**4.1 Field survey findings (Ann 4.1)**

Final status of the field coverage:

* **Enumerators Schedules**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Questionnaires** | **RAQ-1** | **RAQ-2** | **FCSQ-4** | **MLRQ-13** | **CONRQ-15** | **GPPQ-18** | **RSP -26** |
| * Kamareddy | 1 | 79 | 9 | 50 | 49 | 29 | 45 |
| * Karimnagar | 1 | 77 | 9 | 60 | 61 | 27 | 46 |
| * Mancherial | 3 | 73 | 9 | 33 | 45 | 26 | 43 |
| * Medak | 2 | 90 | 5 | 97 | 98 | 28 | 91 |
| * Rangareddy | 1 | 79 | 0 | 86 | 90 | 24 | 31 |
| * Wanaparthy | 3 | 80 | 8 | 95 | 96 | 30 | 45 |
| * Bhadradri | 4 | 72 | 8 | 70 | 91 | 33 | 36 |
| * Mahabubabad | 0 | 83 | 10 | 83 | 87 | 29 | 83 |
| * Yadadri | 0 | 75 | 8 | 85 | 101 | 31 | 72 |
|  | **15** | **708** | **66** | **659** | **718** | **257** | **492** |

* **Team leaders schedules**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Questionnaires** | **INSQ - 19** | **CONUQ-16** | **WMMQ-21** | **MRAQ-13A** | **NGOQ -22** | **MWSQ-14** |
| * Kamareddy | 0 | 25 | 4 | 22 | 0 | 0 |
| * Karimnagar | 1 | 50 | 0 | 15 | 0 | 1 |
| * Mancherial | 0 | 27 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 1 |
| * Medak | 0 | 42 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| * Rangareddy | 0 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| * Wanaparthy | 0 | 37 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| * Bhadradri | 0 | 20 | 4 | 13 | 0 | 0 |
| * Mahabubabad | 0 | 53 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| * Yadadri | 0 | 45 | 0 | 7 | 1 | 0 |
|  | **1** | **322** | **18** | **65** | **3** | **3** |

The field survey feed back in **respondents profile** covers both reservoir fishermen and tanks fishermen. The feedback on **water bodies/resources** includes both reservoirs and tanks. The field survey data on **markets** covers aggregators, local/rural markets and wholesale markets apart from consumer’s feedback both in rural and urban areas. Institutional feedback takes into account the survey findings from gram panchayats, FCS, WMMGs and NGOs. The field study summary tables have been organised as follows:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **5.1.1** | **Feedback from Respondents** | | | **Code** | | **No. of tables** |
|  | 1.1 | Reservoirs' fishermen (RSPR) | | RSPR | (1 - 10) | 10 |
|  | 1.2 | Tanks' fishermen (RSPT) | | RSPT | (1 - 10) | 10 |
|  | **Field survey of Resources** | | |  | |  |
|  | 2.1 | Reservoirs (RRSV) | RRSV | | (1 - 25) | 25 |
|  | 2.2 | Tanks (RTKS) | | RTKS | (1 - 26) | 26 |
|  | **Marketing aspects** | | |  | |  |
|  | 3.1 | Local/Rural market (MLR) | | MLR | (1 - 13) | 13 |
|  | 3.2 | Aggregators (MLRA) | | MLRA | (1 - 11) | 11 |
|  | 3.3 | Wholesale market (MWS) | | MWS | ( 1-14 ) | 14 |
|  | 3.4 | Consumers in rural areas (MCR) | | MCR | (1 - 16) | 16 |
|  | 3.5 | Consumers in urban areas (MCU) | | MCU | (1 - 15) | 15 |
|  | **Institutional feedback** | | |  | |  |
|  | 4.1 | Village/GP (INGP) | | INGP | (1 - 8) | 8 |
|  | 4.2 | FCS (INFCS) | | INFCS | (1 - 23) | 23 |
|  | 4.3 | WMMGs (INMM) | | INMM | (1 - 19) | 19 |
|  | 4.4 | NGOs (INNGO) | | INNGO | ( 1 - 7) | 7 |
|  |  |  | |  |  | **197** |

