Marketing Cost Of Wheat At Different Marketing Places In Haryana

* Anita Dagar
** Sandeep Kumar

ABSTRACT

Wheat has to undergo a series of transfers or exchange (channels) from one hand to another before it finally reaches the consumer. Keeping in view all transfers and channels involved in the marketing of wheat, an attempt has been made in the present paper to examine the marketing cost and its components and the share of marketing cost in the total sales at different marketing places by small, medium and large size farmers in Sirsa, Haryana in relation to the primary marketing channel i.e. from farmers to purchasers. The results of the study are based on primary as well as secondary data. The study concluded that a large amount of wheat was sold outside the village as compared to inside the village. Out of different cost components, the transportation cost comprised of a major share in the total marketing cost inside the village, and the agents' charges comprised of a major chunk of the total marketing cost outside the village. The paper also presents some useful suggestions to reduce the marketing cost of wheat both inside and outside the village.

Keywords: Agricultural marketing, Marketing costs, Middleman, Regulated Market, Farmers

INTRODUCTION

The National Commission on Agriculture defined agricultural marketing as a process which starts with a decision to produce saleable farm commodities, and it involves all aspects of market structure or system both functional, institutional based on technology and academic consideration, including pre and post harvest, i.e. operation, grading, storage, transportation and distribution [5]. The concept of agricultural marketing plays a vital role in the growth of the agricultural sector of an economy as if the purposes of agricultural marketing fail, it will have a negative financial effect on the farmers, which in future will lead to less agricultural production. While measuring the trends in agricultural marketing, one needs to consider the concept of the marketing cost, which is one of the most important components of agricultural marketing. As far as the Indian economy is concerned, the study of the marketing cost of major crops attracted much attention.

Wheat is the staple food of north India. Therefore, stability in price of wheat has remained an important goal for the planners and policy makers. In recent years, it has received considerable attention of researchers due to the high inflation of consumable items. Most of the studies examined the marketing cost of food grains; farmers' share in consumer's rupees, marketing margins by different approaches. These studies played their helpful role in solving the problem of hunger in the country, by presenting the least marketing cost channels to the farmers and consumers as well. The study of wheat marketing costs provides an idea of profitability and could be the yardstick for planners and policy makers. Marketing cost includes all the market charges from local assembling on the farm to the final consumer. Marketing cost depends on several factors, including the type of commodity, nature of functioning necessary in marketing, and the distance of the marketing place from the farm.

Wheat is marketed through different marketing channels, which perform at different marketing places, by involving a large number of intermediaries. As a result, producers sell their produce to the buyer at different places that include different marketing channels. Hence, there are wide variations in the processing and functioning of wheat marketing at different marketing places. Therefore, it is necessary to examine the marketing cost of wheat at different marketing places in Haryana. Moreover, the study of marketing cost of primary marketing channels as compared to other marketing channels is more important for the farmers as the marketing cost of food grains have a direct effect on the farmer's share in consumer's rupees and farmers margin as well. Keeping this in view, an attempt has been made in the

present paper to examine the marketing cost of wheat and its components, and the share of marketing cost in total sales at different marketing places by farmers of different size groups in Sirsa, Haryana at the primary marketing channel, i.e. farmers to purchasing agencies for the year 2007-09.

DATA SOURCE AND METHODOLOGY

The study pertains to Sirsa district of Haryana as district Sirsa was ranked first on the basis of maximum production of wheat in Haryana (Agricultural Department of Haryana, Rabi 2006-07). To meet the objectives of the paper, both primary and secondary data (for the year 2006- 2008) have been used. The secondary data required for the trend, area, and yield analysis was taken from various statistical abstracts of Haryana, and the data on market details and other necessary information regarding the research area was taken from Haryana State Agricultural Marketing Board and Agricultural Department of Haryana. For the purpose of collecting primary data, a multistage sampling technique was used. In the first-stage, district Sirsa was selected on the basis of maximum production of wheat in Haryana (Agricultural Department of Haryana, Rabi 2006-07). From the selected district Sirsa, Mandi Dabwali regulated market was selected on the basis of maximum arrival of wheat in the *mandi's* yards (Haryana State Agricultural Marketing Board, 2007-08) in the second stage. In the third stage, two villages Dabwali (4 km) and Desujodha (10 km) were selected on the basis of distance from Mandi Dabwali Regulated Market. To collect the required information related to the marketing cost from farmers, one set of open-ended questionnaire schedule was structured and pre-tested before the final survey. For the purpose of collecting information from all categories of farmers, the farmers were divided into three categories on the basis of their land holding (i.e. small : 0-2 acre, medium : 2-5 acre, large : 5 – more acre) and 60 farmers (20 from each selected categories) were randomly selected from each selected village. A total sample of 120 farmers (40 from each size group) was interviewed. To analyze the data, statistical tools like Simple Average, Ratio and Percentage were used. The study was conducted during the year 2007-2009.

