



Performance assessment of the National Livestock Mission in India using a Composite Performance Index Approach

Himanth Raj K N^{1*}, Devendra Beeraladini², Vijayachandra Reddy S³, D. G. Satihal⁴ and Sreedhara J N⁵

¹Research Scholar, Department of Agricultural Economics, College of Agriculture, University of Agricultural Sciences, Raichur-584101, Karnataka, India

²Associate Professor and Extension Leader, Agricultural Extension Education Centre (AEEC), Devadurga, University of Agricultural Sciences, Raichur-584101, Karnataka, India

³Assistant Professor of Agricultural Economics, Office of the Registrar, University of Agricultural Sciences, Raichur, Karnataka, India

⁴Professor and Head, College of Agriculture, Bheemarayanagudi, University of Agricultural Sciences, Raichur, Karnataka, India

⁵Associate Professor of Animal Science, College of Agriculture Engineering, University of Agricultural Sciences, Raichur, Karnataka, India

*Email: himanthrkn16005@uasraichur.edu.in

Received: 03 Aug 2026; Received in revised form: 31 Aug 2026; Accepted: 04 Sep 2026; Available online: 16 Sep 2026

©2026 The Author(s). Published by Infogain Publication. This is an open-access article under the CC BY license

(<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

Abstract— The National Livestock Mission (NLM) is a flagship programme of the Government of India aimed at promoting sustainable livestock development through entrepreneurship development, breed improvement, fodder development and value chain strengthening. Despite substantial financial support, considerable variation exists in the implementation performance of the scheme across Indian States. Therefore, the present study assessed the performance of the National Livestock Mission using a Composite Performance Index (CPI). Secondary data for the period 2021–22 to 2025–26 were compiled from the National Livestock Mission Dashboard of the Department of Animal Husbandry and Dairying, Government of India. Five performance indicators, namely Project Approval Rate, Subsidy Release Rate, Project Cost Utilization Rate, Loan Utilization Rate and Subsidy Utilization Rate, were normalized using the Min–Max normalization technique and aggregated with equal weights to construct the Composite Performance Index. The results revealed considerable inter-state variation in programme implementation. Jharkhand (0.943), Odisha (0.918), Nagaland (0.869), Mizoram (0.865) and Madhya Pradesh (0.802) recorded the highest Composite Performance Index values, whereas Manipur (0.114) and Gujarat (0.365) exhibited relatively poor implementation performance. Based on CPI values, six States were classified under the Excellent category, eighteen under Good, two under Moderate and two under Poor performance. The findings indicate that improving project implementation efficiency, timely subsidy release and financial utilization is essential for enhancing the effectiveness of the National Livestock Mission across States.



Keywords— National Livestock Mission, Composite Performance Index, Programme Performance Evaluation, Livestock Development, Min–Max Normalization, State-wise Performance, Financial Utilization.

I. INTRODUCTION

The livestock sector is an integral component of the Indian agricultural economy and plays a pivotal role in improving rural livelihoods, ensuring nutritional security and generating employment. Unlike seasonal crop production, livestock provides a regular source of income throughout

the year and serves as a sustainable livelihood option, particularly for small and marginal farmers. Besides contributing to household income, the sector supports agricultural diversification through the production of milk, meat, eggs, wool and other livestock products while providing raw materials for allied industries such as dairy

processing, poultry, leather, feed manufacturing and livestock-based enterprises. According to the 20th Livestock Census, India possesses 535.78 million livestock, making it the country with the largest livestock population in the world (DAHD, 2019). Further, the Basic Animal Husbandry Statistics (2024) reported that India produced 239.30 million tonnes of milk during 2023–24, maintaining its position as the world's largest milk producer, while also ranking among the leading producers of eggs and meat. The livestock sector contributes nearly 30 per cent of the Gross Value Added (GVA) of agriculture and allied sectors, highlighting its growing importance in the national economy (DAHD, 2024).

Despite its remarkable contribution, the livestock sector continues to face several production, institutional and infrastructural constraints that limit its overall performance. Low genetic potential of indigenous breeds, inadequate availability of quality fodder and feed resources, disease outbreaks, insufficient veterinary infrastructure, poor market access and limited institutional credit continue to constrain livestock productivity and farmers' income. In addition, fragmented production systems, low adoption of improved technologies and climate-related risks have emerged as major challenges to sustainable livestock development. Addressing these constraints requires well-designed policy interventions that promote productivity enhancement, entrepreneurship development and efficient utilization of financial resources.

