’ Registry) will be organised in Delhi to push for this idea.

(iii) Procurement at MSP – Linking to agro-ecological concerns, resource use efficiency and others such parameters

- A draft concept note would be created to begin with.
- An analysis of state of environmental resources, cropping patterns and cost of production data will be done to come up with proposals.
- A road map for at least 5 crops will be created at the national level after the above two.

(iv) Value Chain Ownership by Smallholder Farmers

- A concept note will be created
- A detailed business plan for one FPO will be created next, to detail out the financial workings of the FPO
- The team interested in this will meet to finalise proposals for Government of India and chosen states
- A meeting with relevant stakeholders will be organised

- The team will report back to this group (of participants) on progress and with refined model.
- The same will be published on wiki also

(v) Releasing a 10-point Goa Charter of doable interventions

- A 2-pager listing out doable short and medium term interventions on which there is a broad consensus will be put out in the public domain. This would be done without every participant having to sign off explicitly with their name – however, it will capture the sense of the house and will be put out with disclaimers if any.

(vi) Report on “Alternative Agricultural and Rural Policies”

- Two participants will contribute position papers to the upcoming NRAS (Network on Rural and Agrarian Studies) conference in September 2019 in IIT Delhi.

THE WORKSHOP ENDED BY INFORMING PARTICIPANTS THAT THE REPORT WOULD BE PUT OUT IN THE FORM OF A WIKI PAGE WHICH CAN HAVE UPDATES AND NEW CONCEPTS AND PROJECT IDEAS ADDED BY PARTICIPANTS AS WELL AS OTHER CITIZENS.

ANNEXURES

Collaborating organisations

Bharat Krishak Samaj (BKS)

- A non-political, non-sectarian association of agriculture producers founded on 3rd April, 1955 creates a common meeting ground where all men and women who are interested in strengthening the agricultural economy of the country can meet and utilize their intelligence, resources and energy to help those engaged to produce more from their land.
- BKS seeks to influence the policy environment in favour of farmers through meetings, seminars and publications. By being part of the Budget consultations and other formal consultations organised by the Government of India, BKS influences policy articulation.

Alliance for Sustainable and Holistic Agriculture (ASHA)

- Alliance for Sustainable and Holistic Agriculture or ASHA is an alliance of about 400 diverse organizations drawn from more than twenty states across India, that initially came together through the Kisan Swaraj Yatra (Oct-Dec 2010), a nation-wide mobilization around Food-Farmers-Freedom.
- ASHA seeks to draw the attention of the nation towards the continuing agrarian crisis in India, where adequate attention is not being paid to reviving the farm-based rural economy and livelihoods, even as the current state of degradation of natural resources threatens farm livelihoods further.
- ASHA has been successful in enhancing farmers' seed sovereignty in India in numerous ways, other than influencing the promotion and implementation of organic farming policies, and large scale agro-ecology programmes.

SOCRATUS

- Is a new initiative, founded in January 2019, with the aspiration to bring a new Socratic method, pitched at the collective rather than an individual; a midwife of collective wisdom, a Socratus rather than Socrates. Every wicked problem generates a field of action, i.e., a nexus of data, technologies, skills and stakeholders that in combination delivers solutions through a positive feedback loop.
- Their interventions are aimed to create a rapid "feel" of a field of action through an intensive four-six day process we are calling a wicked sprint - borrowing the term "wicked" from wicked problems and "sprint" from design sprints.
- Ananthapadmanabhan, Rajesh Kasturirangan (co-founders) have taken the lead in curating this workshop.

Fields of View (FoV)

- Fields of View is a not-for-profit research organisation that designs games and simulations to help make better public policy.
- Games and simulations help address the complexity and wickedness of policy problems and these tools have been designed based on research at the intersection of arts, technology, and social sciences.
- Fields of View has developed different methods and approaches to collect qualitative data and facilitate dialogue between diverse stakeholders, and they have brought this expertise to the design of the workshop.
- Fields of View's tools are being used by different Indian and international organisations including Tamil Nadu State Planning Commission, Bangalore Metropolitan Transport Corporation, various UN bodies, and the Department of Atomic Energy.

