

Impact Evaluation of 15 Farmer Producers' Organization Projects in Madhya Pradesh



FPO

Study Sponsored by
National Bank for Agriculture and Rural Development
Bhopal, Madhya Pradesh



AGRO- ECONOMIC RESEARCH CENTRE
Jawaharlal Nehru Krishi Vishwa Vidyalaya,
Jabalpur (M.P.) 482004

March 2021

Impact Evaluation of 15 Farmer Producers' Organization Projects in Madhya Pradesh

Study Sponsored by
National Bank for Agriculture and Rural Development
Bhopal, Madhya Pradesh



**AGRO- ECONOMIC RESEARCH CENTRE
Jawaharlal Nehru Krishi Vishwa Vidyalaya,
Jabalpur (M.P.) 482004**

March 2021

Citation: Sharma H.O.; Rathi D.; Niranjan, H.K; Thakur S.S.; Pandey P.R.; Bareliya R.; Kuril A.; Patidar P.K. and Aske S. (2021) “Impact Evaluation of 15 Farmer Producers' Organization Projects in Madhya Pradesh”, Agro- Economic Research Centre, Ad-hoc *Research Study No.-133*, JNKVV, Jabalpur 65p

Sponsored by

National Bank for Agriculture and Rural Development

Bhopal, Madhya Pradesh

AGRO- ECONOMIC RESEARCH CENTRE

Jawaharlal Nehru Krishi Vishwa Vidyalaya,

Jabalpur (M.P.) 482004

PREFACE

The present study entitled “Impact Evaluation of 15 Farmer Producers' Organization Projects in Madhya Pradesh” has been sponsored by National Bank for Agriculture and Rural Development Bhopal, Madhya Pradesh in the year 2020-21 to this Centre.

The study comprises of 918 producer members of 15 FPOs of National Bank for Agriculture and Rural Development. It is observed from the study that an average FPO was found to earn a market margin of Rs 31.86 over the marketing cost of Rs. 1.00, which ranged between 1:1.43 (production and marketing of vermicompost) to 1:161.63 (processing and marketing of spices). The 41.26, 22.38, 21.35, 34.86, 12.76 and 10.38 per cent producer members were found to be benefited through supply of seed, fertilizers & Bio-fertilizers, plant protection & growth regulator, supply of cattle & cattle feed procurement of grains and procurement of fruits and other products respectively.

I extend heartfelt thanks to Smt. T.S. Raji Gain, Chief General Manager and Dr. Lalit Mourya, Area Manager (Farm Sector Development Department) National Bank for Agriculture and Rural Development Bhopal, Madhya Pradesh for providing valuable guidelines and time to time suggestions for conducting the study successfully.

On behalf of the Centre, I express deep sense of gratitude to Prof. P.K.Bisen, Hon'ble Vice-Chancellor and Chairman (AER centre, JNKVV, Jabalpur), Dr. D. Khare, Dean, Faculty of Agriculture, Dr. G.K.Kottu, Director Research Services, and Dr. Sharad Tiwari, Dean, College of Agriculture, Dr. A. K. Sarawgi, Prof. & Head, Department of Agricultural Economics and Farm Management, Jawaharlal Nehru Krishi Vishwa Vidyalaya, Jabalpur for providing the valuable guidance and all facilities during various stages in successful completion of this study of high importance.

The present study was conducted by Dr. H. O. Sharma, Dr. Deepak Rathi and Dr. H. K. Niranjana of this centre. I wish to express my deep sense of gratitude to team members namely; Mr. S. K. Upadhye, Mr. S. S. Thakur, Dr. P. R. Pandey, Mr. R. S. Bareliya and Mr. Akhilesh Kuril & Mr. P. K. Patidar for their untiring efforts in bringing this innovative study to its perfect shape.

I express sincere thanks to all District Development Managers (NABARD) of the districts viz. Anuppur, Balaghat, Betul, Chhindwara, Datia, Gwalior, Hoshangabad, Khargone (West Nimar), Raisen, Rewa, Sehore, Seoni & Ujjain under and the field staff of respective FPOs for providing not only secondary data but also extending great assistance in collection of primary data from the selected respondents.

I hope the findings and suggestions made in the study would be useful to policy makers of the NABARD, Madhya Pradesh State and Govt. of India.

Date : 24.03.2021

Place: Jabalpur

**(Hari Om Sharma)
Prof. & Director**

CONTENTS

S. No.	Particular	Page No.
CHAPTER-I : INTRODUCTION		1-4
1.1	Objectives of the Study	02
1.2	Methodology	02
1.3	Limitation of the Study	03
1.4	Organization of the Study	04
CHAPTER-II : IMPACT ANALYSIS		5-58
2.1	Organization & Management Structure	05
2.2	Training and Capacity Building	07
2.3	Convergence of FPOs	09
2.4	Business Activities	11
2.4.1	Supply of Seed	11
2.4.2	Supply of Fertilizers and Other Inputs	16
2.4.3	Supply of Cattle and Cattle Feed	25
2.4.4	Procurement of Output	28
2.4.5	Processing of Output	34
2.5	Marketing Efficiency	36
2.5.1	Supply of HYVs Seed	36
2.5.2	Supply of Cattle Feed	38
2.5.3	Supply of Fertilizers	39
2.5.4	Supply of Vegetables Seed	40
2.5.5	Supply of Pesticide	40
2.5.6	Supply of Cattle's	41
2.5.7	Procurement and Marketing of Grains	42
2.5.8	Procurement and Marketing of Vermi Compost	43
2.5.9	Procurement and Marketing of Fruits	43
2.5.10	Procurement and Marketing of Milk	45
2.5.11	Procurement and Marketing of Honey	45
2.5.12	Production and Marketing of Mushroom	45
2.5.13	Processing of Kodo & Marketing of Kodo Rice	45
2.5.14	Processing and Marketing of Spices	46
2.5.15	Overall Performances	46
2.6	Home Consumption	47
2.7	Credit Linkage	47
2.8	Bottle necks/ Constraints	52
2.9	Social Impact on FPOs Members	53
2.10	Facilities provided by FPO	54
2.11	Constraints	55
2.12	Economic Impact	56
2.13	Social Impact	57
CHAPTER III : SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND POLICY IMPLICATIONS		59-62
REFERENCES		63-64
Comment on the Draft Report and Action Taken		65

LIST OF TABLES

S. No.	Particulars	Page No.
1.1	Number of member respondents Selected across FPOs' in Madhya Pradesh	04
2. 1	Organization structure across FPOs (Number)	06
2. 2	Training and Capacity Building of CEO, BODs & Members across FPOs (Per cent attended)	08
2. 3	Training and of Respondents across FPOs (Per cent Member attended)	09
2. 4	Convergence with other Institutions/Stakeholder across FPOs (Number)	10
2. 5	Input seed Supply across FPOs (Per cent Producer members benefited)	12
2. 6	Input seed Supply across FPOs (Per cent FPOs Margin)	13
2. 7	Input seed Supply across FPOs (Per cent Members Margin)	15
2. 8	Fertilizers & Others input Supply across FPOs (Per cent Producer members benefited)	17
2. 9	Plant Protection Chemical and Plant Growth Regulator supply across FPOs (% Producer members benefited)	19
2. 10	Fertilizers & Others input Supply across FPOs (Per cent FPOs Margin)	20
2. 11	Fertilizers & Others input Supply across FPOs (Per cent Farmers Margin)	22
2. 12	Fertilizers & Others input Supply across FPOs (Per cent FPOs Margin)	23
2. 13	Fertilizers & Others input Supply across FPOs (Per cent producer member Margin)	24
2. 14	Cattle/ cattle feed supply across FPOs (Per cent Producer members benefited)	25
2. 15	Cattle Feed Supply across FPOs (Per cent FPOs Margin)	27
2. 16	Cattle & cattle Feed Supply across FPOs (Per cent Farmers Margin)	27
2. 17	Procurement of Output across FPOs (Per cent Producer members benefited)	29
2. 18	Procurement of Output across FPOs (Per cent Producer members benefited)	30
2. 19	Procurement of Output across FPOs (Per cent Producer members benefited)	31
2. 20	Procurement of Output across FPOs (Per cent FPOs Margin)	32
2. 21	Procurement of Output across FPOs (Per cent FPOs Margin)	33
2. 22	Procurement of Output across FPOs (Per cent FPOs Margin)	33
2. 23	Processing of Output across FPOs (Per cent FPOs Margin)	34

S. No.	Particulars	Page No.
2. 24	Processing of Output across FPOs (Per cent FPOs Margin)	35
2. 25	Processing of Output across FPOs (Per cent FPOs Margin)	36
2. 26	Marketing efficiency of Supply of HYVs Seed (Ratio)	37
2. 27	Marketing efficiency of supply of Cattle Feed (Ratio)	38
2. 28	Marketing efficiency of Supply of Fertilizers (Ratio)	39
2. 29	Marketing efficiency of Supply of Vegetables Seed (Ratio)	40
2. 30	Marketing efficiency of Supply of Pesticide (Ratio)	40
2. 31	Marketing efficiency of Supply of Cattles (Baffloes) (Ratio)	41
2. 32	Marketing efficiency of Procurement and Marketing of Grains (Ratio)	42
2. 33	Marketing efficiency of Production and Marketing of Vermi Compost (Ratio)	43
2. 34	Marketing efficiency of Procurement & Marketing of Fruits (Ratio)	44
2. 35	Marketing efficiency of Procurement and Marketing of Milk (Ratio)	44
2. 36	Marketing efficiency of Procurement and Marketing of Honey (Ratio)	45
2. 37	Marketing efficiency of Production and Marketing of Mushroom (Ratio)	45
2. 38	Marketing efficiency of Processing of Kodo & Marketing of Kodo Rice (Ratio)	46
2. 39	Marketing efficiency of Processing and Marketing of Spices (Ratio)	46
2. 40	Marketing efficiency of Activities wise (Ratio)	47
2. 41	Home Consumption of Producer members in different items across FPOs (% increase/month)	48
2. 42	Credit Linkages of FPOs	49
2. 43	Credit Linkages with different sources across FPOs(Per cent Producer members)	50
2. 44	Purpose of Credit across FPOs (per cent)	51
2. 45	Reasons of non- repayment of loan (per cent producer members)	52
2. 46	Bottle necks/ Constraints of FPO	53
2. 47	Social Impact on FPOs Members (Agreed as Increased)	54
2. 48	Facilities provided by FPO (Agreed as Increased)	55
2. 49	Constraints related to Input Management	56

LIST OF FIGURES

S. No.	Particulars	Page No.
1.1	Map showing Area under Study	03
1.2	Collection of Primary data from the respondents	04

INTRODUCTION

A producer company is basically a corporate body registered as a Producer Company under Companies Act, 1956 (As amended in 2002). The same provisions have been retained for FPC after the amendment of Companies Act in 2013. Its main activities consist of production, harvesting, processing, procurement, grading, pooling, handling, marketing, selling, export of primary produce of the members or import of goods or services for their benefit. It provides for sharing of profits/benefits among the members. The Department of Agriculture and Cooperation, Ministry of Agriculture and Farmer Welfare, Govt. of India has identified farmer producer organization registered under the special provisions of the Companies Act, 1956 (As amended in 2002), now Companies Act, 2013, as the most appropriate institutional form of aggregation of farmers. The main objective of mobilizing farmers into member owned producer organizations. Small holder farmers in developing countries are facing problems such as poor infrastructure, limited access to assets and services resulting in higher transaction cost and lower participation in market (Key et al., 2000; Barret 2008; Bernard and Spielman 2009; Fisher and Qaim 2012). Farmers' collectives

such as co-operatives and farmer producer organizations¹ emerged as alternatives for increasing market participation and reducing transaction cost through collective action (Markelova et al., 2009; Valentinov 2007). Co-operatives, even though successful in their initial phases, were unsuccessful in linking the smallholder farmers to the globalized markets (Singh 2008). The key weakness of the co-operative was lack of a face-full owner and poor governance structure (Borhstoem 2013). NABARD promoted FPOs through producer organization upliftment fund (Rs. 200 crores) since 2008-09 (Shah 2016).

Farmer Producer Companies (FPCs), a new form of farmer's collectives emerged under the provision Part-IX-A Chapter-1 of The Companies Act (Singh 2008). These originations are characterized by formal, autonomous, outward oriented organizations and can be regarded as a hybrid between private companies and co-operatives (Trebbin 2014). The studies published so far looked into the role and governance issues (Singh 2008, Trebbin 2014, Venkattakumar and Sontakki 2012). More recent studies had documented successful cases across country (Singh and Singh 2013, Bhamra et al 2016, Raju et al 2017, Sowmya and Raju

2017). Though, these case studies provide lot of insights into the heterogeneity of the FPOs, they did little to compare them across to understand the common factors. Bhamra et al (2016) study did used a framework to evaluate each FPOs but not compared across the FPOs. A recent study by Dey (2018) developed and provided framework for comparing the performance and viability of the FPOs in India. In the era of globalization and climate change, producer organizations are regarded as the only institutional option to safeguard the best interest of the farmers and facilitate them to reach a higher level of profits through novel agro-food networks (Trebbin and Hassler, 2012). Keeping the above views in mind the present study has been under taken with following specific objectives.

1.1 Objectives of the Study

- To analyze organizational and management structure of FPOs, its effectiveness in operations and governance.
- To assess the utility and effectiveness of training and capacity building interventions for making the FPOs vibrant.
- To evaluate the impact of various FPO activities on the gross and net income of member farmers on account of timely input supply, productivity increase, crop diversification, mechanization of farm operations, aggregate produce marketing, diversified marketing interventions and

value addition of produce.

- To understand the current business models and credit linkages to the FPOs.
- To study the social, financial and economic impact of individual members.
- To identify bottlenecks, inadequacies in the FPO ecosystem and suggest further measures for long term sustainability of FPOs.

1.2 Methodology

A list of all the producer members of Farmers Producer Companies (FPOs) under different locations of Madhya Pradesh viz. Anuppur, Balaghat, Betul, Chhindwara, Datia, Gwalior, Hoshangabad, Khargone, Raisen, Rewa, Sehore, Seoni and Ujjain were collected with the consultation of respective FPOs. From the list of the producer members of all the FPOs (15), 10 per cent producer members in each FPO were selected by using proportionate random sampling method subjected to minimum 50 respondents for the study. Thus, the total size of sample was of 918 respondents (Table 1.1). Both primary and secondary data were collected for the study. The primary data were collected from the selected respondents on various parameters viz. socio economic conditions, land use pattern, cropping pattern, cost effectiveness, resource use, family consumption etc. Computer-Assisted Personal Interviewing (CAPI) software developed by Dobility India Ltd, Ahmadabad



Fig. 1.1: Map showing Area under Study

(Gujarat) was used for collection, classification and analysis of data for the study.

Before and after techniques was use to analyze the impact evaluation of different FPOs. The suitable analytical tools viz. mean, percentage, etc. were used to draw conclusions. The period of the study was IV quarter of the financial year 2020-21 (January- March). Marketing efficiency (Ratio) of various business activities has also been analyse by deviding marketing cost to markete Margin.

1.3 Limitation of the Study

The present study is based on primary as well as secondary data. The study pertains to the primary data collected for the agricultural year, 2020-21. Moreover, producer members provided information based on their recall memory. However, thus, there is a possibility of certain memory bias to enter the presentation of the data. The considerable care is taken while generalizing the acceptability of the results of this study.



Fig. 1.2: Collection of Primary data from the respondents

Table 1.1: Number of member respondents Selected across FPOs' in Madhya Pradesh

District	POPI Name	FPO Name	No. of members	Selected sample respondents
Anuppur	SRIJAN	Amarkantak Horticulture Producer Co. Ltd	828	83
Balaghat	Anupama Education Society	Vidhata crop producer company ltd.	301	50
Betul	Naman Sewa Samiti	Kutir Agri Producer Co. Ltd	214	50
Chhindwara	BBLSS	Bhumija Farmers Producer Co. Ltd	615	62
Chhindwara	Madhya Pradesh Vigyan Sabha	Phalam Sampada Producer Company	610	61
Datia	Pragati Path	Pitambra Farmers Producer Co Ltd.	643	64
Datia	VAMA	Jyotsana India Producer Company Ltd.	203	50
Gwalior	VAMA	Ummeed India Producer Company Ltd.	482	50
Hoshangabad	Yukti Samaj Sewa Society	Revanchal Mahila FPC	500	50
Khargone (West Nimar)	Manthan	Vikas Gramin Evam Samaj Sewa Samiti	717	72
Raisen	Lupin	Barna Crop Producer company Pvt. Ltd.	500	50
Rewa	KSUS REWA	Vindhyanal Crop. Producer Company Ltd.	838	84
Sehore	SVSS	Dhanvantri Vegetable Produce Co. Ltd	505	51
Seoni	Nageshwara Charitable Trust	Vainganga Agro Farmers Producer Co. Ltd.	501	50
Ujjain	CARD	Kalisindh Farmer Producer Company Pvt. Ltd.	910	91
Total			8367	918

1.4 Organization of the Study

The study is organized into three chapters, Chapter I, Introduction of the study and covers the background, objectives, research methodology and limitation of the Study. Impact

evaluation of the FPOs is given in chapter II, Chapter III deals Conclusion and Policy Implications of the study .The references used in the study are given the appendix.

IMPACT ANALYSIS

This chapter deals with the results obtained from training and capacity building, convergence of FPOs, business activities related to supply of seed, fertilizers and other inputs, cattle and cattle feed, procurement and processing of output, home consumption, credit linkage, bottle necks/ constraints, social impact on FPOs members, facilities provided by FPO and constraints faced by producer members.

