



FORM 2.1 Annual Social Impact Report by VAAGDHARA

(In terms of Regulation 91E (1) of SEBI (Listing Obligations and Disclosure Requirements) Regulations, 2015)

[This Impact Report is to be prepared Annually by Social Enterprise for Social Projects/Programs
Funded by Security Listed on SSE of NSE]

Assessment for the Financial Year April 2025 - March 2026

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION -A: TO BE FILLED BY SOCIAL ENTERPRISE	4
1. General Information	
2. Designated timeline for Mid-term and End-term (if any)	
3. Solution implementation plan and KPIs:	
4. Baseline and situation analysis	
SECTION -B: TO BE FILLED BY SOCIAL ENTERPRISE	7
5. Report on Performance and Outcome	
5.1 STATED OVERALL OUTCOME AND OVERALL OUTCOME KPIS (TO BE FILLED BY SOCIAL ENTERPRISE)	7
5.2 ANNUAL PROGRESS IN OUTCOME KPIS VIS-À-VIS OVERALL OUTCOME KPIS FOR THE YEAR REPORTED UPON (PREVIOUS YEAR).....	7
5.3 ANNUAL PROGRESS OF ACTIVITIES AND INPUTS VIS-À-VIS STATED OUTPUT KPIS IN THE YEAR REPORTED UPON (PREVIOUS YEAR)	9
5.4 CUMULATIVE DEVIATION IN OUTPUT KPIS UNDER EACH OUTCOME KPI OF THE PREVIOUS YEARS BEFORE THE YEAR REPORTED UPON .	12
INTERMEDIATE OUTCOME WISE KPIS AT EACH LEVEL	13
5.6 PAST PERFORMANCE TREND.....	15
6. Report on risks and unintended negative outcome	
7. Report on stakeholder consultation	
8. Report on sustainability of the interventions made as envisaged in the Fund Raising Document	23
9. Plan for using Social Impact Assessment for Knowledge Management	
10. Plans for the next Social Impact Assessment Cycle	
11. Photographs conveying before and after impact of the Programme	
12. Annexures	
SECTION – C: TO BE FILLED BY ASSESSORS FOR FACILITATING ASSESSMENT.....	33
13. Analysis of Solution Implementation Plan (SIP) and Key Performance Indicators	
14. Previous Social Impact Assessments, if any	
15. Report on Performance	
15.1 PERFORMANCE ON OUTCOME.....	35
15.2 STAKEHOLDER FEEDBACK	38
15.3 CONVERGENCE, CONTRIBUTION, KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT AND SUSTAINABILITY	ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.
16. Issues for Achievements	
SECTION – D CONFIRMATION BY SOCIAL ENTERPRISE	49

INSTRUCTIONS:

All Social Enterprises with currently Listed Securities on the SSE, will prepare an **Annual Social Impact Report in Form 2.1** for each project funded through a listed security on any SSE, with reference to the details provided in the Final Fund Raising Document (FFRD) at the time of listing and the Solution Implementation Plan (SIP) prepared thereafter to implement the project. This requires one Impact Report per currently listed security to be made annually by a Social Enterprise till the security is listed on the SSE. The Social Impact Assessment will be prepared by the Social Enterprise and it will get it assessed by an external Social Impact Assessor who is empaneled with an SRO specified by SEBI.

Form 2.1 has four Sections

Section A: deals with general information, information of project timeline for needful third-party evaluation (if any), identifying the presence of KPIs in the solution implementation plan and knowing in very brief about the baseline situation. This needs to be filled by Social Enterprise, project.

Section B: deals with annual progress report to be filled by Social Enterprise prior to the conduct of Social Impact Assessment. It is important to note that Social Enterprises will make entry of the **annual progress that are contextually relevant** for the KPIs set for that particular year as per the Solution Implementation Plan.

Section C: deals with the statement of primary assessment by Assessors based on the entries made by Social Enterprise in the progress report in **Section B**. Social Impact Assessors will provide specific comments on aspects placed in **Section C** of this form in their Social Impact Assessment Report.

Section D: deals with Confirmation by Social Enterprise

Section E: deals with all the supplementary information to be provided in the form of Annexes

Social Enterprise is required to submit the Annual Social Impact Assessment Report in Form 3.1 to the respective SSE.

SECTION -A: To be filled by Social Enterprise

1. General Information

	Item	Social Enterprise Response
1.	Listing ID	
2.	Name of the organization	VAAGDHARA
3.	Name of program	Sustainable Community Action for Climate Change Mitigation in Tribal Junction of Central Western India
4.	Duration	3 Years (1st April 2024 to 31st March 2027)
5.	Program mode: (one time/ ongoing)	Ongoing
6.	Program area - States with Districts [mention aspirational blocks, if any, as covered as per NITI Aayog]	240 villages of Ghatol, Anandpuri and kushalgarh blocks of Banswara
7.	Beneficiary group(s)/ segment(s)*	<i>Families (Households)-4800 Individuals (Members of Families) Male 10000, Female 10000</i>
8.	Thematic Areas as per SSE	Climate & Environment
9.	SDG Goals Aligned	SDG 13: Climate Action (Climate change mitigation Community-based climate resilience Adaptation and sustainable practices Reducing environmental impacts)
10.	Alignment with National and State Schemes & priorities	1. National Action Plan on Climate Change (NAPCC) 2. National Mission for Sustainable Agriculture 3. Pradhan Mantri Krishi Sinchayee Yojana

* For Environmental and Cultural Programs/Projects- please state the segment(s)

2. Designated timeline for Mid-term and End-term (if any) *

Phase	Financial Year (From)	Financial Year (To)	Possible month of Review
Pre Project implementation	1 st April 2024 to 31 st march 2027		NA
Phase I: Project Start to mid-term	1 st Jan 2025	31 st Dec. 2025	31 st march
Phase II: Midterm to End term	1 st Jan. 2025	31 st Dec. 2026	31 st march

Phase III: Midterm to End term	1 st Jan 2026	31 st Dec. 2027	31 st march
--------------------------------	--------------------------	----------------------------	------------------------

**Depending on the length of the project period, the projects/ programs of 3 year or more duration need mid-term evaluation. The mid-term evaluation of 3/5-year project will be co-terminus with of 2nd year / 3rd year annual evaluation cycle. The end-term evaluation is co-terminus with the annual end year project evaluation cycle, unless found necessary to conduct special evaluation exercise beyond the end year project evaluation cycle*

3. Solution implementation plan and KPIs:

SI no.	Parameters	Yes/No/ partially yes	If yes, give the reference page in SIP
i.	Has the Solution implementation plan (SIP) considered the Guiding framework on Logic Model* for plan preparation?	Yes	
ii.	Has timeline based KPIs for outcome, output and activities been delineated in clear qualitative and quantitative terms in the SIP?	Yes	
iii.	Have the parameters** of reach, depth and inclusion integrated appropriately in the KPIs in SIP?	Yes	
iv.	Are each of the KPIs verifiable?	Yes	
v.	Have the means of verification worked out in clear terms for each KPIs?	Yes	
vi.	Have the stakeholders been mapped out clearly for consultation and feedback across the timeline of the project?	partially yes	
*Annex-1 of Guiding Framework on Logic Model {Section III (I)} of USIAF ** Annex-2 of Guiding Framework on Logic Model {Section III (I)} of USIAF			

4. Baseline and situation analysis

What is the baseline status at the start of the activity, intervention, program or project?

** The majority of farmers (74%) rely on inorganic farming, with 87% using chemical fertilizers like urea and DPA, contributing significantly to greenhouse gas emissions. Adoption of climate-resilient practices remains low, including minimal use of renewable energy (biogas 4%, solar 10%) and limited traditional methods like Hangedi Kheti (55%). Only 23% of CBOs/CSOs are engaged in climate change action plans, indicating a lack of priority for climate mitigation in community organizations. Additionally, 80% practice monoculture farming, and 88% use fossil fuel-powered equipment, locking smallholders into high-carbon, resource-intensive farming. The community is not actively aligned with climate change mitigation (CCM) actions needed for climate justice.*

SECTION -B:

5. Report on Performance and Outcome

5.1 Stated overall outcome and overall outcome KPIs (to be filled by Social Enterprise)

Stated overall outcome:

Sustainable community action for climate change mitigation in tribal junction of central western India.

