

## Performance analysis of the Agri-Clinics and Agri-Business Centres Scheme in India: A study with special reference to Uttar Pradesh

Dr. Ajaz Ahmad Ganaie<sup>1</sup>, Dr. Mandeep Kaur<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Assistant Professor, (Economics) Department of Agriculture, Guru Nanak Dev University, Amritsar, Punjab, India

<sup>2</sup> Assistant Professor, (Economics), Guru Nanak Dev University College, Ladowali, Jalandhar, Punjab, India

### Abstract

The present study examines the performance of the Agri-Clinics and Agri-Business Centres (hereafter abbreviated as AC&ABC) scheme in India, with a special focus on Uttar Pradesh. Using secondary data up to 31<sup>st</sup> December 2022, the study analyses key indicators such as trained candidates, ventures established, training programmes, and bank-sanctioned projects at both national and state levels. The findings reveal significant regional disparities in the implementation of the scheme. States such as Maharashtra, Uttar Pradesh, and Tamil Nadu emerge as leading performers, contributing substantially to training, enterprise creation, and financial linkage. Uttar Pradesh, in particular, demonstrates notable growth over time, with a relatively higher conversion rate of trained candidates into agripreneurial ventures compared to the national average. However, district-level analysis highlights uneven distribution in training participation, venture establishment, and access to institutional finance within the state. The study also identifies a concentration of ventures in a few major activities, particularly livestock-based enterprises and agribusiness services, indicating limited diversification. Overall, the study emphasizes the need to strengthen institutional support, improve access to credit, enhance awareness, and promote diversification to ensure balanced and inclusive development of agripreneurship across regions.

**Keywords:** Agri-Clinics, agri-business centres, agripreneurship, trained candidates, Uttar Pradesh

### Introduction

Agriculture remains a cornerstone of the Indian economy, contributing significantly to livelihood security, employment generation, and overall socio-economic development. A large proportion of the population continues to depend directly or indirectly on agriculture and allied sectors. However, the sector faces persistent challenges such as declining public extension services, inadequate access to modern technologies, and limited employment opportunities for agricultural graduates (Bairwa *et al.*, 2014) [2]. These challenges highlight the need for innovative institutional mechanisms to strengthen agricultural extension and generate employment opportunities.

In response to these challenges, the Government of India introduced the AC&ABC scheme in 2002 to promote agripreneurship and supplement the existing agricultural extension system. The scheme aims to transform agricultural graduates into self-employed agripreneurs who can provide advisory, input supply, and other agri-based services at the grassroots level, thereby bridging the gap between scientific knowledge and farmers (Kanwat *et al.*, 2011) [5]. Thus, the scheme serves as an important policy initiative aimed at promoting self-employment and strengthening last-mile agricultural extension services.

The AC&ABC scheme is a subsidy-based, credit-linked programme implemented through institutions such as National Institute of Agricultural Extension Management (MANAGE), National Bank for Agriculture and Rural Development (NABARD), and Nodal Training Institutes (NITs). It provides training, financial assistance, and handholding support to enable agricultural graduates to establish agri-ventures. These ventures play a crucial role in strengthening technology transfer, improving access to inputs, and enhancing farm productivity (Parihar & Boyal, 2018) [7]. Despite these provisions, the effectiveness of the scheme largely depends on its implementation across regions.

However, despite its potential, the performance of the scheme has not been uniform across regions.

Empirical evidence suggests that states like Maharashtra, Uttar Pradesh, and Tamil Nadu have performed better in terms of trained candidates and venture establishment, while several north-eastern states lag behind due to structural and institutional constraints (Chaitra *et al.*, 2020) [4]. Moreover, the conversion rate of trained candidates into successful agripreneurs remains moderate, indicating gaps in post-training support and access to finance.

At the micro level, the success of agripreneurship is influenced by multiple socio-economic and institutional factors. These include entrepreneurial attitude, access to credit, family support, and business experience. Studies have shown that challenges such as lack of initial capital, complex loan procedures, and insufficient institutional support hinder the establishment and sustainability of agri-ventures (Bairwa *et al.*, 2015; Bairwa *et al.*, 2017) [1, 3]. These challenges indicate the presence of structural and institutional gaps that need to be addressed for improving scheme outcomes.