2.1 Organization & Management

Structure

The organizational structure under study across year of registration, name of POPI, Board of Directors, producer members, blocks and villages covered along with distance of near to far located village is presented in table 2.1. It is observed from the data presented that about 66 per cent of FPOs were found to be registered during the year 2016, while remaining were found to be registered during the year 2015. All the FPOs have NGOs and their POPI. On an average the board of directors during initial and current year was found to be same i.e. 8. The board of directors were found to be five during initial and current year. In case of Pitambra Farmers

Producer Company Ltd., Datia, Jyotstana India Producer Company Ltd., Datia, Umeed India Producer Company Ltd., Gwalior, Dhanvantri Vegetables Producer Company Ltd., Sehore. In case of Kalisindh Farmer Producer Company Pvt. Ltd., Ujjain initially the board of directors 5 which were found to be increased to 8 during the current year. In case of Vikas Gramin Evam Samaj Sewa Samiti, Khargone the board of directors 7 during initial and current year. In remaining FPOs the Board of directors were found to be 10 during initial and current year except in Amarkantak Horticulture Producer Company Ltd., Anuppur (11) and with one increase in Vindhyanchal Crop Producer Company Ltd., Rewa during current year. The producer members were found to be increased by 128.52 per cent in current year over initial year. The increase in producer members in current year over initial year was found to be maximum in case of Kalisindh Farmer Producer Company Pvt. Ltd., Ujjain (3133.33%) followed by Vidhata Crop Producer Company Ltd., Balaghat (3010%), Phalam Sampada Producer Company, Chhindawara (500%), Amarkantak Horticulture Producer Company Ltd., Anuppur

Table 2.1 : Organization structure across FPOs (Number)

Name of FPO	Year of Registration	Name of POPI	Board of Directors		Member			Block Covered	Villages covered	Distance (Km)	
			Initial Year	Current Year	Initial Year	Current Year	Percent change over initial year			Min	Max
Amarkantak Horticulture Producer Company Ltd., Anuppur	2016	Self-Reliant Initiative through Joint Action (SRIJAN)	11	11	150	896	497.33	2	56	7	18
Vidhata Crop Producer Company Ltd., Balaghat	2015	Anupama Education Society	10	10	10	311	3010.00	1	33	7	32
Kutir Agri Producer Company Ltd., Betul	2016	Naman Sewa Samiti	10	10	214	214	0.00	2	45	1	47
Bhumija Farmers Producer Company Ltd., Chhindawara	2016	Bhartiye Bhaudeshaiya Lok Shikshan Sanstha (BBLSS)	10	10	160	706	341.25	3	16	1	22
Phalam Sampada Producer Company, Chhindawara	2016	Madhya Pradesh Vigyan Sabha	5	5	100	600	500.00	1	13	1	15
Pitambra Farmers Producer Company Ltd., Datia	2016	Pragati Path	10	10	643	643	0.00	2	36	7	40
Jyotstana India Producer Company Ltd., Datia	2016	Bal Mahila Vikas Samiti (VAMA)	5	5	203	203	0.00	1	15	0	35
Umeed India Producer Company Ltd., Gwalior	2016	Bal Mahila Vikas Samiti (VAMA)	5	5	482	482	0.00	1	22	8	25
Revanchal Mahila Farmer Producer Company, Hoshangabad	2016	Yukti Samaj Sewa Society	10	10	500	500	0.00	1	24	1	30
Vikas Gramin Evam Samaj Sewa Samiti, Khargone	2015	Manthan Gramin Evam Samaj Seva Samiti Bhopal	7	7	200	720	260.00	2	30	5	48
Barna Crop Producer Company Pvt. Ltd., Raisen	2015	Lupin	10	10	500	500	0.00	1	30	1	22
Vindhyanchal Crop Producer Company Ltd., Rewa	2016	Krishna Samaj Utthan Samiti (KSUS)	10	11	455	1030	126.37	3	33	0	36
Dhanvantri Vegetables Producer Company Ltd., Sehore	2015	Swami Vivekanand Skhikshka Samiti Bhopal (SVSS)	5	5	100	505	405.00	3	35	0	55
Vainganga Agro Farmers Producer Company Ltd., Seoni	2016	Nageshwara ChariAppendix Trust Center for Advanced	10	5	90	501	456.67	1	17	1	25
Kalisindh Farmer Producer Company Pvt. Ltd., Ujjain	2015	Research and Development, Bhopal (CARD)	5	8	30	970	3133.33	2	19	0	15
Average			8	8	256	585 (129%)	128.52	2	28	3	31

(497.33%), Vainganga Agro Farmers Producer Company Ltd., Seoni (456.67%), Dhanvantri Vegetables Producer Company Ltd., Sehore (405%), Bhumija Farmers Producer Company Ltd., Chhindawara (341.25%), Vikas Gramin Evam Samaj Sewa Samiti, Khargone (260%) and Vindhyanchal Crop Producer Company Ltd., Rewa (126.37%), respectively, while in remaining FPOs viz. Kutir Agri Producer Company Ltd., Betul, Pitambra Farmers Producer Company Ltd., Datia, Jyotstana India Producer Company Ltd., Datia, Umeed India Producer Company Ltd., Gwalior, Revanchal Mahila Farmer Producer Company,

Hoshangabad and Barna Crop Producer Company Pvt. Ltd., Raisen no change was observed indicating the same number of producer members during initial and current year.

On an average 2 blocks were found to be covered by FPOs. The maximum 3 blocks were found to be covered by Bhumija Farmers Producer Company Ltd., Chhindawara, Dhanvantri Vegetables Producer Company Ltd., Sehore and Vindhyanchal Crop Producer Company Ltd., Rewa, while 7 FPOs use to cover 1 and 5 FPOs used to cover two blocks. On an average village covered by FPOs were found to be 28 which ranged between 13 (Phalam Sampada Producer Company, Chhindawara) to 56 (Amarkantak Horticulture Producer Company Ltd., Anuppur). The average distance covered by FPO ranged between 0 to 31 km, the minimum distance covered by Phalam Sampada Producer Company, Chhindawara and Kalisindh Farmer Producer Company Pvt. Ltd., Ujjain, Jyotstana India Producer Company Ltd., Datia, Barna Crop Producer Company Pvt. Ltd., Raisen (0-15 km) and maximum distance of 0 to 55 km was covered by Dhanvantri Vegetables Producer Company Ltd., Sehore.

2.2 Training and Capacity Building

The training and capacity building programme attended by CEO, BODs and producer members across various FPOs is presented in table 2.2. The data depicts that on an average all the CEOs, 91.22 per cent BODs and 40.31 per cent producer members were found to attend the training and capacity building programs. It was also found that all the BODs got training in 8 FPOs and it vary from 67.5% across remaining FPOs. 67.50 (Kalisindh Farmer Producer Company Pvt. Ltd. Ujjain) to 98.00 per cent (Kutir Agri Producer Company Ltd., Betul). As for as training and capacity building of producer members is concerned, all the producer members got training in case of Kutir Agri Producer Company Ltd., Betul, while none of the producer member got training in case of Dhanvantari Vegetables Producer Company Ltd. Sehore. Pitambara Farmers Producer Company Ltd. Datia provided training to 94.25% producer members.

In remaining FPOs, 4 FPOs provided training to more than 50% of producer members which ranged between 52.4 per cent (Phalam Sampada Producer Company, Chhindwara) to 67.63 per cent (Amarkantak Horticulture Producer Company Ltd., Anuppur). 3 FPOs

Table 2.2: Training and Capacity Building of CEO, BODs & Members across FPOs (Per cent attended)

Name of FPO	CEO	BOD	Producer Members
Amarkantak Horticulture Producer Company Ltd., Anuppur	100.00	100.00	67.63
Vidhata Crop Producer Company Ltd., Balaghat	100.00	100.00	62.70
Kutir Agri Producer Company Ltd., Betul	100.00	98.00	100.00
Bhumija Farmers Producer Company Ltd., Chhindawara	100.00	78.50	57.20
Phalam Sampada Producer Company, Chhindawara	100.00	100.00	52.40
Pitambra Farmers Producer Company Ltd., Datia	100.00	97.45	94.25
Jyotstana India Producer Company Ltd., Datia	100.00	70.00	37.54
Umeed India Producer Company Ltd., Gwalior	100.00	70.00	31.78
Revanchal Mahila Farmer Producer Company, Hoshangabad	100.00	86.90	17.53
Vikas Gramin Evam Samaj Sewa Samiti, Khargone	100.00	100.00	5.00
Barna Crop Producer Company Pvt. Ltd., Raisen	100.00	100.00	49.40
Vindhyanchal Crop Producer Company Ltd., Rewa	100.00	100.00	9.77
Dhanvantri Vegetables Producer Company Ltd., Sehore	100.00	100.00	0.00
Vainganga Agro Farmers Producer Company Ltd., Seoni	100.00	100.00	10.18
Kalisindh Farmer Producer Company Pvt. Ltd., Ujjain	100.00	67.50	9.28
Average	100.00	91.22	40.31

provided training to more than 25% producer members which ranged between 31.78 per cent (Umeed India Producer Company Ltd., Gwalior) to 49.40 per cent (Barna Crop Producer Company Pvt. Ltd., Raisen), while remaining 5 FPOs provided training to 25% producer members which range between 5.00 per cent (Vikas gram in Evam Seva Samaj Samiti, Khargone) to 17.53 per cent (Rewanchal Mahila Farmer Producer Company, Hoshangabad). It is clear from the above results

that on an average 9% BODs and about 60% producer members were not able to get any training for their capacity building (Table 2.2).

The training and capacity building programmes attended by respondents of respective FPOs across various institution provided training is presented in table 2.3. It is observed from the data that all the respondent were found to attend trainings provided by NABARD and KVK/SAU, while 39.75 per cent respondents were found to attend training

Table 2.3 : Training and of Respondents across FPOs (Per cent Member attended)

Name of FPO	NABARD	KVK/SAU	Department of Agriculture
Amarkantak Horticulture Producer Company Ltd., Anuppur	100.00	100.00	39.75
Vidhata Crop Producer Company Ltd., Balaghat	90.00	90.00	4.00
Kutir Agri Producer Company Ltd., Betul	92.00	6.00	0.00
Bhumija Farmers Producer Company Ltd., Chhindawara	19.35	35.48	20.97
Phalam Sampada Producer Company, Chhindawara	72.97	63.93	40.00
Pitambra Farmers Producer Company Ltd., Datia	97.00	56.00	14.00
Jyotstana India Producer Company Ltd., Datia	90.00	68.00	22.00
Umeed India Producer Company Ltd., Gwalior	90.00	68.00	22.00
Revanchal Mahila Farmer Producer Company, Hoshangabad	30.00	44.00	22.00
Vikas Gramin Evam Samaj Sewa Samiti, Khargone	80.00	70.00	75.00
Barna Crop Producer Company Pvt. Ltd., Raisen	60.00	60.00	2.00
Vindhyanchal Crop Producer Company Ltd., Rewa	52.38	71.42	26.19
Dhanvantri Vegetables Producer Company Ltd., Sehore	10.00	6.00	12.00
Vainganga Agro Farmers Producer Company Ltd., Seoni	0.00	28.00	6.00
Kalisindh Farmer Producer Company Pvt. Ltd., Ujjain	36.26	62.64	34.06
Average	61.33	55.30	22.66

provided by Department of Agriculture. None of the respondents of Vainganga Agro Farmers Producer Company Ltd., Seoni and Kutir Agri Producer Company Ltd., Betul were found to be attend traing from NABARD and Department of Agriculture respectively. On an average training provided by NABARD and KVK/SAU and Department of Agriculture was found to be attended by 61.33, 55.30 and 22.66 per cent respectively (Table 2.3).

2.3 Convergence of FPOs

The convergence of FPOs with other institutions or stakeholders across districts, states and country was also studied and presented in table 2.4.

It is observed from the data that on an average every FPO was found to have convergence with 5, 2 and 1 institutions /stakeholders at district, state and country level respectively. At district level, Kalisindh Farmer

Table 2.4 : Convergence with other Institutions/Stakeholder across FPOs (Number)

Name of FPO	Within		
	District	State	Country
Amarkantak Horticulture Producer Company Ltd., Anuppur	5	0	0
Vidhata Crop Producer Company Ltd., Balaghat	6	2	1
Kutir Agri Producer Company Ltd., Betul	6	0	1
Bhumija Farmers Producer Company Ltd., Chhindawara	4	2	0
Phalam Sampada Producer Company, Chhindawara	6	2	0
Pitambra Farmers Producer Company Ltd., Datia	0	4	1
Jyotstana India Producer Company Ltd., Datia	4	2	1
Umeed India Producer Company Ltd., Gwalior	5	2	1
Revanchal Mahila Farmer Producer Company, Hoshangabad	6	1	0
Vikas Gramin Evam Samaj Sewa Samiti, Khargone	2	3	0
Barna Crop Producer Company Pvt. Ltd., Raisen	4	6	1
Vindhyanchal Crop Producer Company Ltd., Rewa	6	2	1
Dhanvantri Vegetables Producer Company Ltd., Sehore	5	1	1
Vainganga Agro Farmers Producer Company Ltd., Seoni	4	1	2
Kalisindh Farmer Producer Company Pvt. Ltd., Ujjain	13	2	0
Average	5	2	1

Producer Company Pvt. Ltd, Ujjain was found to have convergence with maximum number of institutions/ stakeholders (13) , while Pitambara Farmers Producer Company Ltd, Datia did not have convergence with any institutions. Out of remaining FPOs, the convergence with institutions/ stakeholders ranged between 2 (Vikas Gramin Evam Samaj Seva Samiti, Khargon) to 6 (Vidhata Crop Producer Company Ltd., Balaghat; Kutir Agri Producer Company Ltd., Betul; Phalam Sampada Producer Company, Chhindwara; Rewanchal Mahila Farmer Producer Company, Hoshangabad And Vindhyanchal Crop Producer Company Ltd., Rewa).

At state level, Barna Crop Producer Company Pvt. Ltd., Raisen was found to have convergence with maximum number of institutions/stakeholders (6), while Amarkantak Horticulture Producer Company Ltd. Anuppur and Kutir Agri Producer Company Ltd., Betul did not have convergence with any institution. Out of remaining FPOs, the convergence with institutions ranged between 1 (Rewanchal Mahila Farmer Producer Company, Hoshangabad; Dhanvantari Vegetable Producer Company Pvt. Ltd., Sehore and Vainganga Agro Farmers Producer Company Ltd., Seoni) to 4 (Pitambra Farmers Producer Company Ltd., Datia). At country level, Vainganga Agro Farmers Producer Company Ltd., Seoni was

found to have convergence with 2 institutions/stakeholders while Amarkantak Horticulture Producer Company Ltd., Anuppur; Bhumija Farmer Producer Company Ltd., Chhindwara; Phalam Sampada Producer Company, Chhindwara; Revanchal Mahila Farmer Producer Company, Hoshangabad; Vikas Gramin Evam Samaj Seva Samiti, Khargone and Kali Sindh Farmer Producer Company Private Ltd., Ujjain did not have convergence with any institutions/stakeholders and remaining FPOs were found to have convergence with only one institution/stakeholder (Table 2.4).

2.4 Business Activities

The FPOs under study were found to be involved in various business activities such as supply of seeds of various crops, vegetables and fruit plants; supplier of fertilizers and other inputs; supply of cattle feed and cattles; procurement of output and processing of output from the producer members.

2.4.1 Supply of Seed

The supply of seed was analysed at producer farmer benefited, percentage FPO members and producer members margin reduce from respective FPOs

2.4.1.1 Producer Member Benefited

The supply of seeds for different crops, vegetables and fruit plants and percent producer remembers benefited from this is presented in table 2.5. It is clear from the data that the paddy seed was found to be supplied by the 4 FPOs and percentage of producer members benefited by Vainganga Agro Farmer Producer Company Ltd. were found to be maximum (90%) followed by Barma Crop Producer Company Private Ltd., Raisen (64%), Rewanchal Mahila Farmer Producer Company Hoshangabad (56%) and Vidhata Agro Producer Company Ltd. Balaghat (30%). On an average 60 per cent producer members were found to be benefited due to supply of paddy seeds across 4 FPOs.

The wheat seed was also found to be distributed by 9 FPOs and on an average 45.39 per cent producer members were found to be benefited across these FPOs. The maximum percentage of producer members benefited due to supply of wheat seed were found to be of Bhumija Farmers Producer Company Ltd., Chhindwara (70.82%) followed by Vainganga Agro Farmers Producer Company Ltd., Seoni (70%), Dhanvantari Vegetable Producer Company Ltd., Sehore (69.30%), Vindhyaachal

Table 2.5 : Input seed Supply across FPOs (Per cent Producer members benefited)

Name of FPO	Field Crop				Small millets (Kodo/Kutki)	Vegetables	Fruit Plant
	Paddy	Wheat	Pea	Soybean			
Amarkantak Horticulture Producer Company Ltd., Anuppur	-	-	-	-	18.12	90.58	39.25
Vidhata Crop Producer Company Ltd., Balaghat	30	46					
Kutir Agri Producer Company Ltd., Betul	-						
Bhumija Farmers Producer Company Ltd., Chhindawara		70.82					
Phalam Sampada Producer Company, Chhindawara							
Pitambra Farmers Producer Company Ltd., Datia		6.67					
Jyotstana India Producer Company Ltd., Datia							
Umeed India Producer Company Ltd., Gwalior							
Revanchal Mahila Farmer Producer Company, Hoshangabad	56.00	22.00					
Vikas Gramin Evam Samaj Sewa Samiti, Khargone							
Barna Crop Producer Company Pvt. Ltd., Raisen	64.00	50.00					
Vindhyanchal Crop Producer Company Ltd., Rewa		69.04	1.07	65.47			
Dhanvantri Vegetables Producer Company Ltd., Sehore		69.30		29.70			
Vainganga Agro Farmers Producer Company Ltd., Seoni	90.00	70.00					
Kalisindh Farmer Producer Company Pvt. Ltd., Ujjain		4.68		8.25			
Average	60.00	45.39	1.07	34.47	18.12	90.58	39.25

Crop Producer Company Ltd., Rewa (69.04%), The seed of field pea was found to be distributed only by Vindhyachal Crop Producer Company Ltd., Rewa to 1.07 per cent their producer members only. The soybean seed was distributed by 3 FPOs, out of which the maximum producer members were found to be benefited by Vindhyachal Crop Producer Company Ltd., Rewa (65.47%) followed by Dhanvantari Barna Crop Producer Company Pvt. Ltd., Raisen (50%), Vidhata Crop Producer Company Ltd., Balaghat (46%), Rewanchal Mahila Farmer Producer Company, Hoshangabad (22%), Pitambara Farmers Producer Company Ltd., Datia (6.67%) and Kalisindh Farmer Producer Company Pvt. Ltd. Ujjain (4.68%).

Vegetable Producer Company Ltd., Sehore (29.70%) and Kalishindh Farmer Producer Company Pvt. Ltd., Ujjain (8.25%). On an average percentage of additional members benefited due to supplier of soybean seed were found to be 34.4 7% across above 3 FPOs. The seeds of kodon/kutki, vegetables and fruit plants were found to be distributed to 18.12, 90.58 and 39.25 per cent producer members respectively

only by Amarkantak Horticulture Producer Company Ltd., Anuppur (Table 2.5).

2.4.1.2 FPOs Margin

The percent margin of FPOs due to supply of seeds is presented in table 2.6. The maximum margin due to supply of paddy seeds among producer members was found to be earned by Rewanchal Mahila Farmer Producer Company, Hoshangabad (16%) followed by

Table 2.6 : Input seed Supply across FPOs (Per cent FPOs Margin)

Name of FPO	Field Crops				Small millets Kodo/ Kutki	Vegetables	Fruit Plant
	Paddy	Wheat	Pea	Soybean			
Amarkantak Horticulture Producer Company Ltd., Anuppur					0	0	0
Vidhata Crop Producer Company Ltd., Balaghat	4.11	3.58					
Kutir Agri Producer Company Ltd., Betul							
Bhumija Farmers Producer Company Ltd., Chhindawara		6.45					
Phalam Sampada Producer Company, Chhindawara							
Pitambra Farmers Producer Company Ltd., Datia		16.67					
Jyotstana India Producer Company Ltd., Datia							
Umeed India Producer Company Ltd., Gwalior							
Revanchal Mahila Farmer Producer Company, Hoshangabad	16.00	12.00					
Vikas Gramin Evam Samaj Sewa Samiti, Khargone							
Barna Crop Producer Company Pvt. Ltd., Raisen	9.09	4.69					
Vindhyanal Crop Producer Company Ltd., Rewa		8.20	27.78	20.00			
Dhanvantri Vegetables Producer Company Ltd., Sehore		9.00		9.22			
Vainganga Agro Farmers Producer Company Ltd., Seoni	2.00	27.75					
Kalishindh Farmer Producer Company Pvt. Ltd., Ujjain		3.33		3.64			
Average	7.80	10.19	27.78	10.95	0.00	0.00	0.00

Impact Evaluation of 15 Farmer Producers' Organization Projects in Madhya Pradesh

Barna Crop Producer Company Private Ltd., Raisen (9.09%), Vidhata Crop Producer Company Ltd., Balaghat (4.11%) and Vainganga Agro Farmers Producer Company Ltd. Seoni (2%). The per cent margin earned by an average FPOs was found to be 7.80 per cent per FPOs in the supply of paddy seed.

The maximum margin due to supply of wheat seed among producer members was found to be earned by Vainganga Agro Farmer Producer Company Ltd., Seoni (27.75%) followed by Pitambara Farmers Producer Company Ltd., Datia (16.67%), Rewanchal Mahila Farmer Producer Company, Hoshangabad (12%), Dhanvantari Vegetable Producer Company Ltd., Sehore (9%), Vindhyachal Crop Producer Company Ltd., Rewa (8.20%) and Bhumija Farmers Producer Company Ltd., Chhindwara (6.45%), while rest 3 FPOs were found to earn profit margin of less than 5 per cent. The profit margin earned by an average FPO was found to be 10.19 per cent in supply of wheat seed.

