International Journal of Science, Strategic Management and Technology
Volume **02** Issue **11** November-2026 | ISSN: **3108-1762 (Online)** | Impact Factor: 3.8
An International, Peer-Reviewed, Open Access Scholarly Journal Indexed in recognized academic databases

Optimization of Agricultural Procurement Architecture: An Empirical Assessment of Queueing Dynamics, Information Asymmetry, and Digital Slot-Scheduling Systems in State-Regulated Market Yards

Authors: **Mayank Raj, Ankit Kumar Singh, Golu Kumar Dube ,Nishant Sanu, Chaitnay Kumar Sharma**,
Department of Agriculture, Vivekananda Global University |

https://doi.org/10.55041/ijsmt.v2i11.046

Cite this Article: Raj, M., Singh, A. K., Dube, G. K., Sanu, N. & Sharma, C. K. (2026). Optimization of Agricultural Procurement Architecture: An Empirical Assessment of Queueing Dynamics, Information Asymmetry, and Digital Slot-Scheduling Systems in State-Regulated Market Yards. International Journal of Science, Strategic Management and Technology, *02*(11), 1-9. https://doi.org/10.55041/ijsmt.v2i11.046

License: This article is published under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY 4.0), permitting use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author(s) and source are properly credited.

Abstract

Agricultural procurement mechanisms operated under state price support schemes—such as Minimum Support Price (MSP) regimes in developing agrarian nations—suffer from systematic operational vulnerabilities. Agricultural producers routinely face severe logistical bottlenecks at Agricultural Produce Market Committees (APMC) and designated grain yards (Mandis). These vulnerabilities present primarily as prolonged operational wait times (ranging from 12 to over 72 hours), persistent information asymmetry regarding daily procurement capacity, and severe uncertainty surrounding quality rejection parameters and payment settlement timelines.

This study presents a comprehensive multi-center empirical research paper analyzing the root causes of agricultural procurement delays and evaluates a digital intervention framework (the *Smart-Procure System*). Using a randomized controlled field trial across 12 primary agricultural procurement centers during the 2024–2025 Rabi harvest season, operational data was collected from 450 agricultural producers across three distinct operational checkpoints.

The empirical findings demonstrate that deploying a digital token system paired with real-time intake monitoring reduced total yard dwell time from an average of **38.4 hours to 4.2 hours** ($p < 0.001$), lowered post-harvest transit and exposure damage by **89.4%**, reduced logistics and transit detention overhead by **₹5,050 per haul**, and increased overall producer satisfaction metrics from **1.82 to 4.65** on a 5-point Likert scale. Strategic implementation models, policy frameworks, and queueing theory integrations are discussed in detail to provide an actionable roadmap for supply chain modernization.

Keywords: Agricultural Procurement Logistics, Mandi Bottleneck Dynamics, Queueing Theory in Agriculture, Information Asymmetry, Digital Slot Scheduling, Minimum Support Price (MSP), Post-Harvest Loss Mitigation.

1. Introduction

In modern agrarian economies, agricultural procurement operates as the critical structural bridge connecting primary farmgate production with national food security reserves and commercial processing streams. Under government-backed price stabilization regimes, primary market yards (APMCs/Mandis) serve as the principal physical nodes where state agencies purchase staple commodities directly from agricultural producers. However, the operational architecture of these physical market yards was largely engineered during periods of lower crop yields and less centralized logistics, making them ill-equipped to handle modern post-harvest arrival surges.

When high-yield seasonal harvests hit local procurement nodes within narrow 30-to-45-day operational windows,

© Author(s). This work is peer-reviewed, openly published, and permanently archived
This article is openly accessible and reusable with proper attribution.

physical and administrative infrastructure experiences severe operational stress. Producers transporting their harvested grain to state yards encounter three primary structural inefficiencies:

- **Extended Physical Wait Times:** Due to unstructured arrival management, farmers endure physical dwell times ranging from 12 to 72 hours outside procurement centers. This forces producers to retain rented transport vehicles (tractors, trolleys, or light commercial trucks) on daily idle tariffs, incurring significant financial penalties while exposing harvested grain to ambient moisture, pests, and theft.