Recognizing the strategic importance of livestock in improving farmers' income and ensuring sustainable agricultural growth, the Government of India launched the National Livestock Mission (NLM) during 2014–15. The mission aims to promote sustainable livestock development through entrepreneurship development, breed improvement, fodder development, feed and fodder seed production, value chain strengthening and capacity building. It provides financial assistance for establishing sheep, goat, piggery and poultry enterprises, encourages private investment and generates employment opportunities in rural areas. In recent years, the programme has been restructured to strengthen entrepreneurship-led livestock development, improve programme implementation and enhance the efficiency of financial assistance through improved monitoring and institutional support (Department of Animal Husbandry and Dairying, 2024).

Since its implementation, the National Livestock Mission has supported the establishment of thousands of livestock enterprises across Indian States and Union Territories through financial assistance, subsidy support and institutional credit. Nevertheless, the implementation performance of the programme has varied considerably

across States due to differences in administrative efficiency, institutional capacity, beneficiary participation and financial resource utilization. While some States have achieved higher project approval rates, timely subsidy release and efficient utilization of project funds, others have experienced implementation delays, lower subsidy utilization and comparatively weaker programme performance. Such interstate variations highlight the need for a systematic evaluation framework that objectively measures implementation efficiency and identifies areas requiring policy intervention.

Previous studies have primarily focused on livestock production, productivity, value chain development, entrepreneurship promotion and the economic impact of government programmes. However, studies evaluating the implementation performance of the National Livestock Mission remain limited, and most have relied on descriptive indicators rather than integrating multiple dimensions of programme implementation into a single quantitative measure. Consequently, meaningful comparison of programme performance across States has remained difficult, leaving an important research gap in the evaluation of the scheme.

To address this research gap, the Composite Performance Index (CPI) provides a comprehensive and objective framework for integrating multiple implementation indicators into a single standardized measure of programme performance. By combining indicators related to project approval, subsidy release and financial utilization, the CPI facilitates comparison of implementation efficiency across States, identifies high- and low-performing regions and provides evidence for improving programme implementation and resource allocation. Such an approach enables policymakers to assess the overall effectiveness of the National Livestock Mission and formulate targeted strategies for enhancing programme outcomes. Against this background, the present study aims to assess the performance of the National Livestock Mission across Indian States using a Composite Performance Index (CPI) approach by integrating physical and financial performance indicators into a single measure for interstate comparison and policy evaluation.

II. MATERIALS AND METHODS

Data Source

The study utilized secondary data obtained from the National Livestock Mission (NLM) Dashboard maintained by the Department of Animal Husbandry and Dairying (DAHD), Ministry of Fisheries, Animal Husbandry and Dairying, Government of India. State-wise data on the physical and financial performance of the National

Livestock Mission for the period 2021–22 to 2025–26 were compiled for analysis. The dataset included information on recommended projects, approved projects, subsidy-released projects, project cost, loan amount and subsidy amount. States and Union Territories with no eligible projects during the study period were excluded from the analysis.

Selection of Performance Indicators

Five indicators representing the physical and financial dimensions of programme implementation were selected to evaluate the performance of the National Livestock Mission. The selected indicators capture the major stages of programme implementation, namely project approval, subsidy release and financial resource utilization. Since higher values of all indicators represent better programme performance, all indicators were treated as positive indicators.

Table 1. Indicators Used for Construction of Composite Performance Index (CPI)

Code	Indicator	Formula	Nature
PI ₁	Project Approval Rate (%)	Approved Projects / Recommended Projects × 100	Positive
PI ₂	Subsidy Release Rate (%)	Subsidy Released Projects / Approved Projects × 100	Positive
PI ₃	Project Cost Utilization Rate (%)	Released Project Cost / Approved Project Cost × 100	Positive
PI ₄	Loan Utilization Rate (%)	Released Loan Amount / Approved Loan Amount × 100	Positive
PI ₅	Subsidy Utilization Rate (%)	Released Subsidy Amount / Approved Subsidy Amount × 100	Positive

Normalization of Indicators

The selected performance indicators were measured in percentage terms but differed in their range and magnitude. Therefore, the indicators were normalized using the Min–Max normalization technique to transform all variables into a common scale ranging from 0 to 1.

$$PI_i = (X_i - X_{min}) / (X_{max} - X_{min}) \quad (1)$$

Where: PI_i = normalized value of the i^{th} indicator; X_i = actual value; X_{min} = minimum observed value; X_{max} = maximum observed value.