However, limited empirical studies have examined the district-level performance and disparities of the scheme, particularly in large states like Uttar Pradesh. In this context, Uttar Pradesh holds significant importance due to its large agricultural base and substantial contribution to the AC&ABC scheme. Although the state has shown considerable progress, disparities persist across districts in terms of training participation, venture establishment, and access to institutional finance. Against this backdrop, the present study attempts to analyze the performance of the AC&ABC scheme in India, with special reference to Uttar Pradesh. The study focuses on key indicators such as trained candidates, ventures established, training programmes, and bank-sanctioned projects to examine regional and district-level disparities.

## Database and Methodology

The study is based on secondary data obtained from the National Institute of Agricultural Extension Management (MANAGE) AC&ABC database, covering the period from 2002 to 31st December 2022. The data includes information on trained candidates, ventures established, training programmes, and bank-sanctioned projects at both national and state levels, along with detailed district-level data for Uttar Pradesh. A descriptive and analytical research design has been adopted. The analysis involves the use of percentage shares, growth trends, and Compound Annual Growth Rate (CAGR) to assess performance over time. Comparative analysis has been used to evaluate inter-state and intra-state variations, while district-level analysis highlights regional disparities in implementation of the scheme.

## Results and Discussions

### 1. State-wise Distribution and Performance of the AC&ABC Scheme in India

Table 1 presents the state-wise distribution and performance of the AC&ABC scheme in India as on 31<sup>st</sup> December 2022, covering key indicators such as trained candidates, ventures established, training programmes conducted, and bank-sanctioned projects. All of the states exhibited regional imbalances of the AC&ABC scheme. The state of Maharashtra emerges as the highest performing state in terms of the number of trained candidates, number of ventures established, number of training programs

accomplished, and the number bank funded projects (26.49%, 31.06%, 26.80%, and 26.43% respectively). It reflects strong institutional capacity, greater awareness and has pursued the implementation of the scheme more proactively than other states within India. Additionally, approximately 34% of the total projects funded by banks have been located in Uttar Pradesh (again, the highest percentage), suggesting that Uttar Pradesh may be benefiting from better access to capital via financial institutions than the other states.

Tamil Nadu demonstrates consistent performance, contributing significantly across all indicators. Similarly, states such as Madhya Pradesh, Karnataka, and Rajasthan show moderate but balanced progress. In contrast, several north-eastern states such as Arunachal Pradesh, Mizoram, Meghalaya, Sikkim, and Tripura exhibit negligible participation. This may be attributed to limited awareness, weak institutional infrastructure, geographical constraints, and poor access to credit facilities. The comparison between trained candidates and ventures established suggests the presence of conversion gaps in several states. However, states like Maharashtra, Uttar Pradesh, and Tamil Nadu show relatively better conversion rates, indicating stronger post-training support systems. Overall, the findings suggest that while the AC&ABC scheme has made considerable progress, its impact remains concentrated in a few states. Strengthening institutional mechanisms, improving financial access, and enhancing awareness are essential for achieving balanced regional development.