1. **Schedule Opacity and Logistics Congestion:** The absence of real-time schedule information leads to uncoordinated arrivals. Farmers drive to market yards based on localized rumors or fear of quota exhaustion, resulting in major traffic jams that paralyze local highways and overwhelm weighbridges and grading laboratories.
2. **Procurement Status and Financial Uncertainty:** Without clear pre-dispatch feedback regarding moisture thresholds, grain quality standards, and daily intake caps, farmers face high uncertainty at the point of sale. Rejection after an overnight wait leaves smallholder farmers financially vulnerable, often forcing them into distress sales with informal intermediaries (*Adhatiyas*) at prices below government baseline rates.

This study mathematically models the queueing behavior of traditional agricultural procurement systems, introduces an integrated digital slot-allocation architecture, and presents empirical results from field deployment across 12 procurement centers.

2. Theoretical Framework and Literature Review

2.1 The Economics of Market Yard Bottlenecks

Traditional supply chain literature emphasizes that agricultural perishability and harvest seasonality create extreme supply elasticity challenges at primary collection points. In developing agricultural systems, procurement efficiency is limited by physical constraints:

\text{Throughput Capacity } (C) = \min \left(C_{\text{weigh}}, C_{\text{grad}}, C_{\text{unload}}, C_{\text{pay}} \right)

Where:

- C_{\text{weigh}} = Daily capacity of weighbridges.
- C_{\text{grad}} = Daily processing speed of quality testing and moisture grading facilities.
- C_{\text{unload}} = Physical yard labor and mechanization capacity for bag stacking/unloading.
- C_{\text{pay}} = Administrative processing rate for billing and banking validation. In typical manual procurement centers, C_{\text{grad}} and C_{\text{weigh}} represent severe operational bottlenecks. When daily arrival rate (\lambda) exceeds processing

capacity (\mu), queue length increases exponentially according to classical single-server or multi-server queueing models (M/M/c queueing theory).

2.2 Mathematical Modeling of Unregulated Queueing Behavior

Assuming a procurement center operating with c parallel processing channels (weighbridges/grading tables), where arrival patterns follow a non-homogeneous Poisson process with rate \lambda(t) during harvest peaks, and service times follow an exponential distribution with parameter \mu.

The traffic intensity or utilization factor (\rho) is defined as:

\rho = \frac{\lambda}{c \cdot \mu}

Under conventional un-scheduled operational models, during peak hours \lambda(t) > c

\cdot \mu, leading to \rho > 1. Under these conditions, steady-state queueing collapses, and the average time a producer spends in the system (W) approaches infinity or is bounded only by physical day-end shutdowns:

L_q = \frac{P_0 \cdot \left(\frac{\lambda}{\mu}\right)^c \cdot \rho}{c! \cdot (1 - \rho)^2} Where L_q represents the expected length of the queue, and P_0 is the probability of the system being completely idle. The resulting operational failure produces high detention costs, severe physical loss of crop quality, and economic distress for

© Author(s). This work is peer-reviewed, openly published, and permanently archived
This article is openly accessible and reusable with proper attribution.

producers.

3. Materials and Methods

3.1 Experimental Design and Site Selection

The empirical investigation was conducted during the 2024–2025 Rabi procurement season across 12 primary agricultural procurement centers located in major agricultural districts.
Experimental sites were chosen based on historical grain arrivals, geographical representation, and baseline infrastructure comparability (each handling an average seasonal intake of 15,000 to 35,000 Metric Tonnes).
The 12 centers were randomly divided into two experimental groups:

- **Control Group (6 Procurement Centers):** Maintained the traditional First-In, First-Out (FIFO) manual queue model. Farmers arrived unscheduled, received paper tokens at the entry gate, and waited physically in line.
- **Treatment Group (6 Procurement Centers):** Implemented the **Smart-Procure Platform**—an integrated digital management framework combining SMS/USSD mobile appointment booking, automated capacity-based slot allocation, digital token verification, and real-time operational status updates.

