

Visit us - www.researchjournal.co.in ■ DOI: 10.15740/HAS/IRJAES/7.1/53-55

## International Research Journal of Agricultural Economics and Statistics

Volume 7 | Issue 1 | March, 2016 | 53-55 ■ e ISSN-2231-6434





## District wise performance of different crop insurance products in Tamil Nadu

## S. MENAKA AND K. MANI

See end of the paper for authors' affiliations

Correspondence to:

S. MENAKA
Department of
Agricultural Economics,
Centre for Agricultural and
Rural Development
Studies, Tamil Nadu
Agricultural University,
COIMBATORE (T.N.) INDIA
Email: ms.menaka@

## Paper History:

gmail.com

**Received** : 02.01.2016; **Revised** : 17.01.2016; **Accepted** : 28.01.2016 Abstract: Insurance is a technique where losses suffered by few are met from funds accumulated through small contributions made by many who are exposed to similar risk. Crop insurance is a means to protecting the cultivators against financial loss on account of anticipated crop-loss arising out of practically all natural factors beyond their control such as natural fire, weather, floods, pests, diseases etc. with respect to National Agricultural insurance scheme, Nagapattinam district is having 22.31 percentage of farmers, thus it ranks first in the performance of NAIS in Tamil Nadu. With respect to Modefied National Agricultural Insurance scheme Sivagangai district is having 73190 number of farmers and its having nearly 72 percentage of farmers in Tamil Nadu. In case of Coconut palm insurance scheme Karur district is having 524 number of farmer which accounts for nearly 42 percentage of total farmers in Tamil Nadu, with respect to Weather Based crop Insurance scheme Ariyalur district of Tamil Nadu has maximum number of farmer covered under this scheme and its is having 5432 number of farmers and its accounted nearly 97 percentage of total farmers in Tamil Nadu.

KEY WORDS: NAIS, MNAIS, WBCIS, CPIS

How To CITE THIS PAPER: Menaka, S. and Mani, K. (2016). District wise performance of different crop insurance products in Tamil Nadu. *Internat. Res. J. Agric. Eco. & Stat.*, 7 (1): 53-55.