

STRATEGY FOR THE REPLICATION OF

**THE INTEGRATED LIVESTOCK DEVELOPMENT
PROJECT (ILDP) MODEL IN OTHER KBK DISTRICTS
OF ORISSA**

Prepared by

Dr Sujitav Dash,

Development Consultant

A. PROJECT BACKGROUND

- The Integrated Livestock Development Project (ILDP) in Koraput District commenced operations in April 1993. Although initially planned for implementation over a five-year period (April 1993 to March 1998), actual implementation began in late 1994. The project faced setbacks in 1999–2000 due to funding constraints. As a result, the project period was extended by four years, concluding in March 2003. The three-year extension was justified to allow adequate time for the completion and consolidation of planned and evolving project activities.
- The primary aim of the project was to raise awareness among livestock owners and enable them to adopt improved methods of animal husbandry and fodder production. The project covered 100 villages across four blocks of Koraput District, with a key focus on tribal families owning small ruminants and backyard poultry.
- Despite operating in a challenging environment, the project achieved notable success and earned the trust of the farming community. This was facilitated through the establishment of Community Link Workers (CLWs), Self-Help Groups (SHGs), Village Committees, and SHG Federations (Apex Bodies). Support for improved agricultural practices was extended to farming households via Block Extension Teams (BETs), along with training and extension support from the Animal Husbandry Department (AHD) and other line departments.
- Goal of the ILDP:
- To enhance food security and improve the quality of life of people in tribal communities.
- Development Objectives:
- To improve the living standards of the poorer, primarily tribal rural population, through the overall impact of livestock development in the farming systems of the area, and through income-generating enterprises such as milk, meat, and egg production.
- To reduce environmental degradation in the project area through fodder/pasture development and controlled livestock grazing.
- Immediate Objectives:
- To provide an effective extension approach focused on selected villages, aiming to raise awareness, improve motivation, and increase receptiveness to new methods of fodder production and animal husbandry.
- To develop, test, and disseminate appropriate fodder production packages suited to the varied conditions of the project area.
- To implement an integrated approach to village-based livestock development.

- To integrate project activities with soil and water conservation initiatives carried out by other agencies, such as the Forestry Department and the Department of Soil Conservation.
- Project Achievements:
- Trained 200 Community Link Workers (100 women and 100 men).
- Formed 150 Self-Help Groups (SHGs) comprising 2,700 villagers, with 23 additional SHGs in formative stages.
- Established 19 SHG Apex Bodies, representing 231 SHGs (96 supported by DRDA and 135 by ILDP).
- Constituted 25 Village Committees.
- Disbursed Rs. 2.3 million through Village Revolving Funds.
- Trained approximately 2,800 farmers (men and women) in livestock and allied extension practices, including animal husbandry, agriculture, and horticulture.
- Conducted over 300 on-farm trials and demonstrations on diverse cropping patterns that increased both grain yields and the quantity of residual by-products usable as livestock feed.
- Supported a local demonstration farm cultivating grasses and legumes, with seeds and cuttings distributed to farmers.
- Implemented a goat and sheep upgrading programme by introducing improved indigenous breeds to selected villages.

Impact

- Introduction of CLWs and initiation of a regular poultry vaccination programme in the villages has resulted in a substantial reduction in poultry mortality (mainly due to Ranikhet Disease), resulting in an increase in household income.
- Formation of SHGs has increased the villagers' (particularly women) confidence and supported them in initiating income-generating (particularly livestock and agriculture) activities.
- Formation of the SHG apex bodies provides sustainable support strength to the village SHGs.
- Formation of Village Committees has created a platform for the villagers to plan and implement activities for the entire village.
- Provision of VRFs has helped initiate planned activities as the project is supplementing the SHG's savings with matching amount (max. Rs. 20,000).

- A review of the SHGs in the ILDP villages and credit and indebtedness in ILDP and non-ILDP households indicate that the SHGs have stopped the hold of money lenders in the project area. Interest rates have declined. Distress selling of farm produce and small animals to repay the debts has reduced.
- On-farm demonstration plots and provision of mini-kits have shown farmers, how agricultural productivity can be improved and several farmers have adopted the new production methods, reporting they are having higher yields both in grain and straw.
- Establishment of fodder plots on communal land or private plots has not yet been adopted, though a few villagers were using the grasses established around the villages by ild project.
- Introduction of larger breeds of sheep and goats has increased birth weight and growth rate and provided an incremental net income.

The District Administration has been appreciative of the results of the project and with the District Collector as the driving force, the District Rural Development Agency (DRDA) has organised 1300 SHGs in Koraput following the ILDP model.

B. REPLICABLE MILESTONES

I. Community Link Workers

One of the key strategies of the project was to identify, select and train appropriate male and female 'community link workers (CLW)' in each village, who were then expected to provide doorstep service to the villagers. In the 5 years that the project has been operating, it has clearly been able to establish the usefulness of the CLW institution. With the project now moving on to a consolidation phase it is found that a majority of the trained CLWs are sustainable, and are independently functioning as envisaged.

At present the CLWs collect medicines from the BET offices/Training cum Service Centres at Block Level, where refrigerators are available. In the post project period the CLWs can continue to collect medicines

and vaccines from these centres, as these will continue to operate under the AHD. In that connection the AHD staff will also be able to provide the CLWs with information on livestock services and/or interventions available from the AHD.

Both female and male CLWs are confident that they can continue their activities in cooperation with the AHD after phasing out of ILDP. The CLWs are showing interest to acquire additional skills and to upgrade their present skills.

Each CLW was receiving a honorarium of Rs.200 per month since the inception of the project. The monthly honorarium was reduced to Rs. 100 from 1st January 2001. From 1st July 2001 they were no more paid any honorarium. In spite of this change the CLW concept has been institutionalised in the villages and it has created a local market and a clientele base.

For the CLW concept to be sustainable it is important that their customer base is large enough for them to maintain their skills through frequent practice. The BETs in consultation with the CLWs identified 367 neighbouring non-project villages, where the CLWs have recently started providing their services. Now it depends on CLWs and the BETs to promote the advantages of poultry vaccination and deworming of small ruminants in these villages.

The provision of a castration equipment to each CLW will be too costly. The project should address this issue and explore the advantages and disadvantages of CLWs sharing such equipments and in that case the solution depends on as to where it should be placed according to conditions in the area. One solution could be to have the LI store the equipment and lending it out to the CLWs.

The AHD has accepted the CLW concept but, with its limited budget, it will not be able to replicate training and provision of equipment in the same scale as had been done by the project. The AHD staffs have the experience to train new CLWs. The project should in collaboration with the AHD develop a model whereby new CLWs can be trained, with limited financial requirement by the AHD. Collaboration should be sought with appropriate other stakeholders like DRDA.

Payment for CLW Services

In general, a very high percentage of the respondents across all categories indicated that the farmers will be willing to pay the link workers after the project ended, for their services.

The response on quantum of payment has been quite consistent across the respondent categories as well as blocks. The overall pattern that emerged was that a majority of the farmers were willing to pay Rs.5 for cattle first aid, between Rs. 1-2 for goat and sheep deworming, between Rs.1-2 for goat and sheep first aid, 25-50 paise for poultry deworming, and poultry vaccination. A significant percentage of the farmers were not willing to pay for goat and sheep deworming. Willingness to pay for treatment of pigs, and agricultural advice is very low. There is no significant difference between what the male and female farmers are willing to pay for the same activity.

Income of CLWs

The income generation has been computed assuming that the livestock farmers will only pay for poultry vaccination and deworming, and deworming of sheep and goat. In the optimistic scenario, assuming that each CLW couple covers at least 5 villages, based on the 1998 livestock population figures for the project villages, the range of profit earned by two CLWs per annum will vary from Rs. 1800 to Rs.3000 between the four blocks. In the realistic scenario, the profit will vary from Rs.850 to Rs. 1400, assuming that the CLWs cover at least 5 villages. Given the time required to be spent by the CLW on the activity, the profits are fairly lucrative.

Linkages with AH department

Linkages with the AH department are limited to the project sending persons for training and supply of some medicines and equipment. There has been no attempt to introduce the CLWs to the livestock inspectors (LIs) and vice versa, and encouraging them to work together. The CLWs are not dependent on the department staff for any inputs. However, level of awareness among the LIs about the project is fairly high.

