

Strengthening Agribusiness Management Through Cooperative Institutions: The Strategic Role of India's Ministry of Cooperation in Production, Supply-Chain Integration and Marketing, with Special Reference to Bihar and South Asia

Vikas Kumar Giri

Graduate Scholar, Banaras Hindu University (BHU), Varanasi; Postgraduate Scholar, Jawaharlal Nehru University (JNU), New Delhi;
Agribusiness Management Scholar, DNSRICM, Patna.
Corresponding Author Email: [cfr.raw\[at\]gmail.com](mailto:cfr.raw[at]gmail.com)

Abstract: *Agricultural cooperatives can play a strategic role in transforming smallholder agriculture into commercially viable, inclusive and resilient agribusiness systems. In India, the Ministry of Cooperation provides an institutional platform for strengthening cooperative enterprises, improving governance and expanding the economic opportunities available to rural producers. However, the contribution of cooperatives to agricultural productivity and rural incomes depends not merely on their number or membership, but also on their ability to coordinate production, aggregate output, finance storage and processing, reduce transaction costs, and connect farmers with remunerative markets. This paper develops a conceptual and policy-oriented framework for examining how the Ministry of Cooperation can accelerate agribusiness development over the coming decades, drawing on the cooperative identity and principles of the International Cooperative Alliance (ICA). Particular attention is given to India, Bihar and the wider South Asian region. The study adopts a structured narrative review of relevant policy documents and institutional literature, supplemented by a proposed analytical framework for future empirical testing. It examines the potential contribution of Primary Agricultural Credit Societies (PACS), dairy and fisheries cooperatives, farmer-producer organizations, digital platforms, rural storage infrastructure, food processing and inter-cooperative partnerships. The paper proposes an integrated model that connects cooperative governance, production planning, post-harvest management, value addition, market access, and measurable livelihood outcomes. Bihar is considered a priority setting because of the importance of agriculture and allied activities to rural livelihoods, and the need to improve value addition, market connectivity, and resilience to floods, droughts, and price volatility. For South Asia, the framework identifies opportunities for regional learning in dairy development, fisheries, agricultural logistics, digital commerce and climate-resilient production, subject to national laws and cross-border trade arrangements. The paper recommends a phased implementation strategy, measurable performance indicators, and independent evaluation to determine whether cooperative-led interventions improve farmers' incomes, productivity, market access, and local economic development. It argues that the Ministry's long-term contribution should be assessed by demonstrable improvements in members' welfare, institutional accountability, and the distribution of value across agricultural supply chains.*

Keywords: Cooperative development; agribusiness; agricultural marketing; supply-chain management; rural institutions; Bihar; South Asia

1. Introduction

Agriculture is not simply a process of producing crops or livestock. It is an interconnected economic system involving access to inputs, finance, technology, labour, storage, transport, processing, market information and final consumers. The performance of this system depends on the ability of farmers and other value-chain participants to coordinate activities and negotiate commercial relationships. Smallholder producers frequently encounter disadvantages when purchasing inputs individually, accessing modern infrastructure, obtaining reliable price information or negotiating with large buyers.

Cooperative institutions offer one approach to addressing these disadvantages through collective ownership, member participation, shared services and coordinated commercial activity. When professionally managed, they can aggregate agricultural produce, improve bargaining power, facilitate access to credit and support investment in processing and storage. Their success, however, depends on transparent governance, sound financial management, capable leadership and effective market relationships.

The establishment of India's Ministry of Cooperation created a dedicated central institutional platform for the development of the cooperative sector. The National Cooperation Policy 2025 provides a significant policy reference for strengthening cooperative institutions, expanding their economic participation, improving governance and encouraging technological adoption. The policy identifies six strategic pillars, 16 objectives and 83 recommendations, with a ten-year implementation horizon. These policy ambitions establish an important context for evaluating the potential contribution of cooperative institutions to agribusiness management (Ministry of Cooperation, Government of India, 2025; Press Information Bureau, 2026). The International Cooperative Alliance provides an additional institutional reference. Its Statement on the Cooperative Identity defines a cooperative as an autonomous, voluntarily constituted association operating through joint ownership and democratic member control. Its principles include voluntary and open membership, democratic member control, member economic participation, autonomy, education and training, cooperation among cooperatives, and concern for community (ICA, n.d.). These principles are relevant to agricultural development because economic expansion must remain consistent with

member interests and institutional accountability. In Bihar, the agribusiness challenge includes converting agricultural production into higher and more stable rural incomes. Improvements in productivity alone may not deliver sustained economic gains if producers continue to face inadequate storage, fragmented marketing, limited processing capacity or weak access to institutional buyers. The cooperative sector could help address these constraints through locally adapted systems for crop aggregation, livestock services, dairy collection, fisheries, input distribution, processing and collective marketing.