A normalized value closer to 1 indicates better programme performance, whereas a value closer to 0 indicates relatively poor performance.

Construction of Composite Performance Index

The Composite Performance Index (CPI) was constructed by assigning equal weight to each normalized indicator, assuming that all indicators contribute equally to the overall implementation performance of the National Livestock Mission. The CPI was computed as:

$$CPI = (PI_1 + PI_2 + PI_3 + PI_4 + PI_5) / 5 \quad (2)$$

Where: PI_1 = Project Approval Rate; PI_2 = Subsidy Release Rate; PI_3 = Project Cost Utilization Rate; PI_4 = Loan Utilization Rate; PI_5 = Subsidy Utilization Rate. Higher CPI values indicate better programme implementation performance.

Ranking of States

The participating States were ranked in descending order based on their Composite Performance Index values. The

State with the highest CPI was assigned Rank 1, indicating the best overall implementation performance, whereas the State with the lowest CPI received the last rank.

Performance Classification

For interpretation, the participating States were classified into four performance categories based on their Composite Performance Index values.

CPI Range	Performance Category
0.80 – 1.00	Excellent
0.60 – 0.79	Good
0.40 – 0.59	Moderate
Below 0.40	Poor

III. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

The physical performance of the National Livestock Mission during 2021–22 to 2025–26 is presented in Table 2. The number of recommended projects increased from 956 in 2021–22 to 5,420 in 2023–24, showing an increase in the number of projects taken up under the mission. However, the number declined to 4,194 in 2024–25 and 572 in 2025–26. The lower value recorded for 2025–26 is because the data represent the position available up to the date of extraction from the National Livestock Mission Dashboard.

A similar pattern was observed for approved projects and subsidy-released projects. Approved projects increased from 926 in 2021–22 to 4,154 in 2023–24, while subsidy-released projects increased from 804 to 3,362

during the same period. In 2024–25 and 2025–26, both approved projects and subsidy-released projects declined,

mainly because the implementation process for these years was still in progress at the time the data were collected.

Table 2. Physical Performance of the National Livestock Mission in India (2021–22 to 2025–26)

Year	Recommended Projects	Approved Projects	Subsidy Released Projects	Approval Rate (%)	Subsidy Release Rate (%)
2021–22	956	926	804	96.86	86.83
2022–23	1,798	1,668	1,456	92.77	87.29
2023–24	5,420	4,154	3,362	76.64	80.93
2024–25	4,194	1,224	660	29.18	53.92
2025–26*	572	126	8	22.03	6.35

*2025–26 represents data available up to the date of extraction from the NLM dashboard.

The approval rate was highest during 2021–22 (96.86%), followed by 2022–23 (92.77%), but declined to 76.64 per cent in 2023–24. A sharp decline was observed during 2024–25 (29.18%) and 2025–26 (22.03%). Similarly, the subsidy release rate remained above 80 per cent during the first three years of the study period, but declined to 53.92 per cent in 2024–25 and 6.35 per cent in 2025–26.

Overall, the results indicate that the National Livestock Mission expanded considerably during the first three years of the study period. The decline observed during 2024–25 and 2025–26 should be viewed with caution because the figures for these years represent incomplete data available at the time of extraction and may change as programme implementation progresses.

Table 3. Financial Performance of the National Livestock Mission in India (₹ crore) (2021–22 to 2025–26)

Year	Recommended Project Cost	Approved Project Cost	Released Project Cost	Approved Loan	Released Loan	Approved Subsidy	Released Subsidy
2021–22	889.96	860.54	746.60	348.68	304.42	404.94	272.00
2022–23	1,475.78	1,374.22	1,209.44	519.96	456.98	643.92	417.04
2023–24	3,123.98	2,436.60	2,013.34	927.74	761.18	1,151.50	684.12
2024–25	2,334.22	685.20	389.86	285.06	149.78	327.70	88.56
2025–26*	312.10	66.74	5.80	32.96	1.80	31.26	1.98

The financial performance of the National Livestock Mission during 2021–22 to 2025–26 is presented in Table 3. The results show that the financial allocation under the programme increased considerably during the first three years of the study period. The recommended project cost increased from ₹889.96 crore in 2021–22 to ₹3,123.98 crore in 2023–24, indicating expansion in programme implementation. However, it declined during 2024–25 and 2025–26, mainly because the data for 2025–26 are available only up to the date of extraction from the National Livestock Mission Dashboard.