3.2 Sample Size and Field Data Collection Methodology

A stratified random sampling strategy was applied to select 450 farmers (225 from Control yards, 225 from Treatment yards). Field enumerators were stationed at three key operational checkpoints within each procurement yard:

Key primary variables logged for every sampled producer included:
1. **Time-to-Clearance Variables:** Entry gate registration time, weighbridge entry time, quality testing duration, unloading completion time, and final billing release timestamp.
2. **Economic Overhead Metrics:** Vehicle hire daily rate, detention fees paid to transport operators, labor loss calculations, and fuel consumption during idling.
3. **Quality and Loss Metrics:** Crop moisture level at arrival, rejection rate percentage, and physical spillage/spoilage weight losses measured in kilograms per quintal.
4. **Perception and Satisfaction Index:** Multi-item survey measuring farmer perception across schedule predictability, transparency, moisture grading fairness, and payment confidence, evaluated on a 5-point Likert scale (1 = Highly Unsatisfied, 5 = Highly Satisfied).

3.3 Architecture of the Smart-Procure System

The intervention platform relies on a distributed cloud architecture accessible through low-bandwidth SMS/USSD channels as well as smartphone applications:

- **Module 1: Dynamic Intake Allocation Engine:** Calculates daily center throughput based on available weighbridges, labor count, and storage space, automatically generating staggered hourly time slots.
- **Module 2: Smart Token & Notice Gateway:** Issues digital tokens via SMS/USSD containing assigned arrival windows, gate pass QR codes, and targeted preparation advice (e.g., target moisture thresholds).
- **Module 3: Yard Telemetry and Live Monitoring:** Tracks vehicles through RFID/QR scanning at entry, weighbridge, and exit points, feeding real-time queue length metrics back to a public dashboard accessible to local farmers.

© Author(s). This work is peer-reviewed, openly published, and permanently archived
This article is openly accessible and reusable with proper attribution.

4. Empirical Results and Statistical Analysis

4.1 Evaluation of Operational Dwell Times

Data collected across the 12 experimental centers confirms that structural queue management fundamentally alters yard operational efficiency. Total operational dwell time was tracked from initial arrival at the market yard approach road to final discharge after unloading.

Table 1: Comprehensive Comparison of Dwell Time and Logistics Performance Metrics

Operational Metric / Indicator	Control Group (Manual FIFO)	Treatment Group (Smart-Procure)	Absolute Variance	Percentage Impact	t-statistic / p-value
Approach Queue Waiting Time	18.40 hrs	0.45 hrs	-17.95 hrs	-97.55%	t = 28.41, p < 0.001
Gate Registration to Weighbridge	6.20 hrs	1.65 hrs	-4.55 hrs	-73.38%	t = 14.12, p < 0.001
Weighbridge to Quality Assessment	4.80 hrs	0.80 hrs	-4.00 hrs	-83.33%	t = 11.85, p < 0.001
Quality Clearance to Unloading Yard	9.00 hrs	1.30 hrs	-7.70 hrs	-85.55%	t = 16.90, p < 0.001
Total Yard Dwell Time (Mean)	**38.40 hrs**	**4.20 hrs**	**-34.20 hrs**	**-89.06%**	**t = 34.52, p < 0.001**
Median Dwell Time	36.00 hrs	3.80 hrs	-32.20 hrs	-89.44%	Mann-Whitney U, p < 0.001
Dwell Time Standard Deviation (\sigma)	12.80 hrs	0.95 hrs	-11.85 hrs	-92.57%	F-test, p < 0.001
Vehicle Idle	8.40 L	1.10 L	-7.30 L	-86.90%	t = 18.22, p <
Operational Metric / Indicator	Control Group (Manual FIFO)	Treatment Group (Smart-Procure)	Absolute Variance	Percentage Impact	t-statistic / p-value
Fuel Waste (Liters/Haul)					0.001
Grain Spoilage/Exposure Loss (%)	3.80%	0.40%	-3.40%	-89.47%	t = 9.84, p < 0.005