The wider South Asian context presents related opportunities and constraints. India, Bangladesh, Nepal, Sri Lanka, Pakistan, Bhutan and other regional economies possess diverse agricultural systems and institutional arrangements. Their experiences can inform cooperative development, but regional replication must account for differences in landholding patterns, market infrastructure, cooperative legislation, public finance and cross-border trade conditions.

This paper therefore investigates how India's Ministry of Cooperation can support an integrated, cooperative-led agribusiness system over the coming decades, with particular reference to Bihar and opportunities for South Asian learning.

1.1 Research Objectives

The study has five objectives:

- 1) To examine the strategic role of the Ministry of Cooperation in strengthening agricultural cooperatives and agribusiness management.
- 2) To develop an integrated framework linking production, aggregation, storage, processing, supply chain coordination, and marketing.
- 3) To identify practical implementation priorities for Bihar and other developing agricultural regions.
- 4) To align cooperative development with ICA principles and inclusive, accountable business management.
- 5) To propose measurable indicators and a research design to evaluate economic, social, and environmental outcomes.

1.2 Research questions

The paper addresses four principal questions:

- How can the Ministry of Cooperation strengthen cooperative institutions as commercially viable agribusiness organisations?
- Which institutional and technological interventions are most relevant to improving agricultural supply chains and market access?
- How could a cooperative-led development framework be adapted to Bihar and other South Asian settings?
- Which indicators and evaluation methods should be used to establish whether cooperative interventions improve farmer welfare and local economic development?

2. Institutional and Policy Context

2.1 India's Ministry of Cooperation

The Ministry of Cooperation is responsible for developing the cooperative sector within the applicable constitutional and

legal framework. Its policy significance extends beyond the registration or administrative supervision of cooperative societies. Cooperative institutions can serve as economic intermediaries that connect rural producers with finance, agricultural inputs, infrastructure, processing facilities, and markets.

The National Cooperation Policy 2025 provides a framework for cooperative-sector development, including professional management, transparency, technology adoption, improved access to finance, institutional strengthening and expansion into emerging economic activities (Ministry of Cooperation, Government of India, 2025).

For agribusiness management, the policy agenda can be translated into six practical functions:

- 1) **Institutional development:** Strengthen cooperative governance, professional staffing, auditing and member accountability.
- 2) **Business development:** Support viable cooperative enterprises in agricultural inputs, storage, processing, dairy, fisheries and marketing.
- 3) **Infrastructure coordination:** Improve access to warehouses, cold chains, collection centres, testing facilities and logistics.
- 4) **Digital integration:** Encourage interoperable systems for accounting, inventory, procurement, traceability and market information.
- 5) **Market development:** Enable cooperatives to negotiate contracts, establish commercial partnerships and reach appropriate domestic and international markets.
- 6) **Performance measurement:** Assess member income, service quality, financial sustainability, inclusion and environmental performance.

These functions should be pursued in partnership with state governments, agricultural departments, financial institutions, research organisations, market regulators and private-sector participants. The Ministry's role is not to replace these institutions, but to improve coordination and the enabling environment for cooperative enterprises.

2.2 Primary Agricultural Credit Societies and multipurpose cooperatives

Primary Agricultural Credit Societies occupy an important position in India's rural institutional landscape. Their established local presence may provide a foundation for extending services beyond short-term agricultural credit, where legal authority, business viability and institutional capacity permit.

Potential services include the distribution of seeds and fertilisers, access to farm machinery, storage, procurement support, digital financial services and market linkages. Multipurpose activities should not be introduced indiscriminately: each society requires a feasibility assessment, adequate working capital, trained personnel, risk controls and a clear separation of member services from commercial obligations. The strategic objective should be to develop viable local agribusiness service centers rather than simply expanding the formal list of cooperative activities.

2.3 The International Cooperative Alliance

The ICA is a global representative organisation for cooperatives and a custodian of the international cooperative identity. Its principles provide a governance framework to ensure that cooperatives remain member-oriented even as they expand commercially.