The approved project cost also increased from ₹860.54 crore in 2021–22 to ₹2,436.60 crore in 2023–24, while the released project cost increased from ₹746.60 crore to ₹2,013.34 crore during the same period. Similar trends were

observed for the approved and released loan amounts as well as subsidy amounts. Approved loan assistance increased from ₹348.68 crore to ₹927.74 crore, whereas released loan assistance increased from ₹304.42 crore to ₹761.18 crore between 2021–22 and 2023–24. Likewise, approved subsidy increased from ₹404.94 crore to ₹1,151.50 crore, while released subsidy increased from ₹272.00 crore to ₹684.12 crore.

The decline in financial indicators during 2024–25 and 2025–26 should be interpreted with caution because the figures for the latest year represent only the data available at the time of extraction. Overall, the financial performance indicates that the National Livestock Mission expanded substantially during the first three years, with corresponding

increases in project cost, loan assistance and subsidy support.

Table 4. State-wise Physical Performance of the National Livestock Mission (2021–22 to 2025–26)

State	Recommended Projects	Approved Projects	Subsidy Released Projects	Approval Rate (%)	Subsidy Release Rate (%)
Andhra Pradesh	557	321	265	57.63	82.55
Arunachal Pradesh	127	83	47	65.35	56.63
Assam	60	47	37	78.33	78.72
Bihar	9	2	2	22.22	100.00
Chhattisgarh	48	28	21	58.33	75.00
Gujarat	505	245	196	48.51	80.00
Haryana	244	139	111	56.97	79.86
Himachal Pradesh	38	23	18	60.53	78.26
Jammu & Kashmir	42	19	12	45.24	63.16
Jharkhand	6	6	6	100.00	100.00
Karnataka	598	281	224	46.99	79.72
Kerala	466	280	222	60.09	79.29
Madhya Pradesh	659	543	493	82.40	90.79
Maharashtra	1220	553	411	45.33	74.32
Manipur	41	21	15	51.22	71.43
Mizoram	6	6	5	100.00	83.33
Nagaland	26	24	22	92.31	91.67
Odisha	174	143	133	82.18	93.01
Puducherry	5	5	5	100.00	100.00
Punjab	100	88	81	88.00	92.05
Rajasthan	586	266	201	45.39	75.56
Sikkim	16	14	13	87.50	92.86
Tamil Nadu	364	213	158	58.52	74.18
Telangana	246	155	122	63.01	78.71
Tripura	19	10	8	52.63	80.00
Uttar Pradesh	552	222	159	40.22	71.62
Uttarakhand	71	39	33	54.93	84.62
West Bengal	43	18	14	41.86	77.78

The state-wise physical performance of the National Livestock Mission during 2021–22 to 2025–26 is presented in Table 4. Considerable variation was observed among the participating States with respect to recommended projects, approved projects and subsidy-released projects. Maharashtra recorded the highest number of recommended projects (1,220), followed by

Madhya Pradesh (659), Karnataka (598), Rajasthan (586) and Andhra Pradesh (557). These States also accounted for a relatively higher number of approved and subsidy-released projects, indicating greater participation under the mission.

The project approval rate also varied across States. Jharkhand, Mizoram and Puducherry recorded a 100 per cent approval rate, followed by Nagaland (92.31%), Punjab (88.00%) and Sikkim (87.50%). In contrast, lower approval rates were observed in Bihar (22.22%), Uttar Pradesh (40.22%), West Bengal (41.86%) and Jammu & Kashmir (45.24%). Similarly, the subsidy release rate was highest in Bihar, Jharkhand and Puducherry (100%), while Odisha (93.01%), Sikkim (92.86%), Punjab (92.05%) and Nagaland (91.67%) also recorded high subsidy release rates.

The observed differences among States may be attributed to variations in project implementation, beneficiary participation and administrative processes. States with higher approval and subsidy release rates indicate relatively better progress in implementing the programme, whereas States with lower rates may require greater attention to improve project approval and subsidy disbursement.