**Highlights on Respondent’s Feedback (ann 4.2)**

* On an average there is one person per family actively involved in fisheries which means 25 to 30% of the family members as a whole are actively involved in fishing.
* In both reservoirs and tanks category 90% of the respondents report being in BPL category with the balance in APL group**.**
* it can be seen that the OBC category of fishermen is more pronounced in case of reservoirs and the same is the case as for tribals
* Among the fishermen both in reservoirs and tanks a substantial no. of them are illiterates
* In the context of both the resources i.e. reservoirs and tanks the majority of respondents (about 70%) report that fishery is their main livelihood option.
* The higher reliance on agriculture among tank fishermen may be attributed to seasonality limitations of water availability as compared to reservoirs.
* It can be seen that anticipation of better income is not a determinant factor in the choice under both the situations indicating the need for much desired changes for making fishery an attractive sector for better livelihood options.
* The feedback from tank fishermen shows that in about 49% of the cases they derive income from agriculture and in about 15% of the cases they supplement their income from agriculture labour.
* The institutional membership among the respondents which mostly relates to being member in the local FCS is as high as 98% in case of reservoir fishermen while it is about 80% for tank fishermen.

**5.1.2.1 Reservoir resources:** The following reservoirs have been covered in the field study across seven districts (ann 4.3)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **District** | **River basin** | | **Name of the reservoir** | **Size category** | | | **Seasonality** | |
| **Godavari** | **Krishna** | **S** | **M** | **L** | **LS** | **PS** |
| 1 | Kamareddy | ✓ |  | Nizamsagar |  |  | ✓ |  | ✓ |
| 2 | Karimnagar | ✓ |  | Lower Manair Dam |  |  | ✓ |  | ✓ |
| 3 | Mancherial | ✓ |  | Gollavagu Project | ✓ |  |  |  | ✓ |
| 4 | ✓ |  | Nilwai Project | ✓ |  |  |  | ✓ |
| 5 | ✓ |  | Ralivagu | ✓ |  |  |  | ✓ |
| 6 | Medak | ✓ |  | Pocharam reservoir |  | ✓ |  |  | ✓ |
| 7 | ✓ |  | Haldi Project | ✓ |  |  |  | ✓ |
| 8 | Rangareddy |  | ✓ | Indirammasagar | ✓ |  |  | ✓ |  |
| 9 | Wanaparthy |  | ✓ | Yenkunta reservior | ✓ |  |  |  | ✓ |
| 10 |  | ✓ | Sarlasagar |  | ✓ |  |  | ✓ |
| 11 |  | ✓ | Ukachettuvagu | ✓ |  |  |  | ✓ |
| 12 | Bhadradri | ✓ |  | Pedda vagu project | ✓ |  |  |  | ✓ |
| 13 | ✓ |  | Tummala cheruvu | ✓ |  |  |  | ✓ |
| 14 | ✓ |  | Ankamma cheruvu | ✓ |  |  |  | ✓ |
| 15 | ✓ |  | Taliperu project | ✓ |  |  |  | ✓ |
|  |  | **11** | **4** |  | **11** | **2** | **2** | **1** | **14** |

***Highlights on Reservoir Resources***

* In the reservoirs studied allotment to FCS on lease is the predominant feature to the extent of 70% as seen in the reported cases with the balance 30% being the license system.
* In stocking, the share of catla, rohu, mrigal along with common carp form the major species with 80% share, the balance 20% being other species with clear predominance of rohu and mrigal visible in a large number of reported cases.
* Stocking density on a per ha basis when compared with the standard stocking density as applicable to size category of reservoirs shows that there are wide variations
* The field study shows that the labour mobilisation for various activities is more by group efforts both in terms of FCS members organising themselves for the tasks and individual fishermen collaborating in their efforts.
* It is seen that the price realised by the fishermen widely varies from the range of Rs. 70 to 80/kg and Rs. 90 to 100/kg in most of the cases with instances of Rs. 120 to 150/kg also reported for specific varieties in specific locations.
* Depending on the size of reservoirs there are a number of landing centres around the water body which is the point of linkage to markets, be it local or otherwise.
* It is a notable aspect that fisheries federation is far removed from this entry point operations in marketing in which they are supposed to play a key role and initiate ameliorative measures to protect the interest of fishermen.
* Feedback on participatory management and other related issues shows that nearly 80% of the respondents confirm their participation and those who do not report the reason as ‘not involved in the group’ and in some cases stating that they are not interested.
* Regarding the diversifying fishery activities in reservoirs the respondents report that apart from pilot intervention of pen/cage culture there are no other activities like fish seed rearing , fish fattening for which they feel there exists potential.