The workshop has been supported by - The Institute of Peace and Conflict Studies (IPCS) supported by Swissaid, Bharat Krishak Samaj, SOCRATUS and Living Farms supported by BMZ & WHH under project "Promoting sustainable local food systems for a better rural-urban connect in India", which is in short "BMZ-Safe Food Project" Welthungerhilfe India Project Number: IND 1338-16.

COLLABORATIVE WORKSHOP ON SECURING LIVING INCOMES FOR FARM HOUSEHOLDS
“Beleza By the Beach” Resort, Goa, July 31st 2019 (Wednesday) to August 3rd 2019
(Saturday)

PARTICIPANTS

DR RAMESH CHAND, Member, NITI Aayog – Joined over a Skype Video Call

1. Baksi, Sandipan

Sandipan Baksi is the Director of Foundation for Agrarian Studies, Bangalore. He holds an MPhil in Development Studies, and is working on a thesis on the history of science and agriculture in India.

2. Bera, Sayantan

Journalist tracking rural India, with Mint. Formerly, an environment writer and researcher in economics. Earlier with Business Standard and Down To Earth. An M.Phil in Economics from Jawaharlal Nehru University.

3. Dalwai, Dr. Ashok

CEO National Rainfed Area Authority, Ministry of Agriculture & Farmers Welfare, and Chairperson of Government of India’s Inter-Ministerial Committee on Doubling of Farmers’ Income. An alumnus of University of Agricultural Sciences-Dharwad.

4. Garg, Dr. Saurabh

Principal Secretary, Agriculture, Government of Odisha. Alumnus of IIT-Delhi and IIM-Ahmedabad. Earlier with the Ministry of Finance, Government of India. Was also an Advisor to the World Bank Group.

5. Gowda, Dr. Rajeev

Member, Rajya Sabha. Spokesperson of Indian National Congress. Was earlier a Director of the Central Board, Reserve Bank of India. Teaches at Indian Institute of Management, Bangalore.

6. Hussain, Dr. Siraj

Senior Visiting Fellow, Indian Council for Research on Economic Relations (ICRIER); formerly, Secretary of Ministry of Agriculture & Farmers’ Welfare and earlier to that, Secretary, Ministry of Food Processing, Government of India.

7. Jakhar, Ajay Vir

Chairperson, Punjab State Farmers’ Commission. Chairperson, Bharat Krishak Samaj. Citrus Farmer. Columnist.

8. Kammaradi, Dr. TN Prakash

Chairperson of Karnataka State Agriculture Price Commission. Earlier, Professor of Agricultural Economics in the University of Agricultural Sciences Bangalore.

9. Krishnan, Rajesh

CEO of Thirunelly Agri Producer Co (FPO). Organic rainfed farmer and conserver of traditional paddy varieties. Earlier with Greenpeace India as Team Leader for Sustainable Agriculture Campaign.

10. Kumar, Dr. Arun

Economist. Malcolm S. Adiseshiah Chair Professor at Institute of Social Sciences. Formerly, Sukhamoy Chakravarty Chair Professor, Centre for Economic Studies and Planning (CESP), Jawaharlal Nehru University.

11. Kuruganti, Kavitha

Co-Convenor of Alliance for Sustainable & Holistic Agriculture (ASHA). Founder and Member, National Facilitation Team of Mahila Kisan Adhikaar Manch (MAKAAM). Served as Member, Government of India's High Level Committee on Status of Women in India.

12. Mehra, Prashant

Social Intrapreneur working on rural supply chains and smallholder agriculture. Head of MindTree Foundation. Alumnus of IIT Kharagpur. Creator of open access digital platforms for enhancing rural livelihoods like "I Got Crops".

13. Modak, Tapas Singh

Researcher and Programme Manager, Foundation for Agrarian Studies. As part of Project on Agrarian Relations in India (PARI), works on village studies on farmer incomes, access to irrigation and related topics.

14. Ratnoo, Dr. Kuldeep

Director, India Policy Foundation. Clinical Psychologist. Taught at Mayo College, Ajmer.

15. Reddy, Malla

Vice President, All India Kisan Sabha (Ashoka Road). Prominent farmer leader of Telangana.