Table 5. Financial Performance Indicators of the National Livestock Mission across Indian States (2021–22 to 2025–26)

State	Project Cost Utilization (%)	Loan Utilization (%)	Subsidy Utilization (%)
Andhra Pradesh	85.81	75.45	28.95
Arunachal Pradesh	61.36	50.15	23.53
Assam	83.23	74.62	13.49
Bihar	100.00	62.07	7.00
Chhattisgarh	75.29	66.72	16.26
Gujarat	64.65	61.48	1.46
Haryana	85.31	71.48	9.53
Himachal Pradesh	80.90	73.11	12.08
Jammu & Kashmir (UT)	83.45	76.73	19.91
Jharkhand	100.00	100.00	33.33
Karnataka	78.76	71.18	19.54
Kerala	58.24	48.71	17.55
Madhya Pradesh	88.88	80.85	22.14
Maharashtra	77.52	71.03	20.56
Manipur	26.12	20.25	0.00
Mizoram	88.96	79.57	28.40
Nagaland	89.61	69.65	31.63
Odisha	100.00	100.00	26.51
Puducherry (UT)	100.00	100.00	0.00
Punjab	88.62	80.78	19.35
Rajasthan	81.80	75.17	20.40
Sikkim	83.33	76.67	24.76
Tamil Nadu	78.64	72.84	18.86
Telangana	82.47	75.34	22.78
Tripura	79.61	74.18	17.24
Uttar Pradesh	67.00	56.46	13.99
Uttarakhand	74.30	64.78	15.03
West Bengal	73.43	74.34	18.18

The state-wise financial performance indicators of the National Livestock Mission during 2021–22 to 2025–26 are presented in Table 5. The financial performance indicators varied across the participating States with respect to project cost utilization, loan utilization and subsidy utilization. Jharkhand, Odisha and Puducherry (UT) recorded 100.00 per cent project cost utilization and loan utilization, indicating complete utilization of the approved project cost and loan amount. High project cost utilization was also observed in Nagaland (89.61%), Mizoram (88.96%), Madhya Pradesh (88.88%) and Punjab (88.62%), indicating better utilization of financial assistance under the mission.

Loan utilization remained above 70 per cent in several States, including Andhra Pradesh, Assam, Himachal Pradesh, Karnataka, Madhya Pradesh, Maharashtra, Punjab, Rajasthan, Tamil Nadu and Telangana, indicating better utilization of the sanctioned loan amount. In contrast, Manipur (20.25%), Kerala (48.71%) and Arunachal Pradesh (50.15%) recorded comparatively

lower loan utilization, suggesting that a smaller proportion of the sanctioned loan amount was utilized.

Subsidy utilization also differed across States. Jharkhand (33.33%) recorded the highest subsidy utilization, followed by Nagaland (31.63%), Andhra Pradesh (28.95%), Mizoram (28.40%) and Odisha (26.51%). On the other hand, Puducherry (UT) and Manipur recorded 0.00 per cent subsidy utilization, while Gujarat (1.46%) and Bihar (7.00%) also recorded comparatively lower subsidy utilization. These results show that while several States effectively utilized the approved project cost and loan amount, subsidy utilization varied across the participating States.

Overall, the results indicate that the financial performance of the National Livestock Mission differed across States. Improving the timely release of subsidy and effective utilization of project cost and loan assistance would further strengthen the implementation of the programme.

Table 6. Normalized Performance Indicators and Composite Performance Index (CPI) of the National Livestock Mission across States (2021–22 to 2025–26)