Before discussing the results, it is necessary to define the concept of marketing cost and its different components. Generally, marketing cost includes all those charges which are paid by sellers and purchasers in the functioning of food grain marketing. Keeping the research objectives in view, here, marketing cost deals with only those charges which are paid by the farmers to dispose their surplus from the farm to the purchaser. It was found at the time of the survey that there are generally six types of marketing cost components. These components are as following :–

(i) Transportation Cost : This cost include the charges, which are paid by the farmers for the means of transportation for moving their food grains from the farm to the purchasing agencies or *mandi* yard.

(ii) Agent Charges : It is difficult to define agent charges. These charges are related to middlemen/*arthis* in the regulated markets. After analyzing the reports of HSAMB and while visiting the market committee offices, the researchers noticed that HSAMB had fixed the marketing charges for both the seller and the purchaser. However, the seller (farmers) paid the charges for loading, cleaning and packing or packaging to *Arthis* (middlemen). Here, the *Arthis* play a role between the farmers and the labour (*Palledar*)[1]. It was found during the survey on the sample farmers that the maximum numbers of farmers could not even comprehend the meaning of these charges. They did not know how much they paid for cleaning, loading and packing of the food grains. They considered all these charges as agent charges. Moreover, it was also noticed that the *Arthis* took advantage of the farmers' illiteracy and ignorance and used to collect their commission along with the market charges. This makes the cost of marketing unusually high. Thus, due to illiteracy and ignorance, the farmers could not differentiate between agents' charges and the marketing cost.

(iii) Loading Cost : Those expenses which are paid for loading or unloading the food grain at the farm as well the *mandi* yard by farmers are termed as loading cost.

(iv) Packing Cost : Packing cost includes those charges, which are paid by the farmers for packing or packaging their food grains into bags or different items for moving the food grain from the farm to the purchasing agencies.

(v) Other Costs: Other costs includes those expenses which are paid by the farmers for refreshments, i.e. tea, smoking, meals etc. during the whole marketing process. The results are explained as average per quintal marketing cost (in ₹) and average share of different components of the marketing cost (in ₹) at different marketing places.

---

[1]*Palledar* is the local word which is used for the labourers who work under the *arthis* (middlemen) on a commission basis for cleaning, loading and packing of the foodgrains in the *Mandi's* yards.

MARKETING PLACES OF WHEAT

This section deals with different marketing places where farmers sold their surplus. It was found that generally, two alternative marketing places were available to farmers for selling their surplus. These were :

(a) Within the village ;

(b) Outside the village

The village basically includes two marketing channels i.e. farmers to direct consumers and farmers to village traders and outside the village, the available marketing channels are farmers to regulated markets (Appendix – 2) and farmers to other traders (Malik, Singh, Rai, 1992 ; Narang, 1972). The places for marketing of wheat are presented in the Table 1.

Table 1 : Marketing Places (2007-08)			(In quintals)
Farmers' categories	**Total marketed surplus**	**Inside the village**	**Outside the village**
Small	1066	275 (25.80)	791 (74.20)
Medium	1351	344 (25.46)	1007 (74.54)
Large	5368	703 (13.09)	4665 (86.91)
Grand total	**7785**	**1322 (16.98)**	**6463 (83.02)**
Source: Field Survey			
Figures given in the parenthesis indicate percentage			

The Table 1 indicates that the total marketed surplus of all farmers of different land-holding sizes were 7785 quintals, where out of this, 16.98 percent (1322 quintals) was sold inside the village, and the remaining 83.02 percent (6463 quintals) was sold outside the village by the respondent farmers. With regards to farmers with different size of land holdings, the Table 1 shows that small farmers sold 25.80 percent wheat inside the village and 74.20 percent wheat was sold outside the village from their total marketed surplus (1066 quintals) . Further, with regards to the medium size farmers, the Table 1 indicates that they sold 25.46 percent wheat inside the village and 74.54 percent wheat was sold outside the village out of their total marketed surplus (1351 quintals). The Table 1 also shows that large farmers sold 13.09 percent wheat inside the village and 86.91 percent wheat was sold outside the village out of their total marketed surplus (5368 quintals). Hence, it can be concluded from the analysis that a large portion of wheat was sold outside the village as compared to inside the village.