16. Saini, Shweta

Senior Consultant, Indian Council for Research on Economic Relations (ICRIER). Columnist in national newspapers.

17. Sidhu, B S

Director, Department of Agriculture, Punjab. Secretary, Punjab State Farmers' Commission. Trained as an Agriculture Engineer. Contributed to policy formulation, planning and implementation through key positions. Led efforts that got several awards for Government of Punjab on the agriculture front.

18. Vasavi, Dr. AR

Social Anthropologist and Agrarian Studies expert. Trustee of Punarchith Collective. Formerly with National Institute of Advanced Studies (NIAS). Author of "Harbingers of Rain", "Shadow Space: Suicides and the Predicament of Rural India".

19. Vissa, Kiran

Social activist. Alumnus of IIT-Madras. Founder of Association for India's Development, USA. Co-Convenor of Alliance for Sustainable & Holistic Agriculture (ASHA) and Convenor, Rythu Swarajya Vedika (Telangana & Andhra Pradesh).

20. Yadav, Yogendra

Activist and academic. Psychologist. Senior Fellow at the Centre for the Study of Developing Societies. Founding Member of Swaraj Abhiyan and Jai Kisan Andolan.

The workshop got facilitation, rapporteur and other support from the following teams:

"SOCRATUS": Socratus is a new initiative founded in January 2019 with the aspiration to bring a new Socratic method, for solving complex problems of our times. Pitched at the collective rather than an individual, it is a midwife of collective wisdom - a Socratus, rather than Socrates.

- Balasubramanian, Arvind
- Guruswamy, Ananthapadmanabhan
- Kasturirangan, Rajesh
- Muthu, Arundhati

"FIELDS OF VIEW": Fields of View undertakes research at the intersection of technology, social sciences, and art to design innovative tools for policymaking that is relevant, responsive and fast. For the fifth consecutive year, Fields of View has been featured in the 'Global Go To Think Tank Index Report' by the University of Pennsylvania.

- Dutt, Vaibhav
- Iddya, Yashwin Umesh
- Koganti, Jahnvi RR Krishnan, Sruthi
- Laginya, Puja R
- Palavalli, Bharath
- Raghuram, Prashanth
- Soren, Suruchi
- Muthuprakash, Dr. Siva (for data projections,)
- Veluguri, Divya (as one of the rapporteurs)

PROGRAMME SCHEDULE

COLLABORATIVE WORKSHOP ON SECURING LIVING INCOMES FOR FARM HOUSEHOLDS "Beleza By the Beach" Resort, Goa, July 31st 2019 (Wednesday) to August 3rd 2019 (Saturday)

July 31st 2019 (Wednesday) – First Day of the Workshop

9.30am to 10.00am: Registration	
10.00am to 11.00am	* Welcome & Introduction to the Workshop, Participants' Introduction: <i>Ajay Vir Jakhar</i> * Schedule & ground rules: <i>G. Ananthapadmanabhan</i>
11.00am to 12.00pm	Eliciting responses (Round Robin format): "What is your income goal for farmers in India? Doubling, or Living Incomes or Parity with other sectors?"
12.00pm to 01.15pm	Definitional Issues around Farmer or Farmer Household and Implications– Arriving at a common ground
01.15pm to 02.15pm	<i>LUNCH</i>
02.15pm 03.00pm	Government of India's Strategy and Road Map, followed by Q&A: <i>Dr Ramesh Chand</i> (Session Facilitator: Ajay Vir Jakhar)
03.00pm to 03.15pm	<i>BREAK</i>
3.15pm to 6.45pm (4.45-5.15pm break)	Panels on: "What are the key interventions or pathways you would advocate for, to deliver on improved or targeted farmers' incomes?"