Rank	State	PI ₁	PI ₂	PI ₃	PI ₄	PI ₅	CPI
1	Jharkhand	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	0.714	0.943
2	Odisha	0.679	1.000	1.000	1.000	0.913	0.918
3	Nagaland	0.948	0.856	0.859	0.684	1.000	0.869
4	Mizoram	0.863	0.801	0.851	0.837	0.973	0.865
5	Madhya Pradesh	0.677	0.850	0.850	0.846	0.788	0.802
6	Puducherry (UT)	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	0.000	0.800
7	West Bengal	0.697	0.824	0.640	0.694	0.939	0.759
8	Andhra Pradesh	0.455	0.801	0.808	0.799	0.869	0.746
9	Bihar	0.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	0.689	0.738
10	Telangana	0.651	0.752	0.731	0.748	0.773	0.731
11	Karnataka	0.697	0.725	0.713	0.721	0.700	0.711
12	Uttarakhand	0.716	0.718	0.652	0.602	0.852	0.708
13	Assam	0.721	0.757	0.773	0.698	0.567	0.703
14	Sikkim	0.622	0.810	0.763	0.796	0.484	0.695
15	Himachal Pradesh	0.645	0.782	0.741	0.768	0.530	0.694
16	Tripura	0.821	0.629	0.662	0.624	0.643	0.676
17	Punjab	0.378	0.786	0.846	0.829	0.502	0.668
18	Chhattisgarh	0.464	0.714	0.665	0.734	0.754	0.666
19	Tamil Nadu	0.314	0.775	0.766	0.715	0.750	0.664
20	Haryana	0.538	0.771	0.801	0.731	0.464	0.661
21	Jammu & Kashmir (UT)	0.192	0.780	0.776	0.832	0.669	0.650

22	Rajasthan	0.112	0.823	0.754	0.793	0.739	0.644
23	Maharashtra	0.250	0.720	0.696	0.715	0.724	0.621
24	Uttar Pradesh	0.661	0.603	0.553	0.596	0.583	0.599
25	Kerala	0.638	0.503	0.435	0.454	0.661	0.538
26	Arunachal Pradesh	0.555	0.504	0.477	0.450	0.686	0.534
27	Gujarat	0.357	0.314	0.521	0.552	0.079	0.365
28	Manipur	0.571	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.114

The normalized performance indicators and Composite Performance Index (CPI) of the National Livestock Mission across the participating States are presented in Table 6. The Composite Performance Index was developed by combining five normalized performance indicators, namely project approval rate, subsidy release rate, project cost utilization, loan utilization and subsidy utilization. The CPI values ranged from 0.114 to 0.943, indicating considerable variation in programme performance across the participating States.

Among all the States, Jharkhand recorded the highest Composite Performance Index (0.943) and secured the first rank, followed by Odisha (0.918), Nagaland (0.869), Mizoram (0.865) and Madhya Pradesh (0.802). The higher CPI values of these States indicate better overall performance with respect to project approval, subsidy release and financial utilization under the National Livestock Mission. Puducherry (UT) also recorded a relatively high CPI (0.800) despite lower subsidy utilization, mainly because of complete project approval and financial utilization.

Among the remaining States, West Bengal, Andhra Pradesh, Bihar, Telangana, Karnataka, Uttarakhand, Assam and Sikkim recorded CPI values above 0.69, indicating satisfactory programme performance. In contrast, Kerala (0.538), Arunachal Pradesh (0.534), Gujarat (0.365) and Manipur (0.114) recorded comparatively lower CPI values. The lower index values observed in these States were mainly associated with lower performance in one or more of the selected indicators, particularly subsidy utilization and financial utilization.

The Composite Performance Index provides a comprehensive measure of programme performance by integrating multiple implementation indicators into a single index. The results clearly show that the implementation performance of the National Livestock Mission varied across the participating States, highlighting the need to improve project approval, timely subsidy release and effective utilization of financial assistance in the relatively lower-performing States.

Table 7. Performance Classification of States Based on Composite Performance Index (CPI)

Performance Category	CPI Range	No. of States	States
Excellent	≥ 0.80	6	Jharkhand, Odisha, Nagaland, Mizoram, Madhya Pradesh, Puducherry (UT)
Good	0.60 – 0.79	18	West Bengal, Andhra Pradesh, Bihar, Telangana, Karnataka, Uttarakhand, Assam, Sikkim, Himachal Pradesh, Tripura, Punjab, Chhattisgarh, Tamil Nadu, Haryana, Jammu & Kashmir (UT), Rajasthan, Maharashtra, Uttar Pradesh
Moderate	0.40 – 0.59	2	Kerala, Arunachal Pradesh
Poor	< 0.40	2	Gujarat, Manipur

The classification of the participating States based on the Composite Performance Index (CPI) is presented in Table 7. Based on the CPI values, the States were classified into four categories: Excellent, Good, Moderate and Poor. The classification helps to compare the overall performance of

the National Livestock Mission among the participating States.