MARKETING COST OF WHEAT

This section deals with the marketing cost of wheat and its components.

❖ **Inside The Village :** The Table 2 shows the per quintal average marketing cost (in ₹) of wheat and its components

Table 2 : Average Per Quintal Marketing Cost And Its Components Inside The Village (2007-08)			(₹ per quintal)
Marketing cost	**Small Farmers' Average**	**Medium Farmers' Average**	**Large Farmers' Average**	**Average**
Transportation cost	6.93	6.87	7.71	7.17
Agent charge	-	-	-	-
Loading cost	3.99	2.41	4.07	3.49
Cleaning cost	2.20	1.91	1.96	2.02
Packing cost	3.23	2.73	3.50	3.15
Other cost	0.86	0.92	0.64	0.81
Total cost	**17.21**	**14.84**	**17.88**	**16.64**
Source: Field survey			
(-) Not Applicable			

inside the village. The results indicate that the average per quintal marketing cost was ₹ 16.64 for farmers of all sizes . It was ₹ 17.21, ₹ 14.84 and ₹ 17.88 per quintal for small, medium and large-size farmers respectively. The share of different cost components in the marketing cost is further expressed through the results. In relation to the average per quintal transportation cost, it is clear from the Table 2 that the transportation cost was ₹ 7.17 per quintal for farmers of all sizes. For the small farmers, it was ₹ 6.93 per quintal ; for medium-size farmers, it was ₹ 6.87 per quintal ; and for the large farmers, the per quintal transportation cost was ₹ 7.71. Further, it is evident from the Table 2 that the agent's charges were negligible at this marketing place and the reason for that was that there was no need of *arthis*/ middlemen as the farmers sold their surplus inside the village to direct consumers or to the village traders. With regards to the average per quintal loading cost, the results reveal that it was only ₹ 3.49 per quintal for all sizes of farmers. For the small farmers, it was ₹ 3.99 per quintal; for the medium-size farmers, it was ₹ 2.41 per quintal, which was less than what was charged from the small and large farmers ; and for the large-size farmers, it was ₹ 4.07, which was higher than what was charged from the small and medium farmers. Results on average per quintal cleaning cost reveal that it was ₹ 2.02 per quintal for farmers of different sizes. The cost was ₹ 2.20, ₹ 1.91 and ₹ 1.96 per quintal for small, medium and large farmers respectively. Further, the Table 2 indicates that the average per quintal packing cost was ₹ 3.15 per quintal for farmers of all sizes. For the small size farmers, it was ₹ 3.23 per quintal; for the medium-size farmers, it was ₹ 2.73 per quintal and for the large-size farmers, the average per quintal packing cost was ₹ 3.50 per quintal. Furthermore, the Table 2 also shows that the average per quintal other cost was only ₹ 0.81 per quintal for all farmers. It was ₹ 0.86, ₹ 0.92 and ₹ 0.64 per quintal for small, medium and large farmers respectively.

Table 3 : Average Per Quintal Marketing Cost And Its Components Outside The Village (2007-08) (₹ per quintal)			
Marketing cost	Small farmers' Average	Medium farmers' Average	Large farmers' Average	Average
Transportation cost	10.30	10.76	9.11	10.05
Agent charge	11.76	15.81	19.26	15.61
Loading cost	0.33	0.25	0.05	0.21
Cleaning cost	1.38	1.78	2.32	1.83
Packing cost	0.45	0.09	0.05	0.19
Other cost	1.10	1.60	2.08	1.60
Total cost	**25.33**	**30.29**	**32.87**	**29.49**
Source: Field survey			

❖ **Outside The Village** : The Table 3 shows the total marketing cost and its components with regards to outside the village sale. The Table 3 shows that outside the village, the total average per quintal marketing cost was ₹ 29.49 for farmers of all sizes. For small farmers, it was ₹ 25.33 per quintal. For medium size farmers, it was ₹ 30.29 per quintal, and for large size farmers, the average per quintal marketing cost was ₹ 32.87, which was higher than what was charged from small and medium size farmers. The Table 3 further shows that the average transportation cost was ₹ 10.05 per quintal for all farmers. For the small farmers, it was ₹ 10.30 per quintal, and for medium and large size farmers, it was ₹ 10.76 and ₹ 9.11 per quintal respectively.