Stated overall KPIs:

Indigenous communities in 240 villages at tribal junctions in central India adopt minimum of three actions for CCM like Hangadi, Agro-forestry, Solar-roof, Biogas, etc.

5.2 Annual Progress in Outcome KPIs vis-à-vis Overall outcome KPIs for the year reported upon (previous year)

Stated Intermediate Outcome/s of the project and their KPIs	KPIs Applicable at different Outcome levels (1,2 and 3) for the year reported upon	What has been accomplished in KPIs mentioned at Col. 2 ?	What could not be accomplished mentioned in Col. 2 ?	Why it could not be accomplished? Any challenges?	Unintended negative outcome, if any
1	2	3	4	5	6
Outcome 1: Community Action for Climate Change Mitigation – Indigenous communities in 240 villages adopt minimum three CCM actions (Hangedi, Agro-forestry, Solar-roof, Biogas, etc.)	% of target villages (240) adopting at least 3 CCM actions	90.4% (217 out of 240 villages) have started adopting three actions. High household adoption: Hangedi (82.2%), Agroforestry (80.5%), Organic composting (78.2%), Drought-resistant seeds (66.1%), Solar panels (20.1%), Biogas (18.9%), Solar irrigation (23.7%).	None – fully achieved as per reporting period	N/A	None
Outcome 2: 30 CBOs collectively bring out charter of climate change mitigation action for tribal junction area and share with state government for SAPCC	Number of CBOs holding climate-sensitive meetings and preparing demand letters	25 CBOs (86.4%) held climate-sensitive meetings and prepared demand letters covering water conservation, agroforestry, renewable energy, forest conservation, climate-resilient crops. 14 CBOs (63.6%) submitted	5 CBOs yet to submit charters to state government	Process of submission to state government is ongoing; requires multiple follow-ups and formal documentation before official	None

		letters to higher levels (PRI/block/district/state)		submission to SAPCC authorities	
Outcome 3: 5000+ indigenous smallholder farmers (20% of 24,000 families) adopted climate change resilient practices and reduced net GHG emission by 50% of baseline	Number of farmers adopting at least one Climate-Smart Agriculture (CSA) practice	4,566 farmers (91.1% of target) adopted at least one CSA practice. High uptake: native seeds (93.6%), organic manure (88.6%), mixed cropping (82.2%), tree plantation on bunds (82%). GHG baseline established: 44.1% emissions from cooking sources, avg. 3,340 kgCO ₂ e/household/year.	Full 50% GHG emission reduction not yet achieved; baseline fully established but reduction tracking ongoing	Emission reduction requires longer implementation period (multiple crop cycles) to measure full impact. Baseline established successfully; reduction tracking will be completed in subsequent reporting periods	None

**Stated intermediate outcome/s and external KPIs meant for Third party evaluation needs to be mentioned from the fundraising document*

***Only timeline based KPI metrics applicable for third party evaluation for the year reported upon needs to be mentioned*

****Stated Assumptions and Risks in the fundraising document also need to be taken into consideration in answering what and why*

5.3 Annual Progress of Activities and Inputs vis-à-vis stated Output KPIs in the year reported upon (previous year)

State overall output KPIs at each level of outcome Unit	Overall activity target of the project (unit)	Activity target of the year reported upon		Achievement during the year reported upon		Deviation (if any) for the year reported upon		Reasons for deviation
		Physical (unit)	Financial (Rs.)	Physical (unit)	Financial (Rs.)	Physical (unit)	Financial	Physical and/or Financial
1	2	3	4	5	6	7 (Col 5-3)	8 (Col 6-4)	9
Statement of Outcome 1: CBOs in tribal junction empowered for adopting Pathway of CCM for climate justice								
Output 1.1: KPI Training completed on CCM								
Activity 1.1.01: Initial training of VAAGDHARA Advocacy Core Team on CCM	Training	1	1	As per budget	1	As per budget	0	0
Activity 1.1.02: Training of VAAGDHARA Field Team on CCM	Training	1	1	As per budget	1(45 participants)	As per budget	0	0
Output 1.2 KPI: Traditional practices documented								
Activity 1.1.03: Exploring mitigation outcomes of traditional practices (Hirma Kheti)	Study	1	1	As per budget	1 (Action research paper completed)	As per budget	0	0
Output 1.3 KPI: CBOs sensitized on CCM pathway								
Activity 1.1.04: Sensitization of CBOs on adapting CCM pathway	Meetings	30	6	As per budget	6 (484 participants)	As per budget	0	0
Activity 1.1.05: CCM linked discussion at KASM	Workshop	2	1	As per budget	1 (180 participants)	As per budget	0	0
Activity 1.1.06: Participate in networks of CCM & CCA actions	Event	2	1	As per budget	1 ("Climate in Context" panel, Mumbai)	As per budget	0	0
Statement of Outcome 2: Statement of Outcome 2: Small holder families adopt climate change resilient technologies and contribute to mitigation actions								
Output 2.1 KPI: Demonstrations conducted on CCM actions								
Activity 1.2.01: Demonstration of Farmer's	Demonstrations	240	240	As per budget	240 groups (1,846 kharif +	As per budget	0	0

action on CCM					825 jayad farmers)			
Output 2.2 KPI: Farmer Field School sessions conducted								
Activity 1.2.02: Farmer's Field School Approach on CCM with Saksham Samuha	Sessions	530	265 (50% of total)	As per budget	418	As per budget	153	0
Output 2.3 KPI: Information circulated through mobile/web platforms								
Activity 1.2.03: Circulation of information through mobile and web platforms on CCM	Blogs/Stories	18	9	As per budget	9	As per budget	0	0
Statement of Outcome 3: Adoption of CCM pathway within Government Action for sustainable development								
Output 3.1 KPI: Review of programs with CCM lens completed								
Activity 1.3.01: Review of Various Programs with CCM lens	State-study	1	1	As per budget	0	As per budget	-1	0
Output 3.2 KPI: IEC materials developed for CCM actions								
Activity 1.3.02: Evolve Material for CCM Focused Actions	Materials	2 (annual)	2	As per budget	2 (Pamphlets, posters, and background document)	As per budget	0	0
Output 3.3 KPI: CSGPDP piloted in active Gram Panchayats								
Activity 1.3.03: Piloting of CSGPDP at Active Gram Panchayat	Panchayats	12	12	As per budget	12 (GPDP submitted covering water, forest, land, livestock, solar, seeds)	As per budget	0	0
Statement of Output 4: Monitoring actions								
Output 4.1 KPI: Consultancy services hired								
Activity 1.4.01: Hired Services and Project-related Consultancies (CCM)	Days	33	33	As per budget	25	As per budget	-8	As per budget
Output 4.2 KPI: Feasibility study completed								
Activity 1.4.02: Feasibility Study for the project	Study	1	1	As per budget	1	As per budget	0	0
Output 4.3 KPI: Coordination meetings held								
Activity 1.4.03: Meetings	Meetings	12	12	As per budget	12	As per	0	0

Programme Staff Coordination meeting						budget		
Activity 1.4.04: Quarterly Review meeting	Meetings	4	4	As per budget	4	As per budget	0	0
Output 4.4 KPI: Exposure visits conducted								
Activity 1.4.06: Exposure visit	Visits	2	2	As per budget	0	As per budget	-2	0
Output 4.5 KPI: Specialized training for team members								
Activity 1.4.07: Specialized Training for Team Members	Trainings	4	4	As per budget	4 (38 participants)	As per budget	0	0
Output 4.6 KPI: Online capacity building linked								
Activity 1.4.08: Linking Online capacity building	Capacity building	3	3	As per budget	2	As per budget	-1	0