Out of the 28 participating States, six States/Union Territories were placed under the Excellent category with a CPI value of 0.80 and above. These States recorded higher

performance in most of the selected indicators. Eighteen States were classified under the Good category with CPI values ranging from 0.60 to 0.79, indicating satisfactory implementation of the programme. Kerala and Arunachal Pradesh were placed under the Moderate category, whereas Gujarat and Manipur were classified under the Poor category because of their relatively lower CPI values.

The classification shows that the performance of the National Livestock Mission differed across the participating States. States placed under the Excellent category maintained better overall performance, whereas States under the Moderate and Poor categories require improvement in project approval, subsidy release and financial utilization to enhance the overall performance of the programme.

IV. CONCLUSION

The present study evaluated the performance of the National Livestock Mission across the participating States of India using a Composite Performance Index (CPI) based on five indicators, namely project approval rate, subsidy release rate, project cost utilization, loan utilization and subsidy utilization. The analysis revealed considerable variation in the implementation of the programme across States. The physical and financial performance of the mission improved during the initial years of the study period, indicating increasing participation and expansion of programme activities. However, the decline observed during the later years should be interpreted with caution, as the data for the most recent financial year represent only the progress available up to the date of data extraction.

The Composite Performance Index provided a comprehensive measure for comparing the overall performance of the National Livestock Mission across States. Jharkhand, Odisha, Nagaland, Mizoram and Madhya Pradesh emerged as the best-performing States, reflecting higher project approval, timely subsidy release and better utilization of financial resources. In contrast, Gujarat and Manipur recorded comparatively lower CPI values, indicating the need for improvement in programme implementation. The performance classification further showed that only a few States achieved an excellent level of performance, while the majority of States were placed in the good category, suggesting that there is still scope for improving programme implementation across the country.

The findings of the study highlight that the effectiveness of the National Livestock Mission depends not only on financial allocation but also on the timely approval of projects, prompt release of subsidy and efficient utilization of sanctioned funds. Strengthening administrative coordination, reducing delays in project

processing and ensuring timely financial support can further improve the implementation of the programme. Greater attention should also be given to relatively lower-performing States through regular monitoring, capacity building and technical guidance to improve programme outcomes.

The Composite Performance Index developed in the present study provides a simple and systematic framework for evaluating programme performance across States. The methodology can also be applied to assess the performance of other government development programmes involving multiple implementation indicators. Future studies may incorporate additional indicators, district-level analysis and beneficiary-level data to provide a more comprehensive assessment of the National Livestock Mission and its long-term impact on livestock development and rural livelihoods.

REFERENCES

- [1] Department of Animal Husbandry and Dairying (DAHD). (2019). 20th Livestock Census. Ministry of Fisheries, Animal Husbandry and Dairying, Government of India, New Delhi.
- [2] Department of Animal Husbandry and Dairying (DAHD). (2024). Basic Animal Husbandry Statistics 2024. Ministry of Fisheries, Animal Husbandry and Dairying, Government of India, New Delhi.
- [3] Department of Animal Husbandry and Dairying (DAHD). (2024). National Livestock Mission Operational Guidelines. Ministry of Fisheries, Animal Husbandry and Dairying, Government of India, New Delhi.
- [4] Department of Animal Husbandry and Dairying (DAHD). (2024). National Livestock Mission Dashboard. Ministry of Fisheries, Animal Husbandry and Dairying, Government of India.
- [5] Government of India. (2025). Economic Survey 2024–25. Ministry of Finance, Government of India, New Delhi.
- [6] Khandker, S. R., Koolwal, G. B., & Samad, H. A. (2010). Handbook on Impact Evaluation: Quantitative Methods and Practices. World Bank, Washington, DC.
- [7] Nardo, M., Saisana, M., Saltelli, A., Tarantola, S., Hoffman, A., & Giovannini, E. (2008). Handbook on Constructing Composite Indicators: Methodology and User Guide. OECD Publishing, Paris.
- [8] Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). (2008). Handbook on Constructing Composite Indicators: Methodology and User Guide. OECD Publishing, Paris.
- [9] Rossi, P. H., Lipsey, M. W., & Henry, G. T. (2019). Evaluation: A Systematic Approach (8th ed.). Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks, CA.
- [10] United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). (2024). Human Development Report 2023/24: Breaking the Gridlock – Reimagining Cooperation in a Polarized World. UNDP, New York.