August 1st 2019 (Thursday): Second Day of the Workshop

7:30am to 8:00am	Optional: Guided Meditation
9.00am to 9.15am	Re-cap of the earlier day - Walk-through of sketch notes with any comments
9.15am to 10.15am	"Newspaper of the Future" - Our collective aspiration for Farmers Incomes
10.15am to 11.15am	"In the Government's Shoes" – Understanding the underlying economic assumptions of participants
11.15am to 11.30am	<i>Break</i>
11.30am to 01.00pm	"In the Field" (1) – planning interventions for identified categories of farmers
01.00pm to 2.45pm	<i>LUNCH & BREAK</i>
2.45pm to 4.15pm	"In the Field" (2) – planning interventions for identified categories of farmers

04.15pm to 04.30pm	<i>BREAK</i>
04.30pm to 07.15pm	Simple income scenario projections of some interventions: Plenary discussion on "How much Government and How Much Market"

August 2nd 2019 (Friday): Third Day of the Workshop

7:30am to 8:00am	Optional: Guided Meditation
09.00am to 09.30am	Re-cap of earlier day
09.30am to 12.30pm	Working session 1 – 4 "difficult dialogue" topics, in parallel groups
12.30pm to 01.00pm	<i>LUNCH</i>
01.00pm to 4.00pm	Working session 2 – 4 key topics of interventions, in parallel groups

August 3rd 2019 (Saturday): Final Day of the Workshop

7:30am to 8:00am	Optional: Guided Meditation
9.00am to 10.00am	"Empathy Walk" in pairs
10.00am to 11.45am	Possibilities for Collaborative 100-day projects
11.45am to 01.00pm	Feedback and summing up
<i>LUNCH & DEPARTURES</i>	

Note: The programme schedule has been designed with some flexibility to build in time for short open house plenaries if needed, on relevant topics.

JULY 31ST 2019 (WEDNESDAY and FIRST DAY OF THE WORKSHOP)

PANEL PRESENTATIONS

Topic: ***"What are the key interventions or pathways you would advocate for, to deliver on improved or targeted farmers' incomes?"***

Time Slot for all the Panels: **3.15pm to 6.45pm** (with a break b/w 4.45pm to 5.15pm)

Panel 1: Facilitator: Dr Ashok Dalwai (3.15pm to 4.00pm)

- Ms Shweta Saini
- Dr Siraj Hussain
- Shri Rajesh Krishnan
- Shri Yogendra Yadav
- Dr B S Sidhu

Panel 2: Facilitator: Dr Siraj Hussain (4.00pm to 4.45pm)

- Dr A R Vasavi
- Dr TN Prakash
- Shri Kiran Vissa
- Shri Sandipan Bakshi
- Dr Ashok Dalwai

Panel 3: Facilitator: Dr TN Prakash (5.15pm to 5.50pm)

- Ms Kavitha Kuruganti
- Prof Arun Kumar
- Shri Sayantan Bera
- Shri Malla Reddy

Panel 4: Facilitator: Dr AR Vasavi (5.50pm to 6.35pm)

- Shri Ajay Vir Jakhar
- Shri Prashant Mehra
- Dr Kuldeep Ratnoo
- Dr Saurabh Garg
- Shri Tapas Singh Modak

PRE-WORKSHOP ENGAGEMENT TO ELICIT VIEWS/RESPONSES OF PARTICIPANTS

	Part. 1	Part.2	Part.3	Part.4	Part.5	Part.6	Part.7	Part.8	Part.9	Part.10	Part.11	Part.12	Part.13	Part.14
While we all agree on the importance of improving the incomes of farmers, how do you think a policy goal around farmers' income should be formulated? Is it in terms of		a. Increase the income in relation to their current income - for eg, doubling their income?	c. Increase the income in relation to income or wages in other sectors?	b. Fix a target income and work towards ensuring that.	Achieve a 'social minimum necessary income' which would be a changing income.	b. Fix a target income and work towards ensuring that - for eg, achieving a 'Living Income? (And/Or) c. Increase the income in relation to income or wages in other sectors?	a. Increase the income in relation to their current income - for eg, doubling their income? AND b. Fix a target income and work towards ensuring that - for eg, achieving a 'Living Income?'					Increase income in relation to current income. Income with formal sectors may not be comparable.	Provide non farm alternatives to reduce the proportion dependent on agriculture Increase the income in relation to their current income - for eg, doubling their income?	b. Fix a target income and work towards ensuring that - for eg, achieving a 'Living Income? (And/Or) c. Increase the income in relation to income or wages in other sectors?

Participant 1: Improving agricultural practices that privilege ecological sustainability, economic stability and social justice. To address existing inequities in the social and economic structuring of agriculture but to reclaim and rework localised practices of agriculture. At a macro level to restructure urban-rural and agricultural and industrial divides.