Source: Authors' primary field experiment data (2024–2025 Rabi procurement season across 12 market yards, N = 450). Statistical analytical framework adapted from Panse & Sukhatme (1985), Statistical Methods for Agricultural Workers, ICAR Publications, New Delhi, pp. 87–89; operational bottleneck indicators

© Author(s). This work is peer-reviewed, openly published, and permanently archived
This article is openly accessible and reusable with proper attribution.

contextualized with Department of Agriculture Statistics (2024).

The reduction in mean total dwell time from **38.40 hours down to 4.20 hours** demonstrates an 89% reduction in overall yard congestion. Furthermore, the standard deviation (\sigma) dropped from 12.80 hours to 0.95 hours, indicating highly predictable operational flow in the treatment centers.

4.2 Longitudinal Arrival Patterns and Queue Smoothing

The dynamic appointment engine succeeded in flattening the traditional surge arrival profile that causes severe operational bottlenecks during peak harvest periods.

4.3 Analysis of Information Asymmetry and Perceived Uncertainty

To evaluate how real-time communication affects uncertainty, surveyed farmers were asked to identify specific operational concerns experienced during procurement.

Table 2: Breakdown of Farmers Experiencing High Operational Uncertainty

Source of Uncertainty / Structural Vulnerability	Control Group (N=225)	Treatment Group (N=225)	Chi-Square (\chi^2) Value	Significance Level (p)
Uncertainty on Daily Yard Intake Status	88.44% (199)	6.22% (14)	304.12	$p < 0.001$
Lack of Advance Rejection Criteria Guidance	76.22% (171)	9.33% (21)	204.85	$p < 0.001$
Uncertainty Regarding Moisture Deductions	81.33% (183)	12.00% (27)	218.44	$p < 0.001$
Opaque Payment Disbursement Timelines	92.00% (207)	14.22% (32)	272.50	$p < 0.001$
Forced Reliance on Unofficial Intermediaries	44.89% (101)	2.22% (5)	112.67	$p < 0.001$

Source: Authors' primary field survey data (2024–2025 Rabi procurement season, N = 450). Information asymmetry evaluation framework adapted from Colebrook, Stephen, & Hedden (2020), "Evaluating Information Asymmetry in Smallholder Value Chains," International Agribusiness Management Review, 28(4), 315–332.

In the control group, **88.44%** of producers reported significant operational uncertainty regarding daily yard acceptance capacity, which directly drove premature arrival strategies. In the treatment group, pre-dispatch SMS alerts reduced this uncertainty parameter to **6.22%**.

© Author(s). This work is peer-reviewed, openly published, and permanently archived
This article is openly accessible and reusable with proper attribution.

4.4 Economic Impact and Financial Cost-Benefit Audit

The economic costs associated with market yard delays were compiled across vehicle transport tariffs, product loss, and labor opportunity costs.

Table 3: Economic Cost Breakdown and Financial Savings per Farm Household (Average Load: 50 Quintals / 5 Metric Tonnes)

Financial Cost Head / Loss Vector	Control Group (Manual)	Treatment Group (Smart)	Net Savings (₹)	Net Savings ($ USD Equivalent)
Vehicle Detention Charge (Overnight Halt)	₹3,200	₹800	+ ₹2,400	+ $28.80
Vehicle Fuel Loss (Idle Engine Running)	₹756	₹99	+ ₹657	+ $7.88
Physical Grain Spoilage & Weight Loss	₹1,850	₹200	+ ₹1,650	+ $19.80
Labor Opportunity Loss (2 Days Off-Farm)	₹1,200	₹200	+ ₹1,000	+ $12.00
Food & Emergency Overnight Expenses	₹450	₹50	+ ₹400	+ $4.80
Total Economic Cost per Trip	**₹7,456**	**₹1,349**	**+ ₹6,107**	**+ $73.28**

Note: Currency conversion calculated at baseline nominal exchange rate 1 \text{ USD} = 93.3 \text{ INR}.

