1 Perspective: From the general user

* this is a platform which make a business of live chicken direct from individual farmers .
* this is a platform which engages the farmer community .

2 Perspective: from the Rooster enthusiasts

* Buy and selling trade place for roosters.
* show case the roosters.
* rooster traceability of changing hands.
* social media to contact, share, marketing, networking.
* Alerts, Vet Services, poultry related products.

3 Perspective: From Higher level users

* Higher level Dashboard monstering of Rooster Display, Breeding section, incubation section, chick to adult rooster tracing section, Sales section, Blood line sharing section.
* running Advertisements, Brand premotion.
* rooster tracking from the family tree then first day birth to life time.
* Authenticated of user request for breed or Blood Line sharing.

# Statistics:

According to the 2011 Census, the total rural male population in Andhra Pradesh is approximately **28,243,241** ¹. This number represents males aged 18 and above living in rural areas of the state.

**Total rural population**: 56,361,702 ¹

* ==**Rural male population**: 28,243,241 ¹==
* **Rural female population**: 28,118,461 ¹

Keep in mind that these numbers are based on the 2011 Census, and the population may have changed slightly since then. how love to raise chickens and roosters for Sankranti, I'll consider a few factors:

* **Cultural significance**: Sankranti is a significant festival in Andhra Pradesh, and raising roosters is a popular tradition.
* **Rural lifestyle**: Many rural households in Andhra Pradesh have backyard farms or raise animals, including chickens and roosters.

Based on these factors, here's a rough estimate:

* **Around 20-30%** of 18+ males in rural Andhra Pradesh might be interested in raising chickens and roosters for Sankranti.

==This estimate is based on the assumption that:==

* ==**40-50%** of rural households in Andhra Pradesh might have some form of backyard farming or animal husbandry.==
* ==**50-60%** of these households might be interested in raising chickens and roosters specifically for Sankranti.==

Keep in mind that this is a rough estimate and may vary depending on factors like region, economic conditions, and personal interests.

Hear we have a three perspective users are listed :

1: Perspective: From the general user.

2: Perspective: from the Rooster enthusiasts.

3: Perspective: From Higher level users.

# **Estimation Attempt:**

* **Population of Andhra Pradesh:** Roughly 5.3 - 5.4 Crore (53-54 million).
* **Non-Vegetarian Population:** A very high percentage, likely 85-90% or more, consume non-vegetarian food. Let's estimate this pool at around **4.6 - 4.8 Crore**.
* **Penetration of Nattu Kodi:** Given its cultural importance and rural availability, a significant portion of the non-vegetarian population likely consumes Nattu Kodi at least occasionally (a few times a year or more) when available or affordable, or for special occasions. It's not daily food for the vast majority, but its reach is wide.

Considering these factors, a reasonable estimate would be that **somewhere between 40% and 60%** of the non-vegetarian population consumes Nattu Kodi at least occasionally throughout the year.

* **Lower Estimate (40%):** 4.6 Crore \* 0.40 = **~1.84 Crore people**
* **Higher Estimate (60%):** 4.8 Crore \* 0.60 = **~2.88 Crore people**

**Conclusion:**

While exact figures are unavailable, based on cultural preference, high overall meat consumption, and rural prevalence, it's reasonable to estimate that **roughly 1.8 to 2.9 Crore people (approximately 18 to 29 million) in Andhra Pradesh likely consume Nattu Kodi at least occasionally within a year.**