Linkages of CLWs with Panchayat, linkage of SHGs on sustainability of CLWs is likely to strengthen the role of CLWs.

The project is also trying a market driven approach, wherein the CLWs earn their income from the farmers, have the option of purchasing their supplies from the market or government sources, receive refresher training from the government, and are monitored by the farmers themselves.

Findings of Studies on the Sustainability of Community Link Workers

The main findings of various studies relating to the sustainability of the role of CLWs are:

- Almost all the link workers are carrying out first aid for cattle (though to varying degrees); deworming of goat and sheep, first aid of goat and sheep; deworming and vaccination of poultry. Other activities have been reported by very few CLWs. Deworming of pigs is being carried out essentially only in Laxmipur block. Agricultural practices appear to have had the best response in Jeypore.
- The farmers have been utilising the services of the CLWs and consider them as very useful.
- Farmers in general indicate that the project has had a significant impact in terms of reduction of poultry mortality and increased income due to increased weight of livestock
- Farmers suggest that the CLWs should be provided training on castration of small and large animals, and vaccination of large animals
- The CLW concept is accepted and acknowledged by the district authorities.
- Female and male CLWs are confident that they can continue their activities in co-operation with AHD after **ILDP** is phased out.
- CLWs are well respected, they are role models in their villages and their services are in demand both within their own and neighbouring villages.
- Some CLWs (regardless of sex) function as resource persons to SHGs (e.g, with book keeping and group consolidation).
- The number and the productivity of livestock in the villages have increased (e.g, mortality particularly in poultry has been reduced from 80 -90% to 20 -30%, annual income from poultry has increased and poverty reduced).
- Villagers are eager to access further information on improved agricultural, aqua-cultural, horticultural and animal husbandry practices.
- **ILDP** has succeeded in establishing the CLWs as a useful, logical extension to the government system for providing animal husbandry services at the doorstep in the villages
- ILDP has provided considerable training inputs to CLWs.
- There is reduction in mortality rates, increase in livestock as well as an increase in income due to increase in body weight of the livestock.
- A high percentage of the livestock farmers will be willing to pay for CLWs service in the post project scenario (however, this should not be taken for granted as substantial efforts may need to be put in place to ensure that a high percentage actually pay)

II. Self Help Groups (SHGs)

A total of 150 SHGs comprising 2,800 members have been formed across 100 target villages. An additional 23 SHGs are currently in the formative stages and are expected to be consolidated shortly. The primary motivation for both women and men to join SHGs is to reduce poverty by gaining access to affordable loans. SHG loans are offered at an interest rate of 24% per annum—significantly lower than the 120% charged by private moneylenders. Moreover, these loans do not require members to mortgage jewellery or other assets. Gaining independence from moneylenders has reduced the risk of losing land or other property in cases of default due to factors such as crop failure.

Loan Utilization Patterns:

Members utilize SHG loans for various purposes, including:

- Productive investments in agriculture and livestock
- Housing improvement
- Consumption needs
- Emergencies
- Children's education
- Purchase or lease of land
- Purchase of productive tools

SHG loans are accessible only to members. Some groups permit the first loan to be used for consumption, with subsequent loans required to be for productive purposes. Others insist on all loans being directed toward income-generating activities. Female members, in particular, highlight the confidence they have gained through SHG participation. They now conduct meetings, handle bank transactions, and engage freely with government extension staff. This sense of empowerment extends beyond SHGs, influencing broader village concerns such as cleanliness of common drains and campaigns against alcohol abuse. Some SHGs have also undertaken collective initiatives, such as bulk purchasing of agricultural inputs for resale within their own and nearby villages.

Replication and Influence Beyond Project Villages:

The impact of SHGs has extended beyond project villages. Members, both male and female, are often approached by other villagers seeking guidance on SHG formation. In some cases, SHG members are even compensated for their advisory support.

Reviews on SHGs Indicate the Following Benefits:

- Access to affordable loans and independence from exploitative moneylenders
- Increased confidence and self-reliance, especially among tribal women
- Ability to manage financial transactions and engage in community discussions
- Spread of SHG concept and support for new SHG formation in nearby villages

- No requirement for mortgaging personal assets like jewellery
- Engagement in social welfare activities (e.g., education, sanitation, alcohol abuse prevention)
- Functioning as platforms for information dissemination (e.g., poultry vaccination schedules, training)
- Acquisition of livestock, agricultural, and horticultural management skills under the ILDP
- Emergence as a core customer base, particularly for female Community Livelihood Workers (CLWs)

Indicators of Group Self-Reliance:

The following indicators reflect the self-reliance of ILDP-supported SHGs:

- Regularity of meetings and member attendance
- Shared leadership and active member participation in decision-making
- Continuous growth in savings
- High loan repayment rates
- Ability to resolve group issues independently
- Strong links with development services

SHG members have already participated in a wide range of training programs focused on agriculture and livestock management. There is an expressed interest among members to further enhance their knowledge and skills for income generation.

Efforts have been made to converge the activities of various line departments and their extension agents by using SHGs and Village Committees (VCs) as entry points for delivering development services and extension activities.

III. SHG Apex Bodies

Once SHGs have established a sound economic base, the ILDP plans to promote their consolidation into local-level Apex Bodies. Small groups tend to become stronger and more efficient when horizontally and vertically linked. Apex Bodies promote solidarity and economies of scale in group activities and in the delivery of development services, enabling members to broaden their base for collective action. Furthermore, the development of local – and eventually regional and state-level – structures is expected to stimulate the formation of more SHGs.

- **Apex Bodies represent their constituent groups** but are not executive entities; they are accountable to all group members. Their role is primarily facilitating, coordinating, and educational. They act as sources of technical support, economies of scale, and guidance. For example, a federation can provide training to new groups and even support their activities financially through accumulated savings. They can also serve as models for forming new apex bodies and may take on some responsibilities typically held by community organizers.

- **Apex Bodies support groups with diverse economic activities**, rather than focusing on a single activity. Multi-activity apex bodies are better equipped to address the common needs of groups such as training and information exchange, while also being better positioned to advocate for improved service delivery.
- **Linking Apex Bodies to existing organizations** has improved service delivery and facilitated the integration of group development plans into multi-group or federation-level plans. These can then be aligned with broader area and regional development strategies through local coordination committees, resulting in a two-way planning process.
- **Apex Bodies enhance community recognition and confidence** among the poor. Through their collective voice, members have gained organizational strength and may eventually achieve representation in local governance structures.
- **Apex Bodies may be legally formalized** as pre-cooperatives or federations to gain formal recognition and access to services and facilities. They may also collaborate with participatory, community-focused cooperatives and people's organizations. However, SHGs remain autonomous and do not replace other village institutions. Instead, they complement and strengthen existing traditional and informal structures.

The concept of SHG apex bodies is a relatively new development in project planning, envisioned as a cluster-level approach in which two representatives from 10 to 12 SHGs form an Apex Body. Eventually, these Apex Bodies are expected to come together to form a third-tier district-level representative body. Given that the DRDA is also establishing SHGs and Apex Bodies based on the ILDP model, close collaboration between ILDP and DRDA is both feasible and desirable. To date, the project has supported the formation of 19 Apex Bodies. Discussions with members indicate that these bodies play a vital role in stabilizing and supporting individual SHGs. The main functions of the existing Apex Bodies include:

- Providing guidelines on SHG functioning, including record maintenance.
- Resolving conflicts within SHGs that cannot be managed internally; decisions made by the Apex Body are binding and respected.
- Strengthening weaker SHGs by holding meetings in a rotational manner across villages, reviewing group records and practices, and offering necessary advice.
- Utilizing collective bargaining power to procure inputs like seeds at bulk rates for distribution among members.
- Sharing experiences and providing training to members of new or emerging Apex Bodies within the block or in other blocks.

Review findings:

- Apex Bodies serve as effective forums for SHGs to engage with technical departments and express their needs.
- The district administration has recognized the effectiveness of Apex Bodies, and there is significant potential for replication of this model throughout the district.

IV. Village Committees (VCs)

Village Committees (VCs), in their current form, are based on the principles of self-governance. A VC comprises all adult members of the village, who elect an executive body of 15–20 members, with at least 50% women. The VC includes any local Panchayat member, traditional village council members, and four representatives from each SHG in the village. The VC is responsible for resource mobilization, planning, implementation, and monitoring and evaluation of village micro-plans. So far, 25 VCs have been established in Laxmipur, Koraput, Jeypore, and Kundra. Myrada, Bangalore, has trained three BET members on VC development, who have in turn trained all project staff.