Further, the Table 3 indicates that agent charges were ₹ 15.61 per quintal for farmers of different categories. For small farmers, the cost was ₹ 11.76 per quintal and for medium and large-size farmers, the per quintal agent charges were ₹ 15.81 and ₹ 19.26 respectively.

Furthermore, the Table 3 indicates that the average per quintal loading cost for all farmers was ₹ 0.21 for farmers of different sizes, it was ₹ 0.33, ₹ 0.25 and ₹ 0.05 per quintal respectively. With regard to the cleaning cost, the Table 3 shows that it was ₹ 1.83 per quintal for farmers of all sizes . For small, medium and large farmers, it was ₹ 1.38, ₹ 1.78 and ₹ 2.32 per quintal respectively. The Table 3 indicates that the average per quintal packing cost was ₹ 0.19 for all farmers of different categories. For small farmers, it was ₹ 0.45/ quintal, for medium farmers, it was ₹ 0.09 per quintal and for large-size farmers, it was ₹ 0.05 per quintal. Further, with regards to average per quintal other costs, it is clear from the Table 3 that this cost was ₹ 1.60 per quintal for farmers of all sizes. For small, medium and large farmers, this cost was ₹1.10, ₹1.60 and ₹ 2.08 per quintal respectively.

If the marketing cost for both the marketing places are compared, it is clear that the average per quintal marketing cost for outside the village was more than what it was for inside the village in total and for farmers of all sizes. With regards to the cost components, it was found that the loading cost and packing cost accounted for a larger share in the total marketing cost inside the village as compared to outside the village.

SHARE OF MARKETING COST IN TOTAL SALES

This section deals with the share of the total marketing cost in the total sale in different marketing places. The Tables 4 and 5 show the share of the total marketing cost in the total sale in the marketing place inside the village and outside the village respectively.

❖ **Inside The Village:** The Table 4 indicates that a total of 1332 quintals of wheat were sold inside the village by the respondent farmers of different sizes, where the total sale in rupees was of ₹1326530 and the total marketing cost was ₹22989, which was 1.73 percent of the total sale. Small farmers sold 275 quintals of wheat inside the village, and the total sale was of ₹275300. Out of this, the percentage of the marketing cost was 1.62 percent (₹4474). With regards to the medium size farmers, the Table 4 shows that medium farmers sold 344 quintals of wheat inside the village. The total marketing cost was 1.69 percent (₹5833) out of their total sale of ₹344330. For the large-size farmers, the Table 4 shows that the respondent farmers of large categories sold 703 quintals of wheat inside the village. The total marketing cost was 1.79 percent (₹12682) out of their total sale of ₹706900. Thus, it is clear from the above results that the percentage of marketing cost in the total sale increased with the increase in the size of the land holdings.

Table 4 : Share of Marketing Cost In Total Sales Inside the Village (2007-08)			
Farmers' categories	Total marketed surplus (In quintals)	Marketing cost (in ₹) Share in total sale (In percent)	Total sale (in ₹)
Small	275	4474 (1.62)	275300
Medium	344	5833 (1.69)	344330
Large	703	12682 (1.79)	706900
Grand Total	**1322**	**22989 (1.73)**	**1326530**
Source: Field Survey			
Figures given in the parenthesis indicate percentage			

❖ **Outside The Village :** The Table 5 shows the percentage of the total marketing costs in the total sales. It is apparent from the Table 5 that all respondent farmers sold 6463 quintals of wheat outside the village, and the total marketing cost was 2.56 percent (₹165820) of the total sale of ₹6463420. With regards to the small farmers, the Table 5 shows that small farmers sold 791 quintals of wheat outside the village. The marketing cost was 2.70 percent (₹21354) out of their total sale of ₹791420. On the other hand, the medium farmers sold 1007 quintals of wheat outside the village. Their total marketing cost was 2.85 percent (₹28699) out of their total sale of ₹1007000. The table further indicates