## **Here's the breakdown of the estimation process:**

1. **Recap Estimated Consumption:**
   * We estimated that roughly **1.8 to 2.9 Crore** people in Andhra Pradesh consume Nattu Kodi at least occasionally per year.
2. **Estimate Total Annual Bird Requirement:**
   * This is the trickiest step. How many birds does this translate to annually? Unlike broilers consumed weekly, Nattu Kodi is occasional.
   * **Assumption 1: Frequency & Sharing:** Let's assume that, on average, individuals within this consuming group eat Nattu Kodi maybe 3-5 times a year. And typically, one bird serves a small group (say 3-5 people) for a meal.
   * **Assumption 2: Average Birds per Consumer per Year:** A simpler approach might be to estimate an average number of Nattu Kodi birds consumed per person within the consuming group per year. Given its occasional nature, let's estimate this very low, perhaps **1.0 to 1.5 birds per person per year** on average across this specific group (1.8 to 2.9 Cr people).
   * **Calculation:**
     + Lower Bird Estimate: 1.8 Crore people \* 1.0 bird/person/year = **1.8 Crore birds/year**
     + Higher Bird Estimate: 2.9 Crore people \* 1.5 birds/person/year = **4.35 Crore birds/year**
     + Let's use a mid-range estimate for calculation: Around **2.5 to 3.5 Crore Nattu Kodi birds** consumed annually in Andhra Pradesh seems plausible under these assumptions.
3. **Estimate Average Annual Output per Individual Farmer:**
   * This refers to the number of birds a typical small, unorganized farmer raises to market size for sale or consumption per year.
   * This is highly variable. A backyard farmer might only manage 10-20 birds surviving to marketable age annually. Someone slightly more focused might manage 30-50. These are not commercial operations.
   * **Assumption 3: Farmer Scale:** Let's assume an average annual output of **20 to 40 marketable Nattu Kodi birds per farmer** in this unorganized sector.
4. **Calculate the Estimated Number of Farmers:**
   * Number of Farmers = Total Annual Bird Requirement / Average Annual Output per Farmer
   * **Using Lower Bird Req. & Higher Farmer Output:** 2.5 Crore birds / 40 birds/farmer = **625,000 farmers**
   * **Using Higher Bird Req. & Lower Farmer Output:** 3.5 Crore birds / 20 birds/farmer = **1,750,000 farmers**
   * **Using Mid-Range Estimates:** 3.0 Crore birds / 30 birds/farmer = **1,000,000 farmers**

**Conclusion & Interpretation:**

Based on these layered estimations and assumptions, it's plausible that anywhere from **roughly 600,000 to 1.7 million individual farmers/households** in Andhra Pradesh are involved in rearing Nattu Kodi chickens to serve the estimated demand. A central estimate might be around **1 million farmers/households.**

| **Perspective of users** | **General People** | **NO Users** | **Expected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1 general | 1.84 Crore |  |  |
| 2 enthusiasts | 100000+ |  |  |
| 3 high level | 28,441+ |  |  |

## I took a top 9 influenced youtube channels are pro Roosters community :

on average of the nine channels are nearly 1 lack users are most fallowing of content in the youtube.

and take this in a case study of ![[Screenshot (103).png]] ==28,441 views 30 Mar 2025 in 4 days of span (this shows most active users are listed)==

[#eskurifarms](https://www.youtube.com/hashtag/eskurifarms) [#eskuri](https://www.youtube.com/hashtag/eskuri) [#raghunath](https://www.youtube.com/hashtag/raghunath) [#gp](https://www.youtube.com/hashtag/gp) [#gidivadaprabhakar](https://www.youtube.com/hashtag/gidivadaprabhakar) [#trending](https://www.youtube.com/hashtag/trending) [#chicken](https://www.youtube.com/hashtag/chicken) [#birds](https://www.youtube.com/hashtag/birds) [#chicks](https://www.youtube.com/hashtag/chicks) [#farming](https://www.youtube.com/hashtag/farming) [#gp](https://www.youtube.com/hashtag/gp) we respect our culture and tradition it is awareness video about sankranti festival and tradition no birds were hurt during this video

**Research Report: Unorganized Sector Local Breed Chicken Farming in India – North vs. South Comparison**

**Date:** October 26, 2023

**1. Introduction:**

Beyond India's large, industrialized broiler chicken sector lies a vast, often overlooked, unorganized segment focused on rearing local or native chicken breeds (commonly referred to as 'desi murgi', 'country chicken', 'nattu kozhi', etc.). This sector is characterized by individual smallholder farmers, typically operating on a small scale, often using traditional, low-input methods. These birds are distinct from commercial broilers and layers, prized for their perceived taste, texture, hardiness, and suitability to local scavenging conditions. This report examines the characteristics, market dynamics, challenges, and farmer perspectives within this unorganized sector, specifically comparing the situation in South India and North India.