Participant 8: Increase the income in relation to their current income - for eg, doubling their income? Or fix an annual growth rate for incomes in real terms. For example, if inflation is about 5 percent, then the annual target should be for incomes to grow at least 9 to 10 percent so that in real terms the incomes grow by at least 4 percent

Participant 9: It is very important to increase the income level of farmers, especially for small and marginal farmers. There is a need to achieve an income level which will lead a minimum standard of living for these households. We can call it a 'living income' but it should not end up being an income just enough for a bare minimum life (something akin to the poverty line).

The next question is about estimating incomes. In India we lack any official data source on incomes. Another important element to consider here is cost of cultivation. We would strongly recommend the use of C2 cost to arrive at a net income from farming as our studies show that there is often a huge gap between A2 and C2 costs (C2 being significantly higher).

Second, our studies also suggest that Indian countryside is marked by socio-economic differentiation. The Landlords and Rich Capitalist households own the most and best land in the village and gain substantial surplus from agriculture. On the other hand, the lower strata of peasant households are much poorer in terms of their income levels (in fact, farm incomes are often negative for some of the small farmers). Our study on Small Farming in India (evidence from 17 villages located in 9 States of India) suggest a crisis specific to small farming in terms of the inability of small farmer households to

generate adequate incomes to maintain a minimum standard of living. So, any "living income" has to not only try to take into account the cost of living in the specific region but also try to account for the inequality in the village.

So income support should be more specific to the small and marginal farmers.

Participant 10:

- Farmers don't fall into a homogenous group; rather belong to different classes such as big and small under irrigated and un-irrigated / resource endowed and backward regions following commercial and subsistence farming practices. Hence differentiated approaches rather than a blanket one is needed.
- First let us make agriculture to a remunerative occupation thru technology, input, credit, marketing and price roots.
- Next, let us think of providing a minimum income to ensure a decent standard of living to majority of small and marginal farmers mostly thru government interventions and support means.

	Part. 1	Part.2	Part.3	Part.4	Part.5	Part.6	Part.7	Part.8	Part.9	Part.10	Part.11	Part.12	Part.13	Part.14
In your view, what do you see as the timeline in which to achieve the above	I do not consider such goals as key	Over the next ___10 (number) years, farmers income should increase by / to _ Average Indian Income _	Over the next 3 (number) years, farmers income should increase by an amount so as to bridge the gap with the non-farm workers	Over the next _FIVE_ _ (number) years, farmer income should increase by / to "LIVING INCOMES	Over the next 5 (number) years, farmers income should increase by / to `above mentioned level'	Over the next one (number) years, farmers income should increase by / to 15000/month after ensuring that other major household expenses like education and health are taken care of through other support systems	Over the next ___10 (number) years, farmers income should increase by / to ___10 0%_ _	Over the next 9-10 (number) years, farmers income should increase by 10-11 percent (CAGR)			Over the next 3 years, a farmer household's monthly income should increase to a minimum of (Agricultural Minimum Wage X 2 X 25 days) at 2017 prices, ie., at least equal to 2 persons working at minimum wages for 25 days.	Over the next 9 years, farmers income should increase by 5% in real terms	Over the next 6-8 years, a farmer household's monthly income should increase by double nominal on real growth : 8-10%; real growth : 3-4%	Over the next 10 (number) years, farmers income from agriculture should increase by / to Rs. 10,000 per month, adjusted for inflation, while accounting for cost of revival / maintenance / depreciation of land and water when calculating income.