The profit margin earned due to supply of field pea and producer members by Vindhyachal Crop Producer Company Ltd., Rewa was found to be 27.78 per cent. The profit margin earned due to supply of soybean seed

among producer members was found to be maximum in case of Vindhyachal Crop Producer Company Ltd., Rewa (20%) followed by Dhanvantari Vegetables Producer Company Ltd., Sehore (9.22%) and Kalisindh Farmer Producer Company Pvt. Ltd., Ujjain (3.64%). The profit margin on due to supply of soybean seed among producer members by an average FPO was found to be 10.95%. The profit margin earned due to supply of seeds of small millets, vegetables and fruit plants by Amarkantak Horticulture Producer Company Ltd., Anuppur was found to be nil (Table 2.6).

2.4.1.3 Producer Member Margin

The percent profit earned by producers members in supply of seeds the FPOs under study across various crops is presented in table 2.7. The data is presented in table 1 shows that on an average producer member earned profit margin of 10.71 and 6.28 percent while purchasing seeds of pea and soybean from FPO, respectively. In case of paddy and wheat an average producer members instead of earning incurred loss of 48.42 and 9.86 percent, respectively.

The above earning profit are compared with respect to market price of seed of crops supplied by the FPOs to their producer

Table 2.7 : Input seed Supply across FPOs (Per cent Members Margin)

Name of FPO	Paddy	Wheat	Pea	Soybean
Amarkantak Horticulture Producer Company Ltd., Anuppur				
Vidhata Crop Producer Company Ltd., Balaghat	1.56	-8.11		
Kutir Agri Producer Company Ltd., Betul				
Bhumija Farmers Producer Company Ltd., Chhindawara				
Phalam Sampada Producer Company, Chhindawara				
Pitambra Farmers Producer Company Ltd., Datia				
Jyotstana India Producer Company Ltd., Datia				
Umeed India Producer Company Ltd., Gwalior				
Revanchal Mahila Farmer Producer Company, Hoshangabad	-131.59	49.24		
Vikas Gramin Cvam Samaj Sewa Samiti, Khargone				
Barna Crop Producer Company Pvt. Ltd., Raisen	-36.84	-41.94		
Vindhyanchal Crop Producer Company Ltd., Rewa		-61.54	10.71	18.21
Dhanvantri Vegetables Producer Company Ltd., Sehore		7.81		12.5
Vainganga Agro Farmers Producer Company Ltd., Seoni	-26.79			
Kalisindh Farmer Producer Company Pvt. Ltd., Ujjain		-4.66		-11.88
Average	-48.42	-9.86	10.71	6.28

members. In case of supply of seed of pea and soybean an average producer member of Vindhyanchal Crop Producer Company Ltd., Rewa could earned profit margin 10.71 and 18.21 per cent, respectively, while in case of

Dhanvantri Vegetables Producer Company Ltd., Sehore it was found to be 12.5 percent in case of soybean, while loss of 11.88 per cent was found to be incurred in case of Kalisindh Farmer Producer Company Pvt. Ltd., Ujjain. In case of paddy an average producer member of Vidhata Crop Producer Company Ltd., Balaghat earned profit margin of 1.56 per cent. In case of paddy seeds, the maximum loss to an average producer member was found to be incurred in case of

Revanchal Mahila Farmer Producer Company, Hoshangabad (131.59%) folloed by Barna Crop Producer Company Pvt. Ltd., Raisen (36.84%) and Kalisindh Farmer Producer Company Pvt. Ltd., Ujjain (26.79%).

An average producer member of Revanchal Mahila Farmer Producer Company, Hoshangabad and Dhanvantri Vegetables Producer Company Ltd., Sehore earned profit margin of 49.24 and 7.81 percent, while incurred loss of 61.54, 41.94, 8.11 and 4.66 percent in purchasing of wheat seed from, Barna Crop Producer Company Pvt. Ltd., Raisen, Vidhata Crop Producer Company Ltd., Balaghat and, respectively (Table 2.7).

2.4.2 Supply of Fertilizers and Other

Inputs

The another business activities which was taken up by the FPOs taken under study were found to be supply of fertilizers (bio & chemical), vermi-compost and mushroom kit, protection chemicals and plant growth regulators among producer members and clarified under producer member benefited, FPO margin and producer member margin. The supply of above inputs and producer member benefited across various FPOs is presented in table 2.8.

2.4.2.1 Producer Member Benefited

It is clear from the data that in case of bio- fertilizers, the producer members were found to be benefited by vermi-compost (6.40%), which was supplied by Rewanchal Mahila Farmer Producer Company Hoshangabad. The Khalisindh Farmer Producer Company Pvt.Ltd. Ujjain used to supply rhizobium to 2.20 per cent producer members. The rhizobium was found to be supplied by Vindhyachal Crop Producer Company Ltd., Rewa; Vainganga Agro Farmers Producer Company Ltd., Seoni and Kalisindh Farmer Producer Company Private Ltd., Ujjain to 2.38, 2.00 and 1.10 per cent producer members,

respectively. On an average 1.83 per cent producer members were found to be benefited due to supply of azotobactor across these FPOs. The PSB was found to be supplied by Vindhyachal Crop Producer Company Ltd., Rewa and Kalisindh Farmer Producer Company Private Ltd. Ujjain to 2.38 and 1.10 per cent producer members, respectively. On average 1.74 per cent producer members were found to be benefited through this activity. The mushroom kit was found to be supplied only by Rewanchal Mahila Farmer Producer Company, Hoshangabad to his 33.40 per cent producer members (Table 2.8).

The supply of chemical fertilizers and micronutrients among producer members was also recorded and found that the urea was found to be supplied to maximum producer members by Vindhyachal Crop Producer Company Ltd., Rewa (86.90%) followed by Kalisindh Farmer Producer Company Pvt. Ltd. Ujjain (84.62%), Bhumija Farmer Producer Company Ltd. Chhindwara (70.72%) and Vainganga Agro Farmer Producer Company Ltd., Seoni (26%). The DAP was found to be distributed among maximum producer members by Kalisindh Farmer Producer Company Pvt. Ltd. Ujjain (90.11%) followed by Vindhyachal Crop

Table 2.8 : Fertilizers & Others input Supply across FPOs (Per cent Producer members benefited)

Name of FPO	Bio Fertilizer				Mushroom kit	Fertilizer				
	Rhizobium	Azotobacter	PSB	Vermi Compost		Urea	DAP	MOP	SSP	Micro Nutrient
Amarkantak Horticulture Producer Company Ltd., Anuppur	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Vidhata Crop Producer Company Ltd., Balaghat	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Kutir Agri Producer Company Ltd., Betul	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Bhumija Farmers Producer Company Ltd., Chhindawara	-	-	-	-	-	70.72	70.72	14.14	14.14	21.22
Phalam Sampada Producer Company, Chhindawara	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Pitambra Farmers Producer Company Ltd., Datia	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Jyotstana India Producer Company Ltd., Datia	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Umeed India Producer Company Ltd., Gwalior	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Revanchal Mahila Farmer Producer Company, Hoshangabad	-	-	-	6.40	33.40	-	-	-	-	-
Vikas Gramin Evam Samaj Sewa Samiti, Khargone	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Barna Crop Producer Company Pvt. Ltd., Raisen	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Vindhyanchal Crop Producer Company Ltd., Rewa	0.00	2.38	2.38	0.00	-	86.90	82.14	20.23	20.23	23.80
Dhanvantri Vegetables Producer Company Ltd., Sehore	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Vainganga Agro Farmers Producer Company Ltd., Seoni	0.00	2.00	0.00	-	-	26.00	28.00	2.00	-	6.00
Kalisindh Farmer Producer Company Pvt. Ltd., Ujjain	2.20	1.10	1.10	-	-	84.62	90.11	-	13.19	10.99
Average	2.20	1.83	1.74	6.40	33.40	67.06	67.74	12.12	15.85	15.50

Producer Company Ltd., Rewa (82.14%), Bhoomija Farmer Producer Company Ltd., Chhindwara (70.72%) and Vainganga Agro Farmer Producer Company Ltd., Seoni (28%). The MOP and SSP were also found to be distributed among producer members by same FPOs and found to be maximum in case of Vindhychal Crop Producer Company Ltd., Rewa (20.23%) followed by Bhumiya Farmer Producer Company Ltd., Chhindwara (14.14%). The Vainganga Agro Farmer Producer Company Ltd., Seoni used to distributed MOP to its 2 per cent producer members, while Kalisindh Farmer Producer Company Pvt. Ltd. Ujjain used to distributed SSP to its 13.19 per cent producer members (Table 2.8).

The micronutrients distributed by Vindhychal Crop Producer Company Ltd., Rewa was found to be maximum (23.80%) followed by Bhumiya Farmer Producer Company Ltd., Chhindwara (21.22%), Kalisindh Farmer Producer Company Pvt. Ltd., Ujjain (10.99%) and Vainganga Agro Farmers Producer Company Ltd., Seoni (6%), on an average 67.06, 67.74, 12.12, 15.85 and 15.50 per cent producer members were found to be benefited due to supply of urea, DAP, MOP, SSP

and micronutrients respectively (Table 2.8).

As far as plant protection chemicals are concerned, weedicides and insecticides were found to be supplied by 5 FPOs while fungicide was found to be supplied by only 1 FPO (Table 2.9). The maximum number of producer members were found to be benefited due to supply of weedicide by Kalisindh Farmer Producer Company Pvt. Ltd., Ujjain (50.55%) followed by Vindhychal Crop Producer Company Ltd., Rewa (44.04%), Bhoomija Farmer Producer Company Ltd., Chhindwara (21.51%), Vidhata Crop Producer Company Ltd., Balaghat (14.34%) and Vainganga Agro Farmers Producer Company Ltd., Seoni (2%). The maximum number of members were also found to be benefited due to supplier of insecticide by Kalisiindh Farmer Producer Company Private Ltd., Ujjain (30.77%) followed by Vindhychal Crop Producer Company Ltd., Rewa (29.76%), Vidhata Crop Producer Company Ltd., Balaghat (15.44%), Bhoomija Farmer Producer Company Ltd., Chhindwara (9.2%) and Vainganga Agro Farmer Producer Company Ltd., Seoni (6%). The fungicide was only found to be supplied by Kalisiindh Farmer Producer Company Pvt. Ltd., Ujjain only to 3.30 percent producer members.

**Table 2.9 : Plant Protection Chemical and Plant Growth Regulator supply across FPOs
(% Producer members benefited)**

Name of FPO	Plant Protection Chemical			Plant Growth Regulator				
	Weedicide	Insecticide	Fungicide	Sagarika	Mecrina	Biovita	Expert	Dhanzyme
Amarkantak Horticulture Producer Company Ltd., Anuppur	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Vidhata Crop Producer Company Ltd., Balaghat	14.34	15.44	-	-	-	-	-	-
Kutir Agri Producer Company Ltd., Betul	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Bhumija Farmers Producer Company Ltd., Chhindawara	21.51	9.2	-	42.43	-	-	-	-
Phalam Sampada Producer Company, Chhindawara	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Pitambra Farmers Producer Company Ltd., Datia	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Jyotstana India Producer Company Ltd., Datia	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Umeed India Producer Company Ltd., Gwalior	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Revanchal Mahila Farmer Producer Company, Hoshangabad	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Vikas Gramin Evam Samaj Sewa Samiti, Khargone	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Barna Crop Producer Company Pvt. Ltd., Raisen	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Vindhyanchal Crop Producer Company Ltd., Rewa	44.04	29.76	0.00	-	-	-	-	-
Dhanvantri Vegetables Producer Company Ltd., Sehore	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Vainganga Agro Farmers Producer Company Ltd., Seoni	2.00	6.00	-	-	-	-	-	-
Kalisindh Farmer Producer Company Pvt. Ltd., Ujjain	50.55	30.77	3.30	-	20.62	36.08	13.40	10.31
Average	26.49	18.23	3.30	42.43	20.62	36.08	13.40	10.31

The Plant growth regulator Sagarika was found to be supplied by Bhoomija Farmer Producer Company Ltd. Chhindwara to its 42.43% producer members. Kali Sindh Farmer Producer Company Private Ltd. Ujjain used to supply mercina, biovita, expert and dhanzyme to its 20.62, 36.08, 13.40 and 10.31 per cent producer members, respectively (Table 2.9).

2.4.2.2 FPO Margin

The profit margin earned by FPOs, while supplying rhizobium to its producer members was found to be nil, while that of azotobacter,

Table 2.10 : Fertilizers & Others input Supply across FPOs (Per cent FPOs Margin)

Name of FPO	Bio Fertilizer				Mushroom	Fertilizer				
	Rhizobium	Azoto bactor	PSB	Vermi Compost		Urea	DAP	MOP	SSP	Micro Nutrient
Amarkantak Horticulture Producer Company Ltd., Anuppur	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Vidhata Crop Producer Company Ltd., Balaghat	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Kutir Agri Producer Company Ltd., Betul	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Bhumija Farmers Producer Company Ltd., Chhindawara	-	-	-	-	-	5.56	0	37.76	15.13	31.58
Phalam Sampada Producer Company, Chhindawara	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Pitambra Farmers Producer Company Ltd., Datia	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Jyotstana India Producer Company Ltd., Datia	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Umeed India Producer Company Ltd., Gwalior	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Revanchal Mahila Farmer Producer Company, Hoshangabad	-	-	-	1190.65	128.70	-	-	-	-	-
Vikas Gramin Evam Samaj Sewa Samiti, Khargone	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Barna Crop Producer Company Pvt. Ltd., Raisen	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Vindhyachal Crop Producer Company Ltd., Rewa	0.00	0.00	11.11	0.00	-	3.68	8.23	14.55	-	-
Dhanvantri Vegetables Producer Company Ltd., Sehore	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Vainganga Agro Farmers Producer Company Ltd., Seoni	0.00	25.00	0.00	-	-	0.66	5.77	12.52	-	-
Kalisindh Farmer Producer Company Pvt. Ltd., Ujjain	0.00	0.00	0.00	-	-	13.53	0.47	-	31.58	-
Average	0.00	25.00	11.11	1190.65	128.70	5.86	4.82	21.61	23.36	31.58

PSB and vermicompost it was found to be 25, (Table 2.10). The profit margin earned by Kali Sindh Farmer Producer Company Private Ltd. 11.11 and 190.65 per cent by Vainganga Agro Ujjain due to supply of urea was found to be maximum (13.53%) followed by Bhoomija Farmers Producer Company Ltd., Chhindwara 5.56%), Vindhyachal Crop Producer Company Ltd., Rewa (3.68%) and Vainganga Agro Farmers Producer Company Ltd., Seoni (0.66%).

Vindhyachal Crop Producer Company Ltd. Rewa and Revanchal Mahila Farmer Producer Company Hoshangabad, respectively. The profit margin earned by Revanchal Mahila Farmer Producer Company Hoshangabad due to supply of mushroom kit was found to be 128.70 per cent

In case of DAP the profit margin earned by Vindhyachal Crop Producer Company Ltd. Rewa was found to be maximum (8.23%) followed by Vainganga Agro Farmer Producer Company Ltd., Seoni (5.77%) and Kali Sindh Farmer Producer Company Private Ltd., Ujjain (0.47%). The profit margin earned due to supply of murate of potash was found to be maximum in case of Bhoomija Farmers Producer Company Ltd., Chhindwara (37.76%) followed by Vindhyachal Crop Producer Company Ltd. Rewa (14.55%) and Vainganga Agro Farmers Producer Company Ltd. Seoni (12.52%).

The profit margin of Kali Sindh Farmer Producer Company Private Ltd. Ujjain and Bhoomija Farmers Producer Company Ltd. Chhindwara in supplying of SSP was found to be 31.58 and 15.13%, respectively. Phalam Farmers Producer Company Ltd. Chhindwara earned profit margin of 31.58% by supplying micronutrients to their producer members (Table 2.10).

4.1.2.3 Producer Member Margin

The profit margin earned by an average producer members of FPOs under study across bio fertilizer, mushroom, chemical fertilizer and micro nutrient is presented in table 2.11. which shows that it was found to be maximum in case

of Revanchal Mahila Farmer Producer Company, Hoshangabad, while Purchase of mushroom spawn (31.23%) and earth verms for vermicomposting (28.83%). In case of PSB it was found to be 10 percent for an average producer member of Vindhyanchal Crop Producer Company Ltd., Rewa. The loss of 33.33 per cent was found to be incurred to an average producer members, while purchasing Azotobactor from Vainganga Agro Farmers Producer Company Ltd., Seoni. In case Rhizobium, there was no profit and no loss stage for an average producer member across the FPOs involved in its supply. Purchase of micro nutrients from Bhumiya Farmers Producer Company Ltd., Chhindawara (26.32%) (Table 2.11)..

An average producer members was found to earned profit margin of 18.66 per cent in purchase of murate of potash (MOP) from Bhumiya Farmers Producer Company Ltd., Chhindawara (32.14%), Vindhyanchal Crop Producer Company Ltd., Rewa (12.70%) and (11.13%). In case of Urea profit margin earned by an average producer member was found to be 3.70 per cent which was found to be maximum in case of Kalisindh Farmer Producer Company Pvt. Ltd., Ujjain (11.92%), Vindhyanchal Crop

Table 2.11 : Fertilizers & Others input Supply across FPOs (Per cent Farmers Margin)

Name of FPO	Bio Fertilizer				Mushroom	Fertilizer				Micro Nutrient
	Rhizobium	Azoto bactor	PSB	Vermi Compost		Urea	DAP	MOP	SSP	
Amarkantak Horticulture Producer Company Ltd., Anuppur	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Vidhata Crop Producer Company Ltd., Balaghat	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Kutir Agri Producer Company Ltd., Betul	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Bhumija Farmers Producer Company Ltd., Chhindawara	-	-	-	-	-	0	0	32.14	13.3	26.32
Phalam Sampada Producer Company, Chhindawara	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Pitambra Farmers Producer Company Ltd., Datia	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Jyotstana India Producer Company Ltd., Datia	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Umeed India Producer Company Ltd., Gwalior	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Revanchal Mahila Farmer Producer Company, Hoshangabad	-	-	-	28.83	31.23	-	-	-	-	-
Vikas Gramin Cvam Samaj Sewa Samiti, Khargone	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Barna Crop Producer Company Pvt. Ltd., Raisen	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Vindhyanchal Crop Producer Company Ltd., Rewa	0	-	10	-	-	3.55	7.6	12.7	-	-
Dhanvantri Vegetables Producer Company Ltd., Sehore	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Vainganga Agro Farmers Producer Company Ltd., Seoni	0	-33.33	-	-	-	-0.67	5.45	11.13	-	-
Kalisindh Farmer Producer Company Pvt. Ltd., Ujjain	0	-	-	-	-	11.92	-0.47	-	-46.16	-
Average	0	-33.33	10	28.83	31.23	3.7	3.15	18.66	-16.41	26.32

Producer Company Ltd., Rewa (3.99%), while their no profit and no loss in case of Bhumija Farmers Producer Company Ltd., Chhindawara, while incurred loss of 0.67 per cent in case of Vainganga Agro Farmers Producer Company Ltd., Seoni. The profit margin earned by average producer member while purchasing DAP was found to be 3.15 per cent, which was maximum in Vindhyanchal Crop Producer Company Ltd., Rewa (7.60%) followed by Vainganga Agro Farmers Producer Company Ltd., Seoni (5.45%), while losses of 0.47 per cent incurred in case of Kalisindh Farmer Producer Company Pvt. Ltd., Ujjain and no profit and no loss in case of Bhumija Farmers Producer Company Ltd., Chhindawara. In case of SSP an average producer member incurred loss of 16.41 per

cent, by an average producer members of Bhumija Farmers Producer Company Ltd., Chhindawara was found to be 13.30 per cent, while incurred loss of 46.16 per cent in case of Kalisindh Farmer Producer Company Pvt. Ltd., Ujjain (Table 2.11).