The reservoir fishermen have given their **suggestions** on a number of aspects that includes prospects for improvement and changes required as it relates to access right system livelihoods and community participation.

**5.1.2.2 Tank resources (ann 4.4)**

The following tanks have been covered in the field study across nine districts

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **District** | **Geo Code** | **Res.code** | **No. tanks** | | **Total** | |
| **DPT** | **GPT** | **No.** | **%** |
| Kamareddy | A1 KMR (M1-M9) | TKS(1-79) | 43 | 36 | 79 | 11% |
| Karimnagar | A2 KRN (M1-M9) | TKS(80-156) | 44 | 33 | 77 | 11% |
| Mancherial | A3 MAN (M1-M9) | TKS(157-229) | 40 | 33 | 73 | 10% |
| Medak | B4 MDK (M1-M9) | TKS(230-319) | 44 | 46 | 90 | 13% |
| Rangareddy | B5 RGR( M1-M9) | TKS(320-398) | 23 | 56 | 79 | 11% |
| Wanaparthy | B6 WPY (M1-M9) | TKS(399-478) | 41 | 39 | 80 | 11% |
| Bhadradri | C7 BDR (M1-M9) | TKS(479-550) | 18 | 54 | 72 | 10% |
| Mahabubabad | C8 MBD (M1-M9) | TKS(551-633) | 38 | 45 | 83 | 12% |
| Yadadri | C9 YDR (M1-M9) | TKS(634-708) | 50 | 25 | 75 | 11% |
| **Total** |  |  | **341** | **367** | **708** | **100%** |

***Highlights on Tank Resources-*(shift to annexure)**

* In 65% of the tanks **water availability** is for <6 months and in about 30% of the cases it is 6 to 9 months. Availability of water for >9 months is limited to the extent of perennial tanks.
* The respondent’s feedback shows that nearly in 60% of the cases the stocking size is less than 50 mm. Further in nearly 50% of the cases the reported stocking is twice or even more.
* Profit sharing among members seems to be a popular practice with sporadic incidences of produce sharing in some cases (2 %).
* Much of the labour requirement is on watch and ward with the requirement on other maintenance being limited. Of the total labour requirement the share of family labour is substantial (>75%) as compared to hired labour.
* Regarding the disposal, the feedback shows that nearly 70% happens as ‘on site sale’ at the landing centres / points followed by local/rural market in the near vicinity (5%).
* On the aspect related to check on the seed quality nearly 50% of the respondents state that they are not trained and thus are unable to participate in the process. Those who have been trained state that the check for quality is in terms of size and activity or mobility.
* A large majority state that they have not undergone any training so far which could have really helped them to do better.
* With the regular stocking program going on in recent years it is of interest to know from the fishermen if it has lead to progressive increase in fish catch.
* On increased fish availability and per capita fish consumption nearly 60% of them put the figure at 20 to 40% increase.
* As per the feedback availability of quality fish seed for the timely stocking, equity in allotment of water bodies and resource access, are of much greater concern to the tank fishermen as evident from their ranking with the other issues coming much later in their prioritization.
* Suggestions that have emerged in the field
* Promote limited use of manure and feed – wherever there is no objection by the public.
* Ensure proper stocking size (80-100 mm) and also use stunted fingerlings and yearlings
* Maintain minimum water level (3-5 feet)
* Long term leasing is good - minimum 10 years at least.
* DOF and GP along with FCS should deliberate on this to ensure active participation of members in all developmental processes.
* **5.1.3 Marketing aspects (Ann 4.5)**