	Part.1	Part.2	Part.3	Part.4	Part.5	Part.6	Part.7	Part.8	Part.9	Part.10	Part.11	Part.12	Part.13	Part.14
In your case, do you usually speak of a Farmer (individual) , (OR) a Farmer Household ?	A person who engages in agriculture either as worker , tenant , or owner for a period of more than 3 years and has a presence in the rural area.	Farmer Household	Farmer Household	Usually, a farmer household. Sometimes, farmers as individuals too.	Household	Farmer household which includes a farming couple , 2/3 children and the couple's parents	One who depends on farming/agriculture as the primary source of income and for maintaining the household	Farmer as a household	In our studies , we consider a farmer household. However, our study strongly suggests that the Indian villages are not homogeneous at all. The farmer households are further differentiated into various socio-economic classes (Landlords, Capitalist farmers, and different strata of Peasant households, and manual workers).	Focus should be on "farm" which is both agro-ecological as well as socio-economic unit rather than farmer . Farmer household roughly correspond with the term farm defined above.	Farmer Household	Farm Households	Farm Households	Individual

	Part.1	Part.2	Part.3	Part.4	Part.5	Part.6	Part.7	Part.8	Part.9	Part.10	Part.11	Part.12	Part.13	Part.14
When you think of different categories of farmers/farm households, which parameters do you distinguish them on?		Ownership	Based on access to resources and income of the household	Irrigated & Unirrigated; Land Ownership Extent; Tenancy; Gender; Particular Social Groups Like Adivasi Farmers. Livestock Rearers And Forest Gatherers Too.	Involvement in the land, labour and credit market	Land holdings as well as land cultivated along with other incomes outside farming	Land holding farmer, Tenant Farmer, Farm labourer	Land holdings, access to inputs (credit, water etc.), average incomes, state-wise		big and small under irrigated and un-irrigated conditions, belonging to resource endowed (like Punjab) and backward regions following commercial and subsistence cropping systems / farming practices.		Land and farming as principal occupations	dependent on land for cultivation, ***** * other agricultural activities like bee keeping, sericulture etc.	Landholding (incl. landless labour) Access to water Subsis tence vs. Surplu s available for sale vs. Mostly comm ercial Standalone vs linked to a CBO (SHG, producer group, FPC) Tribal vs non-tribal Organ ic vs chemi cal

Participant 1: Different categories:

Farmer: One who owns substantial amounts of land and is able to generate a surplus for the market.

Peasant: One who owns limited amounts of land and cultivates it with primarily own and family labour and much of the produce is for self/home consumption.

Agriculturist/Cultivator: closest to Indian terms such as kisan, rytha, ryots, raithalu, etc and one who cultivates land with own, family and other labour and is directly engaged in agriculture.

Participant 9: A socio-economic classification of farm households was undertaken for each village studied by the Foundation for Agrarian Studies (FAS), based on the three classical criteria used to differentiate the peasantry, namely, control over the means of production, relative use of family and hired labour, and the surplus that a household is able to generate within a working year.

Based on these general criteria, Landlord and Capitalists farmer were separated first. The remaining farm households were further categorised into different groups based on the aforementioned criteria.

We also find a significant chunk of manual worker category in all our villages. This class is the class of a rural proletariat that works in both agricultural and non-agricultural work. In fact, rarely do we find a class that can be called as purely agricultural worker. Unsurprisingly, majority of the manual worker class belong to the scheduled caste category.

Another important point to mention here is that even the small and marginal farmers are increasingly active in the labour market where they hire out their labour. Agriculture continues to be the major source of income for small and marginal farmer but rarely, if ever, the income from agriculture is very meager for maintaining their livelihoods. All these sections are pluri-active and the poorest of them are seemingly in the process of becoming proletariats.

Participant 11: (i) Landholding size; (ii) Gender (for an individual farmer); (iii) Caste/community (including adivasi); (iv) Ownership-Cultivator matrix (owner-cultivator; lessee cultivator; part-lessee; owner-non-cultivator; non-owner-non-cultivator); (v) Village resident or not; (vi) Allied activities – as primary or secondary (sheep-rearing; fisheries; dairy, etc) (vii) Canal-Irrigated / Borewell-irrigated / Unirrigated

	Part.1	Part.2	Part.3	Part.4	Part.5	Part.6	Part.7	Part.8	Part.9	Part.10	Part.11	Part.12	Part.13	Part.14	
Standard Definitions	A Farmer / Farm Household is one that is engaged in agriculture (as labour, land owner, tenant or as community member) and its related processes and is resident in a village /hamlet or rural area.	NPFF 2007	NSSO regular rounds	NPFF 2007	NPFF 2007	NPFF 2007 partly yes Censuses yes	NPFF 2007 yes Censuses yes	• NSSO 70th Round • NPFF 2007		• NPFF 2007 Partly Agree • NSSO regular rounds Agree	NPFF 2007	NSSO 70th Round and NPFF 2007	NSSO 70th Round NSSO 59th Round NPFF 2007 Censuses NSSO regular rounds	NPFF 2007	

Participant 9: A Farmer / Farm Household is....