The seventh principle, concern for community, is particularly relevant to rural development. It encourages cooperatives to consider the long-term sustainability of their communities, while democratic control and member economic participation provide safeguards against the concentration of benefits among a small group of officeholders or commercial intermediaries.

For India and South Asia, ICA principles can inform training, cooperative audits, leadership development and the design of performance indicators. The ICA should be treated as a source of cooperative standards and international learning, not as a substitute for domestic legal requirements or evidence of endorsement of any specific national program.

2.4 Why agribusiness management requires an integrated approach

Agribusiness management involves more than increasing agricultural output. It requires coordinated decisions across the value chain, from input procurement and production planning to processing, distribution and final sale.

A production-centred approach can generate surpluses without ensuring that farmers receive an adequate return. Conversely, a market-oriented approach without reliable production, quality assurance and aggregation may fail to satisfy buyers.

An integrated cooperative model must therefore connect production decisions to demand, quality standards, logistics, finance and risk management. This principle is central to the framework proposed in this paper.

3. Review of literature and conceptual foundations

3.1 Collective action and smallholder market participation

Collective action can reduce some of the disadvantages associated with fragmented agricultural production. Producers who aggregate their output may achieve economies of scale in transport, storage, processing and procurement. They may also become more attractive counterparties for processors, retailers and institutional buyers.

However, aggregation does not automatically produce higher incomes. Benefits depend on the costs of collective organisation, the quality of management, the availability of buyers and the distribution of commercial gains. Cooperatives require credible accounting systems and transparent rules for pricing, patronage benefits and payment to members.

3.2 Cooperative governance and member welfare

The ICA framework establishes that cooperative enterprises combine economic activity with democratic ownership and member participation. This distinguishes them conceptually from enterprises whose primary governance objective is to maximise returns for external shareholders.

In agricultural practice, the distinction matters when decisions must be made about procurement prices, retained earnings, investment in infrastructure and distribution of surplus. A commercially successful cooperative should therefore be evaluated through both business performance and member outcomes.

3.3 Agricultural value chains and post-harvest management

Agricultural value chains link input suppliers, producers, aggregators, processors, distributors, retailers and consumers. Weak coordination between these stages can increase transaction costs, reduce product quality and cause avoidable post-harvest losses.

Cooperatives may help coordinate these activities by pooling demand for inputs, organizing collection schedules, establishing quality standards, sharing storage facilities and negotiating supply agreements. Cold-chain investments are particularly relevant for milk, fish, fruits, vegetables and other perishable products.

Such investments should be supported by realistic throughput estimates, maintenance plans, energy cost assessments, and buyer commitments. Infrastructure without sufficient utilization can create financial liabilities rather than sustainable rural enterprises.

3.4 Digitalization and market information

Digital technologies can improve the availability and timeliness of information concerning procurement, inventory, transport, payments and market prices. Digital records can also strengthen internal auditing and enable managers to identify operational inefficiencies.

Nevertheless, digitalization is not a substitute for sound governance. Systems must be accessible to members with different literacy levels, available in relevant local languages, secure against unauthorized access and supported by reliable grievance mechanisms.

The proposed framework consequently treats digital tools as enabling infrastructure rather than as an independent solution to agribusiness challenges.

3.5 Research gap

The principal analytical gap addressed here is the need to connect national cooperative policy, international cooperative principles, and practical agribusiness performance within a single implementation framework applicable to local institutions.

The paper does not claim that the proposed model has already demonstrated causal effects. Instead, it develops a set of propositions and indicators that can be examined through field research, administrative records and independent evaluation.

4. Research Methodology

4.1 Research design

This paper employs a conceptual, policy-oriented research design grounded in a structured narrative review. It draws on official cooperative policy material, ICA guidance, and relevant institutional literature concerning agricultural development, value chain coordination, and rural enterprise management.

The analysis synthesises these sources to develop an implementation framework for India, with particular attention to Bihar and potential lessons for South Asia.

This approach is appropriate for developing a policy model and identifying hypotheses for subsequent empirical testing. It does not establish the measured impact of the Ministry's programmes or demonstrate that a particular intervention has caused a change in farmers' incomes, productivity, or the state's gross domestic product.