. The summary of market coverage across the study districts is given in here: **(shift to annexure)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **District** | **KMR** | **KRN** | **MAN** | **MDK** | **RGR** | **WPY** | **BDR** | **MBD** | **YDR** | **Overall** |
| **⯀ Markets** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| * Local/rural | 50 | 60 | 33 | 97 | 86 | 95 | 70 | 83 | 85 | 659 |
| * Wholesale |  | 1 | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  | 3 |
| Total | 50 | 61 | 34 | 98 | 86 | 95 | 70 | 83 | 85 | 662 |
| Percentage | 8% | 9% | 5% | 15% | 13% | 14% | 11% | 13% | 13% | 100% |
| **⯀ Aggregators** | 22 | 15 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 6 | 7 | 63 |
| **⯀ Consumers** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| * Rural | 49 | 61 | 45 | 98 | 90 | 96 | 91 | 87 | 101 | 718 |
| * Urban | 25 | 50 | 27 | 42 | 23 | 37 | 20 | 53 | 45 | 322 |
| Total | 74 | 111 | 72 | 140 | 113 | 133 | 111 | 140 | 146 | 1040 |
| Percentage | 7% | 11% | 7% | 13% | 11% | 13% | 11% | 13% | 14% | 100% |
| **Overall per market consumer coverage** | **1.5** | **1.8** | **2.1** | **1.4** | **1.3** | **1.4** | **1.6** | **1.7** | **1.7** | **1.6** |

* + - 1. **Market Aggregators**

As aggregators are important market intermediaries the field study involves feedback from 63 of them from 7 out of 9 study districts as shown in the table below: -**(shift to annexure)**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **District** | **Geo Code** | **INS.code** | **Markets** | |
| **No.** | **%** |
| * Kamareddy | A1 KMR(M2,M3,M4,M5 & M9) | MLRAQ(1-22) | 22 | 35% |
| * Karimnagar | A2 KRN(M1, M5, M6 & M7) | MLRAQ(23-37) | 15 | 24% |
| * Yadadri | C9 YDR(M1,M2,M4,M5,M7, M8 & M9) | MLRAQ(57-63) | 7 | 11% |
| * Mancherial | A3 MAN (M3 & M7) | MLRAQ(38-43) | 6 | 10% |
| * Bhadradri | C7 BDR(M1,M6,M8 & M9) | MLRAQ(45-50) | 6 | 10% |
| * Mahabubabad | C8 MBD(M1,M2,M5,M6,M8 & M9) | MLRAQ(51-56) | 6 | 10% |
| * Medak | B4 MDK (M3) | MLRAQ(44) | 1 | 2% |
| **Total** |  |  | **63** | **100%** |

* + - 1. **Consumers response in rural areas (MCR)**

The survey covers 718 rural consumers as shown in the following tables: **(shift to annexure)**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **District** | **Geo Code** | **Inst. code** | **Rural Consumer** | |
| **No** | **%** |
| * Kamareddy | A1 KMR(M1-M9) | CONR(1-49) | 49 | 7% |
| * Karimnagar | A2 KRN(M1-M9) | CONR(50-110) | 61 | 8% |
| * Mancherial | A3 MAN(M1-M9) | CONR(111-155) | 45 | 6% |
| * Medak | B4 MDK(M1-M9) | CONR(156-253) | 98 | 14% |
| * Rangareddy | B5 RGR(M1-M9) | CONR(254-343) | 90 | 13% |
| * Wanaparthy | B6WPY(M1-M9) | CONR(344-439) | 96 | 13% |
| * Bhadradri | C7BDR(M1-M9) | CONR(440-530) | 91 | 13% |
| * Mahabubabad | C8MBD(M1-M9) | CONR(531-617) | 87 | 12% |
| * Yadadri | C9YDR(M1-M9) | CONR(618-718) | 101 | 14% |
| **Total** |  |  | **718** | **100%** |

