The Indian Journal of Veterinary Sciences & Biotechnology (2017) Volume 12, Issue 3, 42-44

ISSN (Print): 2394-0247: ISSN (Print and online): 2395-1176, abbreviated as IJVSBT

http://dx.doi.org/10.21887/ijvsbt.v12i3.7088

# Assessment of Livestock Service Delivery Pattern by Mobile Veterinary Units (Mvus) in Kandhamal District of Odisha

Anupama Jena and Mahesh Chander

Division of Extension Education

Indian Veterinary Research Institute, Izantagar-243 122 (UP)

Corresponding Author: drmahesh.chander@gmail.com, anupamajenaap62@gmail.com

This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution International License (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/P), which permits unrestricted use, distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Copyright @: 2016 by authors and SVSBT.

#### **Abstract**

An ex-post-facto study was conducted to assess the livestock service delivery pattern of Mobile Veterinary Unit (MVU), with a sample size of 90 farmers, who had availed the services of MVU, in Kandhamal district of Odisha. According to Total weighed mean square analysis (TWMS), preventive services were ranked first as the most available services in MVU, while in other veterinary service centers, curative services were most available. Further, cent percent respondents reported that the services by MVU were supply driven, whereas, in case of other agencies, only 16.7 per cent told that it was supply driven. Majority (76.7%) of respondents said MVU provides service on demand, moreover, cent percent respondents reported 'doorstep' availability of MVU services. Majority (57.8%) of farmers received services through MVUs three times in last 12 months, while, only two times by any other veterinary service centers during the same period. The minimum fee charged for the services delivered through MVU was only Rs. 2.0, while, Rs. 50-100 were being charged by other veterinary service centers.

Key Words: Livestock service delivery pattern, MVU, Kandhamal, TWMS

#### Introduction

Due to public sector constraints the availability and effectiveness of public veterinary services has been limited (Shweta, 2014; Chander and Rathod, 2013). NCA (1976) had recommended one veterinarian for every 5000 cattle unit and one veterinary institution for 4 villages, whereas we presently have one veterinarian for every 7000 animals, covering 11 villages and about 62 sq. km. area (VCI, 2008). But, in some states the situation is quite dismal. This situation is getting further worsened day by day with increasing ratio of livestock unit per veterinarian. In this context, there is continuous effort by Indian government to regenerate the potential on livestock service delivery by minimizing constraints and meet the demand of the poor livestock farmers. Hence, Mobile Veterinary Unit (MVU) is a recent initiative of Odisha government under Rastriya Krishi Vikas Yojana (RKVY) to improve health service delivery at the door step of the farmers, which is operational in all the 314 blocks of Odisha. A team of professionals visit door to door of farmers, in those villages which are unreachable by the block veterinary officer of concerned block, covering two villages daily, throughout the block on rotation manner and deliver the services for all the livestock irrespective

of species. With this background, the present study was undertaken to assess the service delivery pattern of MVU in Kandhamal district of Odisha.

# Methodology

The study was conducted in Kandhamal district of Odisha, which was selected purposively. Out of the 12 blocks of Kandhamal district, 3 blocks were selected randomly. Further, from each block, 3 villages were selected purposively on the basis that where MVU had provided the service. From the 9 selected villages, 10 farmers from each village were selected purposively, who had availed the services of MVU. As such, 90 farmers in total were selected for the study.

Livestock service delivery pattern of MVU was assessed by the responses obtained from these 90 farmers. For determining the animal health services mostly available to farmers, they were asked to rank the services of MVU and also other sources like Veterinary Dispensary (V.D), Veterinary Hospital (V.H), Livestock aid center (LAC) or any other sources from where they were receiving services for their livestock according to most available services by these agencies. For each 1st rank 5 points were given, for 2nd rank 4 points and so on. For non-availability of services, 0 point was given. Ranking was done for each category based on total weighted mean score. Summation of scores given to particular service by all respondents formed the total weighted score (TWS) and dividing the total weighted score by the total number of respondents shaped the total weighted mean score (TWMS). Other aspects like types of services, service delivery place, frequency of service delivery during last 12 months and minimum charges paid for the service were assessed through frequency and percentage basis.