4.2 Sources and selection criteria

The initial evidence base comprises:

- Official publications and policy documents of India's Ministry of Cooperation.
- The National Cooperation Policy 2025.
- ICA statements and guidance on cooperative identity and principles.
- Government economic and agricultural policy publications.
- Institutional research on agricultural value chains, rural infrastructure and inclusive development.

Priority is given to official or primary sources for descriptions of government policy and cooperative principles. Research publications should be added to the final evidence base through a reproducible literature search prior to journal submission.

4.3 Analytical Framework

The conceptual model consists of six connected stages:

Stage 1: Institutional readiness. Assess governance, membership, financial records, staff capacity, regulatory compliance and member participation.

Stage 2: Production coordination. Estimate production potential, input requirements, crop suitability, local demand and climatic risks.

Stage 3: Aggregation and infrastructure. Identify viable collection centres, storage, transport, processing and quality-testing facilities.

Stage 4: Market integration. Establish buyer relationships, pricing mechanisms, market intelligence, procurement agreements and appropriate digital sales channels.

Stage 5: Member value and inclusion. Measure net income, payment timeliness, participation by women and marginalised producers, and the distribution of benefits.

Stage 6: Evaluation and adaptation. Compare outcomes with baseline measurements and suitable comparison groups, revise operational plans and scale only those interventions supported by evidence.

The stages are mutually reinforcing. For example, market information can improve production planning, while reliable production volumes can increase the commercial viability of storage and processing investments.

4.4 Proposed hypotheses for empirical testing

The following hypotheses are proposed for future field research:

- **H1:** Cooperatives with stronger governance and professional management will demonstrate better financial and operational performance than otherwise comparable institutions with weaker management.
- **H2:** Participation in collective storage, processing and marketing arrangements will be associated with lower marketing costs and higher net producer returns, after accounting for product type and market conditions.
- **H3:** Digital recordkeeping and market information services will improve payment transparency and operational efficiency when members can access and use them effectively.
- **H4:** Cooperatives that combine production planning with confirmed market demand will experience lower unsold-surplus risk than comparable cooperatives that operate without formal demand planning.
- **H5:** Inclusive membership, transparent benefit-sharing and meaningful participation in governance will be associated with stronger member trust and sustained cooperative participation.

These hypotheses are testable propositions, not reported findings.

5. Proposed cooperative-led agribusiness management framework

5.1 Institutional architecture

The proposed framework assigns complementary roles to different institutions.

The Ministry of Cooperation would support the enabling policy environment, coordination and institutional capacity-building within its mandate. State governments would adapt implementation to regional needs, agricultural conditions and cooperative legislation. Cooperatives would organise member services and commercial operations. Agricultural universities and research institutions would contribute technical advice, training and independent evaluation. Financial institutions would assess viable credit and investment proposals. Buyers, processors and logistics providers would participate through commercially sustainable agreements.

The ICA would provide an international reference for cooperative principles and opportunities for mutual learning. Cross-border cooperation in South Asia would require separate consideration of national laws, trade rules, sanitary and phytosanitary requirements, customs procedures and data governance.

5.2 Production planning and input management

Cooperatives can improve production coordination by collecting information on members' intended crops, livestock activities, input requirements and expected harvest periods.

The resulting information can support bulk procurement, better input distribution and more realistic estimates of marketable output. Where appropriate, local agricultural universities and extension services can assist with soil testing, crop suitability, water management, seed selection and integrated pest management.

Production decisions should reflect market demand, local agroecological conditions and household risk tolerance. Cooperatives should avoid encouraging uniform crop choices solely to simplify procurement, particularly in regions where diversification is important for food security or resilience to floods and droughts.

5.3 Storage, processing and logistics

The Ministry and state-level partners can encourage cooperatives to assess infrastructure needs across the entire value chain rather than pursuing isolated construction projects.

Priority investments may include:

- Scientific grain storage and warehouse management.
- Milk chilling and testing facilities.
- Fisheries collection, ice and cold-storage systems.
- Sorting, grading, packaging and processing units.
- Shared transport and route planning.
- Digital stock management and traceability.

Investment decisions should be based on expected throughput, seasonal utilisation, access to electricity, water availability, maintenance capacity and confirmed or realistically forecast market demand.

Where individual cooperatives cannot support the full cost of an asset, shared facilities or partnerships with established operators may offer a more viable alternative.

5.4 Marketing and commercial integration

Collective marketing can strengthen producers' ability to negotiate with wholesalers, processors, retailers and institutional buyers. However, the value of collective selling depends on transparent procurement rules, timely payment, quality assurance and fair allocation of costs and benefits.