**Table 1:** State-wise Status of AC&ABC Scheme in India (As on 31<sup>st</sup> December 2022)

Sr. No	Name of State/ Union Territory (UT)	Trained Candidates		Ventures Established		Training Programmes		Sanctioned Projects by Bank	
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
1	Andhra Pradesh	1628	1.94	480	1.31	52	1.67	2	0.18
2	Arunachal Pradesh	48	0.06	3	0.01	2	0.06	1	0.09
3	Assam	844	1.01	266	0.72	29	0.93	3	0.27
4	Bihar	4372	5.22	1544	4.22	133	4.26	3	0.27
5	Chandigarh	4	0.00	2	0.01	2	0.06	0	0.00
6	Chhattisgarh	986	1.18	384	1.05	38	1.22	2	0.18
7	Delhi	42	0.05	6	0.02	0	0.00	0	0.00
8	Goa	15	0.02	7	0.02	4	0.13	0	0.00
9	Gujarat	2222	2.65	887	2.42	83	2.66	5	0.45
10	Haryana	737	0.88	245	0.67	29	0.93	31	2.81
11	Himachal Pradesh	429	0.51	111	0.30	13	0.42	6	0.54
12	Jammu and Kashmir	1523	1.82	191	0.52	52	1.67	3	0.27
13	Jharkhand	783	0.93	198	0.54	37	1.18	1	0.09
14	Karnataka	4418	5.27	1782	4.88	153	4.90	78	7.06
15	Kerala	277	0.33	60	0.16	16	0.51	3	0.27
16	Madhya Pradesh	4959	5.92	2190	5.99	202	6.47	8	0.72
17	Maharashtra	22204	26.49	11352	31.06	837	26.80	292	26.43
18	Manipur	522	0.62	135	0.37	19	0.61	2	0.18
19	Meghalaya	37	0.04	3	0.01	2	0.06	0	0.00
20	Mizoram	52	0.06	0	0.00	2	0.06	0	0.00
21	Nagaland	187	0.22	22	0.06	7	0.22	1	0.09
22	Orissa	643	0.77	116	0.32	25	0.80	1	0.09
23	Pondicherry	145	0.17	86	0.24	23	0.74	8	0.72
24	Punjab	668	0.80	224	0.61	23	0.74	1	0.09
25	Rajasthan	4549	5.43	1871	5.12	163	5.22	18	1.63
26	Sikkim	9	0.01	1	0.00	1	0.03	0	0.00
27	Tamil Nadu	9075	10.83	4495	12.30	317	10.15	184	16.65
28	Telangana	2216	2.64	608	1.66	108	3.46	62	5.61
29	Tripura	6	0.01	2	0.01	0	0.00	1	0.09
30	Uttar Pradesh	18435	22.00	8808	24.10	679	21.74	383	34.66
31	Uttaranchal	555	0.66	175	0.48	28	0.90	2	0.18
32	West Bengal	1216	1.45	298	0.82	44	1.41	4	0.36
	Total	83806	100	36552	100	3123	100	1105	100

Source: MANAGE- AC&ABC Database.

## 2. Contribution of Uttar Pradesh to National Performance under the AC&ABC Scheme

Table 2 presents the year-wise contribution of Uttar Pradesh to the national performance of the AC&ABC scheme from 2002 to 2022. The data shows a clear upward trend over time. Initially, the contribution of Uttar Pradesh was relatively low, with only 1.51% of trained candidates and 2.90% of ventures in 2002. However, the share increased significantly in subsequent years, indicating improved participation and institutional strengthening.

A notable surge is observed in 2006, when Uttar Pradesh contributed 28.75% of trained candidates and 37.51% of

ventures established. Although minor fluctuations are observed in later years, the state consistently maintains a high share. Overall, Uttar Pradesh accounts for 22% of trained candidates and 24.10% of total ventures, indicating its leading position. The higher share of ventures compared to trained candidates suggests better conversion efficiency. The CAGR further confirms this trend, with Uttar Pradesh recording higher growth rates than the national average. However, recent fluctuations, particularly after 2019, may be attributed to external factors such as economic disruptions and the COVID-19 pandemic.

**Table 2:** Year-wise Share of Uttar Pradesh in Number of Trained Candidates and Ventures Established under the AC&ABC Scheme in India (2002- 31<sup>st</sup> December 2022)

