

Case study

Profitability of zero tillage wheat in rice fallows under NICRA project at Chhattisgarh Plaine zone Durg

Abstract

The research evaluated the economics of producing wheat in NICRA village karga using zero tillage and conventional method, and it evaluated how much technology and inputs contributed to the higher productivity brought over by zero tillage (ZT). ZT method's higher net income is mostly attributable to its reduced production costs when compared to conventional methods. The study found that ZT technology is able to increase farmers' profitability and aid in resource conservation. The difference in gross returns between ZT and CT approaches has been divided into 45% related to ZT and the remaining due to changes in input costs. The adoption of ZT technology has been slow despite various economic and environmental benefits, and one major obstacle that has been found is the challenge of getting availability to a zero-till seed drill machine during the sowing season. According to the report, ZT technology should be made more widely available, and zero-till seed drill accessibility should be guaranteed with this point of view in this NICRA village farmers have been provided zero till seed drill machine through custom hiring center under NICRA project.

Key Words – Zero tillage, Cost reduce, Nicra, Seed drill and Climate

Introduction –

India is the world's second-largest wheat producer (Anonymous, 2011a) With an average yearly production of 80 Mt (million tonnes), It produces about 11.79 percent of the wheat grown worldwide (FAO, 2011). In financial year 2021, over 248 thousand metric tons of wheat was produced in the northern state of Chhattisgarh in India. Increasing productivity and profitability of wheat production in the state is the main challenge. Many farmers raise late-maturing, fine-grained types of rice, which causes wheat to be sown later than usual. The grain production gradually decreases if planting is delayed by each additional day beyond the third week of November (Ali et al., 2010; Irfaq et al., 2005; Sharma, 1992). Hence, farmers have started

implementing resource-saving technologies like zero tillage and surface seeding in the production of wheat in order to avoid planting delays and reduce costs of production (Gupta and Seth, 2007). Due to the use of zero tillage in the cultivation of wheat, savings in input costs, fuel usage, and irrigation water use have been reported (Malik et al., 2003; Bhushan et al., 2007) Due of a lack of field labour and rising fuel expenses, farmers favour this technology. In order to compare the economics of producing wheat using zero tillage and traditional methods and to quantify the impact of technology and inputs to the predicted productivity differences due to zero tillage, the current study was done.

Material and Methods

A climatic intervention was laid out in village namely karga, Durg district of Chhattisgarh in 2022-2023 by KVK Pahanda, Durg under the NICRA project. These demonstrations were laid in irrigated silty loamy soils where farmers adopted normal wheat cultivation whereas zero tillage wheat is taken as improved technology. In this technology, after the harvest of kharif rice, one more crop could be taken up with no tillage for effective utilization of residual moisture by the second crop (wheat). Zero tillage wheat practice was demonstrated to minimize the cost of cultivation & for effective utilization of residual moisture, nutrients. The rice stubbles of 15-20 cm height were left in the field after the harvest. Sowings were started from November last week in order to capture the residual moisture from rice fields. CG 1029 Kanishka variety of wheat which is Late sown, heat tolerant and contain 12 % of protein. Seed (40kg/ac) are taken for zero tillage with 45 kg of DAP. Sowing was done with zero seed cum fertilizer drill provided by NICRA custom hiring center.

Table 1. Weekly data during crop season




Table 2. Comparison between demonstrated climatic intervention and traditional farmer’s practice of wheat cultivation

S. No.	Interventions	Zero tillage Wheat	Conventional wheat
1	Soil	Silty Loamy	Silty Loamy
2	Cropping System	Zero seed cum fertilizer drill	Farmer’s method
3	Time of sowing	15 Nov to 5 December	10 Dec to 25 December
4	Seed Rate	40 kg per acre	50- 60 Kg per acre
5	Method of Sowing	Line sowing	Broadcasting
6	Plant Protection	Not used	Used
7	Weed Management	Used (vesta)	Used (vesta)