The profit margin earned in supplying of weedicide to producer members was found to be maximum in Kalisindh Farmers Producer Company Private Ltd. Ujjain (24.99 %) followed by Vidhata Crop Producer Company Ltd. Balaghat (11.78%), Vainganga Agro Farmers Producer Company Ltd. Seoni (7.69%), Bhumija Farmers Producer Company Ltd. Chhindawara (5.88%), Barna Crop Producer Company Private Ltd. Raisen (5.82%) (Table 2.12).

In case of insecticide, profit margin was found to be earned by Vainganga Agro Farmers Producer Company Ltd., Seoni (20.04%) followed by Kalisindh Farmers Producer Company Private Ltd., Ujjain (14.29%), Vindhyaachal Crop Producer Company Ltd., Rewa (9.06%), Bhoomija Farmers Producer Company Ltd. Chhindwara (1.61%) and Vidhata Crop Producer Company Ltd., Balaghat (0.53%). The profit margin earned by Kalisindh Farmer Producer Company Private Ltd., Ujjain, while supplying fungicide to its producer members was found to be only 0.25 per cent. The Bhumiija Farmers Producer Company Ltd., Chhindwara got profit margin of 6.67% while

supplying Sagarika plant growth regulator to its producer members. The Kalisindh Farmers Producer Company Private Ltd., Ujjain got profit margin of 25, 8.33, 30 and 20 per cent in supplying *Mercina*, *Biovita*, *Expert* and *Dhanzime* its producer members, respectively (Table 2.12).

As far as purchase of plant protection chemicals is concerned, an average producer members was found to earn profit margin of 7.73, which was found to be maximum in case of Kalisindh Farmer Producer Company Pvt. Ltd., Ujjain (19.98%) followed by Bhumiija Farmers Producer Company Ltd., Chhindawara (17.81%), Vainganga Agro Farmers Producer

Table 2.12 : Fertilizers & Others input Supply across FPOs (Per cent FPOs Margin)

Name of FPO	Plant Protection Chemical			Plant Growth Regulator				
	Weedicide	Insecticide	Fungicide	Sagarika	Mecrina	Biovita	Expert	Dhanzime
Amarkantak Horticulture Producer Company Ltd., Anuppur	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Vidhata Crop Producer Company Ltd., Balaghat	11.78	0.53	-	-	-	-	-	-
Kutir Agri Producer Company Ltd., Betul	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Bhumiija Farmers Producer Company Ltd., Chhindawara	5.88	1.61	-	6.67	-	-	-	-
Phalam Sampada Producer Company, Chhindawara	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Pitambra Farmers Producer Company Ltd., Datia	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Jyotstana India Producer Company Ltd., Datia	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Umeed India Producer Company Ltd., Gwalior	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Revanchal Mahila Farmer Producer Company, Hoshangabad	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Vikas Gramin Evam Samaj Sewa Samiti, Khargone	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Barna Crop Producer Company Pvt. Ltd., Raisen	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Vindhyaachal Crop Producer Company Ltd., Rewa	5.82	9.06	0	-	-	-	-	-
Dhanvantri Vegetables Producer Company Ltd., Sehore	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Vainganga Agro Farmers Producer Company Ltd., Seoni	7.69	20.04	-	-	-	-	-	-
Kalisindh Farmer Producer Company Pvt. Ltd., Ujjain	24.99	14.29	0.25	-	25	8.33	30	20
Average	11.23	9.11	0.25	6.67	25	8.33	30	20

Table 2.13 : Fertilizers & Others input Supply across FPOs (Per cent producer member Margin)

Name of FPO	Plant Protection Chemical			Plant Growth Regulator				
	Weedicide	Insecticide	Fungicide	Sagarika	Mecrina	Biovita	Expert	Dhanzime
Amarkantak Horticulture Producer Company Ltd., Anuppur	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Vidhata Crop Producer Company Ltd., Balaghat	-11.76	-0.59	-	-	-	-	-	-
Kutir Agri Producer Company Ltd., Betul								
Bhumija Farmers Producer Company Ltd., Chhindawara	17.81	2.79	-	-6.67	-	-	-	-
Phalam Sampada Producer Company, Chhindawara								
Pitambra Farmers Producer Company Ltd., Datia	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Jyotstana India Producer Company Ltd., Datia								
Umeed India Producer Company Ltd., Gwalior	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Revanchal Mahila Farmer Producer Company, Hoshangabad	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Vikas Gramin Cvam Samaj Sewa Samiti, Khargone	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Barna Crop Producer Company Pvt. Ltd., Raisen	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Vindhyanchal Crop Producer Company Ltd., Rewa	5.5	8.31	-	-	-	-	-	-
Dhanvantri Vegetables Producer Company Ltd., Sehore	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Vainganga Agro Farmers Producer Company Ltd., Seoni	7.14	-25.07	-	-	-	-	-	-
Kalisindh Farmer Producer Company Pvt. Ltd., Ujjain	19.98	12.5	-6.65	-	-25	-8.33	-30	-20
Average	7.73	-0.41	-6.65	-6.67	-25	-8.33	-30	-20

Company Ltd., Seoni (7.14%) and Producer Company Ltd., Balaghat (Table 2.13).

Vindhyanchal Crop Producer Company Ltd., Rewa (5.5%), while loss of 11.76 per cent was found to be incurred in case of Vidhata Crop

On an average, the loss of 0.41 per cent was found to be incurred to producer members in purchase of insecticide, which was found to be

maximum in case of Vainganga Agro Farmers Producer Company Ltd., Seoni (25.07%) and Vidhata Crop Producer Company Ltd., Balaghat (0.59%), while the profit margin was found to be earned by of Kalisindh Farmer Producer Company Pvt. Ltd., Ujjain (12.5%), Vindhyanal Crop Producer Company Ltd., Rewa (8.31%) and Bhumija Farmers Producer Company Ltd., Chhindawara (2.79%). The loss of 6.65 per cent was found to be incurred to an average producer members in purchase of fungicide from Kalisindh Farmer Producer Company Pvt. Ltd., Ujjain.

The loss incurred to an average producer members in purchase of plant growth regulators

such as expert mecrina, dhangime and biovita from Kalisindh Farmer Producer Company Pvt. Ltd., Ujjain were found to be 30, 25, 20 and 8.33 percent, respectively. The loss of 6.67 per cent was found to be incurred to an average producer member in purchased of sagarika from Bhumija Farmers Producer Company Ltd., Chhindawara (Table 2.13).

2.4.3 Supply of Cattle and Cattle Feed

The supply of cattle and cattle feed to producer members across various FPOs is presented in table 2.14, while the profit margin earned by the FPOs and producer members, while doing these activities is presented in table 2.15 & 2.16 respectively.

Table 2.14 : Cattle/ cattle feed supply across FPOs (Per cent Producer members benefited)

Name of FPO	Cattle Supply (Buffalo)	Cattle Feed	
		Sudana	Concentrate
Amarkantak Horticulture Producer Company Ltd., Anuppur	-	-	-
Vidhata Crop Producer Company Ltd., Balaghat	-	-	-
Kutir Agri Producer Company Ltd., Betul	-	-	-
Bhumija Farmers Producer Company Ltd., Chhindawara	-	-	-
Phalam Sampada Producer Company, Chhindawara	-	-	-
Pitambra Farmers Producer Company Ltd., Datia	-	-	-
Jyotstana India Producer Company Ltd., Datia	-	-	16.00
Ummeed India Producer Company Ltd., Gwalior	-	-	22.00
Revanchal Mahila Farmer Producer Company, Hoshangabad	-	-	20.00
Vikas Gramin Evam Samaj Sewa Samiti, Khargone	80.55	41.38	80.50
Barna Crop Producer Company Pvt. Ltd., Raisen	-	-	-
Vindhyanal Crop Producer Company Ltd., Rewa	-	-	-
Dhanvantri Vegetables Producer Company Ltd., Sehore	15.84	8.35	19.05
Vainganga Agro Farmers Producer Company Ltd., Seoni	-	-	-
Kalisindh Farmer Producer Company Pvt. Ltd., Ujjain	-	-	-
Average	48.20	24.87	31.51

2.4.3.1 Producer Member Benefited

It is clear from the data presented that only buffaloes were found to be supplied to producer members by 2 FPOs, out of which 80.55 per cent producer members were found to be benefited by Vikas Gramin Evam Sewa Samaj Samiti, Khargone while 15.84 per cent by Dhanvantari Vegetables Producer Company Ltd., Sehore. On an average 48.20 per cent producer members were found to be benefited by this activity (Table 2.14). The percent margin earned by the above FPOs was found to be 2.91 and 4.17 per cent respectively and on an average the profit margin earned by FPO was found to be 3.54 per cent through supply of buffalos as for as cattle feed supply is concerned 41.38 and 8.35 per cent producer member were found to be benefited by Vikas Gramin Evam Samaj Sewa Samiti, Khargone and Dhanvantri Vegetables Producer Company Ltd., Sehore and on an average 24.87 per cent producer member were found to be benefited by above these two FPOs through supply of mustard oil cake (Table 2.14 & 2.15), while performing this activity the profit margin earned by above FPOs was found to be 7.25 and 11.63 per cent, respectively and on an average it was found to be 9.44 per cent (Table 2.15). The

maximum producer members were found to be benefited by Vikas Gramin Evam Samaj Sewa Samiti, Khargone (80.50%) followed by Ummeed India Producer Company Ltd., Gwalior (22.00%), Revanchal Mahila Farmer Producer Company, Hoshangabad (20.00%), Dhanvantri Vegetables Producer Company Ltd., Sehore (19.05%) and Jyotstana India Producer Company Ltd., Datia (16.00%), respectively. On an average 31.51 per cent producer member were found to be benefited through supply of concentrate by above 5 FPOs (Table 2.14).

2.4.3.2 FPO Margin

The profit margin earned by Jyotstana India Producer Company Ltd., Datia, Ummeed India Producer Company Ltd., Gwalior and Revanchal Mahila Farmer Producer Company, Hoshangabad was found to be 20, 8 and 6.28 per cent, respectively. On an average FPOs earned profit margin of 11.43 per cent by supplying concentrate to their producer members. In spite of benefiting maximum producers members Vikas Gramin Evam Samaj Sewa Samiti, Khargone could not earned profit margin. The same is the case with Dhanvantri Vegetables Producer Company Ltd., Sehore (Table 2.15).

Table 2.15 : Cattle/ cattle feed Supply across FPOs (Per cent FPOs Margin)

Name of FPO	Cattle Supply (Buffalo)	Cattle Feed	
		Sudana	Concentrate
Amarkantak Horticulture Producer Company Ltd., Anuppur	-	-	-
Vidhata Crop Producer Company Ltd., Balaghat	-	-	-
Kutir Agri Producer Company Ltd., Betul	-	-	-
Bhumija Farmers Producer Company Ltd., Chhindawara	-	-	-
Phalam Sampada Producer Company, Chhindawara	-	-	-
Pitambra Farmers Producer Company Ltd., Datia	-	-	-
Jyotstana India Producer Company Ltd., Datia	-	-	20.00
Umeed India Producer Company Ltd., Gwalior	-	-	8.00
Revanchal Mahila Farmer Producer Company, Hoshangabad	-	-	6.28
Vikas Gramin Evam Samaj Sewa Samiti, Khargone	2.91	7.25	-
Barna Crop Producer Company Pvt. Ltd., Raisen	-	-	-
Vindhyanal Crop Producer Company Ltd., Rewa	-	-	-
Dhanvantri Vegetables Producer Company Ltd., Sehore	4.17	11.63	-
Vainganga Agro Farmers Producer Company Ltd., Seoni	-	-	-
Kalisindh Farmer Producer Company Pvt. Ltd., Ujjain	-	-	-
Average	3.54	9.44	11.43

2.4.3.3 Producer Member Margin

The purchase of cattle (buffalo) and producer members from respective FPOs were cattle feed (mustard oil cake and concentrate) by also studied in presented in table 2.16.

Table 2.16 : Cattle/ cattle feed Supply across FPOs (Per cent Farmers Margin)

Name of FPO	Cattle Supply (Buffalo)	Cattle Feed	
		Sudana (Mustard oil cake)	Concentrate
Amarkantak Horticulture Producer Company Ltd., Anuppur	-	-	-
Vidhata Crop Producer Company Ltd., Balaghat	-	-	-
Kutir Agri Producer Company Ltd., Betul	-	-	-
Bhumija Farmers Producer Company Ltd., Chhindawara	-	-	-
Phalam Sampada Producer Company, Chhindawara	-	-	-
Pitambra Farmers Producer Company Ltd., Datia	-	-	-
Jyotstana India Producer Company Ltd., Datia	-	-	7.21
Umeed India Producer Company Ltd., Gwalior	-	-	28.44
Revanchal Mahila Farmer Producer Company, Hoshangabad	-	-	-10.17
Vikas Gramin Cvam Samaj Sewa Samiti, Khargone	-3.33	-10.00	-
Barna Crop Producer Company Pvt. Ltd., Raisen	-	-	-
Vindhyanal Crop Producer Company Ltd., Rewa	-	-	-
Dhanvantri Vegetables Producer Company Ltd., Sehore	-7.14	-11.11	-
Vainganga Agro Farmers Producer Company Ltd., Seoni	-	-	-
Kalisindh Farmer Producer Company Pvt. Ltd., Ujjain	-	-	-
Average	-5.24	-10.56	8.49

The data presented in table 2.16 shows that on an average producer members was found to earned profit of 8.49 per cent from purchase of concentrate, while loss of 10.56 and 5.24 per cent incurred in purchase of mustard oil cake and buffalo. The concentrate purchased by an average producer member from Jyotstana India Producer Company Ltd., Datia and Umeed India Producer Company Ltd., Gwalior earned profit margin of 28.44 and 7.21 per cent, respectively, while incurred loss of 10.17 per cent in case of Revanchal Mahila Farmer Producer Company, Hoshangabad (Table 2.16).

2.4.4 Procurement of Output

The procurement of different product was analysed at producer member benefited and at FPO margin.

2.4.4.1 Producer Member Benefited

The procurement of output of various crops, fruits, forest product, milk, spices and vermicompost from producer members across various FPO is presented in table 2.17. As for as procurement of crops produce is concerned, on an average 24.96 per cent wheat producers followed by soybean (20.01%), kodo (13.47%), paddy (13.14%), gram (12.78%), til & kutki (2.65%) and Maize (5.28%) were found to be

benefited through procurement activity.

In case of paddy Vindhyanchal Crop Producer Company Ltd., Rewa and Vainganga Agro Farmers Producer Company Ltd., Seoni were found to be benefited their 14.28 and 12 per cent producer members. In soybean 24.17, 15.84 per cent producer members were found to be benefited by Kalisindh Farmer Producer Company Pvt. Ltd., Ujjain and Dhanvantri Vegetables Producer Company Ltd., Sehore. In case of wheat producer members of 57.42, 52.82, 26.35 and 23.43 were found to be benefited through Dhanvantri Vegetables Producer Company Ltd., Sehore followed by Vindhyanchal Crop Producer Company Ltd., Rewa, Kutir Agri Producer Company Ltd., Betul and Pitambra Farmers Producer Company Ltd., Datia, respectively. The remaining 3 FPOs could be able to provide benefits to less than 10 per cent of their producer members. In case of gram 26.56, 12.33, 9.83. and 2.38 producer members were found to be benefited by Pitambra Farmers Producer Company Ltd., Datia followed by Kutir Agri Producer Company Ltd., Betul, Phalam Sampada Producer Company, Chhindawara and Vindhyanchal Crop Producer Company Ltd., Rewa, respectively.

Table 2.17 : Procurement of Output across FPOs (Per cent Producer members benefited)

Name of FPO	Paddy	Soybean	Wheat	Gram	Til	Maize	Kodon	Kutki
Amarkantak Horticulture Producer Company Ltd., Anuppur	-	-	-	-	-	-	16.43	-
Vidhata Crop Producer Company Ltd., Balaghat	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Kutir Agri Producer Company Ltd., Betul	-	-	26.35	12.33	-	-	-	-
Bhumija Farmers Producer Company Ltd.,	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Chhindawara Phalam Sampada Producer Company, Chhindawara	-	-	7.25	9.83	-	6.55	10.5	6.25
Pitambra Farmers Producer Company Ltd., Datia	-	-	23.43	26.56	6.25	-	-	-
Jyotstana India Producer Company Ltd., Datia	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Umeed India Producer Company Ltd., Gwalior	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Revanchal Mahila Farmer Producer Company, Hoshangabad	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Vikas Gramin Evam Samaj Sewa Samiti, Khargone	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Barna Crop Producer Company Pvt. Ltd., Raisen	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Vindhyanchal Crop Producer Company Ltd., Rewa	14.28	-	52.08	2.38	-	-	-	-
Dhanvantri Vegetables Producer Company Ltd., Sehore	-	15.84	57.42	-	-	-	-	-
Vainganga Agro Farmers Producer Company Ltd., Seoni	12.00	-	6.00	-	-	4.00	-	-
Kalisindh Farmer Producer Company Pvt. Ltd., Ujjain	-	24.17	2.2	-	-	-	-	-
Average	13.14	20.01	24.96	12.78	6.25	5.28	13.47	6.25

Til was found to be procured only by found to be benefited. Maize was procured by Pitambra Farmers Producer Company Ltd., Phalam Sampada Producer Company, Datia and 6.25 per cent producer members were Chhindawara and Vainganga Agro Farmers

Impact Evaluation of 15 Farmer Producers' Organization Projects in Madhya Pradesh

Producer Company Ltd., Seoni and 6.55 and 4.00 per cent producer members were found to be benefited, respectively. Kodo was found to be procured by Amarkantak Horticulture Producer Company Ltd., Anuppur and Phalam Sampada Producer Company, Chhindawara and 16.43 and 10.5 per cent producer members were found to be benefited, respectively, while Kutki was found to be procured only by Phalam Sampada Producer Company, Chhindawara and 6.25 per cent producer members were found to benefited by this FPO (Table 2.17).

Mango was found to be procured by Amarkantak Horticulture Producer Company Ltd., Anuppur and benefited 25.30 per cent producer members, while Mahua, Java, Tamarind, Honey, Gooseberry (Amla), Harad and Baheda were found to be procured by Phalam Sampada Producer Company, Chhindawara and 22.95, 8.41, 5.14, 3.27, 4.91, 4.92 and 8.2 per cent producer members were found to be benefited, respectively (Table 2.18). Milk was found to be procured by Vikas Gramin Evam Samaj Sewa Samiti, Khargone and 29.51

Table 2.18 : Procurement of Output across FPOs (Per cent Producer members benefited)

Name of FPO	Mango	Mahua	Java	Tamarind	Honey	Gooseberry (Amla)	Harad	Baheda
Amarkantak Horticulture Producer Company Ltd., Anuppur	25.30	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Vidhata Crop Producer Company Ltd., Balaghat	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Kutir Agri Producer Company Ltd., Betul	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Bhumija Farmers Producer Company Ltd., Chhindawara	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Phalam Sampada Producer Company, Chhindawara	-	22.95	8.41	5.14	3.27	4.91	4.92	8.2
Pitambra Farmers Producer Company Ltd., Datia	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Jyotstana India Producer Company Ltd., Datia	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Umeed India Producer Company Ltd., Gwalior	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Revanchal Mahila Farmer Producer Company, Hoshangabad	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Vikas Gramin Evam Samaj Sewa Samiti, Khargone	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Barna Crop Producer Company Pvt. Ltd., Raisen	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Vindhyanchal Crop Producer Company Ltd., Rewa	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Dhanvantri Vegetables Producer Company Ltd., Sehore	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Vainganga Agro Farmers Producer Company Ltd., Seoni	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Kalisindh Farmer Producer Company Pvt. Ltd., Ujjain	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Average	25.30	22.95	8.41	5.14	3.27	4.91	4.92	8.20

per cent producer members were found to be benefited (Table 2.19).

