



# PDI Suggested Modifications, Odisha

SIRD & PR, PR & DW Deptt. Govt. of Odisha





# State/UT Participant details

- Name of the State/UT : Odisha
- Total Number of Participants : 8

Sl. No.	Participant Name	Designation	Department
1	Surendra Kumar. Meena, IAS	Director, SIRD & PR, Odisha	PR & DW Deptt
2	Manish Agarwal, IAS	Addl. Secretary.	P&C Deptt
3	Jyoti Shankar Sahoo, OAS (S)	CDO-cum-EO, ZP, Dhenkanal	PR & DW Deptt
4	Dibyandu Kumar Das, OAS	BDO, Binjharpur Block	PR & DW Deptt
5	Santosh Kumar Patra	Assistant Director, SIRD & PR, Odisha	PR & DW Deptt
6	Pradeepta Kumar Mahapatra	Instructor, IT, SIRD & PR, Odisha	PR & DW Deptt
7	Ajay Singh	Specialist, Social Policy,	Unicef
8	Gautam Patnaik	State Water Consultant, Unicef	PR & DW Deptt



## Status of Field Experience

1. Whether Committee for collection of PDI data constituted :
2. Number of Gram Panchayats where Pilot study carried out:
3. Composition of Committee for pilot study:

Sl. No.	Members Proposed	Included in Committee (Yes/No)
1	Official of RD & Panchayati Raj Dept of State	Committees to be constituted
2	Faculty of SPRC/ SIRD	
3	BDO concerned in whose jurisdiction GP is falling	
4	Statistical Officer at the Block Level	
5	Panchayat Secretary/ PDO of concerned Panchayat	
6	Any other relevant Officer/ Official	



## Process followed for Data Collection

Sl. No.		
1	No. of available LIF Indicators with line department functionaries	In house desk review of PDI at SIRD & P R level
3	Criteria for selection of GPs for Data collection	
5	Key steps involved in data collection at GP level	
i)	Organizing meeting at GP level	
ii)	Whether dept. Wise indicator explained	
iv)	Whether data validate at GP office	
v)	Whether any meeting has been organized for correct interpretation of indicators with GPs	
vi)	Any other (pls specify) training, handholding provided to data collection team & other stakeholders	



# Challenges faced during data validation process at GP level

1. Due to complexity in sectoral indicators it was difficult to collect information.
2. PEO in charge of multiple GP were unable to collect relevant data from line departments.
3. Some information relating to sectoral department like health, education covering multiple GPs was difficult to segregate.
4. Making the stakeholders understand about certain LIFs which were qualitative in nature.
5. Periodicity of indicators not yet defined. (Monthly / Bi Monthly / One Time etc.)
6. Meta data has not been shared with State.



## Institutional Mechanism for Validation

- The institutional framework formed at State, District & Block Level for the purpose of NPA will be made operational for PDI

## Feedback on PDI Portal

- User IDs for State, District & Block may be created in demo PDI Portal for training purpose.

## Plan of Action for Rolling out PDI in the State/UT

No	Activities	Timeline
1	Capacity Building of all stakeholders at State Level	By Nov 2023
2	Mapping of possible activities and schemes against indicators	By Nov 2023
3	Wide range of publicity across the State on PDI through various communication materials	By Dec 2023



# Suggestions in respect of Local Indicators & its data Points (in respect of revision, modification & addition (if any))





1


## Wider Consultations with States

List of indicators shall be shared with the States for getting feedback and appropriate on boarding of various stakeholders.



2

## Re-visiting the LIFs to get more relevant / appropriate & contemporary indicator. For Example



No	Code	Local Indicator Framework (LIF)	Remarks	Suggested New LIF
157	T40700	Percentage of Water sample testing using Field Test Kit	Revised	Percentage of water points meeting water quality standards at the time of testing.
158	T40800	Whether the drinking water source is well maintained. no waste water enters into the source and well protected from any contamination	Revised	Water Safety Plan prepared by GP



A tall, orange water tower with a spiral staircase on the exterior, situated on a concrete base. The tower has a cylindrical tank at the top. 

3

Repetition of Target within the same theme. For example, Water Sufficient Village Target No. 1 & Target No. 3 are same.

4

Repetitions of LIF within the same theme For Example T41200 & T41400; *“Percentage Availability of toilets separately for men and women at public buildings”*

5

**Indicators not captured / difficult to ascertain at GP level**

For example;

- a. T22200 Percentage of people using Alcohol / Tobacco
- b. T22100 Information relating to health indicators like Asthma Diabetic
- c. T22300 GP spending on health out of total expenditure data may not be available in GP
- d. T21900 Prevalence of Hypertension among men & women



6

State specific schemes similar in nature to central schemes and capturing the same parameter shall be provided in the Common Indicators . Ex. BSKY / Ayushman Bharat / Mamata / PMMVVY, Kalia/ PMKSNY, etc



7

Many common indicators which are not applicable to all the GPs to be moved to Optional Indicators. Like market complex in GP.



8

Weightage to be given to Optional Indicators also



9

Local Targets being mentioned as Indicator Targets is confusing. It may be mentioned as Objectives. For example, T1: 1- *To facilitate to improve the living standards of BPL households.*





Thank You