Review findings:

- VCs represent the interests of all village families and have clearly defined objectives linked to village development. The community strongly supports the institution and recognizes its potential benefits.
- VCs are being formed in villages with strong existing SHGs. The community already understands the benefits of cohesive group functioning, which enhances motivation and participation.
- Well-developed VCs are expected to serve as effective interfaces between communities and external institutions, including government departments, marketing agencies, and political forums such as the Gram Panchayat.

V. SHG of Community Livelihood Workers (CLWs)

An SHG of Community Livelihood Workers (CLWs) has been initiated with the aim of mobilizing savings and extending credit to CLWs. This support is especially important for managing inputs related to their livelihood activities after the phasing out of the ILDP. The initiative is gaining momentum, and the response so far has been encouraging.

VI. Livestock Development and Agricultural Activities

- **The project trained over 2,800 farmers—both men and women—in animal husbandry, as well as agricultural and horticultural production.**
- **In 1997–98, a sheep and goat upgrading programme was introduced. Larger breed rams and bucks were distributed to selected villages where local rams and bucks were castrated.**

Although the programme was later discontinued, farmers appreciated the introduction of new breeds and reported that the crossbreeds fetched higher market prices.

- Over the past three years, on-farm trials and demonstrations were conducted on intercropping maize, sorghum, or finger millet with pigeon peas. This practice improved the productivity of the main crops due to the nitrogen-fixing properties of pigeon pea and provided an additional source of income. A key objective was to increase crop residue volume for livestock feed. While farmers have accepted intercropping, more time and effort are needed to encourage them to collect and store crop residues.
- Additional demonstrations focused on utilizing residual soil moisture by sowing leguminous crops (e.g., horse gram, Bengal gram, and field peas) before or immediately after the paddy harvest. The aim was to boost food production, improve soil fertility, and provide more fodder for livestock. As residual moisture cropping is unfamiliar in Koraput, more awareness and capacity-building are required.
- Traditionally, livestock graze freely in fields after the paddy harvest. This practice poses challenges for individual farmers wishing to cultivate a second crop. However, with the support of Village Committees, there is potential to reach a community consensus to limit free grazing, making residual moisture cropping more viable. Since Bengal gram and field peas are not traditional crops in the region, their adoption may be challenging.
- The Randapalli Farm has served as a testing ground for propagating various grasses, legumes, and traditional crops. A nursery for fodder trees was also established. The farm functions as a training centre for farmers, although its use has been limited to the ILDP due to resource constraints at the Animal Husbandry Department (AHD).

Impact of Livestock Development

- The number of households rearing livestock is significantly higher in ILDP villages compared to non-ILDP villages.
- Over the past three years, livestock populations have increased across ILDP villages. Households in these villages report higher ownership of goats, sheep, and poultry, along with greater sales volumes.
- Crossbreed goats and sheep introduced through ILDP attain marketable size within eight months, compared to over a year for traditional breeds, yielding better income.

Impact of ILDP on Crop Production

- ILDP villages have more land under commercial crops such as pulses, legumes, niger, cashew, and turmeric than non-ILDP villages. These crops have been well received by farmers.
- ILDP plains and hill villages report a higher percentage of marketable surplus in agricultural produce compared to non-ILDP areas.
- Demonstration plots in ILDP villages yielded 460 kg/acre of finger millet (ragi)—double the traditional yield. Some farmers using fertilizers achieved record yields of up to 800 kg/acre, showcasing the potential of improved seeds.
- The mixed cropping programmes introduced by ILDP have contributed to fodder development and soil enrichment, potentially easing pressure on grazing lands and reducing environmental degradation.

C. Mainstreaming the DANIDA-ILDP Model

The DANIDA-ILDP model, developed by the PMU-Jaipur team, is based on the institutional strengths of the Government of Odisha and partnerships with DANIDA. The model's effectiveness rests on four pillars:

1. Financial and technical assistance from DANIDA,
2. International exposure through training,
3. Introduction of scientific livestock and allied practices,
4. Cost-effective programme implementation.

Key highlights of mainstreaming include:

- The model's approaches and technologies hold regional significance for the economic upliftment of tribal areas.
- It enhances livestock productivity and sustainability, contributing to poverty reduction and improved livelihoods.
- ILDP placed a strong emphasis on empowering women by facilitating their access to credit and strengthening their role in agriculture.
- Women received training in modern production techniques and marketing, leading to income-generating activities and increased family earnings.
- A participatory approach was adopted, forming village-level women's associations that served as platforms for training, information dissemination, and mutual support.
- These associations empowered women, enhanced their confidence, and increased their role in decision-making.
- Parallel initiatives raised women's awareness and participation in environmental and developmental activities, fostering holistic community development.

ILDP Approach: Participatory Development for Empowerment

Prior to the inception of the Integrated Livestock Development Project (ILDP), the rural poor—particularly tribal and marginalized

communities—had minimal involvement in development planning or implementation. This exclusion stemmed from a lack of organizational structures to represent their interests. Isolated, under-educated, and often reliant on rural elites, these communities were not only disenfranchised but also lacked the means to access resources, markets, or challenge externally imposed programs and technologies that were often unsuited to their realities.

ILDP introduced a paradigm shift. The central lesson from its implementation is clear: meaningful and sustainable development cannot occur without the full participation of the rural poor. The ILDP experience in Koraput validated that *true participation* is achieved only when the poor are organized into small, democratic, informal groups of like-minded farmers who determine their own priorities and take collective action toward achieving them.

This participatory model offers several critical advantages for both the community and development agencies:

- **Economies of Scale:** Delivering services to scattered, small-scale producers is typically expensive and inefficient. Small participatory groups form an effective grassroots structure that reduces the per-unit cost of service delivery, thereby expanding the program's outreach and impact.
- **Increased Productivity and Adoption of Innovation:** When the poor are assured of equitable benefit-sharing, they become more receptive to new practices and technologies, leading to increased productivity, surplus generation, and reinvestment in rural development.
- **Efficiency through Local Knowledge:** Community involvement in planning and implementation reduces costs and leverages indigenous knowledge to better diagnose challenges and craft context-specific solutions.
- **Democratic Skill-Building:** The structure of small, informal groups supports skill development in collective decision-making and leadership. These experiences prepare communities to form federations and engage more effectively in broader governance structures.
- **Sustainability and Self-Reliance:** Participatory development fosters self-confidence and institutional self-reliance among the poor. Over time, this leads to the creation of durable, self-sustaining rural organizations that promote equitable economic growth and inclusive political participation.

Core Elements of the ILDP Participatory Model

Implementation reviews of ILDP highlight several foundational elements that contributed to its success and replicability:

- **Targeted Focus on the Rural Poor:** The project's design, strategies, and resource allocation were consistently oriented toward the

poorest households, especially those from tribal and marginalized backgrounds.

- **Promotion of Women's Participation:** ILDP actively worked to integrate women into development processes—offering training, facilitating access to credit, and promoting women-led income-generating activities. Women's groups became key drivers of local transformation, enhancing their social status and economic agency.
- **Formation of Small Groups:** Group-based organization allowed poor households to collectively access services, savings, and knowledge. These groups became the cornerstone for local governance and decision-making.
- **Deployment of Community Link Workers:** Trained community members served as intermediaries, linking the project with local households. They ensured knowledge dissemination, trust-building, and sustained engagement with project activities.
- **Livelihood-Based Interventions:** Through focused activities in agriculture, horticulture, and animal husbandry, the project enabled income enhancement while also contributing to food security and resource sustainability.
- **Promotion of Savings and Credit:** Encouraging both group savings and access to credit (both group and individual) built financial literacy, resilience, and autonomy among rural households.
- **Capacity Building and Training:** Regular training empowered beneficiaries with technical knowledge and organizational skills. This built long-term human capital that extended beyond the project's lifespan.
- **Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation (PM&E):** Communities were involved in assessing the progress and outcomes of activities. This ensured accountability, continuous learning, and ownership of results.
- **Fostering Self-Reliance:** The ultimate aim of ILDP was to promote self-sufficiency through empowered, informed, and organized community structures capable of continuing development independently.