**2. General Characteristics of Unorganized Local Breed Farming (Across India):**

* **Scale:** Predominantly backyard or small-scale semi-intensive systems, ranging from a few birds (<10) to occasionally up to 50-100 birds per household.
* **Farmer Profile:** Often landless labourers, marginal farmers, or women within farming households managing poultry as a supplementary activity. It rarely constitutes the primary source of income but provides crucial cash flow and household protein.
* **Breeds:** Non-descript local breeds dominate, naturally selected for survival in local conditions. Specific recognized native breeds (e.g., Aseel, Kadaknath, Ghagus, Naked Neck) are also reared, sometimes for specific traits or higher market value.
* **Rearing System:** Primarily free-range scavenging systems where birds forage for insects, seeds, grains, and kitchen waste. Minimal supplementary feeding is common, often using locally available grains or household scraps. Night shelter is basic, often rudimentary coops or within the household structure.
* **Inputs:** Very low external inputs – minimal expenditure on specialized feed, vaccines, or medicines. Farmers rely on traditional knowledge for healthcare.
* **Purpose:** Dual-purpose (meat and eggs). Eggs are often consumed at home or sold locally. Male birds and older hens are sold for meat.
* **Market Channels:** Highly localized and informal. Sales occur:
  + Directly to consumers in the village or nearby towns.
  + At weekly rural markets (haats/shandies).
  + To itinerant traders or middlemen who aggregate birds.
* **Pricing:** Local breed chickens command a premium price (often 1.5x to 3x) over broiler chicken in most markets due to perceived superior taste, texture ('firmness'), and natural rearing methods. However, farmers often receive only a fraction of the final consumer price due to middlemen.

**3. Regional Analysis: South India**

(States like Tamil Nadu, Kerala, Karnataka, Andhra Pradesh, Telangana)

* **Prevalence & Tradition:** Rearing local breeds ('Nattu Kozhi' in Tamil, 'Nati Koli' in Kannada, 'Naatu Kodi' in Telugu) is deeply ingrained in the rural culture and cuisine. There's a strong traditional preference and consistent demand.
* **Market Demand & Premium:** Very strong consumer demand exists, especially in rural areas and smaller towns, but also extending to urban centers through specialized shops. The price premium over broiler chicken is generally significant and well-established. Demand peaks during festivals and specific occasions.
* **Breeds:** High diversity of local non-descript breeds. Specific breeds like Aseel (for meat/fighting characteristics) and others adapted to regional agro-climatic zones are common. There's growing interest, even at the smallholder level, in rearing breeds like Kadaknath (though native to MP, popularised for perceived medicinal value).
* **Farming Practices:** While backyard scavenging is dominant, semi-intensive systems (with slightly more organized feeding and housing) are relatively more common compared to the North, sometimes driven by local entrepreneurs catering to specific demand. Favorable climate allows for year-round rearing with less need for elaborate winter protection.
* **Market Linkages:** While informal channels dominate, some regions have more established local markets or networks specifically for country chicken. The proximity of numerous towns and cities creates relatively better, though still challenging, market access compared to remote Northern areas.
* **Farmer Economics:** While input costs are low, productivity (growth rate, egg numbers) is also low. High mortality rates (disease, predation) are a major risk. The high premium offers potential for good returns if birds survive and the farmer accesses a decent price point, bypassing multiple layers of middlemen. Women play a very significant role in managing these flocks.