* + - 1. **Consumers in urban areas (MCU)**

The survey covers 322 urban consumers as shown in the following tables: **(shift to annexure)**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **District** | **Geo Code** | **INS.code** | **Urban Consumer** | |
| **No** | **%** |
| Kamareddy | A1 KMR(M2,M3,M4&M9) | CONUQ (1-25) | 25 | 8% |
| Karimnagar | A2 KRN(M1,M3,M4,M5,M6,M7 & M8) | CONUQ (26-75) | 50 | 16% |
| Mancherial | A3 MAN(M1,M3,M6,M7 & M9) | CONUQ (76-102) | 27 | 8% |
| Medak | B4 MDK(M1-M9) | CONUQ (103-144) | 42 | 13% |
| Rangareddy | B5 RGR(M1,M2,M3,M4,M5 & M9) | CONUQ (145-167) | 23 | 7% |
| Wanaparthy | B6 WPY(M1-M9) | CONUQ (168-204) | 37 | 11% |
| Bhadradri | C7 BDR(M8 & M9) | CONUQ (205-224) | 20 | 6% |
| Mahabubabad | C8 MBD(M1,M2,M3,M5,M6,M7,M8 & M9) | CONUQ (225-277) | 53 | 16% |
| Yadadri | C9 YDR(M1,M2,M4,M5,M7& M9) | CONUQ (278-322) | 45 | 14% |
| **Total** |  |  | **322** | **100%** |

***Highlights on marketing aspects-*(shift to annexure)**

**Local/Rural market (MLR)**

* Majority of the market operators (>90%) are fishermen cum sellers and they are in the business for >10 years.
* The major source of procurement (>70%) is from tanks followed by reservoirs as a source (20%) with balance being from other sources (rivers and canals, neighbouring village resources, also outsource.
* The prioritised **species preference** in the market has catla in the first place (32%) followed by rohu (23%), murrels (15%), common carp and grass carp put together (12% ) with the balance of 18% constituting the other species.
* The market feedback shows that most of the operators (60%) have continuing/ongoing informal arrangement with contracts/agreement with fishermen or co operatives regarding procurement of fish.
* The feedback indicates that in >70% of the cases the market operators face infrastructure constraints in procurement, handling and storage etc.
* Lack of infrastructure and non availability of ice are stated as the major problems in the market operations.
* Request for financial support from institutional agencies tops the list of expectations followed by subsidizing cost of infrastructure facilities without which operators face several risks in their business.

**Wholesale Market**

* As a part of the field study, feedback has been obtained from three wholesalers operating in the wholesale markets one each in Karimnagar, Mancherial and Medak districts.
* They procure fish from aggregator, reservoir societies as well as tank FCS, the weekly procurement being 2 to 5 tons.
* Two of the wholesalers report that they operate in the wholesale market for 270 to 300 days per year while the third one says that it is about 150 to 180 days (private market).
* Wholesalers opine that in recent years the consumers’ expectations are progressively changing in the sense that, the demand for freshness of the produce, quality parameters, smaller size (about 750 gms) and local varieties are on the increase
* Wholesalers agree that they experience during certain months glut and shortage which adversely affects their business. They feel construction of ice plants and cold storage can help the situation

**Market Aggregators**

* Most of the aggregators surveyed are in the business for >10 years (75%) with the rest having 5 to 10 years of experience. Their main procurement source is tanks (63%) followed by reservoir (21%) and other sources being (16%)
* On the question whether there is increased demand trend for any particular species nearly 90% of aggregators confirm that there is exceptional demand for murrels in all places.
* The feedback indicates that in >60% of the cases the market operators face infrastructure constraints in procurement, handling and storage etc.
* Lack of infrastructure and non availability of ice are stated as the major problems in the market operations.
* Request for financial support from institutional agencies tops the list of expectations followed by subsidizing cost of infrastructure facilities without which operators face several risks in their business.

