AgriCos e-Newsletter
ISSN: 2582-7049

AgriCos e-Newsletter

Open Access Multidisciplinary Monthly Online Magazine

Volume: 04 Issue: 08 August 2023 Article No: 34

Understanding the Farm Laws: Policy Framework, Implementation Challenges, and Agricultural Market Reforms in India

Pradipkumar Adhale[1] and Shekhar Khade[2]*

[1]Punjab Agricultural University, Ludhiana and [2]Birsa Agricultural Univesutry, Ranchi.

SUMMARY

India's three farm laws, enacted in 2020, fundamentally reshape agricultural market regulations and farmer-trader relationships. The Farmers' Produce Trade and Commerce Act removed restrictions on agricultural commodity trading outside regulated APMC markets, enabling direct farmer-buyer transactions. The Farmers (Empowerment and Protection) Agreement on Price Assurance and Farm Services Act legalized contract farming arrangements with defined protections for farmers against price volatility. The Essential Commodities (Amendment) Act deregulated agricultural commodities, removing stockholding limits and trade restrictions. These legislative reforms aimed to increase farmer incomes through expanded market access, reduced intermediation, and contractual arrangements with agribusiness. However, the laws sparked significant controversy among farming communities, particularly in Punjab and Haryana, over minimum support prices (MSP), market infrastructure adequacy, and farmer protection mechanisms. Farmer protests during 2020-2021 raised concerns regarding implementation without adequate safeguards and support systems.

INTRODUCTION

The three agricultural laws enacted by the Indian Parliament in September 2020 represent one of the most significant legislative interventions in post-independence agricultural policy. Introduced amid considerable economic and political circumstances, the laws aimed to modernize India's agricultural marketing system and enhance farmer income through market-driven mechanisms. The Farmers' Produce Trade and Commerce (Promotion and Facilitation) Act, 2020, sought to dismantle restrictive market regulations that confined agricultural trade within APMC markets. The Farmers (Empowerment and Protection) Agreement on Price Assurance and Farm Services Act, 2020, legalized contract farming while incorporating protective clauses for farmer interests. The Essential Commodities (Amendment) Act, 2020, removed agricultural commodities from essential commodities legislation, allowing unrestricted agricultural trade. The government positioned these laws as transformative reform addressing long-standing agricultural challenges including farmer debt, low incomes, post-harvest losses, and insufficient capital access. Policy rationale emphasized competitive market mechanisms, direct farmer-buyer engagement, and contractual arrangements as pathways toward agricultural modernization.

The Farmers' Produce Trade and Commerce Act, 2020

This legislation granted farmers the right to sell agricultural produce outside regulated APMC markets, enabling direct transactions with buyers, traders, exporters, and processors. The act abolished restrictions on agricultural commodity movement across state boundaries, facilitating inter-state trade without licensing requirements. Key provisions included exemption from APMC market fees for transactions outside markets, elimination of forward contracts restrictions, and removal of state-imposed quality standards that previously restricted market access. The law created "dedicated transaction terminals" where farmers could directly interact with bulk buyers without market intermediation. Online trading platforms received regulatory recognition, enabling digital agricultural commerce.

The Agreement on Price Assurance and Farm Services Act, 2020

This legislation legitimized contract farming relationships with specific protections for farmer interests. The act permitted agribusiness enterprises, exporters, and retailers to enter binding agreements with farmers specifying commodity type, quality standards, quantity, price/pricing mechanism, and supply timeline. Price assurance provisions allowed fixed-price contracts, minimum price guarantees, or cost-plus arrangements protecting farmers against market downturns. Dispute resolution mechanisms established at district and state levels provided accessible grievance redressal for contract disputes. The act restricted contract terms to not exceed five years, ensuring farmer flexibility and preventing long-term entrapment. Prohibited practices included forced cultivation of specific crops, mortgaging of farm land, and restricting farmer access to government schemes.

The Essential Commodities (Amendment) Act, 2020

This amendment removed agricultural commodities including cereals, pulses, oilseeds, edible oils, onions, and potatoes from the Essential Commodities Act, 1955. Deregulation eliminated government-imposed stockholding limits, allowing traders and businesses unlimited commodity accumulation. Removal of price control mechanisms and licensing requirements liberalized agricultural trade and distribution. The amendment preserved government authority to impose restrictions during war, famine, or severe price inflation, maintaining contingency provisions.