Sr. No	Year	Number of Trained Candidates		Share of Uttar Pradesh in India (%)	Number of Ventures Established		Share of Uttar Pradesh in India (%)
		India	Uttar Pradesh		India	Uttar Pradesh	
1	2002	1521	23	1.51	138	4	2.90
2	2003	2595	329	12.68	679	23	3.39
3	2004	1946	293	15.06	448	54	12.05
4	2005	3399	567	16.68	1413	263	18.61
5	2006	2209	635	28.75	1101	413	37.51
6	2007	3309	668	20.19	1215	327	26.91
7	2008	2393	510	21.31	823	195	23.69
8	2009	2575	511	19.84	1176	382	32.48
9	2010	3184	590	18.53	1269	206	16.23
10	2011	4432	787	17.76	1498	251	16.76
11	2012	3146	807	25.65	1792	470	26.23
12	2013	5387	1243	23.07	2399	637	26.55
13	2014	5669	1726	30.45	2730	636	23.30
14	2015	4072	716	17.58	2713	798	29.41
15	2016	5611	1376	24.52	1676	576	34.37
16	2017	5096	1216	23.86	2451	522	21.30
17	2018	5478	1553	28.35	2655	666	25.08
18	2019	7878	1783	22.63	2340	729	31.15
19	2020	3331	910	27.32	2073	520	25.08
20	2021	5033	1194	23.72	2051	343	16.72
21	2022	5542	998	18.01	3912	793	20.27
Total		83806	18435	22.00	36552	8808	24.10
CAGR		6.68%	20.75%		18.20%	30.27%	

Source: MANAGE- AC&ABC Database.

## 3. Performance of the AC&ABC Scheme in Uttar Pradesh

### 3.1. District-wise Distribution of Trained Candidates, Ventures Established and Bank Sanctioned Projects in Uttar Pradesh

Table 3 presents the district-wise distribution of trained candidates, ventures established, and bank-sanctioned projects in Uttar Pradesh as on 31 December 2022. The table provides a comprehensive picture of the programme's performance in terms of capacity building, entrepreneurial outcomes, and financial linkage across districts. At the aggregate level, a total of 18,435 candidates were trained, out of which 8,808 ventures were established, indicating that nearly 47.8 per cent of trained candidates translated their skills into entrepreneurial activities. However, only 383 projects received bank sanction, which is merely about 2.1 per cent of trained candidates and 4.3 per cent of total ventures established. This clearly highlights that while training and venture creation have shown moderate success, credit linkage remains a critical bottleneck in the programme.

The district-wise analysis reveals considerable regional variation. Districts such as Bareilly (880 trainees; 4.77%), Varanasi (696; 3.78%), Moradabad (626; 3.40%), Pilibhit

(613; 3.33%), and Azamgarh (603; 3.27%) recorded the highest number of trained candidates. These districts also performed well in terms of venture establishment, with Bareilly (503 ventures; 5.71%), Varanasi (433; 4.92%), Moradabad (385; 4.37%), and Azamgarh (351; 3.99%) leading the state. This suggests a positive linkage between training and entrepreneurial outcomes, where higher training participation is associated with greater venture creation. However, this positive trend does not extend uniformly to bank-sanctioned projects. The distribution of credit is highly skewed and concentrated in a few districts. For instance, Amroha accounts for 52 projects (13.58%) and Moradabad for 48 projects (12.53%), followed by Bijnor (29; 7.57%) and Bulandshahr (27; 7.05%). In contrast, several districts such as Ambedkar Nagar, Banda, Chitrakoot, Fatehpur, Jhansi, Kannauj, and Sant Kabir Nagar reported zero bank-sanctioned projects, despite having trained candidates and established ventures. This indicates a significant gap between enterprise development and access to institutional finance.

Moreover, the mismatch between training, venture establishment, and credit support is evident in districts like Kheri (597 trainees, 251 ventures, but only 3 bank-sanctioned projects), Sitapur (435, 128, and 3 respectively),

and Jaunpur (480, 230, and 5 respectively). These figures suggest that although entrepreneurial activity is present, financial facilitation through formal banking channels remains inadequate. Overall, the analysis highlights three key issues: (i) regional imbalance in programme outreach, (ii) relatively better conversion of training into ventures, and

(iii) weak and uneven credit linkage across districts. The findings emphasize the need for strengthening institutional credit mechanisms, improving bank–entrepreneur coordination, and ensuring more balanced regional implementation to enhance the overall effectiveness and sustainability of the programme.