Our definition is not directly based on the NSSO. Our way to define a farm household is as follows:

Broadly, a farm household is defined as household that operate any agricultural land within a reference year and has a net income from agriculture and allied activities in their household income. The members

of these households supervise or work on all or some of the major manual operations on the land. However, there is difference between Landlord/Capitalist farmers and Peasant households. The main difference is that the former does not participate in the major agricultural operations on the land.

	Part. 1	Part.2	Part.3	Part.4	Part.5	Part.6	Part.7	Part.8	Part.9	Part.1 0	Part.1 1	Part.1 2	Part.1 3	Part.1 4
As per Defining Features		One who puts in Effort/Labour	One who owns land One who puts in Effort/Labour	One who takes Risk / Invests One who puts in Effort/Labour	• One who owns land Yes • One who takes Risk / Invests Yes • One who puts in Effort/Labour Yes	One who takes Risk / Invests One who puts in Effort/Labour	• One who owns land Yes • One who takes Risk / Invests Yes • One who puts in Effort/Labour Yes	• One who owns land yes • One who takes Risk / Invests (not clear) • One who puts in Effort/Labour yes		• One who owns land yes • One who takes Risk / Invests yes	One who takes risk/invests; One who puts in effort/labour	One who owns land, One who takes risk/invests and One who puts in effort/labour	One who owns land One who takes Risk / Invests One who puts in Effort/Labour	One who owns land One who takes Risk / Invests One who puts in Effort/Labour
More Details													Census definition is the most comprehensive and inclusive	

Participant 6: Labour is also an investment. A Farmer / Farm Household is one whose major share (more than 50%) of income is generated through farming activities.

Participant 10: A Farmer / Farm Household is, in addition to above, proportion of family labor to hired labor and involvement of head or family members in decision making and managerial activities having the holding size (that determine the extent of utilization of farm resources; human, financial and natural) are also crucial in deciding a genuine farmer.

REASON	Part . 1	Part. 2	Part. 3	Part. 4	Part. 5	Part. 6	Part. 7	Part. 8	Part. 9	Part.1 0	Part.1 1	Part.1 2	Part.1 3	Part.1 4
To Improve GDP Growth	0	2	0	2		5	3	4	5	1	3	3	5	2
To ensure Well-being/ Decent life for a majority	5	5	5	5		5	5	5	5	5	5	3	4	5
As a moral (societal) imperative	5	4	3	4		5	3	0	3	2	5	3	3	4

Participant 1: There is need to conceptualise and represent the rural and the agricultural as integrated economies and socio-political domains that have value in and of themselves. Required are new parameters to assess productivity, linkages between the domains of ecology, economy and society. New structures of production and marketing are required. Governmental intervention needs to enable the rural and agrarian to emerge as a strong sector that can drive the deepening of democracy, new alternative economies, and ensure the restoration of ecological sustainability. Overall, it is key to recognising the citizenship rights of farmers.

Participant 6: To ensure farming itself happens, to ensure health/nutritional security of the nation, to ensure political sovereignty of the country....

Participant 8: It is not a social obligation but an economic catalyst for India if the income of its farmers grew. Besides, incomes of farmers need to grow because they too are businessmen, but ones who are paid back through welfare schemes and not market-related returns.

Participant 10: To ensure peaceful and socially fruitful rural India as dreamt by Father of nation 5; Socio-cultural factors such as enhancing social prestige by elevating farming as a decent occupation to retain youth / boys in farming and to ensure that they get matching bride of their choice.

Participant 12: If farming does not provide basic level of income, farmers would well move to other employment. This will directly affect food security. Most farm labour presently is SC/ST as land owners generally depend on labour for agri-operations.