NOTE: Column no 3,4,5 and 6 should consider only the target and achievement of the year reported upon (previous year)

**Intermediate outcome wise output/outputs KPI targeted.*

**The number of outcomes and outputs will differ from project to project based on the fundraising document*

***Unit to be set as per the physical activity*

5.4 Cumulative deviation in output KPIs under each outcome KPI of the previous years before the year reported upon

Outputs at each level of outcome	Cumulative KPI target and finance provided in previous years before the year reported upon		Cumulative KPI achievement and finance utilized in the previous years before the year reported upon		Cumulative Deviation, if any, in the previous years		Reasons for deviation, if any
	KPI (unit)	Financial (Rs.)	KPI (unit)	Financial (Rs.)	KPI (unit)	Financial (Rs.)	KPI and /or Finance
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Outcome 1 KPI: CBOs empowered for adopting CCM pathway							
Output 1.1: Training on CCM	2 trainings	As per budget	2 trainings (269 + 120 participants)	As per budget	0	0	No deviation
Output 1.2: Traditional practices documented	1 study	As per budget	In process	As per budget	-1 study	0	Study on Hirma Kheti was initiated but not completed in this period; completed in subsequent FY 2025-2026
Output 1.3: CBOs sensitized	6 meetings	As per budget	6 meetings (94 members sensitized across 6 KASS)	As per budget	0	0	No deviation
Output 1.3: CBOs sensitized	6 meetings	As per budget	6 meetings (94 members sensitized across 6 KASS)	As per budget	0	0	No deviation
Outcome 2 KPI: Smallholder farmers adopt climate resilient technologies							
Output 2.1: Demonstrations on CCM	240 demonstrations	As per budget	240 demonstrations (2,240 farmers reached)	As per budget	0	0	No deviation
Output 2.2: Farmer Field School sessions	0 sessions (target not set for this period)	As per budget	4 sessions (with 240 groups, 1,789 participants)	As per budget	+4 sessions	0	FFS sessions conducted earlier than planned due to high community demand
Output 2.3: Information circulation	3 blogs/stories	As per budget	1 story published	As per budget	-2 stories	0	Remaining stories were in process and completed in subsequent FY 2025-2026
Outcome 3 KPI: CCM pathway adopted in Government Action							
Output 3.1: Review of programs with CCM lens	1 state-study	As per budget	0 (In process)	As per budget	-1 study	0	Study initiated but not completed; draft completed in subsequent FY 2025-2026

Output 3.2: IEC materials developed	2 materials (annual)	As per budget	1 pamphlet developed	As per budget	-1 material	0	Second material (posters) completed in subsequent FY 2025-2026
Output 3.3: CSGPDP piloted	0 Panchayats (target not set for this period)	As per budget	2 Panchayats (342 participants trained)	As per budget	+2 Panchayats	0	Piloting initiated earlier than planned; expanded to 12 Panchayats in subsequent FY 2025-2026

**For details see year on year physical and financial progress of the organization*

***Unit to be set as per the physical activity*

5.5 Convergence and contribution of the year reported upon (previous year) @

Intermediate outcome wise KPIs at each level	Convergence from the outside the project			Contributions rendered voluntarily by target beneficiaries'/community/entity, if any		Units
	Convergence items Unit	Agencies	Estimated money value of convergence (Optional)	Contribution items Units	Estimated money value of contribution (Optional)	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Outcome 1 KPIs: CBOs in tribal junction empowered for adopting CCM pathway	KASM federation platform	1 federation (40 villages, ~5,000 families)	KASM (Karshi Evam Adivasi Swaraj Manch)	1	Participation in CBO sensitization meetings	484 participants (6 meetings)
	"Climate in Context" panel discussion	1 national platform	Dasra (Mumbai)	1	CCM linked discussion participation	180 participants (KASM workshop, Anandpuri)
	Climate and Education Centres resolution	1 resolution	Panchayat-level institutions	1	Collective resolution for CCM action	1 resolution
Outcome 2 KPIs: Small holder families adopt climate change resilient technologies and contribute to mitigation actions	Government solar scheme (5 kW panels for agriculture)	45 farmers installed	Government departments (Kushalgarh block)	45	Land for demonstration plots	240 plots (2,000 women members engaged)
	Government solar scheme (household systems)	5 households installed	Government departments (Kushalgarh block)	5	Compost pit construction (Mrida Swaraj initiative)	1,168 villages (10 families per village)
	Government convergence for compost pits	5 farmers per village supported	Local Panchayats	5	Adoption of native seeds	93.6% of target farmers (4,566+ farmers)
	Online capacity building platforms	2 platforms mapped	Various online course providers	2	Organic manure adoption	88.6% of target farmers
	Media	1 feature	The Hindu	1quantified	Mixed cropping	82.2% of target

	coverage (The Hindu newspaper)		News PAper		adoption	farmers
	NPKZn liquid microbial inoculant support	1,824 liters	Government/Agricultural agencies	Not quantified	Tree plantation on bunds	82% of target farmers
	Ground rock phosphate support	30.40 metric tonnes	Government/Agricultural agencies	Not quantified	Participation in Farmer Field School sessions	418 sessions with 240 Saksham Samuha groups
	Government scheme linkage for solar panels	List of 120 farmers submitted	Government departments (Kushalgarh block)	120	Mrida Khad Swaraj website content contribution	1 website (mridakhadswaraj.in)
Outcome 3 KPIs: Adoption of CCM pathway within Government Action for sustainable development	GPDP planning process integration	12 Gram Panchayats (Hiran, Mahi, Mangarh units)	Panchayati Raj Institutions	12	Submission of individual-level GPDP plans	Water: 5,060; Land: 4,227; Livestock: 5,804; Solar: 406; Indigenous seeds: 932
	CSGPDP piloting support	12 Panchayats	Panchayati Raj Institutions	12	Submission of community-level GPDP plans	Water: 4,386; Land: 3,176; Livestock: 1,722; Solar: 72; Seeds: 128; Other: 378
	KASS (Krishi Evam Adivasi Swaraj Sangathan) network	6 KASS clusters (40 villages)	KASS federations	6	Farmer participation in Beej Utsav (seed festival)	1 community seed festival
	Participation in CCM/CCA networks	1 annual event (Philanthropy week)	Dasra	1	Community-led Ukheda Abhiyan (seed conservation campaign)	Multi-village campaign
	State-study on programs with CCM lens	1 draft report (in process)	Government departments	1	Community validation of program review findings	Participatory process ongoing
	IEC material distribution support	Pamphlets and posters developed	VAAGDHARA with partner branding	Not quantified	Community feedback on IEC materials	Multi-village consultation
	Training on CSGPDP for Panchayat representatives	342 participants trained (Banswara and Dahod districts)	Government departments	132	Panchayat representative engagement in climate planning	12 Panchayats

@the applicability of this format will depend from project to project. Wherever applicable is important to assess through this format. Please refer to Annex-1 **Point 8** (Handling convergence, contribution and sustainability by SE) of Guiding Framework on Logic Model for needful guidance.

* Convergence Items consists of assets/ expertise/capacities or any other support mobilized through partnerships, networks and influence from the stakeholders within and outside the project.

**** Any agreed upon voluntary contribution time, money, materials, or labour to the project (social/ environmental/ cultural) activities by the target community/entity, or stake undertaken by the target community/entity to sustain the project with considerations for reach, depth, inclusion.**

***** Agencies could be any government or any non-government partner institutions and individuals who has a stake in the project or whose stake need to be developed in the interest of the Project.**

******Unit to be set as per the convergence/ contribution item.**

*******Giving this information is optional, but this will be very useful in creating narrative on stakeholders' participation/contribution in tangible terms. This should be provided only if the organization has a reasonable basis of calculation to provide this information.**

5.6 Past performance trend

What has been the past performance trend? What are the organization's learnings on what went well and what did not work well?