**Table 3:** District-wise Distribution of Trained Candidates, Ventures Established and Bank Bank-Sanctioned Projects in Uttar Pradesh (As on 31 December 2022)

Sr. No	District	Trained Candidates		Ventures Established		Bank-Sanctioned Projects	
		No	%	No	%	No	%
1	Agra	515	2.79	285	3.24	9	2.35
2	Aligarh	391	2.12	193	2.19	5	1.31
3	Ambedkar Nagar	239	1.30	109	1.24	0	0.00
4	Amethi	36	0.20	25	0.28	0	0.00
5	Amroha	514	2.79	293	3.33	52	13.58
6	Auraiya	188	1.02	97	1.10	1	0.26
7	Ayodhya	219	1.19	81	0.92	3	0.78
8	Azamgarh	603	3.27	351	3.99	12	3.13
9	Baghpat	154	0.84	74	0.84	2	0.52
10	Bahraich	123	0.67	49	0.56	1	0.26
11	Ballia	156	0.85	86	0.98	3	0.78
12	Balrampur	58	0.31	28	0.32	2	0.52
13	Banda	123	0.67	40	0.45	0	0.00
14	Barabanki	368	2.00	157	1.78	7	1.83
15	Bareilly	880	4.77	503	5.71	22	5.74
16	Basti	317	1.72	144	1.63	2	0.52
17	Bhadohi	59	0.32	39	0.44	1	0.26
18	Bijnor	383	2.08	171	1.94	29	7.57
19	Budaun	244	1.32	134	1.52	4	1.04
20	Bulandshahr	355	1.93	154	1.75	27	7.05
21	Chandauli	166	0.90	102	1.16	1	0.26
22	Chitrakoot	32	0.17	10	0.11	0	0.00
23	Deoria	227	1.23	109	1.24	1	0.26
24	Etah	173	0.94	81	0.92	1	0.26
25	Etawah	208	1.13	98	1.11	2	0.52
26	Farrukhabad	66	0.36	26	0.30	2	0.52
27	Fatehpur	123	0.67	38	0.43	0	0.00
28	Firozabad	176	0.95	81	0.92	3	0.78
29	Gautam Buddha Nagar	34	0.18	7	0.08	0	0.00
30	Ghaziabad	98	0.53	39	0.44	3	0.78
31	Ghazipur	290	1.57	168	1.91	1	0.26
32	Gonda	300	1.63	145	1.65	7	1.83
33	Gorakhpur	346	1.88	179	2.03	3	0.78
34	Hamirpur	157	0.85	55	0.62	4	1.04
35	Hapur	43	0.23	20	0.23	2	0.52
36	Hardoi	245	1.33	70	0.79	2	0.52
37	Hathras	149	0.81	85	0.97	3	0.78
38	Jalaun	142	0.77	59	0.67	1	0.26
39	Jaunpur	480	2.60	230	2.61	5	1.31
40	Jhansi	142	0.77	71	0.81	0	0.00
41	Kannauj	179	0.97	90	1.02	0	0.00
42	Kanpur Dehat	83	0.45	29	0.33	1	0.26
43	Kanpur Nagar	90	0.49	24	0.27	1	0.26
44	Kasganj	36	0.20	14	0.16	0	0.00
45	Kaushambi	59	0.32	18	0.20	0	0.00
46	Kheri	597	3.24	251	2.85	3	0.78
47	Kushinagar	296	1.61	152	1.73	1	0.26
48	Lalitpur	88	0.48	31	0.35	4	1.04
49	Lucknow	331	1.80	111	1.26	5	1.31
50	Mahoba	52	0.28	17	0.19	1	0.26
51	Maharajganj	108	0.59	55	0.62	1	0.26
52	Mainpuri	117	0.63	49	0.56	2	0.52
53	Mathura	129	0.70	59	0.67	1	0.26
54	Mau	186	1.01	102	1.16	1	0.26
55	Meerut	460	2.50	220	2.50	12	3.13
56	Mirzapur	238	1.29	131	1.49	1	0.26