Results and Discussion

The climatic intervention demonstrations were conducted in nicra villages karga of Durg district in Rabi 2022- 2023 seasons. The zero tillage practices resulted in giving better performance in average number of total number of tillers per plant average 7.5 when compared to farmers practice wheat which gave average 5.5 tillers per plant with numbers of irrigation required for zero tillage wheat was 4 whereas at farmers practice taken 6 numbers of irrigation. On an average the percent yield increase of demo plots over check was 7.7 % 2022-23. In these years if we observe the yield of demo practice was 1550kg/hac whereas farmers practice observed 1438.75 kg/ hac, thus enhancing the net income per ha was Rs 12475 with a reduced cost of cultivation of Rs.3250/ha. This reduction in the costs was due to reduced number of irrigations and lessened sowing operations cost. Thus, zero tillage wheat earned good net income with an impressive B:C ratio of 1.47 as compared to normal wheat cultivation in rabi seasons of year 2022. Higher yield in zero tillage wheat is a result of a greater number of productive tillers and filled grains which is due to timely sowing, healthy crop growth, good plant population and less effect of climatic hazard.

Table 3. Yield parameters of demonstrations on zero tillage wheat conducted in Rabi 2022-2023

2022-23	Number of tillers	Number of irrigations	Disease observed	Rainfall/ Temperature effect	Yield (kg/hac)	% Increase
Zero tillage wheat	7.5	4	No	No (Harvested before rainfall)	1550	7.7
Farmer's practice	5.5	6	Black rust	Yes (Affected by rain at maturity)	1438.75	

Table 4. Economic analysis of zero tillage wheat productivity vs Normal conventional wheat cultivation during 2022-2023

Treatments	Seed yield	Cost of cultivation	Gross return	Net Return	B:C ratio
Zero tillage	1550	26275	38750	12475	1.47
Farmer's practice	1438.7	29525	35950	6425	1.21

Table 5. Benefit particulars demonstrations on zero tillage wheat conducted in Rabi 2022-2023

Particulars	Rabi wheat 2022-23
% Increase in yield	7.7
Cost of cultivation reduced by	3250/-
Net return increased by	6050
No. irrigation reduced by	02

References-

- Kumar, D., Kumar, N. and Bisht, H., (2020), Costs and returns of wheat production of different categories of farmers in Udham Singh Nagar district of Uttarakhand, Journal of Pharmacognosy and Phytochemistry; Sp 9(5): 277-282.
- Amarajyoti, P., Mounika, B., Kumar, G., N., Naidu, D., C. and Babu, G., C., (2022), Profitability of zero tillage maize in rice fallows of north coastal Andhra Pradesh, The Pharma Innovation Journal; SP-11(7): 3615-3616.
- Iqbal, M., Khan, M., A. and Anwar, M., Z., (2002) Zero-tillage Technology and Farm Profits: A Case Study of Wheat Growers in the Rice Zone of Punjab, The Pakistan Development Review 41:4 Part II pp. 665–682.
- Tahir, M., A., Sardar, M., S., Quddus, M., A. and Ashfaq, M., (2008) economics of zero tillage technology of wheat in rice- wheat cropping system of Punjab- Pakistan, J. Anim. Pl. Sci. 18(1).
- Tripathi, R., S., Raju, R., and Thimmappa, K., (2013) Impact of Zero Tillage on Economics of Wheat Production in Haryana, Agricultural Economics Research Review Vol. 26(No.1) January-June pp 101-108.

- Erenstein, O., Farooq, U., Malik, R., K., Sharif., M., (2008) On-farm impacts of zero tillage wheat in South Asia's rice–wheat systems, *Field Crops Research* 105 240–252
- Chahal G., B., S., Sood, A., Jalota, S., K., Choudhury, B., U., Sharma, P., K., (2007) Yield, evapotranspiration and water productivity of rice (*Oryza sativa* L.)–wheat (*Triticum aestivum* L.) system in Punjab (India) as influenced by transplanting date of rice and weather parameters, *agricultural water management* 88 14–22

UNDER PEER REVIEW