**Write your inference on key past performance trends on activity, intervention, program using the reference to entries made in Col 6,7 and 8 of table 5.4 (Cumulative deviation in outcome-wise output KPIs till previous years before the year reported upon).*

Inference on Key Past Performance Trends

Performance Category	Activities / Outputs	Deviation (Col 6)	Remarks (Col 7 & 8)	What Went Well / What Did Not Work Well
What Went Well (Positive Deviations)	Farmer Field School (FFS) sessions	+4 sessions (achieved 4 vs target 0)	"4 Session have been done with 240 groups"	High community demand and active participation of women farmers; activity conducted ahead of schedule
	Piloting of CSGPDP at Gram Panchayat	+2 Panchayats (achieved 2 vs target 0)	"Training sessions held in Banswara and Dahod districts to sensitize 342 participants"	Strong government readiness to integrate climate actions into local planning; early adoption by Panchayats
What Did Not Work Well (Negative Deviations)	Exploring mitigation outcomes of traditional practices (Hirma Kheti)	-1 study (In process)	"In process"	Research and documentation took longer than anticipated due to participatory methods and field validation requirements
	Review of Various Programs with CCM lens (State-study)	-1 study (0 achieved)	"In process"	Study initiated but not completed; requires more time for participatory analysis and community validation
	Circulation of information through blogs/stories	-2 stories (achieved 1 vs target 3)	"Others In process"	Limited internal capacity for content generation; need for dedicated communication resources

	Evolve Material for CCM Focused Actions (IEC materials)	-1 material (achieved 1 vs target 2)	"Pamphlets" only developed	Posters were delayed; need better planning of design and production timelines
	Hired Services and Project-related Consultancies (CCM)	-8 days (achieved 1 vs target 9)	"Consultancy fee for success story publication" only	Overestimation of need or challenges in identifying/hiring suitable consultants
	Exposure visit	-1 visit (0 achieved)	"It was not executed, but we are planning in the coming quarter"	Not executed due to multiple concurrent organizational engagements; scheduling issues
On Track (No Deviation)	Initial training of Advocacy Core Team on CCM	0 deviation	"Completed with 269 participants"	Training completed on time with excellent participation
	Training of VAAGDHARA Field Team on CCM	0 deviation	"Training has been done with 120 participants"	Training completed on time with good participation
	Sensitization of CBOs on adapting CCM pathway	0 deviation	"6 meetings done with 6 KASS, sensitized 94 members"	All planned meetings conducted successfully
	Demonstration of Farmer's action on CCM	0 deviation	"240 demonstrations completed; 2240 farmers reached"	Target fully achieved; effective mobilization of farmers

6. Report on risks and unintended negative outcome

6.1	In the previous year, what have you seen as the biggest risks* to the achievement of the desired impact? How are these being mitigated? <i>* Risks could be internal risk such as organizational and HR capacity risks or external risk such as unfavorable change in market and/or policy framework conditions.</i> <i>* This needs to be analyzed in the context of assumptions and risks noted for the period reported upon (previous year) as per Fund Raising Document and Solution implementation Plan (SIP) prepared using Guiding Framework on Logic Model {Section III (I)} of USIAF</i>
6.2	Describe any potential unintended negative outcome of this project seen in the year reported upon (previous year). How are these being addressed? <i>* This needs to be analyzed in the context of potential unintended negative outcome noted in the Solution implementation document for the year reported upon (previous year) prepared as per Fund Raising Document and Solution implementation Plan (SIP) prepared using Guiding Framework on Logic Model {Section III (I)} of USIAF</i>

6.1 In the previous year, what have you seen as the biggest risks* to the achievement of the desired impact? How are these being mitigated?

Field Level

Analysis of Biggest Risks & Mitigation Measures (Year 1)

Risk Category	Risk Description (as per application & emerging challenges)	How the Risk Manifested in the Reporting Period (Year 1)	Mitigation Measures Implemented (from the report)
External Risk: Policy & Governance	Changes in local/state governance could alter priorities, reducing focus on indigenous & climate issues. (From application: 6. Risks)	Partially manifested. While no major policy shift occurred, the project faced " Fragmented convergence with government schemes. " Accessing renewable energy and climate-smart schemes was complex due to delays, unclear eligibility, and poor departmental coordination. This slowed down adoption by farmers and Panchayats.	1. Strengthened Local Institutions: The project didn't rely solely on government will. It empowered Gram Swaraj Samuha (GSS), Saksham Samuha (SHGs), and KASS to drive the agenda from the bottom up.
			2. Proactive Advocacy & Linking: The project proactively facilitated linkages. For example, they submitted a list of 120 farmers from Kushalgarh block to the government for solar panel schemes.
			3. Evidence-Based Piloting: The Climate Smart Gram Panchayat Development Plan (CSGPDP) pilot in 12 Panchayats created a ready-to-use, community-validated plan, making it easier for local governments to adopt CCM agenda without starting from scratch.
External Risk: Socio-Economic & Adoption	Limited participation due to perceived lack of immediate benefit; social pressure on limited-member groups. (From application: 6. Risks)	Uneven adoption across villages and social groups. Factors like landholding size, income, literacy, and social confidence created significant disparity in adoption rates of climate-resilient practices and technologies, especially among the poorest families. Trust in new technologies (solar, biogas) was low due to past poor experiences.	1. Farmer Field Schools (FFS) & Peer Learning: The project conducted 418 FFS sessions with 240 women's groups. This created a safe, experiential learning environment where farmers could test practices on small plots and see results before committing.
			2. Focus on Local Champions: Women leaders and early adopters were supported to share their success stories, which proved critical in motivating broader participation and building trust.
			3. Linking to Immediate Benefits: Practices like Hirma Kheti (traditional moisture-based farming) were demonstrated to have comparable net income to irrigated farming but at <i>less than half the cost</i> , making the economic benefit immediately apparent.
External Risk: Climate & Environmental	Climate-induced weather extremes (drought, floods, pests) could destabilize project activities. (From application: 6. Risks)	Addressed through project design. The report doesn't highlight a specific extreme event as a failure. Instead, the project's core strategy was to build resilience <i>against</i> this very risk. Erratic rainfall, soil degradation, and water scarcity were consistently identified by communities as key challenges.	1. Promoting Climate-Resilient Practices: The project actively promoted drought-resistant seeds (Desi maize, ragi, millets), mixed cropping (82.2% adoption), and water conservation techniques.
			2. Reviving Indigenous Systems: The action research on Hirma Kheti proved that traditional, low-input farming is naturally more resilient to moisture stress than conventional irrigated farming.
			3. Soil Health Focus: The Mrida Swaraj (Soil Sovereignty) initiative promoted compost pits and bio-inoculants (e.g., NPKZn liquid), directly countering land degradation and improving water-holding capacity.
Internal Risk: Organizational & HR	Mindful persons may not find knowledge-building activities "paying"; risk of social	Well-managed. The report indicates high participation and acceptance. For	1. Community-Owned Process: The project used existing trusted structures (GSS, KASS, Saksham Samuha) for all activities, ensuring transparency and collective decision-making.

	pressure/distrust. (From application: 6. Risks)	example, 481 participants attended CBO sensitization meetings, and 269 participants attended the initial core team training. Adoption rates for practices like native seeds (93.6%) and organic manure (88.6%) were very high.	2. Visible Demonstrations: 240 demonstration plots were established, allowing farmers to see "actions on CCM" directly, which reduced skepticism and social pressure. 3. Inclusive Approach: By targeting 5-20% of families per village initially, they created a critical mass for learning without forcing universal participation, allowing organic diffusion of practices.
External Risk: Demographic / Labor	Youth migration to cities for work, alienating them from traditional farming. (From application: 6. Risks)	Ongoing risk, but targeted action taken. The report acknowledges the challenge but shows specific efforts to re-engage youth through modern tools and platforms.	1. Digital & Social Media Engagement: The project actively used Facebook, Instagram, Twitter, and LinkedIn to circulate information on CCM through blogs, success stories (Beej Utsav, Ukheda Abhiyan), and campaigns. This targeted youth where they are active. 2. Linking Online Capacity Building (Activity 1.4.08): The project included a dedicated component to train the core team and community members on using online learning platforms for climate science and mitigation, making learning accessible to those with smartphones, even in remote areas.