Table 5 : Share of Marketing Cost In Total Sales Outside the Village (2007-08)			
Farmers' categories	Total marketed surplus (in quintals)	Marketing cost (in ₹) share in total sale (in percent)	Total sale (in ₹)
Small	791	21354 (2.69)	791420
Medium	1007	28699 (2.85)	1007000
Large	4665	129732 (2.78)	4665000
Grand total	**6463**	**165820 (2.56)**	**6463420**
Source: Field survey			
Figures given in the parenthesis indicate percentage			

that large farmers of both villages sold 4665 quintals of wheat outside the village, where the total marketing cost was 2.78 percent (₹ 129732) out of their total sale of ₹ 4665000.

CONCLUSION AND POLICY IMPLICATIONS

It can be concluded from the above results that wheat was sold in a large amount outside the village as compared to wheat sold inside the village. Medium size farmers sold a larger percentage of wheat inside the village, rather than selling wheat outside the village as compared to small and large farmers. And the reason reported by the medium-size farmers for more sales inside the village was that it was easy to sell inside the village than to sell outside the village. They also opined that this kind of selling and purchasing also depended upon the availability of purchasers inside the village.

With regards to farmers of different sizes, it is clear from the above results that the marketing cost of wheat for large farmers was more than what it was for the small and medium farmers at both the marketing places (inside and outside the villages). Furthermore, in relation to different marketing cost components inside the village, the results show that the share of average per quintal transportation cost was more than the other marketing cost components, and the share of the 'other costs' component was less than the other marketing cost components.

In case of different cost components outside the village, it was found that the agents' charges garnered a larger share in the total average per quintal marketing cost as compared to the other components of the marketing cost. Moreover, the results also indicate that the agents' charges were not the same for farmers of different sizes. These charges were higher for medium size farmers followed by large and small farmers. The reasons which were reported by the farmers were that these charges depended upon the individual relationship of the farmers with the commission agents (*arthis*).

If the marketing costs for both the marketing places are compared (inside and outside the village), it is clear from the study that the average per quintal marketing cost for outside the village was more than what it was for inside the village in total and for farmers of all sizes. With regard to the cost components, it was found that the loading cost and packing cost accounted for a greater share in the total marketing cost inside the village as compared to outside the village. In case of the marketing cost share in the total sale, it is clear from the above results that the percentage of the total marketing cost in total sale was higher for medium size farmers. The results of the Tables 4 and 5 clearly show that the share of the total marketing cost in total sale was higher with regards to outside the village as compared to inside the village.

Besides this, it is also clear from the results that the percentage of marketing cost in the total sale decreased as the size of the farmers' land holdings increased.

Further, the results highlighted that agents' charges and transportation cost occupied a larger share in the marketing cost components. If the farmers communicate among themselves about the agents' charges, this may create an awareness of the amount charged by the agents and the farmers would also become aware of the fact that they have to only pay for the cleaning, packing and loading of the food grains and that the middlemen were duping them by charging their commission (agent charges). The Govt. officials may help the farmers in this regard by providing them necessary information about the functioning of the wheat market. The Market Committee should provide means of transportation to the farmers on its own behalf at reasonable charges; this may reduce the transportation and the marketing cost for the farmers .

REFERENCES

1) Aggrawal, N.L. (1998). "Marketing Costs: Margins and Price-spread For Major Agricultural Commodities of Rajasthan." *Indian Journal of Agricultural Marketing*, Vol.12, No. 13, pp. 61-65.

2) Beohar, B. B. (1998). "Economics And Marketing Of Milk Production In Central Part of M. P." *Indian Journal of Agriculture Economics*, Vol.53, No. 3, p. 401.

3) Chauhan R. S. and Singh J. N. (1998). "Vegetable Marketing Systems in Azamgarh District of U.P." *Indian Journal of Agricultural Economics,* Vol.53, No. 3, p. 413.

4) Gupta S. P. and Rathere N. S. (1998). "Marketing of Vegetables In Raipur District of Chhattisgarh State: An Economic Analysis." *Indian Journal of Agricultural Economics*, Vol.53, No. 3, p.393.