The spices such as Turmeric, Coriander and Red chilli were found to be procured by Kutir Agri Producer Company Ltd., Betul and provided benefit to their 23.36, 76.00 and 40.00

producer members, respectively. Vermicompost was found to be procured by Amarkantak Horticulture Producer Company Ltd., Anuppur and provided benefit to their 20.00 per cent producer members (Table 2.19).

Table 2.19 : Procurement of Output across FPOs (Per cent Producer members benefited)

Name of FPO	Milk	Spices			Vermi compost
		Turmeric	Coriander	Red chilli	
Amarkantak Horticulture Producer Company Ltd., Anuppur	-	-	-	-	20
Vidhata Crop Producer Company Ltd., Balaghat	-	-	-	-	-
Kutir Agri Producer Company Ltd., Betul	-	23.36	76.00	40.00	-
Bhumija Farmers Producer Company Ltd., Chhindawara	-	-	-	-	-
Phalam Sampada Producer Company, Chhindawara	-	-	-	-	-
Pitambra Farmers Producer Company Ltd., Datia	-	-	-	-	-
Jyotstana India Producer Company Ltd., Datia	-	-	-	-	-
Umeed India Producer Company Ltd., Gwalior	-	-	-	-	-
Revanchal Mahila Farmer Producer Company, Hoshangabad	-	-	-	-	-
Vikas Gramin Evam Samaj Sewa Samiti, Khargone	29.51	-	-	-	-
Barna Crop Producer Company Pvt. Ltd., Raisen	-	-	-	-	-
Vindhyanchal Crop Producer Company Ltd., Rewa	-	-	-	-	-
Dhanvantri Vegetables Producer Company Ltd., Sehore	-	-	-	-	-
Vainganga Agro Farmers Producer Company Ltd., Seoni	-	-	-	-	-
Kalisindh Farmer Producer Company Pvt. Ltd., Ujjain	-	-	-	-	-
Average	29.51	23.36	76.00	40.00	20.00

2.4.4.2 FPOs Margin

The profit margin earned by FPOs by procuring of output of crops/fruits/forest produce/spices /milk/vermicompost and its processing is presented in table 2.20. On an average the profit earned by FPO while procuring paddy was found to be 65 per cent which was found to be more by Vindhyanchal

Crop Producer Company Ltd., Rewa (123%) followed by Vainganga Agro Farmers Producer Company Ltd., Seoni (7%). In case of soybean an average profit margin earned by FPOs was found to be 4.76 per cent, which was found to be more procured by Dhanvantri Vegetables Producer Company Ltd., Sehore (9.22%) followed by Kalisindh Farmer Producer Company Pvt. Ltd., Ujjain (0.29%). In case of

Table 2.20 : Procurement of Output across FPOs (Per cent FPOs Margin)

Name of FPO	Paddy	Soybean	Wheat	Gram	Til	Maize	Kodo	Kutki
Amarkantak Horticulture Producer Company Ltd., Anuppur	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Vidhata Crop Producer Company Ltd., Balaghat	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Kutir Agri Producer Company Ltd., Betul	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Bhumija Farmers Producer Company Ltd., Chhindawara	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Phalam Sampada Producer Company, Chhindawara	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Pitambra Farmers Producer Company Ltd., Datia	-	-	11.26	68.15	57.07	-	-	-
Jyotstana India Producer Company Ltd., Datia	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Umeed India Producer Company Ltd., Gwalior	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Revanchal Mahila Farmer Producer Company, Hoshangabad	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Vikas Gramin Evam Samaj Sewa Samiti, Khargone	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Barna Crop Producer Company Pvt. Ltd., Raisen	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Vindhyanchal Crop Producer Company Ltd., Rewa	123	-	30.67	59.67	-	-	-	-
Dhanvantri Vegetables Producer Company Ltd., Sehore	-	9.22	10	-	-	-	-	-
Vainganga Agro Farmers Producer Company Ltd., Seoni	7	-	4.57	-	-	3.13	-	-
Kalisindh Farmer Producer Company Pvt. Ltd., Ujjain	-	0.29	0	-	-	-	-	-
Average	65.00	4.76	14.13	63.91	57.07	3.13	0.00	0.00

wheat an average FPO earned the profit margin of 14.13 per cent, which was found to be more procured by Vindhyanchal Crop Producer Company Ltd., Rewa (30.67%) followed by Pitambra Farmers Producer Company Ltd., Datia (11.26%), Dhanvantri Vegetables Producer Company Ltd., Sehore (10%) and Vainganga Agro Farmers Producer Company Ltd., Seoni (4.57%), respectively (Table 2.20).

In case of gram an average profit margin earned by FPOs was found to be 63.91 per cent, which was found to be more by Pitambra Farmers Producer Company Ltd., Datia (68.15%) and Vindhyanchal Crop Producer Company Ltd., Rewa (59.67%). The til was found to be procured only by Pitambra Farmers Producer Company Ltd., Datia and maize only by Vainganga Agro Farmers Producer Company

Ltd., Seoni and earned a profit margin of 57.07 and 3.13 per cent, respectively (Table 2.20).

The profit margin earned by Amarkantak Horticulture Producer Company Ltd., Anuppur through procurement of mango was found to 3.40 per cent only. The Phalam Sampada Producer Company, Chhindawara could not earned profit margin while procuring forest products. The profit margin earned by Vikas Gramin Evam Samaj Sewa Samiti, Khargone was found to be 11.69 per cent only. In case of vermicompost profit margin earned was found to be 22.12 per cent by Amarkantak Horticulture Producer Company Ltd., Anuppur. The spices procured by Kutir Agri Producer Company Ltd., Betul could not earned any profit margin while procuring them from their producer members (Table 2.21 & 2.22).

Table 2.21 : Procurement of Output across FPOs (Per cent FPOs Margin)

Name of FPO	Mango	Mahua	Java	Tamarind	Honey	Gooseberry (Amla)	Harad	Baheda
Amarkantak Horticulture Producer Company Ltd., Anuppur	3.40	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Vidhata Crop Producer Company Ltd., Balaghat	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Kutir Agri Producer Company Ltd., Betul	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Bhumija Farmers Producer Company Ltd., Chhindawara	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Phalam Sampada Producer Company, Chhindawara	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Pitambra Farmers Producer Company Ltd., Datia	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Jyotstana India Producer Company Ltd., Datia	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Umeed India Producer Company Ltd., Gwalior	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Revanchal Mahila Farmer Producer Company, Hoshangabad	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Vikas Gramin Evam Samaj Sewa Samiti, Khargone	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Barna Crop Producer Company Pvt. Ltd., Raisen	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Vindhyanchal Crop Producer Company Ltd., Rewa	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Dhanvantri Vegetables Producer Company Ltd., Sehore	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Vainganga Agro Farmers Producer Company Ltd., Seoni	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Kalisindh Farmer Producer Company Pvt. Ltd., Ujjain	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Average	3.40	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

Table 2.22 : Procurement of Output across FPOs (Per cent FPOs Margin)

Name of FPO	Vermi Compost	Red Chilli	Coriander	Turneric	Milk
Amarkantak Horticulture Producer Company Ltd., Anuppur	-	-	-	-	22.12
Vidhata Crop Producer Company Ltd., Balaghat	-	-	-	-	-
Kutir Agri Producer Company Ltd., Betul	-	-	-	-	-
Bhumija Farmers Producer Company Ltd., Chhindawara	-	-	-	-	-
Phalam Sampada Producer Company, Chhindawara	-	-	-	-	-
Pitambra Farmers Producer Company Ltd., Datia	-	-	-	-	-
Jyotstana India Producer Company Ltd., Datia	-	-	-	-	-
Umeed India Producer Company Ltd., Gwalior	-	-	-	-	-
Revanchal Mahila Farmer Producer Company, Hoshangabad	-	-	-	-	-
Vikas Gramin Evam Samaj Sewa Samiti, Khargone	11.69	-	-	-	-
Barna Crop Producer Company Pvt. Ltd., Raisen	-	-	-	-	-
Vindhyanchal Crop Producer Company Ltd., Rewa	-	-	-	-	-
Dhanvantri Vegetables Producer Company Ltd., Sehore	-	-	-	-	-
Vainganga Agro Farmers Producer Company Ltd., Seoni	-	-	-	-	-
Kalisindh Farmer Producer Company Pvt. Ltd., Ujjain	-	-	-	-	-
Average	11.69	0.00	0.00	0.00	22.12

2.4.5 Processing of Output

The processing of output of crops/ fruits/forest produce/spices /milk was also done by FPOs and it was found that Kutir Agri Producer Company Ltd., Betul earned 19.05 and 30.31 per cent profit margin, while through

Table 2.23 : Processing of Output across FPOs (Per cent FPOs Margin)

Name of FPO	Processing of Output Profit mMargin of FPO					
	Wheat to Dalia	Multigain Atta	Gram to Chana dal	Maize Atta	Kodo to Kodo Rice	Kutki to Kutki Rice
Amarkantak Horticulture Producer Company Ltd., Anuppur	-	-	-	-	68.00	-
Vidhata Crop Producer Company Ltd., Balaghat	-	-	-	-	-	-
Kutir Agri Producer Company Ltd., Betul	19.05	-	30.31	-	-	-
Bhumija Farmers Producer Company Ltd., Chhindawara	-	-	-	-	-	-
Phalam Sampada Producer Company, Chhindawara	-	185.54	11.66	286.55	33.33	74.59
Pitambra Farmers Producer Company Ltd., Datia	-	-	-	-	-	-
Jyotstana India Producer Company Ltd., Datia	-	-	-	-	-	-
Umeed India Producer Company Ltd., Gwalior	-	-	-	-	-	-
Revanchal Mahila Farmer Producer Company, Hoshangabad	-	-	-	-	-	-
Vikas Gramin Evam Samaj Sewa Samiti, Khargone	-	-	-	-	-	-
Barna Crop Producer Company Pvt. Ltd., Raisen	-	-	-	-	-	-
Vindhyanchal Crop Producer Company Ltd., Rewa	-	-	-	-	-	-
Dhanvantri Vegetables Producer Company Ltd., Sehore	-	-	-	-	-	-
Vainganga Agro Farmers Producer Company Ltd., Seoni	-	-	-	-	-	-
Kalisindh Farmer Producer Company Pvt. Ltd., Ujjain	-	-	-	-	-	-
Average	19.05	185.54	20.99	286.55	50.67	74.59

processing wheat to daliya and gram to chana dal, respectively. The Phalam Sampada Producer Company, Chhindawara earned profit margin 185.54, 11.66, 286.55, 33.33 and 74.59 while processing multigrain ataa, gram to chana dal maize to atta, kodo to kodo rice and kutki to kutki rice, respectively. Amarkantak Horticulture Producer Company Ltd., Anuppur earned profit margin of 68 per cent while processing of kodo to kodo rice (Table 2.23).

As for as forest products are concerned the profit margin earned while processing of Mahua, Java Plum, Tamarind, Honey, Gooseberry and Triphala churn (Gooseberry+ bithiki+Myrrh) by Phalam Sampada Producer Company, Chhindawara was found to be got 65.95, 484.81, 91.15, 59.49, 447.86 and 1043.44 per cent profit margin, respectively. The Kutir Agri Producer Company Ltd., Betul processed various spices such as turmeric, coriander, red

Table 2.24 : Processing of Output across FPOs (Per cent FPOs Margin)

Name of FPO	Mahua	Java Plum	Tamarind	Honey	Gooseberry	Triphala churn (Gooseberry+ bithiki+Myrrh)
Amarkantak Horticulture Producer Company Ltd., Anuppur	-	-	-	-	-	-
Vidhata Crop Producer Company Ltd., Balaghat	-	-	-	-	-	-
Kutir Agri Producer Company Ltd. Betul	-	-	-	-	-	-
Bhumija Farmers Producer Company Ltd., Chhindawara	-	-	-	-	-	-
Phalam Sampada Producer Company, Chhindawara	65.95	484.81	91.15	59.49	447.86	1043.44
Pitambra Farmers Producer Company Ltd., Datia	-	-	-	-	-	-
Jyotstana India Producer Company Ltd., Datia	-	-	-	-	-	-
Umeed India Producer Company Ltd., Gwalior	-	-	-	-	-	-
Revanchal Mahila Farmer Producer Company, Hoshangabad	-	-	-	-	-	-
Vikas Gramin Evam Samaj Sewa Samiti, Khargone	-	-	-	-	-	-
Barna Crop Producer Company Pvt. Ltd Raisen	-	-	-	-	-	-
Vindhyanal Crop Producer Company Ltd., Rewa	-	-	-	-	-	-
Dhanvantri Vegetables s Producer Company Ltd., Sehore	-	-	-	-	-	-
Vainganga Agro Farmers Producer Company Ltd., Seoni	-	-	-	-	-	-
Kalisindh Farmer Producer Company Pvt. Ltd., Ujjain	-	-	-	-	-	-
Average	65.95	484.81	91.15	59.49	447.86	1043.44

Table 2.25 : Processing of Output across FPOs (Per cent FPOs Margin)

Name of FPO	Turmeric	Coriander	Red chilli	Garm Masala
Amarkantak Horticulture Producer Company Ltd., Anuppur	-	-	-	-
Vidhata Crop Producer Company Ltd., Balaghat	-	-	-	-
Kutir Agri Producer Company Ltd., Betul	64.47	58.93	44.32	66.67
Bhumija Farmers Producer Company Ltd., Chhindawara	-	-	-	-
Phalam Sampada Producer Company, Chhindawara	-	-	-	-
Pitambra Farmers Producer Company Ltd., Datia	-	-	-	-
Jyotstana India Producer Company Ltd., Datia	-	-	-	-
Umeed India Producer Company Ltd., Gwalior	-	-	-	-
Revanchal Mahila Farmer Producer Company, Hoshangabad	-	-	-	-
Vikas Gramin Evam Samaj Sewa Samiti, Khargone	-	-	-	-
Barna Crop Producer Company Pvt. Ltd., Raisen	-	-	-	-
Vindhyanchal Crop Producer Company Ltd., Rewa	-	-	-	-
Dhanvantri Vegetables Producer Company Ltd., Sehore	-	-	-	-
Vainganga Agro Farmers Producer Company Ltd., Seoni	-	-	-	-
Average	64.47	58.93	44.32	66.67

chilli and garam masal and earned profit margin of 64.47, 58.93, 44.32 and 66.67 per cent respectively for their products (Table 2.24 & 2.25).

2.5 Marketing Efficiency

Marketing efficiency of different business activities performed by various FPOs were analysed for the study and presented in this subhead.

2.5.1 Supply of HYVs Seed

Out of 15 FPOs, majority of them were found to have performed supply of HYVs seed business activity (8). An average FPO was found to earn a market margin of Rs 5.21 (market efficiency) over the marketing cost of Rs. 1.00 (Table 2.26).

Amongst these FPOs, marketing efficiency of supply of HYVs seed of Rewanchal Mahila Farmer Producer Organization, Hoshangabad (10.63) was found to be highest over Pitambra Farmers Producer Organization, Datia (7.75), Vidhata Farmer Producer Organization, Balaghat (6.79), Vainganga Agro-Farmers Producer Organization, Seoni (6.58), Bhumija Farmer Producer Organization Chhindawara (Chand) (3.64), Kalisindh Farmer Producer Organization, Ujjain (2.86), Barna Farmer Producer Organization, Raisen (2.70) and Vindhyanchal Farmer Producer Organization, Rewa (0.26).

Table 2.26 : Marketing efficiency of Supply of HYVs Seed (Ratio)

Name of FPO	Purchase by FPO			Distribution of Farmers			Market Efficiency
	Qnt. (in q.)	Rate (₹)	Marketing cost (₹/q)	Qnt. (in q.)	Rate (₹)	FPO Margin (₹/q)	
Rewanchal Mahila Farmer Producer Organization, Hoshangabad	35.25	3832	56	34.89	4427	595	10.63
Pitambra Farmers Producer Organization, Datia	23	3000	65	23	3500	500	7.75
Bhumija Farmer Producer Organization Chhindawara (Chand)	370	3100	55	370	3300	200	3.64
Kalisindh Farmer Producer Organization, Ujjain	143.33	4454	49	143.33	4594	140	2.86
Vainganga Agro -Farmers Producer Organization, Seoni	34	10833	149	34	11817	983	6.58
Barna Farmer Producer Organization, Raisen	28.57	4480	63	28.57	4650	170	2.70
Vindhyanchal Farmer Producer Organization, Rewa	33.95	5928	85	33.95	5950	22	0.26
Vidhata Farmer Producer Organization, Balaghat	20.77	13680	70	20.77	14155	475	6.79
Average	86.15	6163	73.98	86.11	6549	385.72	5.21

The marketing cost incurred in this particular activity was found to be maximum in case of Vainganga Agro-Farmers Producer Organization, Seoni (Rs. 149/q) as compared to Vindhyanchal Farmer Producer Organization, Rewa (Rs. 85/q), Vidhata Farmer Producer Organization, Balaghat (Rs. 70/q), Pitambra Farmers Producer Organization, Datia (Rs. 65/q), Barna Farmer Producer Organization, Raisen (Rs. 63/q), Rewanchal Mahila Farmer Producer Organization, Hoshangabad (Rs. 56/q), Bhumija Farmer Producer Organization Chhindawara (Chand) (Rs. 55/q) and Kalisindh Farmer Producer Organization, Ujjain (Rs. 49/q), while market margin earned by Vainganga Agro-Farmers Producer Organization (Rs. 983/q), Seoni was found to be maximum followed by Rewanchal Mahila Farmer Producer Organization, Hoshangabad (Rs. 595/q), Pitambra Farmers Producer Organization, Datia (Rs. 500/q), Vidhata Farmer Producer Organization, Balaghat (Rs. 475/q), Bhumija Farmer Producer Organization Chhindawara (Chand) (Rs. 200/q), Barna Farmer Producer Organization, Raisen (Rs. 170/q), Kalisindh Farmer Producer Organization, Ujjain (Rs. 140/q) and

Impact Evaluation of 15 Farmer Producers' Organization Projects in Madhya Pradesh

Vindhyanchal Farmer Producer Organization, Hoshangabad (1.88) and Dhanvantri Rewa (Rs. 22/q). Vegetables Produce co. Ltd., sehere (1.40).

2.5.2 Supply of Cattle Feed

Out of 15 FPOs, only 5 FPOs were found to perform supply of cattle feed business activity. An average FPO was found to earn a market margin of Rs 3.03 (market efficiency) over the marketing cost of Rs. 1.00 (Table 2.27).