**4. Regional Analysis: North India**

(States like Uttar Pradesh, Bihar, Punjab, Haryana, Rajasthan, Himachal Pradesh, Uttarakhand)

* **Prevalence & Tradition:** Rearing 'desi murgi' is common, particularly in poorer rural households, but perhaps less culturally central to cuisine in some regions compared to the deep South. In certain areas (like Punjab, Haryana), the organized broiler sector's penetration is extremely high, somewhat overshadowing the local breed market visibility.
* **Market Demand & Premium:** Demand exists, especially in rural areas and for specific festive occasions. However, the price premium over broilers might be slightly less pronounced or more variable in some Northern markets compared to the South. Price sensitivity among consumers can be higher. In colder regions, demand might be more seasonal.
* **Breeds:** Primarily hardy, non-descript local breeds adapted to harsher climates (heat in Rajasthan, cold in hills). Aseel is known, often associated with hobbyists or specific communities. Formal identification and promotion of specific Northern native meat breeds are less common than in the South.
* **Farming Practices:** Predominantly backyard scavenging. Climate poses challenges – extreme summer heat and harsh winters necessitate better shelter and potentially supplementary feeding during lean foraging periods, increasing farmer effort or cost (if feed is purchased). Winter can significantly impact egg laying and chick survival.
* **Market Linkages:** Markets are highly localized and often fragmented. Accessing larger town markets can be difficult for individual smallholders in remote villages. Middlemen play a very dominant role, often dictating low farm-gate prices. Infrastructure for transport and aggregation is less developed for this specific segment compared to commodity crops.
* **Farmer Economics:** Similar challenges of low productivity and high mortality exist. Climate extremes add another layer of risk. Farmers are highly vulnerable to exploitation by middlemen due to fewer direct selling opportunities in some areas. The supplementary income role is crucial, but scaling up even slightly is often difficult due to resource constraints and environmental challenges.

**5. Comparative Summary: South vs. North India (Unorganized Local Breed Sector)**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Feature | South India | North India |
| **Cultural Emphasis** | Strong, deeply integrated into cuisine/tradition | Common, but perhaps less central in some regions |
| **Market Demand** | Very strong, consistent, high premium generally | Existent, can be more seasonal/variable premium |
| **Breed Diversity** | High diversity, specific breeds recognized | Primarily hardy non-descript, fewer recognized types |
| **Farming Intensity** | Primarily backyard, some semi-intensive visible | Overwhelmingly backyard scavenging |
| **Climate Impact** | Generally favorable year-round | Significant impact (extreme heat/cold) |
| **Market Access** | Relatively better access to local/town markets | Often more fragmented, higher reliance on middlemen |
| **Established Premium** | Generally higher and more stable | Can be more variable, potentially lower |
| **Govt/NGO Focus** | Some regional initiatives for native breeds | Less focused initiatives specifically for local poultry |

This estimation involves significant assumptions due to the lack of direct precedent and the informal nature of the target market.

## **I. Target Audience Recap:**

* **Farmers:** Estimated ~600,000 to 1.7 million individuals/households involved in rearing Nattu Kodi, mostly small-scale, unorganized, rural-based, varying tech literacy.
* **Consumers:** Estimated ~1.8 to 2.9 million individuals consuming Nattu Kodi occasionally, primarily concentrated in urban/semi-urban areas for online purchases, seeking authenticity and willing to pay a premium.

## **II. Farmer Adoption Estimation:**

This is arguably the **biggest challenge**.

* **Factors Influencing Adoption:**
  + **Smartphone Penetration & Digital Literacy:** While growing, consistent smartphone use and comfort with transactional apps is not universal among small, rural farmers (especially older demographics).
  + **Trust:** Farmers need to trust the platform for payments, fair dealings, and reliable order pickup. Building this trust against established informal networks is hard.
  + **Value Proposition:** The app must offer a clear benefit, primarily a significantly better price than selling to middlemen or locally, enough to overcome the hassle factor.
  + **Ease of Use:** The app must be extremely simple, intuitive, and available in Telugu, potentially with voice support.
  + **Logistics Integration:** CRITICAL. How does the bird get from the farmer to the consumer? Does the app integrate with delivery partners? Who bears the cost/risk? Farmers won't adopt if they suddenly have complex delivery logistics to manage.
  + **Training & Support:** Significant on-ground effort would be needed to onboard and support farmers.
  + **Consistency of Supply:** Individual farmers have small, irregular batches. Aggregating this supply visually on an app for consistent consumer demand is complex.
* **Estimated Adoption Rate:**
  + **Year 1 (Initial Launch):** Very low. Expect adoption primarily from slightly larger/more progressive farmers near urban centers or those with younger, tech-savvy family members. An optimistic estimate might be **0.5% to 1.5%** of the potential farmer base actively listing and using the app. This translates to roughly **3,000 to 25,000 farmers**. Achieving even this requires intense groundwork.
  + **Years 2-3 (Post-Validation):** If the platform proves reliable, demonstrates higher earnings, and crucially, solves the logistics, adoption could slowly climb. Perhaps reaching **3% to 7%** (**18,000 to 120,000 farmers**).
  + **Long Term:** Significant penetration (e.g., >10-15%) seems unlikely without major structural changes in rural digital infrastructure, logistics networks, and farmer training, or a hybrid model involving local aggregation points.