The ILDP model represents a holistic and inclusive approach to rural development that aligns well with contemporary ideas of rights-based, gender-sensitive, and sustainable development. It provides a valuable blueprint for similar interventions across other underdeveloped and tribal regions.

Costs and Benefits of ILDP

The cost-effectiveness of the Integrated Livelihoods Development Project (ILDP) is a critical measure of its economic and financial viability. While the participatory nature of ILDP requires initial investment and support, its long-term success hinges on fostering self-reliance

among rural communities, thus ensuring declining costs and increasing returns over time.

Cost Analysis

The ILDP was implemented over a span of seven years, with donor contributions averaging ₹86,38,714. These external funds covered most of the total project costs. Since its inception in 1994, ILDP facilitated the formation of 150 groups, encompassing 2,710 member households and indirectly benefiting at least 14,000 individuals, including dependents.

- Average Annual Cost per Group: ₹57,591
- Cost per Member: ₹3,187
- Cost per Beneficiary: Less than ₹617

Although the cost per participant and per beneficiary appeared high during the initial phases—primarily due to staff training and group formation—these costs declined significantly as project mechanisms matured and groups achieved self-reliance. In larger-scale, mainstream projects, average costs are expected to reduce further due to economies of scale.

Additional Participatory Costs

Incorporating participatory development approaches entails specific recurring and one-time expenditures:

- Recruitment and limited-term engagement of locally recruited field workers or community facilitators for group formation and support.
 - Training and capacity-building workshops for both staff and participants on participatory methods and group dynamics.
 - Annual review and evaluation workshops to track progress and adapt strategies.
 - Participatory socio-economic research and monitoring for data-driven planning and feedback loops.
-

Benefit Analysis

The benefits of ILDP, although varied and in some cases intangible, clearly outweigh the initial and operational costs. These benefits are evident both at the individual household level and in broader community and societal impacts:

1. Improved Agricultural Productivity and Food Security

- ILDP groups recorded a 20% higher maize yield per hectare compared to non-participants.
- Finger millet (ragi) yields on demonstration plots reached 460 kg/acre—double the area average—and up to 800 kg/acre for farmers using fertilizers.
- Animal husbandry interventions significantly boosted income:
 - Poultry: ₹2,000 to ₹4,500 per household
 - Goat/Sheep: ₹1,000 to ₹3,000
 - Pigs: ₹1,400 to ₹1,500

- Animal survival rates increased by 80–100% due to disease control and improved feeding practices.
2. **Enhanced Nutritional Intake**
 - Per capita cereal consumption in ILDP areas exceeded that of non-ILDP areas by 10%.
 - Meat consumption was 20–25% higher in project villages.
 - Increased backyard cultivation of vegetables and fruits boosted household nutrition and reduced dependency on markets.
 3. **Increased Household Incomes**
 - Hill blocks: ILDP household income was ₹15,236 versus ₹10,965 in non-ILDP areas—an increase of ₹4,271.
 - Plains: ILDP household income was ₹17,527 versus ₹14,009—an increase of ₹3,518.
 - Incremental income per household rose by approximately ₹5,000 annually, pushing many households above the poverty line.
 4. **Improved Employment and Labour Utilization**
 - ILDP's low-cost, labour-intensive agricultural techniques increased farm labour demand.
 - Higher production per hectare led to more consistent employment opportunities in rural areas.
 5. **Mobilization of Savings and Reduced Debt Burden**
 - Per capita savings of ₹2,000 emerged as a significant milestone for communities with no prior savings culture.
 - Self-Help Groups (SHGs) provided affordable credit at 2% monthly interest, far below moneylenders' rates (6–10%).
 - Many households were able to reclaim mortgaged land and invest in productive assets, education, and health, thanks to timely and low-cost credit access.
 6. **Acquisition of Technical and Organizational Skills**
 - ILDP participants gained technical knowledge, leadership abilities, and organizational capabilities, leading to stronger community institutions.
 - Group-based learning enabled collective problem-solving and fostered a sense of ownership, mutual support, and innovation.
 7. **Economic Return**
 - The Economic Rate of Return (ERR) for ILDP was calculated at 22%, which is a robust indicator of value for money in rural development programming.

Conclusion

The Integrated Livelihoods Development Project demonstrates a cost-effective, participatory development model that yields substantial and sustainable socio-economic benefits. While the start-up phase involves considerable investment in training, capacity building, and facilitation, the long-term dividends—manifested in increased income, productivity, food security, employment, and self-reliance—justify the

costs. The ILDP's approach underscores the critical importance of empowering rural poor communities through inclusive, group-based strategies and grassroots leadership.

Benefits for Society as a Whole

The ILDP (Integrated Livelihood Development Programme) provides substantial societal benefits that extend beyond individual participants, contributing to the broader development ecosystem. These benefits can be grouped into five key areas:

1. Creation of Low-Cost, Self-Sustaining Rural Service Systems

A core societal benefit of ILDP is the establishment of “zero-cost” or low-cost receiving systems that evolve into self-sustaining mechanisms requiring minimal external subsidy. The participatory group-based model facilitates more efficient service delivery in rural areas compared to conventional approaches. For instance, financial institutions benefit from reduced transaction costs through group-based credit and savings mechanisms, which also result in higher loan repayment rates. This translates into significant fiscal savings for governments and donors. Additionally, Community Livestock Workers (CLWs), once fully integrated and supported by Self-Help Groups (SHGs), offer a model of sustainable service delivery through market-based and credit-linked systems.

2. Development of Rural Infrastructure at Minimal Cost

ILDP groups have demonstrated the ability to initiate and execute community development initiatives, such as cleaning village drains and maintaining communal resources. These activities are often carried out using voluntary labour and locally available materials, minimizing government expenditure. This community-driven infrastructure development fosters ownership, sustainability, and responsiveness to local needs.

3. Strengthening of Rural Institutions

One of the systemic impacts of ILDP is its role in revitalizing local institutions. Traditional rural governance and development bodies often suffer from limited participation and accountability. ILDP groups, by linking with existing institutions, enhance grassroots participation and transparency. As community members engage more directly with decision-making processes, institutional performance improves, reducing dependency on external technical or financial assistance.

4. Empowerment of Women

The ILDP model has significantly advanced gender equity and women's empowerment. Women have gained access to formal credit systems, secured land titles, and established connections with line departments. The practice of rotational leadership within SHGs has nurtured a cadre of tribal women leaders who actively participate in local governance and civic dialogue. Furthermore, there has been a marked increase in gender sensitivity within community institutions, with greater attention to women's development concerns. This shift contributes to broader societal change in gender norms and practices.

5. Capacity Building and Enabling Environment

ILDP has contributed to creating an enabling environment for sustainable development by investing in capacity building at multiple levels. Through systematic training and participatory processes, community members have developed critical technical, organizational, and leadership skills. This empowerment has led to the emergence of more informed and capable rural citizens who are equipped to sustain development initiatives and engage constructively with external agencies.

Conclusion

From a societal perspective, the ILDP model offers a replicable framework for rural development that is participatory, cost-effective, and empowering. By fostering community ownership, enhancing institutional functionality, and catalyzing social transformation—especially for women—the programme delivers long-term systemic benefits. The holistic and inclusive design of ILDP demonstrates that developmental interventions, when grounded in local participation and self-reliance, can produce both individual and collective gains.

Integrated Livestock Development Programme (ILDP) Replication Strategy – KBK Region, Odisha

Overview

The Integrated Livestock Development Programme (ILDP) has demonstrated measurable success in improving rural livelihoods through community-based livestock interventions. The Government of Odisha, in collaboration with development partners, now proposes replicating the ILDP model in the backward KBK region – one of the poorest zones in India, comprising districts like Nabarangpur, Malkangiri, and Koraput. These districts face chronic poverty, erratic rainfall, underutilized water resources, and recurrent droughts. The replication aims to scale effective models that promote livestock development, improve household incomes, and build community resilience.

Key Interventions for Replication
The replication model comprises a package of interlinked interventions:

- Community-led veterinary services through trained Community Link Workers (CLWs) for first aid and poultry disease control.
- Livestock extension and training programs for small ruminants and poultry.