The proposed framework encourages cooperatives to develop annual marketing plans that identify target products, quality grades, potential buyers, delivery schedules, price risks and contingency arrangements.

Digital commerce should complement rather than replace established channels. Cooperatives should evaluate platform fees, logistics costs, product returns, consumer demand and the practical ability to meet delivery commitments before committing resources to online sales.

International market participation should follow product-specific standards and applicable regulations. Export access is an opportunity for evaluation, not a guaranteed outcome of cooperative aggregation.

5.5 Finance and risk management

Cooperative enterprises require suitable working capital to purchase members' produce, maintain inventories and meet operating expenses before buyers make payment.

Financial planning should distinguish short-term working-capital requirements from long-term investment in warehouses, processing plants and transport infrastructure. Each business unit should maintain realistic cash-flow projections and assess its exposure to interest rates, commodity price movements, energy costs, spoilage, and delayed payments.

Public support, where available and legally permissible, should be designed to strengthen viable services rather than conceal persistent operational losses. An independent financial review can help identify problems before they threaten members' savings or institutional solvency.

5.6 Inclusion and member accountability

Cooperative development should preserve democratic member control and provide meaningful participation to smallholders, women, young people, tenant cultivators and other groups whose access to markets and decision-making may be limited. Relevant measures include transparent membership rules, accessible meetings, clear pricing schedules, timely financial disclosure, grievance procedures and representation in governance.

Member welfare should be evaluated by the distribution of benefits rather than by aggregate turnover alone. A cooperative may increase sales while delivering limited gains to small producers if costs rise or commercial benefits accrue disproportionately to intermediaries.

6. Special Focus: Bihar

6.1 Agribusiness development priorities

Bihar offers a relevant setting for studying cooperative-led agribusiness because agricultural livelihoods are closely connected to rural employment, local commerce and household income. The state's varied production systems and exposure to climatic risks make differentiated, district-level planning essential.

The proposed priorities are not a claim that all districts share the same constraints. Baseline assessments should determine the appropriate interventions for each district and product.

Priority areas include:

- 1) **Crop aggregation and storage:** Develop commercially justified arrangements for grain collection, grading, warehouse access and transparent procurement.
- 2) **Dairy and livestock:** Strengthen milk collection, quality testing, chilling, veterinary services, feed supply and reliable payment systems.
- 3) **Fisheries:** Assess the need for ice, cold storage, transport, processing, market information and improved access to buyers.
- 4) **Fruits and vegetables:** Support grading, packaging, short-duration storage, cold-chain logistics and coordinated deliveries.
- 5) **Rural input services:** Improve access to quality seeds, fertilisers, machinery rental and extension support where demand and institutional capacity justify expansion.
- 6) **Climate resilience:** Integrate flood-risk information, drought preparedness, water management, crop diversification and contingency marketing into cooperative planning.

6.2 A district-level implementation model

A practical Bihar programme could begin with a small number of pilot clusters selected through transparent criteria. Candidate districts should be chosen after assessing agricultural production, cooperative readiness, climate exposure, market access, infrastructure gaps and the willingness of local institutions to participate.

Each pilot cluster would include the following activities:

First, establish a baseline. Record participating farmers, crop and livestock activities, production volumes, current marketing costs, storage availability, average payment delays, household income indicators and existing market channels.

Second, assess cooperative readiness. Review governance, financial health, membership participation, management skills, existing assets and legal compliance.

Third, prepare a product-specific business plan. Select one or more products based on local suitability, buyer demand, logistics costs and potential member benefits.

Fourth, introduce targeted services. Depending on the assessment, these could include bulk input procurement, collection centres, storage, quality testing, cold-chain access, market information or buyer agreements.

Fifth, measure outcomes independently. Compare participating producers with suitable non-participating producers, or use a phased rollout to enable credible comparisons over time.

Sixth, expand conditionally. Replicate interventions only where operational performance, member benefits and financial sustainability meet pre-established criteria.

6.3 Potential contribution to state gross domestic product

Cooperative-led agribusiness may contribute to Bihar's state gross domestic product (SGDP) through improved agricultural productivity, reduced avoidable losses, expanded

processing, higher-quality products, employment in logistics and services, and greater local retention of value added.