Source: Authors' primary economic audit data (2024–2025 Rabi procurement season, N = 450). Cost-loss valuation methodology adapted from Harshitha, Rao, & Prakash (2021), "Economic Impact Assessment of Transport Delays and Market Yard Congestion on Farmer Net Returns," International Journal of Environment and Climate Change, 11(7), 89–94; and Dar, Uddin, & Khan (2019), Journal of Food Engineering and Agricultural Economics, 15(3), 201–218.

The deployment of the Smart-Procure framework delivered direct cash savings of **₹6,107 per trip** (~$73.28 USD) for an average 50-quintal haul. Scaled across a medium-sized market yard handling 5,000 farmer trips per procurement season, the net localized economic value preserved exceeds **₹30.5 Million ($366,000 USD)** per center annually.

4.5 Farmer Satisfaction Metrics

Farmer perception was evaluated across five structural domains using a validated 5-point Likert scale (1 = Very Poor, 5 = Excellent).

© Author(s). This work is peer-reviewed, openly published, and permanently archived
This article is openly accessible and reusable with proper attribution.

Table 4: Farmer Perception and System Satisfaction Metrics

Assessment Domain	Control Group Mean Score	Treatment Group Mean Score	Difference (\Delta)	Mann-Whitney U Test (p-value)
Predictability of Arrival Schedule	1.42	4.78	+ 3.36	$p < 0.001$
Transparency of Weight Measurement	2.10	4.55	+ 2.45	$p < 0.001$
Fairness of Quality Assessment	1.85	4.40	+ 2.55	$p < 0.001$
Ease of System Access (SMS/USSD)	N/A	4.62	N/A	N/A
Overall Yard Experience	**1.82**	**4.65**	**+ 2.83**	**$p < 0.001$**

Source: Authors' primary Likert-scale farmer perception survey (2024–2025 Rabi procurement season, N = 450). Non-parametric Mann-Whitney U evaluation adapted from Panse & Sukhatme (1985), Statistical Methods for Agricultural Workers, ICAR Publications, New Delhi, pp. 87–89.

5. Systemic Constraints and Implementation Challenges

While digital slot scheduling yields major operational improvements, field evaluation revealed several systemic implementation challenges:

1. **Digital Literacy Gaps:** Smallholder farmers without smartphone access experienced initial friction when interacting with text-based appointment platforms. This required setting up village-level assistance kiosks at local public service centers.
2. **Network Infrastructure Outages:** Connectivity dropouts in rural market yards disrupted real-time database updates at weighbridge scanners. Local offline database synchronization was required to maintain operational continuity.
3. **Behavioral Resistance from Local Intermediaries:** Traditional commission agents initially resisted direct-to-farmer scheduling, as reduced yard congestion limited their ability to arrange discounted private sales.

6. Strategic Policy Framework and Roadmap

To address these implementation challenges and scale digital procurement systems, state agricultural departments should adopt a multi-phase deployment framework:

6.1 Phase 1: Pre-Season Infrastructure Preparation

- Perform capacity audits across all weighbridges, testing stations, and storage yards to set accurate daily throughput baselines.
- Establish village-level booking kiosks to assist non-literate farmers with token generation.
- Deploy offline-first mobile databases at procurement centers to protect against network downtime.

© Author(s). This work is peer-reviewed, openly published, and permanently archived
This article is openly accessible and reusable with proper attribution.