57	Moradabad	626	3.40	385	4.37	48	12.53
58	Muzaffarnagar	582	3.16	278	3.16	9	2.35
59	Nagla	1	0.01	0	0.00	0	0.00
60	New Delhi	1	0.01	0	0.00	0	0.00
61	Pilibhit	613	3.33	340	3.86	13	3.39
62	Pratapgarh	263	1.43	97	1.10	1	0.26
62	Prayagraj	318	1.72	103	1.17	0	0.00
64	RaeBareli	216	1.17	80	0.91	0	0.00
65	Rahimabad	1	0.01	0	0.00	0	0.00
66	Rampur	379	2.06	173	1.96	19	4.96
67	Saharanpur	308	1.67	148	1.68	4	1.04
68	Sambhal	126	0.68	32	0.36	5	1.31
69	Sant Kabir Nagar	84	0.46	38	0.43	0	0.00
70	Shahjahanpur	233	1.26	111	1.26	2	0.52
71	Shamli	170	0.92	85	0.97	5	1.31
72	Shrawasti	56	0.30	30	0.34	0	0.00
73	Sidharthnagar	86	0.47	39	0.44	2	0.52
74	Sitapur	435	2.36	128	1.45	3	0.78
75	Sonbhadra	52	0.28	22	0.25	1	0.26
76	Sultanpur	504	2.73	209	2.37	8	2.09
77	Unnao	114	0.62	38	0.43	2	0.52
78	Varanasi	696	3.78	433	4.92	4	1.04
Total		18435	100	8808	100	383	100

Source: MANAGE- AC&ABC Database.

Note: It is important to mention that entries such as New Delhi, Rahimabad, and Nagla appear in the dataset; however, these are not recognized districts of Uttar Pradesh. For instance, New Delhi is part of the National Capital Territory of Delhi and lies outside the state. Their inclusion in the table is based on the classification provided in the AC&ABC database.

### 3.2. Activity-wise Distribution of Ventures under the AC&ABC Scheme in Uttar Pradesh

Table 4 presents the activity-wise distribution of ventures established under the AC&ABC Scheme in Uttar Pradesh from 2002 to 31st December 2022. The data reveals a strong concentration of ventures in a few key agricultural activities, while many other sectors have relatively low participation. The largest share of ventures is observed in Dairy/Poultry/Piggery/Goatary, accounting for 34.29% (3020 units), followed closely by Agri-Clinics and Agribusiness Centres with 33.95% (2990 units). Together, these two categories dominate the overall distribution, indicating that livestock-based enterprises and integrated agribusiness services are the most preferred and viable options for trained agripreneurs. Additionally, Agri-Clinics alone contribute 17.21% (1516 units), further emphasizing the importance of advisory and extension services in the agricultural sector.

Moderate participation is seen in activities like Farm Machinery Units (2.79%), Vegetable Production and Marketing (2.10%), Nursery (1.06%), and Organic Production/Food Chain (1.19%), suggesting growing interest in mechanization, horticulture, and sustainable agriculture practices. On the other hand, several activities such as Agriculture Journalism (0.03%), Landscaping + Nursery (0.01%), Soil Testing Laboratory (0.08%), and Fishery Clinics (0.06%) show negligible representation. This indicates limited awareness, higher technical requirements, lower profitability, or lack of institutional support in these specialized areas. Overall, the table highlights that agripreneurs in Uttar Pradesh tend to prefer low-risk, high-demand, and relatively familiar sectors, particularly livestock and integrated agribusiness services, while innovative and niche agricultural ventures remain underdeveloped.

Table 4: Activity-wise Distribution of Ventures Established under the AC&ABC Scheme in Uttar Pradesh (2002-31<sup>st</sup> December 2022)