These outcomes are possibilities to be tested, not guaranteed effects. A rise in cooperative turnover does not necessarily imply an equivalent increase in SGDP because turnover may include intermediate transactions, purchased inputs and activities that would otherwise have occurred through different channels.

Evaluation should therefore distinguish gross sales from net value added, producer income, employment effects and changes in productivity. State-level economic contributions should be estimated using appropriate accounting methods and credible counterfactual assumptions.

6.4 Proposed Bihar pilot timeline

A staged implementation schedule is recommended:

- **Months 1–6:** Baseline research, stakeholder consultation, cooperative readiness assessments and market feasibility studies.
- **Months 7–18:** Initial service delivery, staff training, infrastructure optimisation and the establishment of commercial partnerships.
- **Months 19–30:** Monitoring of operating performance, member outcomes, payment transparency and financial sustainability.
- **Months 31–36:** Independent evaluation, publication of results and a decision on whether to expand, redesign or discontinue individual interventions.

The timeline is a proposed planning framework. Actual implementation would depend on funding, procurement, state-level approvals, seasonal production cycles and institutional readiness.

7. South Asian opportunities and regional adaptation

7.1 Shared challenges and differentiated solutions

Agricultural producers across South Asia face varying combinations of fragmented holdings, climate risks, post-harvest losses, rural infrastructure constraints and uneven market access. Cooperative institutions may help address some of these challenges, but regional solutions must be adapted to local conditions.

India's experience in dairy collection and cooperative marketing may offer lessons for other countries. Experience with community-based fisheries, producer aggregation, rural finance and local processing may also support regional knowledge exchange.

Such learning should focus on transferable operational principles rather than assuming that one country's legal or institutional structure can be reproduced elsewhere without modification.

7.2 Cooperation across national boundaries

The ICA's international network provides a potential channel for exchanging knowledge on cooperative governance,

management training, sectoral development and cooperative enterprise models.

Potential regional activities include:

- Cooperative leadership and agribusiness management training.
- Exchange of methods for dairy, fisheries and horticultural supply chains.
- Research collaboration on digital procurement and traceability.
- Knowledge sharing on climate-resilient agricultural practices.
- Comparative studies of cooperative finance, auditing and member participation.

Cross-border trade or shared commercial infrastructure would require additional feasibility assessments and compliance with the laws of participating countries. Institutional dialogue should not be confused with an existing trade agreement or a confirmed financing commitment.

7.3 A South Asian cooperative learning network

A regional learning network could bring together cooperative federations, universities, agricultural research organisations and relevant public agencies. Its initial activities could include case studies, technical workshops, comparable performance indicators, and exchanges of practical training materials.

Over time, participating institutions could develop comparative evidence on which cooperative services improve market access, reduce operating costs and increase producer returns under different agricultural and regulatory conditions.

The network should remain member-oriented, transparent and open to independent evaluation. Its value would lie in the quality of evidence and practical learning generated rather than in the number of participating institutions alone.

8. Implementation Strategy for the Coming Decades

8.1 Short-term priorities: 2026–2030

The initial period should focus on institutional foundations and targeted demonstrations. Key actions include strengthening governance, improving accounting and auditing, identifying viable product clusters, training cooperative managers, mapping storage and logistics gaps, and establishing baseline performance indicators.

Digitalisation should begin with practical functions such as accounting, stock records, procurement information and member payments. Investments should be prioritised according to demonstrated needs and institutions' ability to maintain the systems.

8.2 Medium-term priorities: 2031–2040

Where pilot results justify expansion, cooperatives could develop stronger links with processors, retailers, institutional buyers and logistics providers.

The medium-term agenda could include shared processing infrastructure, quality certification, more sophisticated inventory management, diversified financial products and improved market intelligence.

Professional management should be combined with continued member control. Commercial expansion should not weaken the accountability mechanisms that distinguish cooperatives from other business structures.

8.3 Long-term priorities: 2041 and beyond

Long-term development should focus on resilient and adaptable cooperative enterprises capable of responding to technological change, climate pressures, consumer preferences and shifts in domestic and international markets.

Potential priorities include climate-informed production planning, resource-efficient processing, improved traceability, circular-economy practices, stronger cooperative research partnerships and broader participation by younger members.

The long-term objective should be a cooperative ecosystem that improves the economic position of its members while contributing to sustainable rural development.

These periods are proposed planning horizons, not official government deadlines.