- Dual-purpose mixed cropping systems to enhance food and fodder security.
- Promotion and federation of Self-Help Groups (SHGs) into apex bodies with linkages to DRDA and ITDA.
- Formation of Village Development Committees (VDCs) and introduction of Village Revolving Funds (VRFs).

Strategic Replication Plan

- **Phase I:** Replication will begin in two new districts (Nabarangpur and Malkangiri) and non-ILDP blocks of Koraput.
- **Geographic Scope:** Initial coverage includes 31 blocks, 402 Panchayats, and over 2,700 villages, benefiting over 5.3 lakh households across the region.
- **Institutional Anchoring:** The strategy leverages existing government personnel, including 175 Veterinary Assistant Surgeons and 708 Livestock Inspectors, trained in ILDP protocols to ensure sustainable scaling within the public extension framework.

Why ILDP Matters

- Proven improvement in animal health services access and income diversification for tribal and marginalized communities.
- Strengthens women's participation through SHGs and federation models.
- Enhances food and nutrition security through integrated livestock and crop systems.
- Builds local capacity through community-based cadres, ensuring ownership and sustainability.

Call for Support

We seek donor partnership to fund the scaling of ILDP in KBK districts—supporting training, capacity building, field mobilization, and innovation in livestock service delivery. Your support will directly contribute to poverty alleviation, resilience-building, and inclusive rural development in one of India's most vulnerable regions.

Replication Strategy for the Integrated Livelihood Development Programme (ILDP)

Targeting Livelihood Enhancement and Community Empowerment in the KBK Region

1. Objective of the Replication Strategy

The ILDP replication strategy aims to upscale successful interventions of the original project to similar socio-economic and agro-ecological regions, with the core goal of improving rural livelihoods, promoting community-based development, and ensuring long-term sustainability. The focus is to ensure scalability without dilution of quality, and to mainstream the ILDP model into the existing extension systems of the government and other development agencies.

2. Guiding Principles for Replication

- **Consolidation before Expansion:** Secure and reinforce achievements from the initial phase—particularly institutional strengthening and service delivery mechanisms—before expanding into new areas.
- **Adjacency and Contiguity:** Prioritize expansion into districts or blocks adjacent to original ILDP areas for easier management, staff mobility, resource sharing, and institutional collaboration.
- **Replication Package Integrity:** Maintain all critical ILDP components in the replication phase; if scaling constraints arise, reduce geographic coverage rather than omitting essential interventions.
- **Sustainability and Institutional Linkage:** Strengthen integration with government programs (e.g., DRDA, ITDA, OLM), and local institutions (SHGs, Panchayats, producer groups).
- **Community Ownership:** Promote local leadership, decentralized planning, and ownership through SHGs, federations, and village-level committees.
- **Gender and Social Inclusion:** Ensure targeted participation of women, SC/ST communities, and vulnerable households in all aspects of project replication.

3. Strategic Components of Replication

A. Institutional Framework and Human Resource Deployment

- **Core Staff Deployment & Capacity Building:**
 - Train existing veterinary and livestock personnel (175 VAS, 708 LIs) in ILDP methodologies.
 - Create district-level ILDP cells within Animal Husbandry Departments.
 - Recruit and train new Community Organizers (COs), preferably local youth, mentored by experienced senior COs.
 - Form Inter-Group Federations to serve as anchors for training, credit facilitation, and technology dissemination.
- **Coordination Mechanisms:**
 - District Steering Committees chaired by the Collector, with members from DRDA, Agriculture, Veterinary, Panchayati Raj, WCD, NGOs, and SHG federations.
 - Block-level Coordination Committees for planning and implementation oversight.

B. Geographic Rollout Plan

Initial Phase (2–3 Years):

Start replication in:

- Nabarangpur District: 10 blocks, 148 panchayats, 880 villages
- Malkangiri District: 7 blocks, 77 panchayats, 878 villages

- Non-ILDP blocks of Koraput District: 14 blocks total, expansion limited to uncovered blocks
- | | | | |
|------------|--------|------|---------|
| Subsequent | Phases | (3–5 | Years): |
|------------|--------|------|---------|
- Gradual expansion to:
- Rayagada, Kalahandi, Nuapada, Bolangir, and Sonepur districts
- | | | | |
|-----------|----------|-----|------------------|
| Selection | Criteria | for | Blocks/Villages: |
|-----------|----------|-----|------------------|
- High poverty rates, tribal population concentration, existing SHGs, livestock ownership patterns, proximity to existing ILDP areas.

C. ILDP Intervention Package for Replication

1. Livestock and Veterinary Services

- Train and deploy Community Livestock Workers (CLWs) for poultry disease control, first-aid services.
- Integrate CLWs with SHGs for financial sustainability through user fees or service contracts.
- Promote vaccination drives, mobile vet camps, and preventive care awareness.

2. Small Animal Development

- Provide support for backyard poultry, goat, sheep, and pig rearing.
- Link livestock rearers to credit facilities, markets, and technical training.
- Use SHG federations to aggregate production and access institutional buyers.

3. Agriculture and Cropping Systems

- Promote dual-purpose mixed cropping systems to improve food and fodder availability.
- Link farmers to input suppliers and promote improved practices via demonstration plots.

4. Capacity Building and Training

- Train SHGs in enterprise development, group management, and financial literacy.
- Promote leadership through rotational roles and exposure visits.

5. Institutional Development

- Facilitate formation of SHGs, federations, village committees, and apex bodies.
- Set up Village Revolving Funds managed by SHG federations to support livelihood ventures.
- Ensure convergence with ITDA, DRDA, and Panchayat programs for institutional support.

6. Logistics and Infrastructure Support

- Support infrastructure for training centers, veterinary aid posts, and demonstration units.
 - Ensure communication and transport support for field workers and CLWs.
-

4. Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E)

- Establish an M&E framework aligned with key ILDP outcome indicators:
 - Household income increases
 - SHG functionality and credit linkages
 - Livestock mortality and productivity
 - Participation of women and tribal households
 - Use MIS systems for real-time data tracking
 - Conduct regular third-party evaluations and community scorecards
-

5. Risk Mitigation Measures

- Dilution of Quality: Limit simultaneous expansion; consolidate gains in existing areas first.
 - Staff Shortages: Engage retired officials, NGOs, and promote internal cadre development.
 - Resource Constraints: Leverage convergence funds from government schemes like NRLM, MGNREGS, OLM.
 - Weather Vulnerability: Promote climate-resilient agriculture and water harvesting structures.
-

6. Timeline and Milestones

Phase Timeframe Key Activities

Phase I Year 1–2 Staff training, pilot replication in 2 districts

Phase II Year 3–4 Expansion to Koraput and Rayagada

Phase III Year 5 Expansion to rest of KBK districts

7. Expected Outcomes by Year 5

- 2,500+ new SHGs formed and federated
- 500+ CLWs trained and active
- 50,000 households benefiting from improved livelihoods
- Veterinary service access improved in 80% of villages
- 100% increase in average income of target households
- 50% reduction in livestock mortality
- Enhanced women's leadership in local development structures

analytical Overview of Workshop on ILDP Replication

On 23rd November 2001, a workshop was convened at the Gopabandhu Academy of Development Administration, Bhubaneswar, with the aim of discussing the replication of the Integrated Livestock Development Programme (ILDP) in other districts of the KBK region in Odisha. The workshop brought together participants from a wide array of sectors, including government officials from the Animal Husbandry and Allied Departments, bilateral agencies, and development experts. The discussions focused on key lessons learned from the ILDP, as well

as strategies for expanding the model to other regions in Odisha, particularly in the KBK districts.

Objectives of the Workshop

1. **Evaluation of ILDP Interventions:** Participants reviewed the most effective and adaptable interventions of the ILDP, with an emphasis on scalability and sustainability for replication in KBK districts.
2. **Formulation of Replication Strategies:** The workshop aimed to develop comprehensive strategies for replication, emphasizing alignment with regional needs, resource availability, and institutional support systems.