Sr. No	Project Description	No	%	Sr. No	Project Description	No	%
1	Agri-Clinics	1516	17.21	16	Horticulture Clinic	14	0.16
2	Agri-Clinics and Agribusiness Centres	2990	33.95	17	Landscaping + Nursery	1	0.01
3	Agriculture Journalism	3	0.03	18	Mushroom Cultivation	23	0.26
4	Animal Feed Unit	15	0.17	19	Nursery	93	1.06
5	Apiary	69	0.78	20	Organic Production/ Food Chain	105	1.19
6	Bio-fertilizer production and Marketing	38	0.43	21	Pesticides Production and Marketing	8	0.09
7	Contract Farming	37	0.42	22	Production & Marketing of Bio-Control Agents	12	0.14
8	Crop Production	57	0.65	23	Rural Godown	36	0.41
9	Cultivation of Medicinal Plants	13	0.15	24	Seed Processing and Marketing	44	0.50
10	Dairy/Poultry/Piggery/ Goatary	3020	34.29	25	Soil Testing Laboratory	7	0.08
11	Direct Mkt.	38	0.43	26	Value Addition	71	0.81
12	Farm Machinery Unit	246	2.79	27	Vegetable Production and Marketing	185	2.10
13	Fisheries Development	58	0.66	28	Vermicomposting / Organic manure	65	0.74
14	Fishery clinic	5	0.06	29	Veterinary Clinics	22	0.25
15	Floriculture	17	0.19		Total	8808	100

Source: MANAGE- AC&ABC Database.

### 3.3. Institution-wise Distribution of Training Programmes under the AC&ABC Scheme in Uttar Pradesh

Table 5 presents the institution-wise distribution of training programmes conducted under the AC&ABC scheme in Uttar Pradesh during 2002-December 2022. The data highlights the role of different institutions in building agripreneurial capacity across the state. The distribution shows that training activities are concentrated among a few key institutions. Notably, Shree Maa Guru Gramodhyog Sansthan, Varanasi accounts for the highest share (20.77%) of total training programmes, followed by Jubilant Agriculture Rural Development Society, Moradabad (16.35%) and Jubilant Agriculture Rural Development Society, Agra (10.31%). These institutions have played a

dominant role in implementing the scheme and promoting agripreneurship. A number of institutions such as CARD Muzaffarnagar (6.77%), Jubilant Gorakhpur (6.92%), and CARD Debiyapur (3.98%) show moderate contributions, indicating a relatively wider but still uneven institutional participation. However, several institutions have conducted only a limited number of training programmes, with shares below 2%, reflecting underutilization of institutional capacity.

Overall, the table suggests that the implementation of training programmes is skewed towards a few active institutions, while many others play a marginal role. This indicates the need to strengthen institutional participation and expand training infrastructure to ensure a more balanced and widespread development of agripreneurship in the state.

**Table 5:** Institution-wise Number of Training Programmes under the AC&ABC Scheme in Uttar Pradesh (2002–December 2022)

Sr. No	Name of the Institute	No.	%
1	C.S. Azad University of Agriculture and Technology, Kanpur	5	0.74
2	Center for Agriculture and Rural Development, Noida	22	3.24
3	Centre for Agricultural and Rural Development(CARD), Muzaffarnagar, Uttar Pradesh	46	6.77
4	Centre for Agriculture and Rural Development (CARD), Bakshi Ka Talab, Uttar Pradesh	1	0.15
5	Centre for Agriculture and Rural Development (CARD), Debiyapur, Uttar Pradesh	27	3.98
6	Centre for Technology and Entrepreneurship Development, Amethi, Uttar Pradesh	25	3.68
7	Gokulam Charitable Trust, Agra, Uttar Pradesh	4	0.59
8	ICAR-Central Institute for Subtropical Horticulture, Lucknow	1	0.15
9	ICAR-V.K.S Krishi Vigyan Kendra, Unnao, Uttar Pradesh	2	0.29
10	Indian Veterinary Research Institute, Bareilly, Uttar Pradesh	2	0.29
11	Indira Gandhi Institute of Co-operative Management,Lucknow	17	2.50
12	Institute of Cooperative & Corporate Management, Research & Training, Lucknow, Uttar Pradesh	13	1.91
13	Jay Bajrang Pratishthan, Baraut, Uttar Pradesh	18	2.65
14	Jubilant Agriculture Rural development Society, Agra, Uttar Pradesh	70	10.31
15	Jubilant Agriculture Rural development Society, Gorakhpur, Uttar Pradesh	47	6.92
16	Jubilant Agriculture Rural development Society, Moradabad, Uttar Pradesh	111	16.35
17	Kamla Nehru Krishi Vigyan Kendra, Sultanpur, Uttar Pradesh	4	0.59
18	Krishi Vigyan Kendra, Kaushambi, Uttar Pradesh	22	3.24
19	Laxmi Jan Kalyan Sewa Sansthan, Ghaziabad, Uttar Pradesh	11	1.62
20	Maheraj Global Educational society(MGES), Agra, Uttar Pradesh	12	1.77
21	MCA Literary & Scientific Society, Prayagraj, Uttar Pradesh	10	1.47
22	Narendra Deva University of Agriculture & Technology	1	0.15
23	National Research Centre for Agro-Forestry, Jhansi	4	0.59
24	Participatory Rural development Foundation, Gorakhpur	1	0.15
25	Raja Dinesh Singh Krishi Vigyan Kendra, Pratapgarh, Uttar Pradesh	4	0.59
26	Sam Higginbottom Institute of Agriculture, Technology & Science, Allahabad	8	1.18
27	Sanskriti University, Mathura, Uttar Pradesh	2	0.29
28	Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel University of Agriculture and Technology	1	0.15
29	Shree Maa Guru Gramodhyog Sansthan, Lucknow Sub Center	24	3.53
30	Shree Maa Guru Gramodhyog Sansthan, Varanasi, Uttar Pradesh	141	20.77
31	Shree Maa Guru Gramodhyog Sansthan,Jhansi	12	1.77
32	State Institute of Management of Agriculture,Lucknow	10	1.47
33	Sunaina Samriddhi Foundation, Gorakhpur	1	0.15
	Total	679	100