Farmer Concerns

Minimum Support Price Insecurity

Farmer protests emphasized absence of explicit legal guarantee for minimum support prices (MSP) across agricultural commodities. While government maintained that MSP regime would continue, the laws created perception that MSP protection would eventually erode through progressive market liberalization. Concerns specifically focused on the Farmers' Produce Trade and Commerce Act's provisions enabling direct farmer-buyer transactions outside regulated markets where MSP-based government procurement traditionally occurred. Farmers feared that without market infrastructure and government price support, commodity prices could collapse during surplus production periods. This anxiety reflected legitimate concerns regarding agricultural price volatility and farmer income stability in liberalized market conditions.

Inadequate Market Infrastructure

Effective functioning of the three laws required supporting infrastructure including transportation networks, warehousing facilities, quality testing mechanisms, and market information systems. Many agricultural regions lacked such infrastructure, particularly in central and eastern India. Farmers in Punjab and Haryana, despite superior infrastructure, worried that small and marginal farmers lacking capital, information, and market connections would face disadvantages in direct trading arrangements.

Power Imbalances in Contract Farming

Despite protective provisions, concerns persisted regarding information asymmetries and power imbalances in contract farming negotiations. Farmers, particularly those with limited education and market knowledge, might face disadvantageous contract terms from powerful agribusiness entities. Contract dispute resolution mechanisms, while nominally accessible, required legal awareness and resources that marginal farmers often lacked.

The Farmer Protests: Mobilization and Negotiation

Farmer organizations articulated four primary demands: legal guarantee of minimum support prices for all commodities, withdrawal of the three laws, compensation for farmers during transition period, and legal recognition of farmers' rights to regulated market participation. Negotiations between government and farmer representatives extended across multiple sessions, with partial concessions on implementation timelines and regulatory modifications failing to satisfy farmer demands.

Implementation Outcomes and Lessons

Market Response and Adoption

During the brief implementation period (September 2020 to November 2021), market response to the three laws remained limited. Farmer adoption of direct trading provisions under the Farmers' Produce Trade and Commerce Act showed only marginal growth in most regions. The absence of supporting infrastructure, limited buyer participation outside traditional markets, and farmer uncertainty regarding market viability constrained voluntary transitions toward deregulated trading. Some buyers and traders cautiously explored direct transaction possibilities, but large-scale structural shift did not materialize within the short implementation window.

Regional and Sectoral Variations

Implementation experiences varied significantly across regions. Agriculturally developed states like Punjab and Haryana, despite providing organized opposition, demonstrated greater infrastructure readiness for deregulated trading compared to less developed agricultural regions. Commodity-specific responses showed differentiation, with perishable commodities (fruits, vegetables) facing persistent marketing challenges even under deregulated conditions due to infrastructure constraints. Staple commodities continued gravitating toward traditional market channels where government procurement and price support mechanisms remained operational.

Stakeholder Position Evolution

Experiences with partial implementation and stakeholder consultations revealed nuanced positions among agricultural stakeholders beyond simplistic farmer opposition versus government support. Some progressive farmers recognized potential benefits in direct trading and contract farming arrangements. Agricultural exporters, processors, and modern retailers viewed the laws as facilitating supply chain modernization and organized procurement. Agricultural input dealers and small traders expressed concerns regarding demand reduction under liberalization scenarios. These diverse positions suggested that appropriately designed agricultural market reforms could potentially benefit multiple stakeholders if implemented with adequate transitional support and protective mechanisms.

CONCLUSIONS

India's three farm laws represented ambitious attempt at agricultural market liberalization and modernization addressing legitimate challenges in conventional marketing systems. The legislation sought to expand farmer market access, reduce intermediation, formalize contract farming, and remove commodity trade restrictions. However, the legislative process's lack of inclusivity, inadequate supporting infrastructure, and perceived threats to farmer income security generated sustained farmer mobilization and ultimately led to complete legislative withdrawal. The episode provides critical lessons for future agricultural policy reform emphasizing necessity of stakeholder consensus, institutional preparedness, and protective mechanisms accompanying market liberalization. While the specific legislative framework has been withdrawn, underlying policy questions regarding optimal agricultural market regulation, farmer income enhancement pathways, and appropriate modernization strategies remain unresolved. Potential agricultural reforms should incorporate inclusive deliberation, comprehensive infrastructure development, explicit farmer protections, and gradual transition mechanisms.

REFERENCES

Chatterjee, P. (2021). Agricultural reform in India: farmers versus the state. The Lancet Planetary Health, 5(4), e187-e189.

Dev, M. (2021). Agricultural reforms in India. Indian Public Policy Review, 2 (1 (Jan-Feb)), 16-28.

Krishnamurthy, M. (2021). Agricultural market law, regulation and resistance: A reflection on India’s new ‘farm laws’ and farmers’ protests. The Journal of Peasant Studies, 48(7), 1409-1418.