Amongst these FPOs, marketing efficiency of supply of cattle feed of Ummeed India Producer Company Limited, Gwalior (4.62) was found to be maximum as compare to Jyotsana India Producer Company Limited, Datia (4.59), Vikas Gramin Evam Samaj Sewa Samiti (FPO), Khargone (2.64), Rewanchal Mahila Farmer Producer Organization,

The marketing cost incurred in this particular activity was found to be maximum in case of Jyotsana India Producer Company Limited, Datia (Rs. 56/q) followed by Dhanvantri Vegetables Produce Co. Ltd., Sehere (Rs. 55/q), Vikas Gramin Evam Samaj Sewa Samiti (FPO), Khargone (Rs. 55/q), Rewanchal Mahila Farmer Producer Organization, Hoshangabad (Rs. 53/q) and Ummeed India Producer Company Limited, Gwalior (Rs. 50/q), while market margin earned by Jyotsana India Producer Company Limited, Datia (Rs. 257/q) was found to be maximum followed by Ummeed India Producer Company Limited,

Table 2.27 : Marketing efficiency of supply of Cattle Feed (Ratio)

Name of FPO	Purchase From Farmers			Disposal in Market			Market Efficiency
	Qnt. (in q.)	Rate (₹)	Marketing Cost (₹/q)	Qnt. (in q.)	Rate (₹)	FPO Margin (₹/q)	
Ummeed India Producer Company Limited, Gwalior	150	1790	50	83	2021	231	4.62
Jyotsana India Producer Company Limited, Datia	91	1790	56	39	2047	257	4.59
Dhanvantri Vegetables Produce co. Ltd., sehere	134	1592	55	134	1668	77	1.40
Vikas Gramin Evam Samaj Sewa Samiti (FPO), Khargone	500	2000	55	500	2200	145	2.64
Rewanchal Mahila Farmer Producer Organization, Hoshangabad	828	1174	53	815	1273	99	1.88
Average	341	1669	54	314	1842	162	3.03

Gwalior (Rs. 231/q), Vikas Gramin Evam Samaj Sewa Samiti (FPO), Khargone (Rs. 145/q), Rewanchal Mahila Farmer Producer Organization, Hoshangabad (Rs. 99/q) and Dhanvantri Vegetables Produce Co. Ltd., sehore (Rs. 77/q).

2.5.3 Supply of Fertilizers

Out of 15 FPOs, only 4 FPOs were found to perform supply of fertilizers business activity. An average FPO was found to earn market margin of Rs 2.8 (market efficiency) over the marketing cost of Rs. 1.00 (Table 2.28) .

Amongst these FPOs, marketing efficiency of supply of fertilizers of Vainganga Agro-Farmers Producer Organization, Seoni (3.4) was found to be maximum as compared to

Vindhyanchal Farmer Producer Organization, Rewa (3.0), Bhumija Farmer Producer Organization Chhindawara (Chand) (2.5) and Kalisindh Farmer Producer Organization, Ujjain (2.4).

The marketing cost incurred in this particular activity was found to be maximum in case of Vindhyanchal Farmer Producer Organization, Rewa (Rs.45.0/q) followed by Vainganga Agro-Farmers Producer Organization, Seoni (Rs.32.5/q), Kalisindh Farmer Producer Organization, Ujjain (Rs.30.0/q) and Bhumija Farmer Producer Organization Chhindawara (Chand) (Rs.24.0/q), while market margin earned by Vindhyanchal Farmer Producer Organization,

Table 2.28 : Marketing efficiency of Supply of Fertilizers (Ratio)

Name of FPO	Purchase by FPO			Distribution of Farmers			Market Efficiency
	Qnt. (in q.)	Rate (₹)	Marketing Cost (₹/q)	Qnt. (in q.)	Rate (₹)	FPO Margin (₹/q)	
Vindhyanchal Farmer Producer Organization, Rewa	876.7	1513	45.0	876.7	1695.0	137.0	3.0
Bhumija Farmer Producer Organization Chhindawara (Chand)	820.0	834	24.0	820.0	919.0	61.0	2.5
Kalisindh Farmer Producer Organization, Ujjain	1084.0	1150	30.0	1084.0	1252.0	72.0	2.4
Vainganga Agro -Farmers Producer Organization, Seoni	350.0	1388	32.5	350.0	1530.0	110.0	3.4
Average	782.7	1221	32.9	782.7	1349	95.0	2.8

Impact Evaluation of 15 Farmer Producers' Organization Projects in Madhya Pradesh

Rewa (Rs.137.0/q) was found to be maximum over Vainganga Agro-Farmers Producer Organization, Seoni (Rs.110.0/q), Kalisindh Farmer Producer Organization, Ujjain (Rs.72.0/q) and Bhumija Farmer Producer Organization Chhindawara, Chand (Rs.61.0/q)

2.5.4 Supply of Vegetables Seed

Out of 15 FPOs, only one FPO i.e. Vindhyanchal Farmer Producer Organization,

Rewa, was found to perform supply of vegetables seed business activity. The FPO was found to earn a market margin of Rs 9.00 (market efficiency) over the marketing cost of Rs. 1.00. The marketing cost and marketing margin incurred in supply of vegetables seed business activity was found to be Rs. 125/q and 1125/q respectively (Table 2.29)

Table 2. 29 : Marketing efficiency of Supply of Vegetables Seed (Ratio)

Name of FPO	Purchase by FPO			Distribution of Farmers			Market Efficiency
	Qnt. (in q.)	Rate (₹)	Marketing Cost (₹/q)	Qnt. (in q.)	Rate (₹)	FPO Margin (₹/q)	
Vindhyanchal Farmer Producer Organization, Rewa	0.25	22125	125	0.25	23250	1125	9.00

2.5.5 Supply of Pesticide

Out of 15 FPOs, only 3 FPOs were found to perform supply of pesticide business activity.

An average FPO was found to earn a market margin of Rs 11.89 (market efficiency) over the marketing cost of Rs. 1.00 (Table 2.30).

Table 2. 30: Marketing efficiency of Supply of Pesticide (Ratio)

Name of FPO	Purchase by FPO			Distribution of Farmers			Market Efficiency
	Qnt. (in q.)	Rate (₹)	Marketing Cost (₹/q)	Qnt. (in q.)	Rate (₹)	FPO Margin (₹/q)	
Vidhata Farmer Producer Organization, Balaghat	0.185	1484.2	230	0.185	1848	133.8	0.6
Bhumija Farmer Producer Organization Chiindawara (Chand)	0.33	91603	111	0.33	94177	2463	22.2
Kalisindh Farmer Producer Organization, Ujjain	9.44	33737	292	9.44	37795	3766	12.9
Average	3.32	42275	211.00	3.32	44607	2120.93	11.89

Amongst these FPOs, marketing efficiency of supply of pesticide of Bhumija Farmer Producer Organization Chhindawara (Chand) (22.2) was found to be higher over Kalisindh Farmer Producer Organization, Ujjain (12.9) and Vidhata Farmer Producer Organization, Balaghat (0.6).

The marketing cost incurred in this particular activity was found to be maximum in case of Kalisindh Farmer Producer Organization, Ujjain (Rs. 292/q) followed by Vidhata Farmer Producer Organization, Balaghat (230/q) and Bhumija Farmer Producer Organization Chhindawara (Chand) (Rs. 111/q). The market margin earned by Kalisindh Farmer Producer Organization, Ujjain (Rs. 3766/q) was found to be maximum followed by Bhumija Farmer Producer Organization Chhindawara (Chand) (Rs. 2463/q) and Vidhata Farmer

Producer Organization, Balaghat (Rs. 133.8/q)

2.5.6 Supply of Cattle's

Out of 15 FPOs, only 2 FPOs were found to perform supply of cattle business activity. An average FPO was found to earn a market margin of Rs 3.48 (market efficiency) over the marketing cost of Rs. 1.00 (Table 2.31).

Amongst these FPOs, marketing efficiency of supply of cattle of Dhanvantri Vegetables Produce Co. Ltd., Sehore (2.50) was found to be higher over Vikas Gramin Evam Samaj Sewa Samiti (FPO), Khargone (0.93) per cattle. The marketing cost and marketing margin incurred in supply of cattle activity was found to be higher Dhanvantri Vegetables Produce Co. Ltd., Sehore (Rs. 2000 & 5000/cattle) as compared to Vikas Gramin Evam Samaj Sewa Samiti (FPO), Khargone (Rs. 1259 & 1172/cattle) (Table 2.31).

Table 2. 31: Marketing efficiency of Supply of Cattles (Baffloes) (Ratio)

Name of FPO	Purchase by FPO			Distribution of Farmers			Market Efficiency
	No.	Rate (₹)	Marketing Cost (₹/Cattle)	No.	Rate (₹)	FPO Margin (₹/Cattle)	
Dhanvantri Vegetables Produce Co. Ltd., Sehore	29	70000	2000	29	75000	5000	2.50
Vikas Gramin Evam Samaj Sewa Samiti (FPO), Khargone	116	59224	1259	116	61655	1172	0.93
Average	275	40716	872	275	43052	1963	3.48

2.5.7 Procurement and Marketing of Grains

Out of 15 FPOs, only 5 FPOs were found to perform procurement and marketing of grains business activity. An average FPO was found to earn a market margin of Rs 5.74 (market efficiency) over the marketing cost of Rs. 1.00 (Table 2.32) .

Amongst these FPOs, the marketing efficiency of procurement and marketing of grains of Phalam Sampada Producer Company, Tamia, Chhindwara (117.24) was found to be higher over Pitambra Farmers Producer Organization, Datia (27.91), Vainganga Agro-

Farmers Producer Organization, Seoni (1.2), Kalisindh Farmer Producer Organization, Ujjain (0.90) and Vindhyanchal Farmer Producer Organization, Rewa (0.45).

The marketing cost incurred in procurement and marketing of grains of Vindhyanchal Farmer Producer Organization, Rewa (Rs. 568.25/q) followed by Pitambra Farmers Producer Organization, Datia (Rs. 67/q), Phalam Sampada Producer Company, Tamia, Chhindwara (Rs. 14.04/q), Vainganga Agro-Farmers Producer Organization, Seoni (Rs.58.12/q) and Kalisindh Farmer Producer Organization, Ujjain (Rs. 10/q), while market

Table 2.32 : Marketing efficiency of Procurement and Marketing of Grains (Ratio)

Name of FPO	Purchase From Farmers			Disposal in Market			Market Efficiency
	Qnt. (in q.)	Rate (₹)	Marketing cost (₹/q)	Qnt. (in q.)	Rate (₹)	FPO Margin (₹/q)	
Pitambra Farmers Producer Organization, Datia	134.89	3488	67	134.89	5358	1870	27.91
Kalisindh Farmer Producer Organization, Ujjain	782.5	3740	10	782.5	3749	9	0.90
Phalam Sampada Producer Company, Tamia, Chhindwara	14.04	5640	14.04	2975	7286	1646	117.24
Vindhyanchal Farmer Producer Organization, Rewa	568.25	2564	568.25	20	2820	256	0.45
Vainganga Agro - Farmers Producer Organization, Seoni	762.5	1548.13	58.12	762.5	1678.75	72.5	1.2
Average	374.92	3858.06	164.82	978.10	4803.33	945.28	5.74

margin earned by Phalam Sampada Producer Company, Tamia, Chhindwara (Rs. 1646/q) was found to be maximum followed by Pitambra Farmers Producer Organization, Datia (Rs. 1870/q), Vindhyanchal Farmer Producer Organization, Rewa (Rs. 256/q), Vainganga Agro-Farmers Producer Organization, Seoni (Rs. 72.5/q) and Kalisindh Farmer Producer Organization, Ujjain (Rs. 9/q).

2.5.8 Procurement and Marketing of Vermi Compost

Out of 15 FPOs, only 2 FPOs were found to perform procurement and marketing of vermi compost business activity. An average FPO was found to earn a market margin of Rs 1.43 (market efficiency) over the marketing cost of Rs. 1.00 (Table 2.33) .

Table 2. 33: Marketing efficiency of Production and Marketing of Vermi Compost (Ratio)

Name of FPO	Purchase From Farmers			Disposal in Market			Market Efficiency
	Qnt. (in q.)	Rate (₹)	Marketing Cost (₹/q)	Qnt. (in q.)	Rate (₹)	FPO Margin (₹/q)	
Rewanchal Mahila Farmer Producer Organization, Hoshangabad	160.65	350	105	160.65	550	200	1.90
Amarkantak Horticulture Producer Organization, Anuppur	422.11	500	105	422.11	600	100	0.95
Average	291.38	425	105	291.38	575	150	1.43

The marketing efficiency of FPOs in procurement and marketing of vermi compost of Rewanchal Mahila Farmer Producer Organization, Hoshangabad (1:1.90) was found to be higher over Amarkantak Horticulture Producer Organization, Anuppur (1:0.95) . The marketing margin obtained in this particular activity was found to be maximum for Rewanchal Mahila Farmer Producer Organization, Hoshangabad (Rs.200/q) as compared to Amarkantak Horticulture Producer Organization, Anuppur (Rs. 100/q), while the market cost incurred by Rewanchal Mahila Farmer Producer Organization, Hoshangabad (Rs. 105/q) and Amarkantak Horticulture Producer Organization, Anuppur (Rs. 105/q) was found to be equal in both the FPOs.

2.5.9 Procurement and Marketing of Fruits

Out of 15 FPOs, only 2 FPOs were found to perform procurement and marketing of fruits business activity. An average FPO was found to

Impact Evaluation of 15 Farmer Producers' Organization Projects in Madhya Pradesh

earn a market margin of Rs 61.17 (market efficiency) over the marketing cost of Rs. 1.00 (Table 2.34) .

Amongst all these FPOs the marketing efficiency of procurement and marketing of fruits of Phalam Sampada Producer Company, Tamia, Chhindwara (767.86) was found to be higher over Amarkantak Horticulture Producer Organization, Anuppur (2.6). The marketing

cost incurred in this particular activity was found to be maximum for Amarkantak Horticulture Producer Organization, Anuppur (Rs. 443/q) followed by Phalam Sampada Producer Company, Tamia, Chhindwara (Rs. 63.35/q). while the market margin earned by Phalam Sampada Producer Company, Tamia, Chhindwara (Rs. 48644/q) was found to be higher than Amarkantak Horticulture Producer Organization, Anuppur (Rs. 1150/q).

Table 2. 34: Marketing efficiency of Procurement & Marketing of Fruits (Ratio)

Name of FPO	Purchase From Farmers			Disposal in Market			Market Efficiency
	Qnt. (in q.)	Rate (₹)	Marketing Cost (₹/q)	Qnt. (in q.)	Rate (₹)	FPO Margin (₹/q)	
Amarkantak Horticulture Producer Organization, Annuppur	4.24	5050	443	3.75	6200	1150	2.60
Phalam Sampada Producer Company, Tamia, Chhindwara	63.35	107689	63.35	76914	156333	48644	767.86
Average	188.35	22803	164.29	15558	32852	10049	61.17

2.5.10 Procurement and Marketing of Milk

Out of 15 FPOs, only one FPO i.e. Vikas Gramin Evam Samaj Sewa Samiti, Khargone was found to perform procurement and marketing of milk business activity. The FPO

was found to earn a market margin of Rs 9.00 (market efficiency) over the marketing cost of Rs. 1.00. The marketing cost and marketing margin incurred in procurement and marketing of milk business activity were found to be Rs. 50/l and 450/l, respectively (Table 2.35).

Table 2. 35: Marketing efficiency of Procurement and Marketing of Milk (Ratio)

Name of FPO	Purchase From Farmers			Disposal in Market			Market Efficiency
	Qnt. (in "00" l.)	Rate (₹)	Marketing Cost (₹/"00" l.)	Qnt. (in "00" l.)	Rate (₹)	FPO Margin (₹/"00" l.)	
Vikas Gramin Evam Samaj Sewa Samiti, Khargone	16.75	3925	50	16.75	4375	450	9.00

2.5.11 Procurement and Marketing of Honey

Out of 15 FPOs, only one FPO i.e. Phalam Sampada Producer Company, Tamia, Chhindwara was found to perform procurement and marketing of honey business activity. The

FPO was found to earn a market margin of Rs 119.29 (market efficiency) over the marketing cost of Rs. 1.00. The marketing cost and marketing margin incurred in procurement and marketing of honey business activity was found to be Rs. 70/q and 8350/q (Table 2.36).

Table 2. 36: Marketing efficiency of Procurement and Marketing of Honey (Ratio)

Name of FPO	Purchase From Farmers			Disposal in Market			Market Efficiency
	Qnt. (in q.)	Rate (₹)	Marketing Cost (₹/q)	Qnt. (in q.)	Rate (₹)	FPO Margin (₹/q)	
Phalam Sampada Producer Company, Tamia, Chhindwara	70	34150	70	11150	42500	8350	119.29

2.5.12 Production and Marketing of Mushroom

Out of 15 FPOs, only one FPO i.e. Rewanchal Mahila Farmer Producer Organization, Hoshangabad was found to perform procurement and marketing of mushroom business activity. This FPO was

found to earn a market margin of Rs 45.83 (market efficiency) over the marketing cost of Rs. 1.00. The marketing cost and marketing margin incurred in procurement and marketing of mushroom business activity was found to be Rs. 120/q and 5500/q, respectively (Table 2.37).

Table 2. 37: Marketing efficiency of Production and Marketing of Mushroom (Ratio)

Name of FPO	Purchase From Farmers			Disposal in Market			Market Efficiency
	Qnt. (in q.)	Rate (₹)	Marketing Cost (₹/q)	Qnt. (in q.)	Rate (₹)	FPO Margin (₹/q)	
Rewanchal Mahila Farmer Producer Organization, Hoshangabad	33.43	10500	120	33.43	16000	5500	45.83

2.5.13 Processing of Kodo & Marketing of Kodo Rice

Out of 15 FPOs, only one FPO i.e. Amarkantak Horticulture Producer

Organization, Anuppur was found to perform processing of Kodo & marketing of Kodo Rice business activity. The FPO was found to earn a market margin of Rs 6.54 (market efficiency)

over the marketing cost of Rs. 1.00. The Rice business activity was found to be Rs. 289/q marketing cost and marketing margin incurred and 1889/q, respectively (Table 2.38).
in processing of Kodo & marketing of Kodo

Table 2. 38: Marketing efficiency of Processing of Kodo & Marketing of Kodo Rice (Ratio)

Name of FPO	Purchase From Farmers			Disposal in Market			Market Efficiency
	Qnt. (in q.)	Rate (₹)	Marketing Cost (₹/q)	Qnt. (in q.)	Rate (₹)	FPO Margin (₹/q)	
Amarkantak Horticulture Producer Organization, Anuppur	2.19	2700	289	1.93	4589	1889	6.54

2.5.14 Processing and Marketing of Spices

Out of 15 FPOs, only one FPO i.e. Kutir Agri Producer Company Limited, Betul was found to perform processing and marketing of spices business activity. The FPO was found to earn a market margin of Rs 161.63 (market

efficiency) over the marketing cost of Rs. 1.00.

The marketing cost and marketing margin incurred in supply of processing and marketing of spices business activity was found to be Rs. 64/q and 10344/q, respectively (Table 2.39).

Table 2. 39: Marketing efficiency of Processing and Marketing of Spices (Ratio)

Name of FPO	Purchase From Farmers			Disposal in Market			Market Efficiency
	Qnt. (in q.)	Rate (₹)	Marketing Cost (₹/q)	Qnt. (in q.)	Rate (₹)	FPO Margin (₹/q)	
Kutir Agri Producer Company Limited, Betul	42.00	6989	64.00	25.00	17333	10344	161.63

2.5.15 Overall Performance

Amongst all these business activities, marketing of fruits (61.17), production and marketing of mushroom (45.83), supply of pesticide (11.89), procurement and marketing of milk (9), supply of vegetables seed (9), processing of Kodo & marketing of Kodo rice (6.54), procurement and marketing of grains (5.74), supply of HYVS seed (5.21), supply of

cattle (buffaloes) (3.48), supply of cattle feed (3.03) and supply of fertilizer (2.84), respectively (Table 2.40). average FPO was found to earn a market margin of Rs 31.86 over the marketing cost of Rs. 1.00. which ranged between 1:1.43 (production and

The overall efficiency of all these business activities performed by FPOs, an marketing of vermicompost) to 1:161.63 (processing and marketing of spices).