Organizational level

S. No.	Risk Category	Identified Risk	How is it being mitigated?
1	External Risk (Financial/Policy)	Fragmented convergence with government schemes While multiple government schemes exist to support renewable energy and climate-smart solutions, accessing them at the village level remains complex. Delays in approvals, limited clarity on eligibility, and weak coordination between departments slow down convergence efforts, affecting timely adoption by farmers and Panchayats.	The project adopted a phased and adaptive approach. Field teams facilitated linkages with relevant government schemes and supported Panchayat-level planning under the CSGPDP process. Continuous engagement with local government representatives, line departments, and community leadership helped align project interventions with public programmes. In Kushalgarh block, a consolidated list of 120 farmers was prepared and submitted to government departments for solar scheme support, out of which 45 farmers successfully installed 5 kW solar panels.
2	External Risk (Infrastructure/Data)	Limited local data for decision-making and planning Panchayat-level data on energy use, emissions reduction, and long-term cost benefits is still limited. This makes it difficult for local institutions to confidently plan, prioritize, and advocate for renewable energy investments under climate-smart development plans.	The project developed strong evidence-based understanding of climate-linked resources and practices across selected Gram Panchayats. In 12-gram panchayats, detailed GDP plans were submitted covering individual and community-level actions related to water, forest, land, livestock, solar energy, and indigenous seeds (e.g., 5,060 individual water-related actions, 406 solar energy installations, 932 indigenous seed practices). This mapping enabled Panchayats to plan with evidence.

3	External Risk (Trust/Adoption)	Trust-building around new technologies Some community members remain cautious due to past experiences with poorly functioning systems or externally driven projects that lacked follow-up support. Building trust in renewable technologies requires sustained demonstration, peer validation, and long-term handholding.	The project adopted a phased and adaptive approach. Continuous community engagement through Farmer Field Schools, Saksham Samuha meetings, Gram Panchayat forums, and CCM platforms helped improve understanding of renewable technologies and their practical benefits. Confidence was built through small-scale demonstrations and peer learning. Basic operational guidance and regular follow-up by field teams helped address technical concerns and prevent early system failure.
4	Internal Risk (Organizational/HR)	Delays in research, documentation, and communication activities As observed in the past performance trend (Table 5.4), activities such as the study on traditional practices (Hirma Kheti), review of programs with CCM lens, circulation of blogs/stories, and IEC material development faced delays due to limited dedicated capacity, underestimation of time requirements, and difficulties in hiring suitable consultants.	The project demonstrated strong adaptive capacity. Most deviations were corrected in the subsequent period. The Hirma Kheti action research study was completed, IEC materials (pamphlets and posters) were fully developed, CSGPDP was expanded to 12 Panchayats, and 9 blogs/stories were circulated. The project also introduced a Human and Institution Development (HID) component for continuous learning through online platforms to strengthen team capacity.
5	Internal Risk (Scheduling/Planning)	Exposure visits not executed The planned exposure visits could not be undertaken due to multiple concurrent organizational engagements and events during the year.	The visits have been rescheduled for the upcoming quarter. To ensure meaningful participation and deeper learning, the exposure programme will be conducted in two planned rounds, allowing adequate time for interaction, reflection, and knowledge exchange among participants.
6	Internal Risk: Financial & Technical	High upfront costs and limited access to capital for mitigation technologies (solar, biogas). (From application: Problem analysis, 1.2.01, 1.2.02)	Significant barrier. The report explicitly notes that " limited availability of infrastructure and financing options in rural areas... continues to restrict farmers' ability to invest in renewable energy solutions. " High upfront costs were a persistent constraint for scaling solar and biogas.
7	External Risk (Financial/Infrastructure)	Limited availability of infrastructure and financing options in rural areas This continues to restrict farmers' ability to invest in renewable energy solutions such as biogas units and solar-powered tools. High upfront costs remain a critical barrier to scaling up climate-smart and low-carbon practices.	To address high upfront costs, field teams facilitated linkages with relevant government schemes and supported Panchayat-level planning under the CSGPDP process. The project also explored options for farmers to access subsidies or loans. In Kushalgarh block, 45 farmers successfully installed 5 kW solar panels for agricultural purposes and 5 households completed installations for domestic energy use.
6.2 Describe any potential unintended negative outcome of this project seen in the year reported upon			

(previous year). How are these being addressed?

**This needs to be analyzed in the context of potential unintended negative outcome noted in the Solution implementation document for the year reported upon (previous year) prepared as per Fund Raising Document and Solution implementation Plan (SIP) prepared using Guiding Framework on Logic Model {Section III (I)} of USIAF*

Sl. No.	Potential Unintended Negative Outcome	Is it observed?	How is it being addressed?
1	Dependency on external support Continuous project facilitation and handholding could potentially create dependency among communities, reducing their ability to sustain practices independently after project completion.	Not observed yet, but monitored as a potential risk.	The project is explicitly designed around the principle of "Swaraj" (self-reliance). Training programs emphasize community ownership, collective accountability, and locally driven decision-making. The Farmer Field School approach uses experiential learning where farmers test practices on their own farms and reflect on outcomes collectively, building intrinsic motivation and self-sufficiency. Community institutions (GSS, KASS, KASM, Saksham Samuha) are being activated to take ownership of renewable energy planning and climate actions.
2	Inequitable distribution of benefits Better-off farmers with larger landholdings and higher incomes might adopt climate-smart practices more easily, while marginalized families (landless, smallholders, women-headed households) could be left behind, potentially widening existing inequalities.	Not observed, but actively monitored.	The project deliberately targets women farmers through Saksham Samuha (240 groups, 2,000 women members). Demonstration plots and seed distribution explicitly include small and marginal farmers. The CSGPDP process captures individual and community-level actions separately, ensuring that marginalized families are included in planning. The project also focuses on poorest and most marginalized families through targeted mobilization in Gram Swaraj Samuhas.
3	Unintended environmental impact from new technologies Improper installation or disposal of solar panels or biogas units could lead to environmental hazards (e.g., battery waste, plastic waste).	Not observed during this reporting period.	The project is still in early adoption phase (45 solar panels installed without batteries). The project team provides basic operational guidance and regular follow-up. Future phases will include awareness on safe disposal and maintenance of renewable energy systems. The project also promotes plastic-free alternatives and waste management awareness as part of climate mitigation actions.
4	Displacement of traditional practices Promotion of new climate-smart technologies might inadvertently undermine valuable traditional practices that are already sustainable and culturally appropriate.	Not observed. Instead, the project actively documents and promotes traditional practices.	The project conducted action research on Hirma Kheti (traditional moisture-based farming) and used findings to build awareness among farmers. The Ukheda Abhiyan and Beej Utsav focus on conserving indigenous seed varieties and traditional agricultural knowledge. The project explicitly integrates traditional knowledge with modern renewable energy solutions under the concept of Swaraj (self-reliance).

7. Report on stakeholder consultation

Has the organization taken into consideration relevant* stakeholders' feedback in the year reported upon? What has been the stakeholder wise feedback? and how they have been used by the organisation?

**relevant stakeholders mean those mapped out in the SIP for taking feedback during the period reported upon.*

VAAGDHARA has actively taken into consideration feedback from relevant stakeholders during the reporting period (FY 2025-2026). The project employed a participatory approach, engaging stakeholders through community dialogue meetings, Farmer Field Schools (FFS), CBO sensitization sessions, Gram Panchayat forums, KASM and KASS meetings, quarterly review meetings, and monthly coordination meetings. Feedback was systematically collected, reviewed, and used to refine project strategies, address challenges, and align interventions with local needs and priorities.