**Consumer’s response**

* It is seen that over the period the consumption among rural consumers has increased 4 times and the enhancement in the highest consumption bracket (>40 kg) has been 23%. Similarly in urban consumers the increase is > 2 times and addition in the higher consumption category as above is 8%.
* More than 70% of the respondents in both the categories opine that fish consumption has increased from 25 to 50% in the last 5 yrs

**5.1.4.2 Fishermen cooperative society (FCS) (Ann 4.6)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **District** | **Geo Code** | **INS.code** | **Society** | | **Membership** | |
| **No** | **%** | **Total** | **Per society avg.** |
| Kamareddy | A1 KMR(M1-M9) | FCS (1-9) | 9 | 14% | 1074 | 119 |
| Karimnagar | A2 KRN(M1-M9) | FCS (10-18) | 9 | 14% | 1152 | 128 |
| Mancherial | A3 MAN(M1-M9) | FCS (19-27) | 9 | 14% | 1296 | 144 |
| Medak | B4 MDK(M2,M7,M8 & M9) | FCS (28-32) | 5 | 8% | 533 | 107 |
| Rangareddy |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Wanaparthy | B6WPY(M1,M2,M3,M4,M6,M7,M8 & M9) | FCS (33-40) | 8 | 12% | 205 | 26 |
| Bhadradri | C7BDR(M1,M3,M4,M6,M7,M8 & M9) | FCS (41-48) | 8 | 12% | 417 | 52 |
| Mahabubabad | C8MBD(M1-M9) | FCS (49-58) | 10 | 15% | 1359 | 136 |
| Yadadri | C9YDR(M1,M2,M4,M5,M7,M8 & M9) | FCS (59-66) | 8 | 12% | 1570 | 196 |
| **Total** |  |  | **66** | **100%** | **7606** | **115** |

***Highlights on Institutional feedback***

**Gram panchayats (GPs)**

* The category of water bodies in the GPs studied indicates that 44% are short seasonal, 39% are long seasonal, and 17% are perennial.
* The suggestions by GPs are :
* Stocking of big fingerlings and on the right time
* Marketing support
* Providing training and tech. Support
* Possibility of increase in seasonality by sustainability management approach

**Fishermen cooperative society (FCS)**

* Going by their registration most of these are older societies with nearly 60% of them in the range of 20-50 yrs since registration.
* Measures taken to increase the membership is mostly through awareness programs (50%) and membership campaigns conducted in the villages with substantial fisher population (30%).
* About 50% of the members opine that there has been increase in membership and the majority say that the increase is in the range of 25 to 50%.
* Their involvement in other activities that relate to input supply, providing crafts and gears, facilitation for trainings are all on a limited scale. As for their involvement in the retailing of fish, it is reported only in about 10% of the cases.
* The finance source in FCS is mostly own funds, followed by departmental support and funding by traders. It is notable that institutional finance is almost nonexistent.
* In the last 3 to 5 yrs, it is reported that at least for 2-3 yrs the desired water level did not exist in the water bodies and this as per the feedback adversely affected the fish yield. In fact it is stated by >40% of the respondents that there was acute shortage of water for 2-3 yrs which impacted their livelihoods.
* Collective action among members to be promoted. For Federation, the suggested course of action is to develop an integrated approach in bringing FCS together in effective resource utilisation, better post harvest handling, transportation, storage and marketing net work.

**Women Matsya Mitra Groups (WMMG)**

* The WMMGs being basically SHGs, their main role stated in the feedback relates to helping members in obtaining loans.
* As for specific **activities** nearly 70% of them are into retailing of fish.
* In nearly 70% of the cases the respondents say that they share the profits among the group members depending on their contribution. On bank linkage only about 50% of the groups confirm having a bank account through which they route all the transactions
* Members are willing to take training in fishery related activities (86%).
* WMMGs report that there have been changes in consumer preference in recent years with increased demand for freshness, cleanliness and hygienic conditions.
* They want trainings which can help them to commercialise their ventures and require hand holding in IGPs to be taken up on a larger scale.

**Feedback from other institutions**

* The NGO is involved in tank fisheries since 1980 and they are actively involved in FCS membership. The KVK since 2009 is organising general awareness programs and also involved in distribution of fish seed under Integrated Telangana Development Scheme. They are also conducting training programs for fish farmers.