6.2 Phase 2: Operational Rollout and Queue Control

- Mandate slot-based tokens for all procurement yard entries during peak harvest weeks.
- Deploy village-level moisture pre-testing centers so farmers can check grain quality before transport.
- Install public digital screens at yard entrances to display live queue numbers and daily intake progress.

6.3 Phase 3: Systemic Integration and Automation

- Integrate procurement platforms directly with bank settlement systems to automate fast direct-to-account (DBT) payments upon quality clearance.
- Introduce automated optical grain grading systems to speed up moisture and purity assessments.
- Apply predictive analytics to dynamic scheduling models to adjust intake capacities based on real-time weather forecasts.

7. Conclusion

Logistical bottlenecks at state agricultural procurement yards are not an inevitable reality of agricultural marketing. Instead, they stem from outdated, unscheduled batch processing systems that create severe operational delays and information asymmetry.

This study demonstrates that implementing a digital scheduling framework fundamentally transforms agricultural procurement yards:

- **Total yard dwell time** dropped by **89%** (from 38.4 hours to 4.2 hours).
- **In-transit grain damage** was reduced by **89.4%**.
- **Direct logistics costs** were reduced by **₹6,107 per trip**, preserving millions in economic value for local agricultural communities.
- **Farmer satisfaction** scores improved from **1.82 to 4.65** out of 5.

By replacing unstructured, unscheduled arrivals with transparent, token-based appointment systems, state procurement agencies can streamline supply chains, lower post-harvest losses, and protect farmgate incomes.

References

1. Global Agricultural Supply Chain Metrics & USDA Procurement Profiles. (2022). *Report on International Grain Logistics and Post-Harvest Systems*.
2. Directorate of Economics and Statistics. (2023). *Agricultural Statistics at a Glance*. Ministry of Agriculture and Farmers Welfare, Government of India.
3. Department of Agriculture Statistics. (2024). *State-Wise Crop Area, Production, and Yard Throughput Yield Indicators*. Commissionerate of Agriculture, Benchmark Technical Bulletin Series.
4. Sharma, R. R., & Singh, R. (2021). "Queueing Theory Applications in Seasonal Market Yard Bottlenecks." *Journal of Agricultural Logistics & Supply Chain Engineering*, 41(2), 110–126.
5. Colebrook, H., Stephen, G., & Hedden, P. (2020). "Evaluating Information Asymmetry in Smallholder Value Chains." *International Agribusiness Management Review*, 28(4), 315–332.
6. Panse, V. G., & Sukhatme, P. V. (1985). *Statistical Methods for Agricultural Workers*. Indian Council of Agricultural Research (ICAR) Publications, New Delhi, 87–89.
7. Kumari, M., Choudhary, B. L., Abhinav, Ola, M. P., & Ekta. (2024). "Effectiveness of Growth Hormones and Foliar Applications on Crop Yield and Economic Efficiency Parameters." *Chemical Science Review and Letters*, 13(51), 126–131.
8. Leena, P. B., Deotale, R. D., & Raut, S. M. (2020). "Physiological Optimization and Operational Bottlenecks in Post-Harvest Transport." *Association of Agricultural Engineering & Crop Care Sciences*, 29(1), 45–52.
9. Harshitha, G., Rao, C. B. B., & Prakash, T. R. (2021). "Economic Impact Assessment of Transport Delays

© Author(s). This work is peer-reviewed, openly published, and permanently archived
This article is openly accessible and reusable with proper attribution.

and Market Yard Congestion on Farmer Net Returns." *International Journal of Environment and Climate Change*, 11(7), 89–94.

10. Dar, T. A., Uddin, M., & Khan, M. M. A. (2019). "Quantitative Modeling of Supply Chain Losses in State-Regulated Procurement Schemes." *Journal of Food Engineering and Agricultural Economics*, 15(3), 201–218.

© Author(s). This work is peer-reviewed, openly published, and permanently archived
This article is openly accessible and reusable with proper attribution.