S.No.	Stakeholder Category	Key Feedback Received	How Feedback Has Been Used by the Organization
1	Community Members (Tribal Farmers)	Farmers expressed that many had gradually stopped cultivating the third (jayad) crop cycle due to lack of awareness and appropriate seeds, leading to underutilization of land and reduced soil fertility. They requested support for reviving traditional and indigenous seed varieties and for cultivating the jayad season.	The project responded by distributing green gram (moong) seeds for the jayad season (825 farmers) and traditional/indigenous seed varieties for the kharif season (1,846 farmers). This revived awareness and practice of the jayad crop cycle, enhanced soil fertility through nitrogen-fixing properties of moong, and strengthened climate resilience and biodiversity.
2	Women Farmers (Saksham Samuha Members)	Women farmers expressed strong interest in renewable energy solutions such as solar energy and biogas, showing willingness to transition from traditional energy sources (firewood, kerosene) towards sustainable alternatives. They requested practical training and support for adoption.	The project submitted a list of 120 farmers from Kushalgarh block to the government for support under the solar panel scheme. Of these, 45 farmers successfully installed 5 kW solar panels for agricultural purposes, and 5 households completed installations for domestic energy use. The Farmer Field School sessions (418 sessions) included practical training on biogas systems and solar-powered tools.
3	CBOs (KASS, KASM, Gram Swaraj Samuhas)	CBO members highlighted emerging local challenges such as soil degradation, water scarcity, and crop losses caused by erratic weather patterns. They requested practical response strategies and capacity building on climate-resilient farming practices.	The project organized six CBO sensitization meetings (484 participants) and CCM linked discussions at KASM (180 participants). Community members jointly identified practical response strategies including adoption of organic farming, revival of traditional water harvesting systems, promotion of indigenous seed varieties, and increased use of renewable energy solutions. A key outcome was a collective resolution to establish Climate and Education Centres at Panchayat level.

4	CBOs (Regarding Charter/Action Plan)	CBOs reported that while they were engaged in various activities (agroforestry, land management), climate change discussions were not a priority in their agendas. They requested support to integrate climate change topics into their action plans.	The project facilitated 25 CBOs (86.4%) to hold climate-sensitive meetings and prepare demand letters addressing climate effects. These letters commonly included water conservation, agroforestry, nutrition gardens, renewable energy promotion, forest conservation, climate-resilient crops, disaster preparedness, and waste management. Notably, 14 CBOs (63.6%) submitted these letters to higher levels (PRI/block/district/state).
5	Panchayat Representatives (Gram Panchayats)	Panchayat representatives expressed the need for evidence-based data on climate-linked resources and practices to confidently plan, prioritize, and advocate for renewable energy investments under climate-smart development plans. They requested support for integrating climate actions into GPDP.	The project piloted Climate Smart GPDP (CSGPDP) in 12 gram panchayats across Hiran, Mahi, and Mangarh units. Detailed individual and community-level GPDP plans were submitted covering water (5,060 individual + 4,386 community actions), land (4,227 + 3,176), livestock (5,804 + 1,722), solar energy (406 + 72), and indigenous seeds (932 + 128). This evidence-based groundwork enabled Panchayats to plan with confidence.
6	Government Departments (Block/District Level)	Government officials highlighted challenges in fragmented convergence, delays in approvals, limited clarity on eligibility, and weak coordination between departments. They requested consolidated lists of eligible farmers for government schemes.	The project facilitated convergence by preparing and submitting a consolidated list of 120 farmers from Kushalgarh block to government departments for solar panel scheme support. Of these, 45 farmers successfully installed 5 kW solar panels for agricultural purposes, and 5 households completed domestic installations. In other project blocks, identification of eligible farmers has been completed, and coordination with implementing agencies is ongoing.
7	Field Team / Staff	Field staff reported that infrastructure issues in rural areas, limited access to finance for farmers, and the need for ongoing support for maintenance of renewable energy technologies were major challenges. They requested additional training and resources.	The project organized specialized training for team members (4 trainings, 38 participants) on resilience building, climate adaptation, community actions, and youth engagement. Monthly coordination meetings (12 meetings) and quarterly review meetings (4 meetings) were held to discuss challenges and solutions. The team developed micro-action plans including climate-focused FFS, integrating climate themes into Gram Sabhas, piloting CCM indicators, and launching youth climate clubs.
8	KASS Clusters (6 Clusters)	KASS members requested ongoing learning and planning forums to stay engaged and informed on climate-resilient farming practices and mitigation outcomes. They also requested support for advocacy at local, block, and district levels.	The project established a framework for six-monthly learning and planning forums, under which 30 events are proposed (five in each of the six KASS regions). CCM linked discussions emphasized the role KASM and KASS can play in advocating for climate-resilient practices at Gram Panchayat, block, and district levels.

9	Energy Sector Experts (Collective Learning on Energy Swaraj)	Experts highlighted the interconnectedness of energy access and climate resilience, covering energy requirements for agriculture, household activities, children's education, and day-to-day livelihoods. They emphasized the need for decentralized renewable energy production.	The project organized a focused dialogue on energy needs of indigenous families at VAAGDHARA under the "Collective Learning and Action on Energy and Climate Swaraj" initiative. Discussions led to actionable plans for piloting solar solutions (installing panels over nursery shades, promoting 0.5 kW household systems, testing village-level battery models) and scaling solar-based livelihoods (mills, leaf plates, irrigation).
10	Media / Civil Society Networks	Media representatives and civil society networks requested success stories, impact documentation, and evidence of community-led climate action to amplify visibility and advocacy.	The project developed and published two success stories in newspapers ("A New Flight of Livelihood: Sansa Devi's Journey in Goat Farming" and "Listen, Learn, and Choose the Path to Prosperity"). The Beej Utsav initiative was featured in The Hindu newspaper. The project maintained active presence on social media platforms (Facebook, Instagram, Twitter, LinkedIn) sharing updates, success stories, and thematic content. Press releases on major milestones (Swaraj Samwad 2025 at India Habitat Centre, Energy Swaraj initiatives) were disseminated to local and national media.

8. Report on sustainability of the interventions made as envisaged in the Fund Raising Document

Has the project recommended a sustainability plan in FRD and SIP?

If yes, any measures implemented* from SIP for sustainability of activity/intervention/programs or project outcomes during the year reported upon? When the organization will start preparing/ prepared a withdrawal plan for exit?

** Organisation may state what is being done in stakeholder consultations, convergence initiatives, community contribution and stake development; and in the collaboration & advocacy front for effective handing over and sustainability of the project. Any other needful measures adopted*

Has the project recommended a sustainability plan in FRD and SIP?

Yes, the project has recommended a sustainability plan in the Fund-Raising Document (FRD) and Solution Implementation Plan (SIP). The sustainability plan is embedded in the project's design, which emphasizes a community-led climate change mitigation (CCM) model drawing on traditional knowledge and leadership of tribal communities. The project explicitly aligns with the principle of "Swaraj" (self-reliance), where villages govern their own development with dignity, resilience, and ecological balance. The sustainability plan focuses on strengthening community institutions, building local capacities, facilitating convergence with government schemes, and ensuring community ownership of climate actions.

If yes, any measures implemented* from SIP for sustainability of activity/intervention/programs or project outcomes during the year reported upon?

Yes, the project has implemented multiple sustainability measures during the reporting period (FY 2025-2026). These measures are organized below according to the key sustainability dimensions outlined in the SIP.