9. Monitoring, evaluation and performance indicators

A cooperative programme requires a balanced scorecard that measures financial performance, member welfare, operational efficiency, inclusion and environmental sustainability.

Performance dimension	Suggested indicator	Measurement approach
Production	Yield per hectare or output per livestock unit	Baseline and follow-up farm records
Marketing	Net price received by producers	Compare realised prices after marketing costs
Supply chain	Post-harvest loss rate	Measure losses by product and season
Payments	Average time between delivery and payment	Procurement and bank records
Finance	Operating surplus and liquidity	Audited financial statements
Value addition	Local processing and net value added	Business accounts and economic analysis
Inclusion	Participation and benefit distribution	Disaggregated membership and payment records
Governance	Audit completion and member meeting participation	Independent governance review
Employment	Full-time-equivalent jobs supported	Payroll and enterprise records
Resilience	Variability in net producer income	Repeated seasonal or annual observations

Indicators should be defined consistently before the programme begins. For example, the net price received by a producer should account for relevant transport, handling, quality deductions and marketing expenses.

Where possible, the evaluation should use a comparison group, phased implementation or another credible quasi-experimental design. Difference-in-differences analysis may be appropriate when suitable pre-intervention and post-intervention data are available, and its assumptions can be assessed.

Results should report uncertainty, missing data, implementation costs and differences across farmer groups. Positive outcomes should not be attributed to cooperative interventions without considering rainfall, commodity prices, government support, input costs and other plausible explanations.

10. Discussion

The proposed framework highlights the distinction between expanding cooperative activity and improving cooperative performance. A rise in the number of registered societies or their recorded turnover may indicate institutional expansion, but neither measure alone establishes that farmers are better off.

The Ministry of Cooperation's potential contribution to agribusiness is strongest when policy support enables local institutions to provide services that are both economically viable and responsive to member needs. These services may include shared procurement, storage, processing, market access and access to reliable business information.

Three implications follow.

First, **institutional quality matters as much as institutional coverage**. Cooperatives require competent management, clear financial responsibilities, independent audits and meaningful participation by members. Multipurpose expansion should follow business feasibility rather than administrative targets alone.

Second, **market integration must be designed around member returns**. Collective sales, digital platforms and processing facilities are useful only when their benefits exceed their costs and the gains are distributed fairly. Reliable buyers, transparent pricing and timely payment are central to sustainable performance.

Third, **regional development requires local adaptation**. Bihar's agricultural and climatic conditions differ across districts, while South Asian countries operate under different legal and economic arrangements. A common framework can support comparison and learning, but specific interventions must be selected through local evidence.

The ICA principles provide an important safeguard in this process. Commercial expansion should strengthen, not dilute, democratic member control, autonomy, cooperation among cooperatives and concern for communities. Professional management and member democracy should be treated as complementary rather than competing objectives.

11. Limitations and Future Research

This paper is conceptual and policy-oriented. It does not present primary survey data, audited cooperative-level performance records or a causal evaluation of Ministry programmes. Consequently, it cannot establish the magnitude of any effect on farm income, agricultural productivity, employment or SGDP.

The literature review is a structured narrative synthesis rather than a fully systematic review. Before journal submission, the search strategy, screening process and inclusion criteria should be documented in greater detail, and the reference list should be expanded through a reproducible search of academic databases and official publications.

Future research should examine cooperative performance across different commodities and institutional settings. A study in Bihar could compare cooperatives with varying levels of professional management, access to infrastructure, and market integration. It could also assess whether benefits differ by farm size, gender, social group, land tenure and distance from major markets.

Longitudinal studies would be especially valuable for determining whether initial improvements persist after external support is reduced. Research should also investigate institutional failures, member dissatisfaction, elite capture, financial distress and the circumstances in which individual marketing arrangements may outperform collective ones.

12. Policy Recommendations

Based on the conceptual analysis, the following recommendations are proposed.

- 1) **Link cooperative support to demonstrated business needs.** Require a feasibility assessment before substantial investment in storage, processing or other fixed assets.
- 2) **Strengthen professional management.** Provide practical training in accounting, inventory, procurement, marketing, logistics, financial risk and member communication.
- 3) **Prioritise viable local value chains.** Select products based on production potential, market demand, logistics, climate risks, and expected benefits to members.
- 4) **Improve access to shared infrastructure.** Assess whether cooperatives can jointly use warehouses, cold chains, testing facilities, processing units and transport services.
- 5) **Build transparent digital systems.** Encourage accessible digital accounting, procurement records, inventory management and timely member payments, with suitable safeguards for data privacy and cybersecurity.
- 6) **Support accountable market partnerships.** Develop clear buyer agreements, quality standards, payment terms, pricing arrangements and dispute-resolution mechanisms.
- 7) **Protect member participation.** Strengthen democratic governance, independent auditing, accessible meetings and the participation of women, young people and smallholder producers.