Table 2. 40: Marketing efficiency of Activities wise (Ratio)

Name of Activities	Purchased by FPO/ Purchased from Farmers			Disposal to Farmers/Market			Marketing Efficiency
	Qnt. (in q.)	Rate (₹)	Marketing Cost (₹/q.)	Qnt. (in q.)	Rate (₹)	FPO Margin (₹/q.)	
Supply of Pesticide	3.32	42275	211.00	3.32	44607	2120.93	11.89
Supply of Vegetables Seed	0.25	22125	125.00	0.25	23250	1125.00	9.00
Supply of HYVs Seed	86.15	6163	73.98	86.11	6549	385.72	5.21
Supply of Cattle (Buffaloes)	275.15	40716	872.48	275.15	43052	1963.33	3.48
Supply of Cattle Feed	340.65	1669	53.70	314.28	1842	161.75	3.03
Supply of Fertilizer	782.68	1221	32.88	782.68	1349	95.00	2.84
Production & Marketing of Vermi compost	291.38	425	105.00	291.38	575	150.00	1.43
Procurement and Marketing of Grains	374.92	3858.06	164.82	978.10	4803.33	945.28	5.74
Processing of Kodo & Marketing of Kodo Rice	2.19	2700	289	1.93	4589	1889	6.54
Procurement and Marketing of Milk	16.75	3925	50.00	16.75	4375	450.00	9.00
Production and Marketing of Mushroom	33.43	10500	120.00	33.43	16000	5500.00	45.83
Procurement & Marketing of Fruits	188.35	22803	164.29	15558.38	32852	10048.80	61.17
Processing and Marketing of Spices	42.00	6989	64.00	25.00	17333	10344	161.63
Procurement and Marketing of Honey	70.00	34150	70.00	11150.00	42500	8350.00	119.29
Average	-	-	171.15	-	-	3029.38	31.86

2.6 Home Consumption

The home consumption of producer member of respective FPOs among different item was also recorded and presented in table 2.41. It was found that on an average the home consumption of producer member was found to be increased by 43.46, 62.53, 42.64, 43.49, 46.32, 29.61, 68.33, 50.85, 66.68, and 34.72 per cent per month in vegetables, fruits, pulses,

milk, ghee, millets, dry fruits, meat, vegetable oil and cereals by the respondents across FPOs taken under study.

2.7 Credit Linkage

Out of 15 FPOs, 8 FPOs viz. Vidhata Crop Producer Company Ltd., Balaghat, Vindhyanchal Crop Producer Company Ltd., Rewa, Dhanvantri Vegetables Producer Company Ltd., Sehore, Kalisindh Farmer

Table 2. 41: Home Consumption of Producer members in different items across FPOs (% increase/month)

Name of FPO	Vegetables	Fruits	Pulses	Milk	Ghee	Millets	Dry Fruits	Meat	Vegetable oil	Cereals
Amarkantak Horticulture Producer Company Ltd., Anuppur	39.93	61.81	47.63	54.03	34.52	49.59	150.00	50.17	100.00	12.24
Vidhata Crop Producer Company Ltd., Balaghat	48.44	75.09	26.30	17.05	31.81	0.00	65.10	61.11	100.00	22.56
Kutir Agri Producer Company Ltd., Betul	48.09	59.33	49.35	42.47	57.62	66.67	44.67	87.88	100.00	26.33
Bhumija Farmers Producer Company Ltd., Chhindawara	53.10	63.00	40.97	29.92	43.63	26.83	36.42	44.74	100.00	24.65
Phalam Sampada Producer Company, Chhindawara	57.23	83.17	42.09	140.66	130.00	43.74	242.86	73.97	100.00	28.54
Pitambra Farmers Producer Company Ltd., Datia	38.00	71.56	44.64	51.15	59.24	0.00	44.86	8.40	100.00	25.45
Jyotstana India Producer Company Ltd., Datia	36.36	48.52	47.82	36.57	40.34	0.00	36.46	58.42	36.21	42.59
Umeed India Producer Company Ltd., Gwalior	36.36	48.52	47.82	36.57	40.34	0.00	36.46	58.42	25.88	46.22
Revanchal Mahila Farmer Producer Company, Hoshangabad	51.22	70.82	37.68	21.33	24.86	29.49	35.77	24.42	34.37	58.73
Vikas Gramin Evam Samaj Sewa Samiti, Khargone	29.00	52.95	26.66	44.49	28.85	33.47	74.95	29.34	52.95	44.49
Barna Crop Producer Company Pvt. Ltd., Raisen	53.65	74.48	72.59	57.71	65.14	35.67	63.87	58.21	72.59	33.67
Vindhyanchal Crop Producer Company Ltd., Rewa	43.50	56.47	27.30	28.81	25.26	90.74	52.44	68.17	56.47	28.81
Dhanvantri Vegetables Producer Company Ltd., Sehore	23.64	28.00	37.03	23.04	27.55	24.88	47.66	14.74	37.03	23.04
Vainganga Agro Farmers Producer Company Ltd., Seoni	45.66	70.00	32.68	37.92	44.35	24.41	52.80	39.51	39.37	54.25
Kalisindh Farmer Producer Company Pvt. Ltd., Ujjain	47.65	74.28	59.00	30.63	41.25	18.69	40.57	44.99	45.36	49.17
Average	43.46	62.53	42.64	43.49	46.32	29.61	68.33	50.85	66.68	34.72

Producer Company Pvt. Ltd., Ujjain, Jyotstana Chhindawara, Bhumija Farmers Producer India Producer Company Ltd., Datia, Umeed Company Ltd., Chhindawara, Kutir Agri India Producer Company Ltd., Gwalior, Phalam Producer Company Ltd., Betul, Barna Crop Sampada Producer Company, Chhindawara and Producer Company Pvt. Ltd., Raisen, Vainganga Vainganga Agro Farmers Producer Company Agro Farmers Producer Company Ltd., Seoni Ltd., Seoni, were taken loan from the various and Kalisindh Farmer Producer Company Pvt. institution ie. NABKISAN Finance Ltd., State Ltd., Ujjain FPOs fix their cash credit limit from Bank of India, Rewa, Samunnati Finance Madhya Pradesh Gramin bank at 11.00 per cent Intermediation and Services Pvt. Ltd. and SFAC interest. In all these FPOs the credit limit was . on an average a FPO taken loan of 14.12 lakh at found to be fix Rs. 3.00 lakh per year except the rate of interest 10.86 per cent per year. Kalisindh Farmer Producer Company Pvt. Ltd.,

The maximum loan was found to be Ujjain (Rs. 10.00 lakh). The FPOs like taken from NABKISAN Finance Ltd. across Amarkantak Horticulture Producer Company FPOs. Among various FPOs Revanchal Mahila Ltd., Anuppur, Pitambra Farmers Producer Farmer Producer Company, Hoshangabad, Company Ltd., Datia and Vikas Gramin Evam Phalam Sampada Producer Company, Samaj Sewa Samiti, Khargone were found to be

non-loaner FPOs not taking any loan from any institute. (Table 2.42)

Credit linkage of producer members of respective FPOs across various sources (Institutional and No-Institutional) is presented

in table 2.43. It is clear from the data that on an average about 50 per cent respondents used to borrow credit from institutional sources, while only 5 per cent used to borrow credit from non-Institutional sources.

Table 2. 42: Credit Linkages of FPOs

Name of FPO	Name of Institution	Amount (Lakh)	Rate of Interest
Loan taken			
Vidhata Crop Producer Company Ltd., Balaghat	NABKISAN Finance Ltd.	5.00	11.10
Vindhyanchal Crop Producer Company Ltd., Rewa	State Bank of India, Rewa	11.50	10.50
	NABKISAN Finance Ltd.	45.00	11.10
Dhanvantri Vegetables Producer Company Ltd., Sehore	NABKISAN Finance Ltd.	20.00	11.10
	Samunnati Finance Intermediation and Services Pvt. Ltd.	10.00	14.00
Kalisindh Farmer Producer Company Pvt. Ltd., Ujjain	NABKISAN Finance Ltd.	19.50	11.10
Jyotstana India Producer Company Ltd., Datia	Commercial Bank, Cooperative Bank & others	12.50	11.15
Umeed India Producer Company Ltd., Gwalior	NABKISAN Finance Ltd.	17.50	11.10
	Samunnati Finance Intermediation and Services Pvt. Ltd.	6.50	14.00
Phalam Sampada Producer Company, Chhindawara	NABKISAN Finance Ltd.	6.00	11.10
	SFAC	6.00	12.00
Vainganga Agro Farmers Producer Company Ltd., Seoni	NABKISAN Finance Ltd.	10.00	11.10
Average		21.18	10.86
Credit limit per year			
Revanchal Mahila Farmer Producer Company, Hoshangabad	Madhya Pradesh Gramin Bank, Hoshangabad	3.00	11.00
Phalam Sampada Producer Company, Chhindawara	Madhya Pradesh Gramin Bank, Tamia, Chhindwara	3.00	11.00
Bhumija Farmers Producer Company Ltd., Chhindawara	Madhya Pradesh Gramin Bank, Chhindwara	3.00	11.00
Kutir Agri Producer Company Ltd., Betul	Central Cooperative Bank, Athner, Betul	3.00	11.30
Barna Crop Producer Company Pvt. Ltd., Raisen	Madhya Pradesh Gramin Bank, Raisen	3.00	11.00
Vainganga Agro Farmers Producer Company Ltd., Seoni	Madhya Pradesh Gramin Bank Kurai, Seoni	3.00	11.00
Kalisindh Farmer Producer Company Pvt. Ltd., Ujjain	Madhya Pradesh Gramin Bank, Ujjain	10.00	11.00
Average		4.00	11.00
Non- loaner FPOs			
Amarkantak Horticulture Producer Company Ltd., Anuppur	-	-	-
Pitambra Farmers Producer Company Ltd., Datia	-	-	-
Vikas Gramin Evam Samaj Sewa Samiti, Khargone	-	-	-

Impact Evaluation of 15 Farmer Producers' Organization Projects in Madhya Pradesh

On an average 30.82 per cent respondent used to borrow credit from nationalised bank, 9.90 per cent from co-operative bank and 9.64 per cent from NGOs/SHGs. The maximum per cent producers members of Kalisindh Farmer Producer Company Pvt. Ltd., Ujjain (85.71%) used to borrow credit from nationalized bank followed by Bhumija Farmers Producer Company Ltd., Chhindawara (61.29%) and Vainganga Agro Farmers Producer Company Ltd., Seoni (48.00%), Vindhyanal Crop Producer Company Ltd., Rewa (44.00%), Barna Crop Producer Company Pvt. Ltd., Raisen (36.00%), Dhanvantri Vegetables Producer Company Ltd., Sehore (35.29%) and Pitambra Farmers Producer Company Ltd., Datia (34.36%), respectively. While in case of remaining FPOs less than 25 per cent producer members used to borrowed credit from nationalized bank. The 47.22 and 32 per cent

Table 2. 43: Credit Linkages with different sources across FPOs (Per cent Producer members)

Name of FPO	Institutional Sources			Non-Institutional Sources
	Nationalized Bank	Co-Operative Bank	NGO/SHG	
Amkantak Horticulture Producer Company Ltd., Anuppur	10.84	2.41	14.46	2.41
Vidhata Crop Producer Company Ltd., Balaghat	14.00	0.00	42.00	2.00
Kutir Agri Producer Company Ltd., Betul	12.00	32.00	8.00	0.00
Bhumija Farmers Producer Company Ltd., Chhindawara	61.29	6.65	0.00	3.23
Phalam Sampada Producer Company, Chhindawara	12.05	7.23	8.43	0.00
Pitambra Farmers Producer Company Ltd., Datia	34.36	3.12	1.56	0.00
Jyotstana India Producer Company Ltd., Datia	16.00	0.00	0.00	42.00
Umeed India Producer Company Ltd., Gwalior	8.00	0.00	40.00	0.00
Revanchal Mahila Farmer Producer Company, Hoshangabad	24.00	18.00	6.00	0.00
Vikas Gramin Evam Samaj Sewa Samiti, Khargone	20.83	47.22	0.00	4.17
Barna Crop Producer Company Pvt. Ltd., Raisen	36.00	4.00	14.00	0.00
Vindhyanal Crop Producer Company Ltd., Rewa	44.00	3.00	0.00	5.00
Dhanvantri Vegetables Producer Company Ltd., Sehore	35.29	13.73	5.88	11.76
Vainganga Agro Farmers Producer Company Ltd., Seoni	48.00	10.00	2.00	0.00
Kalisindh Farmer Producer Company Pvt. Ltd., Ujjain	85.71	1.10	2.20	2.20
Average	30.82	9.90	9.64	4.85

producer members of Vikas Gramin Evam Samaj Sewa Samiti, Khargone and Kutir Agri Producer Company Ltd., Betul were found to borrowed credit from co-operative bank. The rest of FPOs less than 20 per cent producer members used to borrow credit from co-operative bank. In case of NGOs/ SHGs 42 and 40 per cent producer members of Vidhata Crop Producer Company Ltd., Balaghat and Umeed India Producer Company Ltd., Gwalior used to borrow credit, while less than 15 per cent producers members of respective FPOs used to borrowed credit from this source. As for as non-institutional sources is concerned 42 per cent producers members of Jyotstana India Producer Company Ltd., Datia used to borrow credit from this source. While less than 15 per cent producer members of respective FPOs used to borrow from this source (Table 2.43).

The purpose of borrowing was found to be production and consumption as reported by 85.19 and 14.81 per cent producer members (Table 2.44).

Table 2. 44: Purpose of Credit across FPOs (per cent)

Name of FPO	Production	Consumption
Amarkantak Horticulture Producer Company Ltd., Anuppur	88.00	12.00
Vidhata Crop Producer Company Ltd., Balaghat	93.10	6.90
Kutir Agri Producer Company Ltd., Betul	100.00	0.00
Bhumija Farmers Producer Company Ltd., Chhindawara	100.00	0.00
Phalam Sampada Producer Company, Chhindawara	100.00	0.00
Pitambra Farmers Producer Company Ltd., Datia	100.00	0.00
Jyotstana India Producer Company Ltd., Datia	56.00	44.00
Umeed India Producer Company Ltd., Gwalior	44.00	56.00
Revanchal Mahila Farmer Producer Company, Hoshangabad	48.00	52.00
Vikas Gramin Evam Samaj Sewa Samiti, Khargone	72.22	27.78
Barna Crop Producer Company Pvt. Ltd., Raisen	96.30	3.70
Vindhyanchal Crop Producer Company Ltd., Rewa	96.15	3.85
Dhanvantri Vegetables Producer Company Ltd., Sehore	85.29	14.71
Vainganga Agro Farmers Producer Company Ltd., Seoni	100.00	0.00
Kalisindh Farmer Producer Company Pvt. Ltd., Ujjain	98.80	1.20
Average	85.19	14.81

The per cent amount which could not be repaid and reasons their off by the producers member of the respective FPOs in presented in table 2.45.

Table 2. 45: Reasons of non- repayment of loan (per cent producer members)

Name of FPO	% Amount Non- Repayment	Crop Loss	Expecting Debt Waiver	Other Major Expenses	Payment will be made after Harvesting
Vidhata Crop Producer Company Ltd., Balaghat	18.85	0	0	0	100
Kutir Agri Producer Company Ltd., Betul	27.83	0	60	40	0
Bhumija Farmers Producer Company Ltd., Chhindawara	40.73	0	12.5	87.5	0
Phalam Sampada Producer Company, Chhindawara	58.35	0	0	85.71	14.29
Pitambra Farmers Producer Company Ltd., Datia	25.71	0	25	0	75
Jyotstana India Producer Company Ltd., Datia	3.45	0	100	0	0
Umeed India Producer Company Ltd., Gwalior	7.24	0	6.9	0	0
Revanchal Mahila Farmer Producer Company, Hoshangabad	29.39	0	0	0	0
Vikas Gramin Evam Samaj Sewa Samiti, Khargone	65.38	8.82	91.18	0	0
Barna Crop Producer Company Pvt. Ltd., Raisen	0	0	0	0	14.81
Vindhyanchal Crop Producer Company Ltd., Rewa	60	6.25	9.38	18.75	65.63
Dhanvantri Vegetables Producer Company Ltd., Sehore	66.67	0	0	0	17.65
Vainganga Agro Farmers Producer Company Ltd., Seoni	40	0	0	0	26.67
Kalisindh Farmer Producer Company Pvt. Ltd., Ujjain	4.18	4.82	4.82	6.02	4.82
Average	29.85	1.33	20.65	15.87	21.26

The data depict that on an average 29.85 per cent loan could not be repaid by the producer members due to the reason as reported by them were payment will be made after harvesting (21.26%) followed by expecting debt viewer scheme (20.65%), other major expenses (15.87%) and crop loss (1.33%). The per cent amount could not be repaid by the FPOs under the study ranged between 4.18 (Kalisindh Farmer Producer Company Pvt. Ltd., Ujjain) to 66.67 (Dhanvantri Vegetables Producer Company Ltd., Sehore) per cent.

2.8 Bottle necks/ Constraints

The FPOs faced various constraints/ bottle necks in their operational area the major bottle necks observed during the time of the

investigation were found to be lack of procurements of food grains from the producer members followed by lack of quality inputs distributed to their producer members on time and at reasonable price viz. fertilizer, plant protection chemical, lack of Retail out let for sale of produce viz. mushroom, organic produce (vegetables), vermin compost etc., lack of resources/ infrastructure, lack of knowledge regarding seed production programme of improved varieties, lack of credibility and accountability, lack of custom hiring center of FPO for farm equipment/machinery facility for shareholders, lack of transportation facilities for input supply and procurement., lack of information regarding various government

Table 2. 46: Bottle necks/ Constraints of FPO

Particulars	
1.	Lack of procurements of food grains from the producer members
2.	Lack of quality inputs distributed to their producer members on time and at reasonable price viz. fertilizer, plant protection chemical
3.	Lack of Retail out let for sale of produce viz. mushroom, organic produce (vegetables), vermin compost etc.
4.	Lack of resources/ infrastructure
5.	Lack of knowledge regarding seed production programme of improved varieties.
6.	Lack of credibility and accountability
7.	Lack of custom hiring center of FPO for farm equipment/machinery facility for shareholders.
8.	Lack of transportation facilities for input supply and procurement.
9.	Lack of information regarding various government schemes related to Agriculture & Rural development.
10.	Lack of Market information & market intelligence.
11.	Heavy Interface by POPI
12.	The integrity and quality of the leadership, its acceptance within the community, as well as the market environment
13.	Lack of vision and direction from BODs
14.	Lack of knowledge and skill in BODs
15.	Poor return over investment, repaying and risk bearing capacity
16.	Lack of own warehouse and godown
17.	Lack of facility about equipment regarding grading, processing and packaging.
18.	Lack of coordination FPO & agriculture specialist and between POPI & BODs
19.	Lack of supervision by Competing Authorities
20.	Lack of vision and direction from BODs Lack of vision and direction from BODs

schemes related to Agriculture & Rural agriculture specialist and between POPI & development, lack of Market information & BODs, lack of supervision by Competing market intelligence, heavy Interface by POPI, Authorities and lack of guidance/training the integrity and quality of the leadership, its regarding crop production & animal husbandry. acceptance within the community, as well as the (Table 2.46)

market environment, lack of vision and direction from BODs, lack of knowledge and skill in BODs, poor return over investment, repaying and risk bearing capacity, lack of own warehouse and godown, lack of facility about equipment regarding grading, processing and packaging, lack of coordination FPOs &

2.9 Social Impact on FPOs Members

The Social Impact on FPOs Members which is quantified with various indicators is presented in table 2.47. It is observed from the data presented that the social participation, household management decision, bargaining power related to inputs & output were found to

be increased as reported by 90, 62, 60 & 50 per cent respondents. The education of children, adoption of improved cultivation practices, participation of women in production activities, account management ability, input purchase capacity and storage capacity of produce were also reported to be increased by 48, 38, 38, 28, 28 and 20 per cent, respectively. The less than 20 per cent respondents reported to increase in adoption of organic farming, timely receive amount of the sale, visit to outside, processing of produce, output sale capacity, regular and authentic source of information regarding market prices, use of solar energy equipment and use of bio-gas and other equipment for health (Table 2.47).