## **III. Consumer User Traffic Estimation:**

This depends heavily on marketing, app usability, trustworthiness, and consistent availability of chicken from farmers.

* **Factors Influencing Traffic:**
  + **App Awareness:** Marketing efforts needed to reach target consumers (urban dwellers seeking Nattu Kodi).
  + **Trust & Quality Assurance:** Consumers need assurance they are getting authentic, healthy Nattu Kodi. Reviews, ratings, farmer profiles, and potentially certification/checks are vital.
  + **Convenience & Delivery:** Ordering must be simple, and delivery reliable and reasonably priced (or factored into the chicken cost). Live bird vs. dressed chicken options impact logistics and appeal.
  + **Price Competitiveness:** While expecting a premium, the final price (including delivery) must be perceived as fair value compared to specialized local butcher shops or markets selling Nattu Kodi.
  + **Geographic Coverage:** Initially likely limited to major cities (Visakhapatnam, Vijayawada, Guntur, Tirupati etc.) where delivery is feasible and demand concentrated.
* **Estimated User Traffic:**
  + **Registered Users (Year 1):** With focused digital marketing in target cities, could potentially attract **20,000 to 50,000** downloads/registrations from interested consumers.
  + **Active Buyers (Year 1):** The number making actual purchases will be much lower initially, depending on farmer availability and successful fulfillment. Perhaps **1,000 to 5,000** active buyers making purchases monthly in the early stages.
  + **Growth Potential:** If the platform builds trust, ensures quality, and offers reliable delivery with sufficient farmer supply, user traffic could grow significantly, potentially reaching **hundreds of thousands of registered users** and **tens of thousands of active monthly buyers** in the medium term (3-5 years) within covered geographic areas.
  + **Traffic Pattern:** Expect peaks around weekends and festivals, mirroring traditional Nattu Kodi buying habits.

## **IV. Practical Adoption Summary & Key Challenges:**

* **Farmer Adoption:** This is the bottleneck. Adoption will likely be **slow and low** initially, hampered by digital literacy, trust issues, and the unsolved challenge of hyper-local logistics for small, individual sellers. Success hinges on demonstrating clear financial benefit and providing immense support/simplified logistics.
* **Consumer Traffic:** There is clear potential demand from urban consumers. Converting this interest into active, repeat online purchases requires building a trustworthy brand, ensuring quality/authenticity, offering convenient delivery, and having enough farmers actually using the platform to provide supply.
* **The Chicken-and-Egg Problem:** You need enough farmers listing to attract consumers, but farmers won't join without seeing consumer demand (orders). This requires initial investment to subsidize one or both sides or solve logistics centrally.
* **Unit Economics:** The cost of customer acquisition, farmer onboarding, and especially delivery for relatively low-frequency, small-batch orders from dispersed farmers needs careful calculation to ensure viability.

**Conclusion:**

An app concept for marketing Nattu Kodi directly has theoretical appeal due to existing demand and potential for better farmer prices. However, **practical adoption, especially by the target farmers in the unorganized sector, faces enormous hurdles.** Initial farmer adoption is likely to be very low (thousands, not hundreds of thousands). Consumer traffic can be generated with marketing, but retaining them depends entirely on the platform's ability to reliably source from enough active farmers and manage delivery effectively and affordably. It's a high-potential but extremely high-execution-risk venture heavily dependent on solving the ground-level logistics and trust issues.