Key Issues for Discussion

The workshop participants deliberated on several crucial issues that needed to be addressed before proceeding with the replication of the ILDP model. These issues were centered around community-based delivery systems, policy alignment, and institutional support mechanisms.

i. Community Link Worker (CLW) Incentive Structure

1. **Honorarium and Financial Sustainability:**
 - The ILDP provided CLWs with a monthly honorarium of Rs. 200, alongside a veterinary first aid kit and essential medicines. A critical issue discussed was the sustainability of this honorarium in the context of replication. It was questioned whether the model could be replicated in a way that removes financial incentives or reduces them over time.
 - The viability of introducing a system without financial incentives during the training period was debated, as CLWs are central to the success of the ILDP delivery system.
 - Discussions also focused on whether SHGs, village committees, or other community organizations could bear the costs of training and the provision of kits.
2. **Incorporating Broader Institutional Support:**
 - A key challenge identified was how to involve various institutional stakeholders such as Panchayati Raj Institutions (PRIs), NGOs, ITDA, DRDA, and Watershed Projects in the delivery and sustainability of the ILDP model.
 - Participants raised the importance of aligning local governance structures with the needs of the community, considering the active presence of NGOs and community-based organizations (CBOs) in the region. This could help in integrating the CLW model within existing local frameworks.
3. **Policy and Licensing Considerations:**
 - The necessity of policy reforms at the state level to enable the official recognition of CLWs as legitimate service providers was a significant issue. Questions around

whether licensing or authorization was necessary for CLWs to operate in the rural setup were raised.

- Cold chain facilities for vaccines and medicines were also discussed as an essential part of the replication model, especially at the block and panchayat levels.

ii. Support for Backyard Poultry and Small Livestock

1. Alignment with State and National Policies:

- The workshop acknowledged the growing demand from farmers for interventions in backyard poultry and the development of small livestock (e.g., sheep, goats, and pigs). Participants explored how well these interventions fit into existing state and national policies aimed at livestock development.
- It was noted that the ILDP experience showed positive results in promoting such activities, but questions arose about the sustainability and scale of these interventions in a broader context.

2. Role of Government in Replication:

- A central issue was how government agencies could effectively scale these interventions, ensuring coordination across sectors and avoiding overlap with other schemes.

iii. Support for Dual-Purpose Mixed Cropping Systems

- The introduction of dual-purpose mixed cropping systems, combining cereals and legumes, was discussed as an effective intervention for improving food security and income diversification in rural households. The key question was whether the mainstream extension system could effectively incorporate this intervention, considering its multi-sectoral nature (involving both agriculture and livestock).

iv. Methodology for Replication at Various Levels

- A robust methodology for replication was discussed, emphasizing the need for a district-level approach that involved collaboration with local institutions such as PRIs, NGOs, and CBOs.
- The importance of local knowledge and customized solutions for each district was highlighted. Additionally, networking and partnerships with other community-driven initiatives, such as watershed planning and land rights movements, were deemed essential to creating a holistic model for rural development.

v. Involvement of Other Stakeholders

- The workshop identified the participation of local communities and civic institutions as crucial to the success of ILDP replication. The involvement of Panchayati Raj Institutions (PRIs) and NGOs was particularly stressed as they are already active in 10% of villages in the region. These organizations are involved in various livelihood support programs, such as minor irrigation, land rights, grain and seed banks, and micro-financing.

- The need for intersectoral collaboration between government departments and civil society organizations was seen as pivotal to creating a synergistic effect for rural development.

Conclusion and Way Forward

The workshop successfully highlighted several key challenges and opportunities in the replication of the ILDP model in the KBK districts. There is a consensus that careful planning, institutional support, and policy alignment will be critical for the successful scaling of the program. Stakeholders recognized the importance of community ownership, collaboration between various development players, and sustainability of interventions as essential for ensuring that the ILDP model becomes a long-term solution to improving the livelihoods of rural communities in Odisha.

Inauguration

The workshop was formally inaugurated by Dr. K.J.S. Chatrath, I.A.S., Chief Administrator of the KBK Area Development Project and Director General of the Gopabandhu Academy of Administration, Bhubaneswar. Dr. N. Dhar, JD, AHD, Government of Orissa, welcomed the participants and dignitaries.

Other distinguished attendees included Mr. S.C. Hota, I.A.S., APC-cum-Principal Secretary of F&ARD, Bhubaneswar; Mr. S.C. Mohapatra, I.A.S., Managing Director of OMFED, Bhubaneswar; Mr. Peter Ellehoj, Counsellor, Royal Danish Embassy, New Delhi; Mr. Mahendra Pal, Senior Programme Officer, Royal Danish Embassy, New Delhi; Mr. Jan Morrenhof, Chief Coordinator, ISPO, Bhubaneswar; Dr. S. Dash (Consultant); Dr. Aurobindo Padhee, I.A.S., Collector, Koraput; Ms. Sandhya Das, Danida Advisor (TEWA), Bhubaneswar; Dr. Abhimanyu Mishra, Project Director ILDP/CDVO, Koraput; Dr. S.B. Tripathy, Retd. Professor (Veterinary Medicine), Bhubaneswar; Mr. Helge Brunse, Chief Advisor, ILDP, Jeypore; and Mr. Kornel Das, Danida Advisor, ILDP, Jeypore.

Presentation on ILDP: Activities & Achievements

The major achievements of ILDP were presented as follows:

- Trained 200 Community Link Workers (100 women and 100 men).
- Formed 150 Self-Help Groups (SHGs) comprising 2,700 villagers, with 23 more SHGs in the formative stages.
- Formed 19 SHG Apex Bodies comprising 231 SHGs (96 from DRDA, 135 from ILDP).
- Established 25 Village Committees.
- Disbursed Rs. 2.3 million through Village Revolving Funds.
- Trained approximately 2,800 farmers (both men and women) on livestock and allied extension practices, including animal husbandry, agriculture, and horticultural production.
- Conducted over 300 on-farm trials and demonstrations on various cropping patterns, enhancing grain yield and livestock feed availability.

- Supported a local farm that grew various grasses and legumes, distributing seeds and cuttings to farmers.
- Ran a goat and sheep upgrading program, introducing indigenous breeds to selected villages.

Impact

- The introduction of CLWs and a regular poultry vaccination program in the villages resulted in a significant reduction in poultry mortality (mainly due to Ranikhet Disease), leading to an increase in household income.
- The formation of SHGs boosted villagers' (especially women's) confidence, enabling them to initiate income-generating activities in livestock and agriculture.
- SHG Apex Bodies provided sustainable support to the village SHGs.
- Village Committees created a platform for villagers to plan and implement activities for the entire community.
- The provision of Village Revolving Funds (VRFs) helped initiate planned activities by supplementing SHG savings (maximum Rs. 2,000 per member).
- A review of SHGs in ILDP villages indicated a reduction in dependence on money lenders, with interest rates declining and distress selling of farm produce and small animals reducing.
- On-farm demonstration plots and mini-kits helped farmers adopt new agricultural production methods, leading to increased yields of both grain and straw.
- The introduction of larger sheep and goats increased birth weight and growth rate, providing incremental net income.

Replicable Milestones Developed by ILDP

The ILDP model introduced key elements that were deemed replicable and were discussed in detail:

- Community Link Workers (CLWs)
- ILDP Model Self Help Groups (SHGs)
- SHG Apex Bodies
- Village Committees
- SHGs of CLWs
- Livestock Development and Agricultural Activities

The SHG of CLWs, particularly, was designed to mobilize savings and extend credit to CLWs to manage inputs for their activities, especially after the phase-out of ILDP. This initiative showed promising results.

Impact of Livestock Development under ILDP

- The number of households rearing livestock in ILDP villages is higher than in non-ILDP villages.
- Over the past three years, the livestock population in ILDP villages has increased.
- A higher percentage of households in ILDP villages rear livestock compared to non-ILDP villages.

- Households in ILDP villages possess more goats, sheep, and poultry, with higher sales of these animals.
- Crossbred goats and sheep introduced by ILDP fetched higher income due to their marketable size, achieved in 8 months as compared to over a year for traditional breeds.

Impact of ILDP on Crop Production

- The area under commercial crops, particularly pulses, legumes, oilseeds like niger, cashew, and turmeric, is higher in ILDP villages than in non-ILDP villages.
- ILDP villages show a higher percentage of marketable surplus in agricultural produce compared to non-ILDP villages.
- The yield of finger millet (ragi) from ILDP demonstration plots was 460 kg per acre, double the yield obtained using traditional seeds without fertilizer.
- Some farmers using fertilizer achieved record yields of 800 kg per acre, indicating the potential of improved seed varieties.
- The mixed cropping program introduced by ILDP helped conserve grazing lands, reducing environmental degradation, while also improving soil quality by utilizing crop residues as fodder.

