

## Mitigating Farmer distress

### What is the issue?

\n\n

Poor earnings of the farmers result in an unending distress in the agricultural sector and there is need for an appropriate policy response.

\n\n

### What is the current scenario?

\n\n

\n

- Agricultural prices are rising less than others and as a result, the rural wages are depressed.

\n

- 70% of India's recent disinflation has been led by the fall in rural inflation.

\n

- When incomes are low, the demand for some food items such as milk and protein tends to be weak, leading to a fall in their prices.

\n

- Chronic income crunch is pushing farmers into a debt trap, leading to a clamour for loan waivers and higher MSPs.

\n

\n\n

### What are the concerns?

\n\n

\n

- **MSP calculation** - The National Commission for Farmers had recommended that MSP for crops be fixed at 50% above the C2 cost.

\n

- But the government is still using 50% margin of Cost A2 or maybe cost A2+FL, which is lower than cost C2.

\n

- **Pricing** - The arbitrarily fixed prices tend to cause distortion in production, perpetuating a glut and depressing prices to the detriment of producers.

\n

- Efficient, transparent, competitive and hassle-free marketing is a must to ensure reasonable prices to the growers.  
\n
- This will ensure demand-driven production, thereby, restricting surpluses and shortages to manageable levels.  
\n
- **Focus on productivity** - Most of the agricultural development schemes aim largely at boosting crop productivity and production.  
\n
- It disregards the negative impact of higher output on prices in a surplus situation.  
\n
- **External trade policy** - These are focused more on managing inflation than on maintaining the price line to safeguard the farmers' interests.  
\n
- An export window is usually denied for farm products by imposing import and export curbs, which makes it difficult to mitigate domestic surplus.  
\n
- Frequently modifying duties and minimum export prices on the pretext of controlling inflation add to the woes.  
\n

\n\n

### **What should be the future course of action?**

\n\n

- The focus has to be shifted from farm income to farmers' income.  
\n
- A recent discussion paper brought out by the **NITI Aayog** reveals that about two-thirds of rural income now comes from non-agricultural sources.  
\n
- Also, **70<sup>th</sup> round of NSSO** finds that wage employment is the principal source of income for 56% of small and marginal farmers.  
\n
- Clearly, expanding job avenues in and around rural areas is imperative to boost farmers' earnings.  
\n
- Promoting relatively lucrative allied activities of agriculture such as horticulture and floriculture also helps boost farm incomes.  
\n
- Thus, a multifaceted income-generation plan, rather than MSP hikes and loan waivers, can mitigate farmers' disquiet.  
\n

\n\n

\n\n

**Source: Business Standard**

\n\n

## Quick Facts

\n\n

### MSP calculation

\n\n

\n

- The Commission for Agricultural Costs and Prices (CACP), gives three definitions of production costs: A2, A2+FL and C2.

\n

- A2 costs - It basically cover all paid-out expenses, both in cash and in kind, incurred by farmers on seeds, fertilisers, chemicals, hired labour, fuel, irrigation, etc.

\n

- A2+FL costs - It cover actual paid-out costs plus an imputed value of unpaid family labour.

\n

- C2 costs - These costs are more comprehensive, accounting for the rentals and interest forgone on owned land and fixed capital assets respectively, on top of A2+FL.

\n

- The M.S. Swaminathan Committee report had recommended a minimum support price of 50% profits above the cost of production classified as 'C2' by the CACP.

\n

\n



**SHANKAR**  
**IAS PARLIAMENT**  
*Information is Empowering*