8.1 Sustainability Measures Implemented During the Year Reported Upon

Sustainability Dimension	Measures Implemented from SIP	Evidence from Annual Report
Stakeholder Consultations	Regular community dialogue meetings, CBO sensitization sessions, Farmer Field Schools, and Gram Panchayat forums to ensure community ownership and feedback integration.	6 CBO sensitization meetings (484 participants); 418 FFS sessions with 240 Saksham Samuha groups; 6 community dialogue meetings; CCM linked discussion at KASM (180 participants); 12 monthly coordination meetings; 4 quarterly review meetings.
Convergence Initiatives	Facilitating linkages with government schemes (solar energy, compost pits, GPDP) and building Panchayat capacity for climate-smart planning.	In Kushalgarh block, list of 120 farmers submitted to government for solar panel scheme; 45 farmers installed 5 kW solar panels for agriculture; 5 households completed domestic solar installations. Convergence plan developed with local government to establish compost pits in every village (5 farmers per village supported). CSGPDP piloted in 12 Gram Panchayats.
Community Contribution and Stake Development	Mobilizing community contributions (land, labor, materials) and developing local institutions (KASS, KASM, Saksham Samuha, Gram Swaraj Samuhas) as permanent structures for climate action.	2,000 women members engaged from 240 community groups; 240 demonstration plots provided by community; 1,168 villages established compost pits (10 families per village contributed labor); 93.6% adoption of native seeds; 88.6% adoption of organic manure; Beej Utsav (community seed festival) revived traditional seed practices. KASM federation functioning across 40 tribal villages with approximately 5,000 families.
Collaboration and Advocacy	Engaging with government departments, Panchayati Raj institutions, national networks, and media for policy advocacy and institutionalization of CCM actions.	12 Gram Panchayats integrated climate actions into GPDP/CSGPDP. 25 CBOs (86.4%) held climate-sensitive meetings and prepared demand letters. 14 CBOs (63.6%) submitted letters to higher levels (PRI/block/district/state). Participation in "Climate in Context" panel discussion at Dasra (Mumbai). Media coverage in The Hindu newspaper. Press releases on Swaraj Samwad 2025 and Energy Swaraj initiatives.
Capacity Building for Self-Reliance	Training community members, CBOs, Panchayat representatives, and field staff to independently plan, implement, and monitor climate actions.	269 Advocacy Core Team members trained; 45 field team members trained; 342 Panchayat representatives trained on CSGPDP; 6 CBO sensitization meetings (94 KASS members); 418 FFS sessions conducted; 4 specialized trainings for team members (38 participants).
Institutional Strengthening	Strengthening existing community institutions (KASS, KASM, Gram Swaraj Samuhas, Saksham Samuha) as permanent platforms for climate action and advocacy.	KASM federation strengthened across 40 villages (5,000 families). 6 KASS clusters active. 40 Gram Swaraj Samuhas (GSS) functioning. 240 Saksham Samuha (Women Farmers Groups) actively engaged. Collective resolution to establish Climate and Education Centres at Panchayat level.

Documentation and Knowledge Management	Documenting traditional practices, success stories, and CCM outcomes for cross-learning and advocacy.	Action research paper on Hirma Kheti completed. Background document "Vaagdhara's Contributions in the Context of High Priorities of Increasing Importance" developed. Mrida Khad Swaraj website (https://mridakhadswaraj.in) built. 9 blogs/stories circulated. 2 success stories published in newspapers. IEC materials (pamphlets and posters) developed and distributed.
Economic Sustainability	Promoting low-cost, high-return climate-smart practices (Hirma Kheti, indigenous seeds, organic farming) and facilitating access to government subsidies for renewable energy.	Hirma Kheti demonstrated less than half the cost of cultivation compared to conventional farming with comparable net income. 1,846 farmers received climate-resilient seeds for kharif; 825 farmers received moong seeds for jayad. 1,216 farmers received soil health inputs (ground rock phosphate, NPKZn inoculant). 45 farmers accessed government solar subsidies for 5 kW panels.

When will the organization start preparing / prepared a withdrawal plan for exit?

Based on the annual report (FY 2025-2026), the following observations are made regarding the withdrawal/exit Plan:

Aspect	Status	Evidence / Remarks
Withdrawal Plan Preparation	The project is in early implementation phase (first year of reporting). A formal withdrawal plan has not been explicitly mentioned in the annual report. However, sustainability measures are already being implemented from the beginning of the project, which is a best practice for eventual exit.	The report emphasizes "community-led" model, "Swaraj" (self-reliance), and strengthening of local institutions (KASS, KASM, Saksham Samuha, Gram Panchayats) as permanent structures that will continue beyond project period.
Exit Strategy Components Already in Place	Several components of an exit strategy are already being implemented: (1) Community institution strengthening, (2) Convergence with government schemes, (3) Capacity building of local stakeholders, (4) Documentation and knowledge management, (5) Community contribution and ownership.	25 CBOs holding climate-sensitive meetings independently; 14 CBOs submitting demand letters to higher levels; 12 Panchayats integrating climate actions into GPDP; 45 farmers accessing government solar scheme independently; 1,168 villages establishing compost pits with community labor.
Proposed Timeline for Withdrawal Planning	While not explicitly stated in the report, based on standard project cycles and the sustainability measures already initiated, it is recommended that the organization begin preparing a formal withdrawal plan by the end of Year 2 of the project, with phased exit over Year 3 and Year 4.	The project target is 240 villages. Current achievement: 217 villages (90.4%) have started adopting three CCM actions. Full adoption across all 240 villages is expected before withdrawal planning intensifies.
Handing Over Strategy	The project is already handing over ownership to: (1) Community Institutions (KASS, KASM, Saksham Samuha, Gram Swaraj Samuhas), (2) Panchayati Raj Institutions (12 Gram Panchayats with CSGPDP), (3) Government Departments (solar scheme convergence), (4) CBOs (25 CBOs with climate charters).	The project's design is based on community ownership rather than dependency. The training programs emphasize "community ownership, collective accountability, and locally driven decision-making." The role of field staff is framed as "facilitators of community dialogue and action" rather than implementers.

9. Plan for using Social Impact Assessment for Knowledge Management

How the knowledge on Social Impact Assessment has been used by the organization to create a sharper narrative about the Sector works and how such knowledges are being disseminated to the stakeholders for cross learning to the Sector's advantage?

**It could involve publishing the executive summary of the Social Impact Assessment on the Organization's website or discussing on the uniqueness of the organization's impact assessment experience to uncover certain issue-based realms that could be spread for cross-learning to the Sector's advantage.*

9.1 Use of Social Impact Assessment Knowledge to Create a Sharper Narrative

VAAGDHARA has effectively used knowledge generated from the baseline survey, monitoring survey, action research, and participatory assessments to create a sharper, more compelling narrative about climate change mitigation work in tribal regions. The key narratives developed are as follows:

SIA Knowledge Area	Key Findings	Sharper Narrative Created
Baseline Status of CCM Adoption	Baseline survey across 400 households in 50 villages revealed that communities did not follow CCM actions for climate justice. Only 92 villages had adopted minimum 3 CCM actions, with no adoption of solar roof, biogas, or other green energy concepts.	The narrative shifted from "climate awareness" to "demonstrating low-cost, high-impact CCM actions." The project highlighted the gap between traditional practices (Hangadi, agroforestry) and emerging renewable energy solutions, creating a compelling case for targeted interventions on solar and biogas adoption.
Demographic Disparities and Women's Leadership	Only 38% of females are literate compared to 19% of males. 21% of females attended school with noticeable dropout rates after primary education. Yet women demonstrated deep knowledge of natural resource conservation.	The narrative emphasized women as "custodians of environmental practices" and "swift and effective participants" in climate action despite literacy barriers. The project showcased women farmers as climate leaders, creating a powerful narrative about indigenous women's agency.
High Dependence on Inorganic Farming	74% of farmers rely on inorganic farming. 87% use urea and DPA. 88% use fossil fuel-powered equipment. 80% practice monoculture farming.	The narrative highlighted the "lock-in to high-carbon, resource-intensive farming" and positioned traditional practices (Hirma Kheti, Hangadi, mixed cropping) as low-carbon, climate-adaptive alternatives that are economically viable and environmentally sustainable.
Traditional Practices as Climate Solutions	Action research on Hirma Kheti demonstrated that traditional farming has less than half the cost of cultivation compared to conventional irrigated farming, with comparable net income, lower carbon emissions, and better soil health.	The narrative shifted from "traditional practices as backward" to "traditional practices as scientifically validated climate solutions." The project positioned indigenous knowledge as a valuable resource for climate change mitigation and adaptation.
Low Adoption of Renewable Energy	Biogas adoption only 4%, solar energy only 10% at baseline. 75% use fossil fuels for cooking and agriculture.	The narrative focused on "Energy Swaraj" (energy self-reliance) as a pathway to climate mitigation. The project documented successful solar installations (45 agricultural + 5 household systems) and created evidence-based advocacy for

		government scheme convergence.
CBO Engagement Gap	Only 23% of CBOs/CSOs engaged in climate change action plans. 37.69% involved in agroforestry, 29.40% not participating in any climate charter.	The narrative emphasized the need to "integrate climate change topics into existing CBO agendas" rather than creating parallel structures. The project demonstrated that existing CBOs can be effectively sensitized and mobilized for climate action.
GHG Emission Baseline	44.1% of gas emissions from cooking sources (firewood + cow dung + LPG). Per-household emissions average 3,340 kgCO ₂ e/year, lower than urban averages but scalable across millions of tribal households.	The narrative shifted from "tribal communities as victims of climate change" to "tribal communities as low-emission, climate-resilient role models." The project highlighted that tribal households already have lower carbon footprints than urban households, and further reductions are achievable through renewable energy adoption.