4o mini



Presentation on Replicability of the ILDP Model

In this session, discussions were focused on the following lessons learned from the ILDP:

- **The appropriateness of tribal animal husbandry practices, particularly those related to small animals, and the build-ups attempted by ILDP over the project period.**
- **The amount of household savings after consumption in the ILDP target households was clarified, showing that it was substantial within the context of tribal production systems.**
- **Exposure to farming practices, on-field demonstrations, and timely availability of credit had brought significant changes to household economies, particularly in terms of income from agriculture.**
- **Savings and credit activities had provided a boost to non-farm activities throughout the year, including the processing of turmeric, pulses, hill brooms, etc.**
- **The project had established clear linkages and collaborations with district administration.**
- **The feasibility of inter-cropping and linking it with improved agricultural practices, such as stall-feeding and enhanced milk and meat production, was discussed.**
- **The impact of ILDP on social parameters, such as education, decreasing school dropouts, and increasing emphasis on the education of girls, was highlighted.**

- The Community Link Worker (CLW) effort in increasing hen units and poultry populations in the project areas was emphasized.

Benefits of ILDP to Participants:

The benefits of ILDP were presented, with the following key indicators:

- Increased food production.
- Higher per capita consumption.
- Higher net family incomes.
- Higher incremental income.
- Higher economic rate of return.
- Increased employment opportunities.
- Higher rates of saving.
- Higher income due to SHG involvement.
- Acquisition of new skills through training.
- Building of rural community infrastructure at a low cost.
- Strengthening of rural institutions.
- Women empowerment.
- Capacity building and promotion of an enabling environment.

Participants' Reactions, Questions, Suggestions, and Observations:

Participants expressed their positive perceptions of ILDP based on feedback they had received from formal and informal sources about the program's success in Koraput. They acknowledged the synergy between the KBK region's development objectives and ILDP's goals.

Several issues were discussed, including:

- Honorarium for community link workers.
- The possibility of introducing a distribution system based on CLWs without incentives.
- The feasibility of providing a monthly honorarium of Rs. 200 to CLWs and veterinary first aid kits and medicines in the replication model in other districts.
- Options for CLW trainees to pay for training and the involvement of PRI, NGOs, ITDA, DRDA, and Watershed Projects.
- Potential for focusing replication on villages with SHGs and networking with these SHGs.
- Ideas for SHGs or village committees to fund training and/or kits.
- The need to strengthen the capabilities of AHD and local veterinary hospitals to support CLWs.
- Provision of cold chain facilities at the block and panchayat level.
- Policy initiatives needed by the Government of Odisha to embrace the CLW model.
- The need for licensing or authorization for CLWs to work.
- The policy relevance of supporting small farm animal development (poultry, goats, sheep, pigs) and its fit within the state's or national policies.
- The potential for integrating dual-purpose mixed cropping of cereals and legumes into the mainstream extension system.
- Replication methodologies at district, block, and village levels.

- Involvement of other stakeholders like Panchayati Raj and civic institutions and the adequacy of the monitoring and evaluation system developed by ILDP.
- The effect of de-worming cattle in 100 villages on neighboring areas (whether the effect is temporary or spread to other panchayats).
- A comprehensive livestock policy by the Government of Odisha is yet to be developed, but there was emphasis on a holistic approach addressing poverty and livelihood, with a focus on promoting small animal development without ecological degradation.

Participants' Response on a Replicable Model:

Based on the lessons and benefits from ILDP, the replication strategy was proposed as follows:

1. Through expansion of project activities in adjacent areas:
The essential project interventions would be fully consolidated and made sustainable within various line departments. Replication of critical elements would occur both within Koraput district and in adjacent districts. These elements include:
 - The veterinary delivery system through CLWs/facilitators for poultry disease control and veterinary first aid.
 - Extension and training activities.
 - Low-cost skills within the small animal and village poultry production system, including support for poultry and other small animals (sheep, goats, pigs).
 - Promotion of dual-purpose mixed cropping systems.
 - Logistical support for forming SHGs and Apex Bodies of SHGs, and their integration into DRDA, ITDA, and other agencies.
 - Creation of Village Development Funds (VDF) and Village Revolving Funds (VRF) through SHGs.
2. Through multiplication—launching similar projects in other districts:
It was proposed to replicate the project across the KBK region, starting with two new districts: Nabarangpur and Malkangiri, as well as non-ILDP blocks in Koraput. These districts are among the poorest in India, with 80% of the population below the poverty line.
3. Through the introduction of ILDP components in larger-scale rural development projects and programs:
In non-ILDP or new areas, establishing linkages in the expansion phase would be crucial. Information about existing groups, people's organizations, and development agencies will be key to ensuring collaboration. Conceptual models from ILDP, such as CLWs, SHGs, Apex Bodies, and Village Committees, will be integrated into rural development projects through convergence with other line departments. Other agencies, such as OMFED and

watershed projects, can support the training and implementation of CLWs, facilitating replication.

4. **Relevance of privatization of certain veterinary practices:** Various models were discussed for continuing the CLW concept as a veterinary delivery system, including:
 - **Government model**
 - **Market model**
 - **Mixed government and market model**

The Critical Factors Emerging from the Discussion on Modalities for Replication:

1. **Time Frame for Replication:**
 - The replication process should span over a minimum period of **2 years** during the phasing-out period. This duration should include both **introduction** and **consolidation** phases to ensure that the model can be effectively implemented and sustained.
2. **Funding:**
 - **Resource constraints** due to the **withdrawal of Danida assistance** immediately after the phasing-out period must be addressed. It is critical to plan for financial sustainability post-funding.
3. **Geographical Coverage:**
 - During the phasing-out period, the focus should be on the **most vulnerable blocks**. Criteria for selection should include:
 - **Relative inaccessibility** or **connectivity** issues.
 - **Vulnerability to food stress** and **seasonality**.
 - The districts fitting these criteria, as suggested, are **Rayagada** (Kashipur and Chandrapur) and **Nawarangpur** (Chandahandi, Kosakoda).
 - Additionally, there is a suggestion to cover the **entire undivided Koraput District**, particularly focusing on blocks such as **Kudmulkuma** and **Khariar**.
4. **Convergence:**
 - The model's success depends on collaboration with **other stakeholders** such as **OMFED, DRDA, and ITDA** in the KBK region.

Suggestions

Impact Study:

- To assess the **impact of ILDP on 5000 households**, an impact study should be conducted, covering several parameters with a reference to the benchmark. This study should consider:
 - **Incremental income.**

- **Reduction in mortality rate** of small animals.
- **Savings generation** while maintaining village fund structures.
- **Spread effect** of de-worming and other activities to neighboring villages, blocks, and panchayats, particularly among the **100 ILDP villages**.
- The suggested methodology for the impact study includes:
 - Covering all **100 villages**.
 - Taking a **sample of families** from each village.
 - Using **statistical estimation** to project the likely impact of the project and forecast the spread effect.

Replicability of the Model:

- The **interaction between the Animal Husbandry Department (AHD)** and the ILDP project must be **strengthened** for successful replication.
- **Regular interaction** with the line departments was repeatedly emphasized for smooth implementation and replication.

Study on the Economics of Successful Practices Developed Through ILDP

Background of the Study:

The ILDP, implemented in **Koraput District** from **April 1994 to March 2002**, developed several successful practices with potential for replication in the region. The **economic impact** of these practices forms the basis for this in-depth study.

Project Achievements:

1. **Community Link Workers (CLWs):**
 - Trained **males and females** as community link workers to enhance veterinary services and disease control, particularly for poultry.
2. **Self-Help Groups (SHGs):**
 - Created SHGs with a focus on **livestock** and **microfinance** activities.
 - Provided **Village Revolving Funds (VRF)** to promote savings and credit.
3. **Farmer Training:**
 - Conducted training on **livestock** and **agriculture** practices, improving production and knowledge.
4. **On-Farm Trials and Demonstrations:**
 - Showcased **improved cropping patterns**, which not only increased grain yield but also produced residual by-products as **livestock feed**.
5. **Livestock Development:**
 - Introduced **indigenous sheep and goat breeds**, focusing on improving growth and productivity.