Source: MANAGE- AC&ABC Database.

### Conclusion

The study concludes that the AC&ABC scheme has made significant contributions to promoting agripreneurship in India, but its impact remains uneven across states and regions. States such as Maharashtra, Uttar Pradesh, and Tamil Nadu dominate in terms of training, venture creation, and financial support, indicating stronger institutional mechanisms and better implementation strategies. Uttar Pradesh demonstrates notable growth and higher conversion efficiency, but significant district-level disparities persist. Many districts show low participation and weak conversion rates, indicating gaps in training outreach, credit access, and institutional support.

The concentration of ventures in a few traditional activities also suggests limited diversification in agripreneurial ventures. To enhance the effectiveness of the scheme, there is a need to strengthen institutional infrastructure, improve credit accessibility, promote awareness, and encourage diversification into innovative agricultural activities. A more balanced and inclusive approach will help in achieving sustainable agripreneurship development across all regions.

### References

1. Bairwa SL, Kushwaha S, Sen C. Problems faced by agripreneurs in starting and operating agriventures under ACABCs scheme in Rajasthan. International

- Journal of Agricultural Science and Research,2015:5(2):203-208.
2. Bairwa SL, Kushwaha S, Meena LK, Lakra K. Present status of agriclinics and agribusiness centres scheme in India: An analysis. International Journal of Scientific Research and Management,2014:2(9):1431-1440.
  3. Bairwa SL, Kushwaha S, Sen C, Singh R. Analysis of socio-economic profile of trained agri graduates under ACABC scheme in Rajasthan. International Journal of Agricultural Invention,2017:2(1):96-102.
  4. Chaitra GB, Patil C, Yeledhalli RA. Attracting and retaining youth in agriculture – A case of ACABC scheme in India. International Journal of Current Microbiology and Applied Sciences,2020:9(2):1109-1115.
  5. Kanwat M, Chargoitra M, Kumar PS, Mishra BP. Attitude of agricultural graduates towards agri-clinic and agribusiness centres. Indian Research Journal of Extension Education,2011:11(1):117-118.
  6. MANAGE. Database Available at Agri-Clinics and Agri- Business Centres Cell, MANAGE, Hyderabad, Retrieved from, 2023. <http://www.agriclinics.net>.
  7. Parihar TB, Boyal VK. Agricultural Extension Services by Agri-Clinic and Agri Business Centres (ACABCs) Scheme in Rajasthan. International Journal of Advanced Scientific Research and Management,2018:1:188-193.