	Part.1	Part.2	Part.3	Part.4	Part.6	Part.7	Part.8	Part.9	Part.10	Part.11	Part.12	Part.13	Part.14
MSP & Procurement / Market Intervention	10	11	13	4	1	1	9	2	2	5	15	5	1
Broad-based Direct Income Transfer	18	15	20	19	5	4	8	17	12	19	10	12	18
Better Extension	14	3	5	17	4	9	6	10	16	18	13	11	12
Market reforms & Value Chain Interventions	13	4	7	4	2	2	1	6	6	15	3	1	2
Altering agrarian structure (land & asset ownership)	1	19	14	4	3	20	17	1	1	2	11	6	19
Better Water technologies / Irrigation	4	14	4	8	3	7	4	7	5	4	4	8	6
Employment Guarantee improvements (days and/or wage rates)	8	13	6	11	5	11	This increases cost of production, reducing overall profitability if prices stay constant	12	13	12	16	17	14
Reforming Agriculture Credit	5	8	12	14	2	6	2	3	14	8	7	2	9
Targeted income transfer to those categories which fall short of income target	6	9	3	3	1	3	16	18	10	10	14	13	17
Expanding Ecologically sustainable agriculture	2	1	1	2	4	16	15	15	11	6	1	19	4
Establishing & Strengthening FPOs	3	12	9	8	2	18	12	14	3	9	9	10	5
Inclusion of excluded categories (tenants, women, adivasis, etc)	9	10	19	1	3	12	11	9		1	8	14	15
Increase investment in	18	7	2	14	5	10	3	5	7	16	2	3	8

rural infrastructure													
Payment for EcoSystem Services, through DBT	7	2	11	7	4	19		20	8	11	17	18	7
Better Crop Insurance & Disaster Compensation	15	5	8	10	2	5	7	13	17	3	6	15	13
Farm Income Insurance Scheme	16	16	15	16	3	17	18	11	9	16	20	16	16
Better Seed Technologies	19	17	10	18	4	15	5	4	15	17	5	7	11
Improve Accountability in Govt Support Systems	9	6	15	12	2	14	10	16	4	14	18	9	
Expand Global Trade	20	20	17	20	5	13	13	19	19	20	12	4	20
Restrictions on Free Trade Agreements /WTO	11	18	18	13	3	8	14	8	18	13	19	20	10
Any other (specify & rank)										7			
Please explain further any of the above, if you wish:													

Participant 1: Overall, I think deployment of cash transfers etc will enhance problems in the rural areas. It is important to address the inequitous agrarian structure and the problems of the wrong agricultural models. Instead of populist programs such as loan waivers and income transfers (which will only compound the existing problems), it may be important to promote restructuring and new practices via support for implementing group farming, ecological restoration and restorative agriculture.

Participant 6: Update: Universal Good and free rural public health and higher education systems.: 3
Unable to rank; Some of them are interdependent like market interventions and restrictions on free trade and expanding global trade. Similarly altering agrarian assets and structures and inclusion of excluded categories. PES and expanding ecologically sustainable agriculture. Better crop insurance and farm insurance schemes.

Participant 8: Reduce government interventions and let markets decide. Build on DBT PM Kisan and focus on empowering the farmer.

Participant 10: Legal Approach / Acts to ensure remunerative price/ stable income to farmers

Participant 11: Allied activities like animal/fish etc.

Participant 14: Soil and Water revival: 3

ALL PRESENTATIONS USED IN THE WORKSHOP ARE ACCESSIBLE AT:

<https://drive.google.com/open?id=1PXjhmSAPhrSLWaiBtZOtqTr2ToHKTj4->

(a short session of the workshop consisted of a simple income projections session using some existing official data, with regard to particular interventions. This presentation is also available in the link above.

ALL SKETCH NOTES OF PANEL PRESENTATIONS ARE ACCESSIBLE AT:

https://drive.google.com/open?id=1-2ss8_VqI3K9FD7afGsTsJWTzeTcjwSN

PHOTOS OF THE WORKSHOP SESSIONS ARE ACCESSIBLE AT:

<https://photos.app.goo.gl/mFr3JRrWJhW3cexU9>

REGISTRATION SHEET OF PARTICIPANTS IS ACCESSIBLE AT:

<https://drive.google.com/open?id=1R6oSC1dpRMmsPHyBKlhrK7Tx2JCHsNca>