Impact:

1. **Reduction in Poultry Mortality:**
 - Regular vaccination programs significantly **reduced poultry mortality** (especially due to Ranikhet Disease), increasing household income.
2. **Increased Confidence and Income:**
 - SHG formation, particularly for women, boosted confidence and initiated **income-generating activities**, including livestock and agriculture.
3. **Sustainable Support through Apex Bodies:**
 - SHG **apex bodies** provided ongoing support to village-level SHGs.
4. **Decreased Dependence on Moneylenders:**
 - SHGs helped reduce the influence of moneylenders by lowering **interest rates**, allowing households to save more.
5. **Improved Agricultural Practices:**
 - **On-farm demonstrations** showed farmers how to improve agricultural productivity, leading to **higher yields**.
6. **Increased Livestock Productivity:**
 - **Larger sheep and goat breeds** increased birth weights and growth rates, resulting in **incremental net income** for farmers.

Need for a Cost-Effectiveness Study:

The **cost-effectiveness** study is crucial for the following reasons:

- To assess the **economic viability** of the introduced practices from both a **financial** and **economic perspective**.
- To determine the **regional significance** of these practices for **economic growth**, particularly in **tribal areas**.

Objectives of the Study:

1. **Economic Analysis at Two Levels:**
 - **Individual Level:** Focused on increased food production, per capita consumption, income, savings, and skills.
 - **Community Level:** Focused on the economic impact for different categories of households and the economics of **women empowerment**, **capacity building**, and **enabling environment**.

Individual Level Indicators:

- Increased **food production** and **per capita consumption**.
- Higher **net family incomes** and **incremental income**.
- **Economic Rate of Return** and **higher savings**.
- Income due to SHG formation and **Village Revolving Funds**.
- Acquisition of **new skills** and their **market potential**.

Community Level Indicators:

- Economic outcomes for different household categories (**landless, marginal, small, medium**).
- **Women empowerment** and the **impact of capacity building**.

DANIDA-ILDP Model: Lessons and Insights

The DANIDA-ILDP (Integrated Livelihood Development Project) in Koraput and its subsequent adaptation in other regions provides valuable insights into the effectiveness of rural development strategies focused on community-driven initiatives, livestock management, and women's empowerment. Below is an analytical summary of the key lessons and findings from the project:

Key Lessons from the DANIDA-ILDP Model

1. **Literacy as a Pre-requisite for Effective Learning:**
The literacy levels of Community Livestock Workers (CLWs) played a crucial role in the effectiveness of their activities, particularly in learning, recording, and handling drugs. Higher literacy levels correlated with better performance in these roles. This was evidenced in both the DANIDA-assisted watershed project in Koraput and the similar implementation in KVK, Semiliguda, where better-educated CLWs showed greater competency in their responsibilities.
2. **Expanding Veterinary Service Needs:**
As more species of animals were raised, the need for veterinary services expanded. This shift was reflected in the differential earning from CLW services in the project areas, with the demand for diversified services influencing their financial sustainability.
3. **Community and SHG Funding of CLW Services:**
The experiment of funding CLW services through community sources, particularly Village Committees (VCs) and Self-Help Groups (SHGs), proved successful. These localized funding mechanisms ensured the continuity and sustainability of services at the grassroots level.
4. **Cooperation with Traditional Veterinary Providers:**
Collaboration between CLWs and traditional veterinary service providers enhanced the efficiency and reach of CLW services. This partnership was essential for ensuring broader community buy-in and trust.

The Effectiveness of the DANIDA-ILDP Model

1. **Inclusion of Poor and Women in Development Planning:**
One of the standout features of the ILDP model was its emphasis on involving the tribal poor, especially women, in development planning. Before the ILDP, these groups were often excluded from the decision-making process. The introduction of organizational structures allowed them to influence socio-economic development both at the village and regional levels.
2. **Enabling Participation for Rural Poor:**
The model emphasized the need to provide the rural poor with the means to participate fully in development. This realization led to the formation of grassroots organizations, such as SHGs and VCs, which empowered the poor to actively engage in development processes and share in the benefits of the services offered.

3. **Pooling Efforts for Efficient Resource Utilization:**
ILDP demonstrated that true participation is achievable when rural poor individuals pool their efforts and resources. Small democratic groups, composed of like-minded farmers, were pivotal to achieving economies of scale and broadening the reach of development services. These groups significantly reduced the cost of service delivery while increasing the production and income levels of participants.
4. **Higher Productivity and Reduced Costs:**
By encouraging the pooling of resources, ILDP improved productivity through better access to resources, adoption of new technologies, and a guaranteed share of the benefits. This led to higher family incomes and a strengthened economic base for the community. The collective participation of beneficiaries also resulted in lower project costs, as local knowledge and labor were utilized to identify constraints and seek solutions.
5. **Building of Democratic and Sustainable Organizations:**
The small group structure provided an ideal environment for fostering collective decision-making and leadership skills. These groups, once trained, helped build sustainable rural organizations that could function independently, ensuring the long-term success of the development programs.
6. **Long-term Sustainability of Participatory Development:**
The participatory nature of the ILDP led to increased self-reliance among the poor. The creation of self-sustaining rural organizations within the ILDP framework was a major achievement. These organizations enhanced local economic growth and broadened access to markets, favoring balanced development and creating opportunities for the poor to contribute constructively to their own development.

Cost-Benefit Analysis of ILDP

The ILDP model demonstrated significant cost-effectiveness and long-term viability. Although initial external aid was required for start-up, the project's design aimed for self-reliance with decreasing recurrent costs and increasing cost recovery by the participants. This transition to self-sufficiency is a hallmark of the model's success.

Benefits of ILDP

The benefits of the ILDP model are multifaceted and can be viewed from the perspectives of both individual participants and society as a whole:

Individual Participants:

1. **Increased Food and Livestock Production:**
ILDP demonstrated substantial increases in food crop and livestock production. Participants saw higher yields from crops like maize and finger millet, with the latter yielding up to 800 kg per acre in some cases. Additionally, improved livestock management and disease control resulted in a significant increase in the survival rates of small animals.
2. **Increased Per Capita Consumption:**
The ILDP areas recorded a 10% higher per capita cereal consumption and a 20-25% increase in per capita meat consumption compared to non-ILDP areas. This improvement was also mirrored in the consumption of vegetables and fruits, which were promoted through backyard cultivation.
3. **Higher Family Incomes:**
The annual income of ILDP households increased significantly compared to non-ILDP households, with an excess of Rs. 4,271 per household in hill areas and Rs. 3,518 in plains. Additionally, income from livestock (poultry, goats,

sheep, and pigs) also saw considerable growth due to better disease control and feeding practices.

4. **Enhanced Skills and Empowerment:**

Participants acquired new technical, organizational, and leadership skills through their involvement in ILDP groups. This facilitated knowledge-sharing, problem-solving, and the exchange of ideas, further empowering the rural poor.

Benefits for Society:

1. **Creation of Cost-efficient Rural Service Systems:**

The ILDP model created self-propelling rural service delivery systems that required minimal outside subsidies. Group-based credit and savings arrangements, for example, reduced financial transaction costs and increased loan recovery rates, leading to cost savings for both development agencies and governments.

2. **Strengthening Rural Infrastructure and Institutions:**

ILDP groups initiated low-cost community infrastructure projects, such as drain cleaning, using local labor and materials. Additionally, the model helped strengthen rural institutions by fostering greater participation in decision-making, reducing dependency on government support.

3. **Empowerment of Women:**

The ILDP significantly empowered women, granting them access to credit, land ownership, and local government institutions. Women's participation in SHGs also led to leadership development and increased gender sensitivity in community and local government institutions.

4. **Capacity Building for Sustainable Development:**

The focus on capacity building within the community, through both training and creating an enabling environment, ensured the long-term sustainability of the ILDP initiatives. Participants gained a sense of ownership and responsibility, which is crucial for the ongoing success of development activities.

Conclusion

The DANIDA-ILDP model proved to be an effective and sustainable approach to rural development, particularly in the context of tribal and marginalized communities. By promoting community-driven initiatives, empowering women, and creating self-sustaining organizations, the ILDP achieved tangible improvements in productivity, income, and community infrastructure. The model's success is grounded in its focus on participatory development, local resource mobilization, and capacity building, which can serve as a guide for future rural development projects.

4o mini