5) Kathirval, N. (2009). "A Study On Satisfaction Level of Farmers Towards Production and Marketing of Agricultural Products." *Indian Journal of Marketing*, Vol. XXXIX, No. 2, pp. 41-45, pp. 54-55.

6) Kumar Ashok Narange (1972). "Marketable and Market Surplus of Wheat and Paddy in Kurukshetra, Haryana." *Thesis (Ph.D.)*, Haryana Agricultural University, Hisar.

7) Malik D.P., Singh, S.N., and Rai, K.A., (1992). "Market and Market Surplus of Wheat and Paddy Crops in Kurukshetra District of Haryana." *Indian Journal of Agricultural Marketing*, Vol. XXXV, No. L, pp.59-65.

8) Naik, D. and Dalawai, A. (1998). "Production and Marketing of Milk in Orissa." *Indian Journal of Agriculture Economics*, Vol.53, No. 3, p. 379.

9) Parmod, Kumar (1999). "Marketed Surplus of Different Crops Across Farm Size-A Study of Haryana." *Indian Journal of Agricultural Economics*, Vol.55, No.4, pp. 500-521.

10) Rauf Abdul, Saraf Sajad, A. (2011). "Marketing Strategies in Apple Industry- An Empirical Study in Himachal Pradesh and Jammu and Kashmir." *Indian Journal of Marketing,* Vol. 41, No. 8, pp.78-84.

11) Tomar, B.S., Singh, V.K., and Singh Dalbir (1998). "Marketing of Wheat in Haryana." *Indian Journal of Agricultural Economics*, Vol.53, No. 3, pp. 418-419.

Appendix - 1 Minimum Support Price of Wheat In Haryana	
Year	Minimum Support Price (In ₹)
2000-01	580
2001-02	610
2002-03	620
2003-04	620+10 (Drought Relief)
2004-05	630
2005-06	640
2006-07	650+50 Bonus
2007-08	750+100 Bonus
2008-09	1000
2009-10	1080
2010-2011	1100
Source: Food and Supplies Department, Haryana	

S.No.	Name of the Grain Market	S.No.	Name of the Grain Market	S.No.	Name of the Grain Market
1	Ambala City	37	Sohna	73	Nissing
2	Ambala Cant.	38	Tauru	74	Taraori
3	Naneola	39	Hissar	75	Panipat
4	Mullana	40	Adampur	76	Israna
5	Barara	41	Barwala(H)	77	Madlauda
6	Naraingarh	42	Hansi	78	Samalkha
7	Barwala{P}	43	Uklana	79	Bapoli
8	Panchkula	44	Narnaund	80	Thanesar
9	Raipur Rani	45	Fatehabad	81	Ismailabad
10	Sahzadpur	46	Bhattu Kalan	82	Pehowa
11	Yamuna Nagar	47	Bhuna	83	Pipli
12	Chhachhrauli	48	Jakhal	84	Shahabad
13	Mustfabad	49	Ratia	85	Ladwa
14	Radaur	50	Tohana	86	Babain
15	Jagadhari	51	Dharsul	87	Mohindergarh
16	Sadhaura	52	Jind	88	Ateli
17	Bilaspur	53	Jullana	89	Kanina
18	Bhiwani	54	Pillukhera	90	Narnaul
19	Behal	55	Safidon	91	Rewari
20	Ch. Dadri	56	Narwana	92	Kosli
21	Jui	57	Uchana	93	Jhajjar
22	Loharu	58	Kaithal	94	Bahadurgarh
23	Tosham	59	Cheeka	95	Rohtak
24	Siwani	60	Dhand	96	Meham
25	Faridabad	61	Pundri	97	Sampla
26	Ballabgarh	62	Kalayat	98	Sirsa
27	Hodal	63	Siwan	99	Dabwali
28	Hassanpur	64	Pai	100	Ding
29	Palwal	65	Karnal	101	Ellenabad
30	Hathin	66	Assandh	102	Kalanwali
31	Gurgaon	67	Gharaunda	103	Rania
32	F. Zhirka	68	Indri	104	Sonepat
33	Farrukhnagar	69	Jundla	105	Ganaur
34	Nuh	70	Kunjpura	106	Gohana
35	Pataudi	71	Nighdu		
36	Punhana	72	Nilokheri		

Appendix 2 : List of Regulated Markets in Haryana

Source: Haryana State Agriculture Marketing Board