- 8) **Develop Bihar pilot clusters.** Start with a limited number of districts and product chains, establish baselines and scale only after independent evaluation.
- 9) **Encourage South Asian research collaboration.** Facilitate knowledge exchange through universities, cooperative federations and relevant regional institutions, while respecting national laws and market regulations.
- 10) **Measure economic additionality.** Distinguish increased turnover from genuine gains in net producer income, employment and value added.
- 11) **Align funding with measurable results.** Where public or development financing is available, establish transparent eligibility criteria, cost estimates, reporting obligations and evaluation procedures.
- 12) **Publish implementation evidence.** Make programme results accessible to cooperative members, policymakers, researchers and the public, including negative findings and lessons from unsuccessful interventions.

13. Conclusion

The Ministry of Cooperation has significant potential to strengthen the institutional foundations of cooperative-led agribusiness in India. By supporting professional management, transparent governance, suitable infrastructure, digital capabilities and effective market relationships, it can help cooperatives become more capable participants in agricultural production and value chains.

The contribution of cooperative institutions should be assessed by improvements in members' welfare and economic performance rather than by organisational expansion alone. Higher net producer returns, lower avoidable losses, more reliable payments, improved financial sustainability and inclusive participation provide more meaningful measures of progress than turnover or membership counts in isolation.

Bihar offers a practical setting for testing this approach through carefully selected district-level pilots involving crop aggregation, dairy, fisheries, horticulture and other locally appropriate activities. Such pilots should be grounded in baseline evidence, commercially realistic business plans and independent evaluation. Their results could inform wider implementation across India and provide useful lessons for South Asian agricultural development.

The International Cooperative Alliance's principles offer an essential reference for ensuring that market expansion remains consistent with democratic control, member economic participation and concern for communities. Regional cooperation can support learning and adaptation, although national institutions, legal frameworks and market conditions must guide implementation.

Ultimately, cooperative-led agribusiness should be understood as a means of improving the economic position of producers, strengthening rural enterprises and retaining more value within agricultural communities. Its long-term contribution to India's development will depend on the ability to combine institutional accountability, commercial viability, evidence-based policy and inclusive rural growth.

References

- [1] Government of India, Ministry of Cooperation. (2025). *National Cooperation Policy 2025*. Government of India. [https://www.cooperation.gov.in/sites/default/files/2025-07/NCP\(Eng\)_23Jul2025_v6_Final.pdf](https://www.cooperation.gov.in/sites/default/files/2025-07/NCP(Eng)_23Jul2025_v6_Final.pdf)
- [2] Government of India, Ministry of Cooperation. (n.d.). *Initiatives of the Ministry of Cooperation*. <https://www.cooperation.gov.in/initiatives-ministry-cooperation-1>
- [3] International Cooperative Alliance. (n.d.). *Cooperative identity, values and principles*. <https://www.ica.coop/en/cooperatives/cooperative-identity/>
- [4] International Cooperative Alliance. (2017). *The guidance notes to the cooperative principles*. <https://www.ica.coop/en/media/library/research-and-reviews/guidance-notes-cooperative-principles>
- [5] International Cooperative Alliance. (n.d.). *About the International Cooperative Alliance*. <https://ica.coop/en/about-us/international-cooperative-alliance>
- [6] Press Information Bureau, Government of India. (2026, February 10). *National Cooperation Policy, 2025*. <https://www.pib.gov.in/PressReleasePage.aspx?PRID=2225901>
- [7] Press Information Bureau, Government of India. (2026, July 21). *Implementation of National Cooperation Policy, 2025*. <https://www.pib.gov.in/PressReleasePage.aspx?PRID=2287166>
- [8] United Nations. (2012). *About cooperatives: International Year of Cooperatives*. <https://www.un.org/en/events/coopsyear/about.shtml>
- [9] Government of India. (2025). *Economic Survey 2024–25*. Ministry of Finance. <https://indiabudget.gov.in/budget2025-26/economicsurvey/>