Table 2. 47: Social Impact on FPOs Members (Agreed as Increased)

S. No.	Particulars	%
1	Social participation	90
2	Household management decision	62
3	Bargaining power related to inputs	60
4	Bargaining power related to outputs	50
5	Education of children	48
6	Adoption of improved cultivation practices	38
7	Participation of Women in production activities	38
8	Account management ability	28
9	Input purchase capacity	28
10	Storage capacity of produce	20
11	Adoption of Organic farming	18
12	Timely receive amount of the sale	14
13	Visit to Outside (Other State & Abroad)	12
14	Processing of produce	12
15	Output sale capacity	12
16	Regular and authentic source of information regarding market prices	8
17	Use of solar energy equipment	6
18	Use of bio-gas and other equipment for health	4

2.10 Facilities provided by FPO

The facilities provided by FPO was also recorded and presented in table 2.48. The training for skill development was found to be increased as reported by 58 per cent respondents,

while the 56 per cent respondents agreed up-on increase in technical guidance for crop production and regular field visit of FPO. The loan/credit for purchase of inputs, training for farmers regarding improved cultivation of crops and technical guidance regarding organic

Table 2. 48: Facilities provided by FPO (Agreed as Increased)

S. No.	Particulars	%
1	Training for skill development	58
2	Technical Guidance for crop production	56
3	Regular field visit by FPO	56
4	Loan/Credit for purchase inputs	32
5	Training for farmers regarding improved cultivation of crops	30
6	Technical guidance regarding Organic farming	22
7	Knowledge regarding grain grading and processing	14
8	Improve market information systems for easy trading	10
9	Awareness regarding opening of retail markets in nearby cities	6
10	Knowledge regarding Custom hiring facility for farm equipment /machinery	2

farming were also increased as reported by 62, 30 and 22 per cent respondent. The 14 per cent respondents reported that knowledge regarding grain grading and processing was also increased. The market information systems for easy trading, awareness regarding opening of retail markets in nearby cities and knowledge regarding custom hiring facility for farm equipment/machinery were also found to be increased as reported by less than 10 per cent respondents.

2.11 Constraints

The constraint related to input management were reported by respondents and listed in table 2.34. The majority of respondents reported that the major constraints which they faced was lack of knowledge about toll free

number- 1551 or 1800-180-1551 (72%) followed by lack of capital and knowledge about contract farming (70%), lack of knowledge about recommended packages of practices of cultivation of crops (68%), lack of credit facility through FPO (52%), lack of knowledge about scientific storage & warehousing and high cost of inputs (50%), lack of knowledge about soil health card (48%), lack of knowledge about integrated farming system and crop insurance (44%), lack of knowledge about value addition techniques (42%), unavailability of desire variety of crop & quality input on time (40%), lack of knowledge regarding government schemes related to agriculture and rural development (38%), lack of knowledge about custom hiring equipment/machinery (36%) and delay in payment of farm produce (14%), respectively (Table 2.49).

Table 2. 49: Constraints related to input management

S. No.	Particulars	%
1	Lack of knowledge about Toll Free Number- 1551 or 1800-180-1551	72
2	Lack of knowledge about contract farming	70
3	Lack of capital	70
4	Lack of knowledge about Recommended Packages of Practices of cultivation of crops	68
5	Lack of credit facility through FPO	52
6	High cost of inputs	50
7	Lack of knowledge about scientific storage & warehousing	50
8	Lack of knowledge about Soil Health Card	48
9	Lack of knowledge about Integrated Farming System	44
10	Lack of knowledge regarding of crop/ cattle insurance	44
11	Lack of knowledge about value addition techniques	42
12	Unavailability of desire Variety of crop & quality input on time	40
13	Lack of knowledge regarding government schemes related to Agriculture and Rural Development	38
14	Lack of knowledge about Custom hiring equipment/machinery	36
15	Delay in payment of farm produce	14

Looking to the above findings, it can be concluded that the number of producer members of Kutir Agri Producer Co.Ltd Betul, Pitambra Farmers Producer Co Ltd., Datia, Jyotsana India Producer Company Ltd., Datia, Ummeed India Producer Company Ltd., Gwalior, Revanchal Mahila FPC, Hoshangabad and Barna Crop Producer company Pvt. Ltd., Raisen were found to be same as in its inception (500) which shows that the efforts made by the BODs & POPI of these FPOs were not satisfactory. During the investigation it was found that, the most of the producer members did not know that they are producer member of their respective FPO and were not aware of the role of the organization. Their perception is Ltd. as they viewed the organization similar to that of Self Help Group.

This shows that FPO not putting proper efforts in making them aware about the benefits of the FPOs. Hence, exposure and awareness among producer member should be increased about the role of FPOs and the benefits that they reap from it.

2.12 Economic Impact

An average FPO was found to receive profit margin of Rs. 161.63, 119.29, 64.17, 45.85, 11.89, 9.00, 6.54, 5.21, 5.74, 3.82, 3.03, 2.84 and 1.43 on investment Rs 1.00 in marketing cost from processing and marketing of spices, procurement and marketing of honey, procurement & marketing of fruits, production and marketing of mushroom, supply of pesticide, procurement and marketing of milk,

supply of vegetables seed, processing of Kodo & marketing of Kodo rice, supply of HYVS seed, procurement and marketing of grains, supply of cattle (buffaloes), supply of cattle feed and supply of fertilizer, respectively. An overall efficiency of all these business activities performed by FPOs., an average FPO was found to earn a market margin of Rs 31.86 over the marketing cost of Rs. 1.00, which ranged between 1:1.43 (production and marketing of vermicompost) to 1:161.63 (processing and marketing of spices).

The 41.26, 22.38, 21.35, 34.86, 12.76 and 10.38 per cent producer members were found to be benefited through supply of seed, fertilizers & Bio-fertilizers, plant protection & growth regulator, supply of cattle & cattle feed procurement of grains and procurement of fruits and other products respectively. An average producer member was found to receive input and cattle feed in approximately 10 per cent less price than the market price from the FPO.

2.13 Social Impact

The social participation, household management decision, bargaining power related to inputs & output, education of children, adoption of improved cultivation practices, participation of women in production activities, account management ability, input purchase capacity and storage capacity of produce, adoption of organic farming, timely receive amount of the sale, visit to outside, processing of

produce, output sale capacity, regular and authentic source of information regarding market prices, use of solar energy equipment and use of bio-gas and other equipment for health were found to be increased as reported by more than 20 per cent of farmer producer member as the FPOs provided various facilities to them i.e. Training for skill development & improved cultivation of crops, Technical Guidance for crop production, Regular field visit, Loan/Credit for purchase inputs, Technical guidance regarding Organic farming; grain grading & processing, Improve market information systems for easy trading, Awareness regarding opening of retail markets in nearby cities and Knowledge regarding Custom hiring facility for farm equipment/machinery.

It was also found that the participation of producer members in various trainings ranged between 0.00 (Dhanvantri Vegetable Produce Co. Ltd, Sehore) to 100 (Kutir Agri Producer Co.Ltd, Betul) per cent shows that participation of producer members of majority of FPOs was less. The majority of them were not found to be involved in these training programmes, which is to be taken care off. It may be due to the fact that remaining members are interested in other business activities. Therefore, the interest of all the members is required to be captured followed by arranging trainings accordingly, so that all the producer members will become active and start participating in various business activities of FPO. Which will not only make the FPO vibrant

but at the same time more and more producer members will start taking interest in joining FPO for their future livelihood security and welfare, Hence, active participants of producer members need to be ensured for sustainability of FPO. Not only this market led exposure training programmes are required to be given more emphasis rather production led extension.

FPO have very limited relation with other institutions and stakeholders due to which it was found to perform very limited business activities that too subsidiary activities only viz. production of mushroom & vermi-compost and supply of inputs, cattle & cattle feed. To overcome this following measure should be taken:

1. FPO should have convergence with various ongoing program/scheme related to agricultural and rural development of State of Madhya Pradesh and central government of India which will help in start of various activities and creation of infrastructure like Custom Hiring Center/ Common Facilitation Center with machinery /equipment related to production & post-production, value addition & farm level processing, storage and other activities to make FPO sustainable and economically viable.
2. Efforts should be made to converge with agriculture marketing infrastructure

(AMI) sub scheme of integrated scheme for agriculture marketing for developing post-harvest and marketing infrastructure by availing assistance provided under the scheme.

3. Efforts should be made to develop relationship with training institute of Micro Small & Medium Enterprises, Bhopal for developing business environment in creation of micro industries in the area under operation.
4. In this connection it has become imperative that FPO should perform all the activities of Gramin Agriculture Market (GAM) for ease of doing business by creating enabling business environment through procurement of the produce of producer members at Minimum Support Price (MSP). Once FPO will perform activities of GAM, it will automatically connect with electronic – National Agriculture Market (e-NAM). Once it is connected with e-NAM it will become vibrant and serves its purpose in a holistic manner.
5. The FPO availed credit facility only from Madhya Pradesh Garamin Bank, Hoshangabad. Hence, there is need of the inclusion of local financing agency personal in the Board of Directors of FPO which can facilitate FPO in the proper direction for credit linkage.

CONCLUSION AND POLICY IMPLICATIONS

It can be concluded from the result of the study that the number of producer members of Kutir Agri Producer Co.Ltd Betul, Pitambra Farmers Producer Co Ltd., Datia, Jyotsana India Producer Company Ltd., Datia, Ummeed India Producer Company Ltd., Gwalior, Revanchal Mahila FPC, Hoshangabad and Barna Crop Producer company Pvt. Ltd., Raisen were found to be same as in its inception (500) which shows that the efforts made by the BODs & POPI of these FPOs were not satisfactory. During the investigation it was found that, the most of the producer members did not know that they are producer member of their respective FPO and were not aware of the role of the organization. Their perception is Ltd. as they viewed the organization similar to that of Self Help Group. This shows that FPO not putting proper efforts in making them aware about the benefits of the FPOs. Hence, exposure and awareness among producer member should be increased about the role of FPOs and the benefits that they reap from it.

Proper care should be taken while electing CEO and BODs of the respective FPOs because these are the key person and

representative of particular FPO. The person who have qualities of entrepreneur viz, creativity, professionalism, risk-taking ability, passions, knowledge, social skill, open mindedness towards learning, people & even failure, empathy and customer is everything should be CEO/BODs so that he work with their farm managers (producer members) for the various business activity in the true sense.

It was also found that the participation of producer members in various trainings ranged between 0.00 (Dhanvantri Vegetable Produce Co. Ltd, Sehore) to 100 (Kutir Agri Producer Co.Ltd, Betul) per cent shows that participation of producer members of majority of FPOs was less. The majority of them were not found to be involved in these training programmes, which is to be taken care off. It may be due to the fact that reaming members are interested in other business activities. Therefore, the interest of all the members is required to be captured followed by arranging trainings accordingly, so that all the producer members will become active and start participating in various business activities of FPO. Which will not only make the FPO vibrant but at the same time more and more producer

members will start taking interest in joining FPO for their future livelihood security and welfare, Hence, active participants of producer members need to be ensured for sustainability of FPO. Not only this market led exposure training programmes are required to be given more emphasis rather production led extension.

FPO have very limited relation with other institutions and stakeholders due to which it was found to perform very limited business activities that too subsidiary activities only viz. production of mushroom & vermi-compost and supply of inputs, cattle & cattle feed.

The lack of procurements of food grains from the producer members, lack of quality inputs distributed to their producer members on time and at reasonable price viz fertilizer, plant protection chemical, lack of Retail out let for sale of produce viz. mushroom, organic produce (vegetables), vermin compost etc., lack of resources/ infrastructure, lack of knowledge regarding seed production programme of improved varieties, lack of credibility and accountability, lack of custom hiring center of FPO for farm equipment/machinery facility for shareholders, lack of transportation facilities for input supply and procurement., lack of

information regarding various government schemes related to Agriculture & Rural development, lack of Market information & market intelligence, lack of storage facilities were found to be major hindrance came across in further improvement of FPOs in the area under study, which is required to be sorted out as soon as possible.

Efforts should be made to converge ongoing program/scheme related to agricultural and rural development of State and central government along with agriculture marketing infrastructure (AMI) sub scheme of integrated scheme for agriculture marketing for developing post-harvest and marketing infrastructure by availing assistance provided under the scheme.

Efforts should be made to develop relationship with training institute of Micro Small & Medium Enterprises, Bhopal for developing business environment in creation of micro industries in the area under operation.

In this connection it has become imperative that FPO should perform all the activities of Gramin Agriculture Market (GAM) for ease of doing business by creating enabling business environment through procurement of the produce of producer members at Minimum

--*

Support Price (MSP). Once FPO will perform activities of GAM, it will automatically connect with electronic – National Agriculture Market (e-NAM). Once it is connected with e- NAM it will become vibrant and serves its purpose in a holistic manner.

The majority FPOs availed cash credit limit facility from Madhya Pradesh Garamin Bank and Central Cooperative Bank and ignoring other institutes. Hence, there is need of the inclusion of local financing agency personal in the Board of Directors of FPO which can facilitate FPO in the proper direction for credit linkage.

It has become imperative and it's high time to appoint some agency as a strategic partner which will act as a a nodal agency not only in solving various problems faced by FPO but at the same time provide immediate solutions with hand holding support. The problems which FPO are facing were found to be absence of institutions to safeguard their interest, unable to integrate with the agricultural value chain fight the risks and vulnerabilities such as commodity price volatility, crop failure, insect-pest attack etc. therefore FPO are operating at sub optimal level and thus attain lower equilibrium.

The FPO must be provided some market space at tehsil of the district level for selling their produce/products, which will not only inculcate the business tactics among members of FPO but at the same time awareness about FPO and its products will increase among consumers and competitive environment may be created among FPO.

End to end approach is required to be established and professional management should be able to ensure that adequate commercial benefits should accrue to all the stakeholders on runtime/real time basis for making value chain vibrant.

To make faster changes hand holding support by NABARD is required on continuous basis in every sphere of their business that is from loan disbursement to performing various activities time to time such as channelizing input and output helping them to take advantage of various government schemes preparation of different licences used for performing various activities connecting them with industries and corporate sectors to make their value chain more vibrant and efficient in professional manner.

Transparent price transmission mechanism is required to be established not only within the FPO but price tracking just like

traceability along with cost incurred across various channels using barcoding techniques is the need of the hour. This is to be given utmost priority not only to safeguard the interest of the producer in availing remunerative prices and making the commodity accessible to the consumer at affordable prices along with desired quality but at the same time it will help to build congenial environment by generating

efficiencies in the value chain and ensuring profit to all stakeholders on sustainable or continuous basis.

The role of producer company and SHGs/NGOs are seems to be almost same. To distinguish this the FPO should start distributing profits to their members or shareholders at least gift during festive seasons as a token of belongingness to the company and to make them understand the benefits one can reap through effective participation in FPOs.

REFERENCES

- Barret, C.B. 2008. Smallholder market participation: Concepts and evidence from Eastern and South Africa. *Food Policy*. 33(4):299-317.
- Borhstoem, M. 2013. Effective co-operative governance: A practitioner's perspective. *Journal of Co-operative Organization and Management*. 1: 49-50.
- Dey, K. 2018. Farmers Producer Companies in India: Determinants of performance and viability. 53(35): 44-52.
- Fisher, E. and Qaim, M. 2012. Linking smallholders to markets: Determinants and impact of farmer's collective action in Kenya. *World Development*. 40(6): 1255-1268.
- Key, N., Sadoulet, E., and de Januvry, A. (2000). Transaction costs and agricultural household supply response. *American Journal of Agricultural Economics*. 82(2):245-259.
- Manaswi B.H.; Kumar, Pramod; Prakash P.; Anbukkani, P.; Kar, Amit; Jha, G.K. and Rao, D.U.M. (2018) Progress and Performance of States in Promotion of Farmer Producer Organisations in India. *Indian Journal Extension Education*. 54, (2) :108-113
- Markelova, H., Meinzen-Dick, R., Hellin, J., and Dohrn, S. 2009. Collective action for smallholder market access. *Food Policy*. 34(1): 1-7.
- Raju K.V., Kumar R., Vikraman S., Moses Shyam D., Srikanth R., Kumara Charyulu D., and Wani S.P. 2017. Farmer Producer Organization in Andhra Pradesh: A Scoping Study. Rythu Kosam Project. Research Report IDC-16. Patancheru 502 324. Telangana, India: International Crops Research Institute for the Semi-Arid Tropics. 160 pp. ISBN 978-92-9066-592-2
- Roy, D and Thorat, A. 2008. Success in High Value Horticultural Export Markets for the small farmers: the case of Mahagrapes in India. *World Development*. 36(10): 1874-1890.
- Shah, T. 2016. Farmer producer companies: Fermenting new wine for new bottle. *Economic and Political Weekly*. 51(8): 15-20.
- Singh, S and Singh, T. 2013. Producer Companies in India: A study of organization and performance. Centre for Management in Agriculture, Indian Institute Management, Ahmedabad.

- Singh, S. 2008. Producer companies as New Generation Co-operatives. *Economic and Political Weekly*. 43(20): 22-24.
- Trebbin, A. 2014. Linking small farmers to modern retail through producer organizations- Experiences with producer companies in India. *Food Policy*. 45: 35-54.
- Trebbin, A., and Hassler, M. (2012) Farmers' producer companies in India: a new concept for collective action? *Environment and Planning A*, 44(2), 411-427.
- Valentinov, V. 2007. Why are co-operatives important in agriculture? An organizational economic perspective. *Journal of Institutional Economics*. 3(1): 55-69.
- Venkattakumar, R and Sontakki, B.S. 2012. Producer companies in India- Experiences and Implications. *Indian Research Journal of Extension Education*. Special Issue 1: 154-160.

Comment on the Draft Report and Action Taken

Title of the Study	: Impact Evaluation of 15 Farmer Producers' Organization Projects in Madhya Pradesh
Date of Received Draft Report	: 24/03/2021
Date of Dispatch of the Comments	: 14/07/2021

1. Page 13 to 36 of the draft report deals with business activity. The business activities having maximum margin and the activities having minimum input cost need to be indicated. A mix of these activities will help in improvement of profitability, which in turn can be replicated by other FPOs.

Action: Necessary corrections were made as per suggestions and given page no. 41 to 52

2. On an average each FPO was found to have convergence with 5 institutions at district level (page 11). However, on page 46, the report says that FPOs should have convergence with various ongoing programmes / schemes related to agriculture and rural development of GoMP and GoI. Efforts should be made to converge with AMI sub-scheme of Integrated Scheme for Agricultural Marketing (ISAM) for developing post harvest and marketing infrastructure. FPO should perform all activities of Gramin Agriculture Market (GAM), by creating enabling business environment through procurement of FPO members produce at Minimum Support Price (MSP)

Action: Based on findings suggestions were made for further improvement of FPOs

The FPOs faced various constraints / bottlenecks ... lack of market information and market intelligence. The point is repeated on page 53 and page 55.

Action: Corrected as Suggested

FPO should have convergence with various ongoing program / scheme related to agriculture and rural development. The point is repeated on page 46 and page 56.

Action: Corrected as Suggested

3. The Project outcomes – Economic Impact and Social Impact may be spelt out specifically / quantified, instead of commenting on it in a general manner.

Action: Corrected as Suggested and given in page no. 52



Agro Economic Research Centre for Madhya Pradesh & Chattishgarh

Jawaharlal Nehru Krishi Vishwa Vidyalaya, Jabalpur (M.P.) 482 004

Phone: 0761 - 2680315, Tele-Fax: 0761 - 2680315, E-mail: aerc_jbp@yahoo.co.in, Web: www.aerc.jnkvv.org