### **Results and Discussion**

## Most available livestock health services according to farmers' view

There is somehow difference in trend according to most available services. The MVU is focused more towards preventive and extension services while the other agencies were more focused towards curative aspect then breeding services. As curative service is situational and breeding service is a timely activity, so it is not possible in part of MVU to provide these two services adequately to farmers for its mobile nature but they are being able to provide preventive services and MVU was also organizing daily awareness camp in the respective villages to make people aware about the preventive aspects of diseases, sanitary measures, feeding, breeding and health care of animals but on the contrary in other agencies, very less importance is being given towards extension activities like any training programme, awareness camp etc. This result of MVU contradicts the finding of Shakir *et al.* (1999), who reported in health services major emphasis was given to curative services rather than preventive services.

## Types of services

It must be noted that service on farmer's doorstep is the mandate of MVU and farmers received all the services on their doorstep. Hence this was observed as cent percent farmers responded availability of supply driven service in case of MVUs. Whereas, only 16.7 percent replied that it was supply driven by other centers, as in case of other agencies except for rarely preventive services no other services were being provided without farmers demand.

Further, as per MVU guidelines, it is suppose to provide demand driven services only in case of any outbreak, emergency situation, fire, flood or any natural calamities, so 76.7 percent farmers responded for availability of demand driven services by MVU but still 23.3 percent respondents replied for not availability of demand driven services as it is not practically feasible to provide all the usual livestock related services as per farmers demand. Whereas, cent percent farmers replied that other agencies were providing services as per their demand.

## Place of receiving services

Cent percent respondents reported for 'doorstep' availability of MVU services, so MVU was working as per its mandate but only 28.9 percent respondents confirmed 'doorstep' availability of services of any other agencies as discussed earlier, only in case of some preventive services like vaccination and deworming, were available at farmers doorstep by other agencies. But if consider for 'in centre' services then no MVU service is available in any centre but services of most of the other agencies were available in their respective centers.

## Frequency of services availed during last 12 months

The frequency of services received in the last twelve months, through MVUs stood at three; while it was only two from any other agencies, as reported by majority of the farmers. The respondent farmers were not much dependent on other agencies for livestock health services owing to the reasons like longer distances of centers, higher charges of livestock health services by the agencies so sometimes treating the animals with some locally available resources. Only very few (20%) of respondents utilized the services by other agencies to the extent of 4-5 times per year, which might be due to emergency nature of cases, where treatment becomes an immediate demand. The frequency and utilization of MVU services by the farmers show its high credibility of doorstep service.

# Minimum charges paid for Service

Fees paid to any service provider for livestock related services usually depend upon the severity of the case. In the case of MVUs, irrespective of severity of cases, people were paying only Rs. 2/- as nominal charge for the services while; for any other agencies the minimum charge was of Rs. 50/- to Rs. 100/-. The fee used to get doubled and tripled or even more in case of emergency situations, door step service delivery etc., by other agencies. MVUs serve the poor farmers with a very nominal charge and the beneficiary farmers appreciate high levels of reliability on the services by MVU in the study area. This result of MVUs, which is a kind of public veterinary service, is in line with the findings of Ahuja and Radmond (2004), who had also reported that most of the government livestock services in many South Asian countries including India were free of cost or subsidized, further Ahuja *et al.* (2003) reported price for home visits for animal health services was 100 to 200 rupees.

Conflict of Interest: All authors declare no conflict of interest.

### References:

Ahuja, V. and Radmond, E. (2004). Livestock services and the poor. Tropical Animal Health and Production, **36(3)**: 247-268.

Ahuja, V.; Morrenhof, J. and Sen, A. (2003). The delivery of veterinary services to poorer communities: the case of rural Orissa, India. Rev. sci. tech. int. Epiz., **22(3)**: 931-948.

Chander, M. and Rathod, P. (2013). Investment in livestock extension activities by state departments of animal husbandry (SDAH) in India: An appraisal. Indian Journal of Animal Sciences, **83(2):**185-189.

NCA. (1976). National Commission on Agriculture in India. Part III, Ministry of Agriculture and Irrigation, GOI, New Delhi, pp. 439.

Shakir, K.; Mian, M. A. and Farooq, M. (1999). Contribution of backyard chicken to rural household economy in Chitra. Thesis, M.Sc. North West Frontier Province University, Peshawar, Pakistan.

Shweta, K. (2014). Indian Res. J. Ext. Edu, 14(1): 90-92.

VCI. (2008). Strategies for strengthening of veterinary education and practice sectors, Recommendation of National Seminar held at Hyderabad, India.