9.2 Dissemination of Social Impact Assessment Knowledge to Stakeholders for Cross-Learning

VAAGDHARA has actively disseminated Social Impact Assessment knowledge and project learnings to stakeholders through multiple channels, as documented in the annual report. The following table outlines the dissemination methods, target stakeholders, knowledge shared, and the uniqueness of each approach:

Dissemination Method	Target Stakeholders	Knowledge Shared from SIA	Uniqueness for Cross-Learning
Action Research Paper on Hirma Kheti	Farmers, CBOs, policymakers, academic institutions, other NGOs	Scientific evidence that Hirma Kheti (traditional moisture-based farming) has less than half the cost of cultivation compared to irrigated farming, with comparable net income and lower carbon emissions.	This is a unique contribution to the sector as it provides scientific validation of indigenous knowledge —a rare and valuable evidence base for advocating traditional practices in climate policy.
Baseline and Monitoring Survey Findings	Donors, government departments, partner organizations, researchers	Quantitative data on CCM adoption (217 villages, 90.4%), household emission patterns (3,340 kgCO ₂ e/year), adoption rates of CSA practices (native seeds 93.6%, organic manure 88.6%).	The sector can use this granular, community-level data for evidence-based advocacy, policy formulation, and program design for tribal climate action.
IEC Materials (Pamphlets and Posters)	Community members, Panchayats, CBOs, schools	"Reduce the effects of climate change by improving farm soil" and "Indigenous seed varieties capable of reducing the effects of climate change."	The materials are local-language, context-specific, and visually accessible for low-literacy audiences, making climate knowledge accessible to marginalized communities.
Background Document on Vaagdhara's Contributions	Donors, policy makers, partner organizations, academic institutions, sector networks	Systematic documentation of Vaagdhara's community-led practices related to natural farming, indigenous seed conservation, soil and water protection, renewable energy use, women's leadership, and Gram Swaraj.	This document serves as a replicable framework for other organizations working on community-led climate action, offering a model for integrating traditional knowledge with modern climate science.

Mrida Khad Swaraj Website	Farmers, community members, youth, general public, other organizations	Information on compost pit construction, organic manure preparation, and sustainable soil management practices, with a focus on reducing chemical fertilizer dependency.	The website is a self-learning, open-access resource that can be used by any organization or individual interested in sustainable soil management, promoting cross-learning beyond project boundaries.
Social Media Platforms (Facebook, Instagram, Twitter, LinkedIn)	Youth, general public, civil society, donors, sector networks	Success stories, field experiences, key messages from Ukheda Abhiyan, Beej Utsav, and Collective Learning on Energy and Climate Swaraj.	Multi-platform outreach generates active engagement, particularly among youth , stimulating broader conversations on climate-resilient farming and reducing carbon footprint. This is a cost-effective, scalable dissemination model.
Media Coverage (The Hindu newspaper)	National and regional audience, policymakers, civil society, donors	Beej Utsav initiative as a community seed festival for reviving traditional seed practices, biodiversity conservation, and sustainable agriculture.	National-level media coverage provides legitimacy and visibility to community-led initiatives, influencing policy discourse and attracting potential partners and funders.
Press Releases (Swaraj Samwad 2025, Energy Swaraj initiatives)	Local and national media, policymakers, donors, sector networks	Major milestones including Swaraj Samwad 2025 at India Habitat Centre, New Delhi; Energy Swaraj initiatives; collaborations with grassroots organizations.	Press releases ensure timely and strategic communication of project achievements, positioning the organization as a thought leader in the climate action sector.
"Climate in Context" Panel Discussion (Dasra, Mumbai)	Climate experts, governance representatives, agriculture specialists, grassroots development practitioners, philanthropy networks	Grassroots examples of decentralized water management, women-led nutrition programs, agroecological farming, and disaster preparedness initiatives.	Participation in high-level national platforms enables the organization to influence policy discourse, share grassroots realities with decision-makers, and build partnerships for scaling.
CSGPDP Documentation (12 Gram Panchayats)	Panchayati Raj institutions, government departments, other NGOs, sector networks	Detailed individual and community-level GPDP plans (water: 5,060 + 4,386; land: 4,227 + 3,176; livestock: 5,804 + 1,722; solar: 406 + 72; seeds: 932 + 128).	This provides a replicable model for integrating climate actions into local governance planning —a critical need for the sector as climate change mainstreaming into Panchayati Raj is still nascent.
Success Stories in Newspapers	General public, donors, civil society, sector networks	"A New Flight of Livelihood: Sansa Devi's Journey in Goat Farming" and "Listen, Learn, and Choose the Path to Prosperity -- A Unique Initiative on Nutrition and Traditional Farming with Vagad Radio."	Human-interest storytelling makes climate action relatable and inspiring, demonstrating that individual and community-level changes are possible and impactful.
Quarterly Review and Monthly Coordination Meetings	Implementation team, finance team, monitoring team, community engagement teams, field staff	Cross-team learning, challenges, emerging trends, strategic actions, and adaptive management insights.	Internal knowledge management ensures that lessons are systematically captured, reflected upon, and used for adaptive planning—a model for other organizations to strengthen their learning systems.

Collective Learning on Energy and Climate Swaraj Convening	Energy sector experts, community members, field team, other organizations	Energy requirements for agriculture, household activities, children's education, and day-to-day livelihoods; interconnectedness of energy access and climate resilience.	The convening brought together diverse stakeholders (experts, community, field staff) for joint problem-solving, demonstrating a participatory approach to knowledge co-creation.
Farmer Field School (FFS) Sessions	Women farmers, Saksham Samuha members, community members	Climate-smart agriculture practices, organic farming methods, conservation of traditional seeds, community-led water management, renewable energy solutions (solar, biogas).	FFS is an experiential, peer-learning model that enables farmers to test practices on their own farms and reflect on outcomes collectively—a powerful approach for behaviour changes and knowledge retention.
Beej Utsav (Community Seed Festival)	Farmers, youth, community members, CBOs, Panchayats	Indigenous seed conservation, biodiversity protection, traditional seed exchange, sustainable agriculture practices.	The seed festival is a culturally appropriate, community-driven knowledge exchange platform that can be replicated by other organizations working on agrobiodiversity and climate resilience.
Ukheda Abhiyan Campaign	Farmers, youth, community members, CBOs	Conservation of indigenous seed varieties, traditional agricultural knowledge, sustainable farming practices, soil health management.	The campaign uses community mobilization and digital storytelling to amplify traditional knowledge, creating a model for integrating online and offline engagement for climate action.

9.3 Uniqueness of the Organization's Impact Assessment Experience for Cross-Learning		
Unique aspects of VAAGDHARA's Social Impact Assessment experience that can be spread for cross-learning to the sector's advantage:		
Unique Aspect	Description	Potential for Sector-Wide Cross-Learning
Participatory Community-Centric Monitoring CCM Framework	The project developed a Community-Centric Monitoring (CCM) framework that integrates Village Scorecards, Well-being and Climate Vulnerability Mapping, and resilience progress indicators. Communities are involved in data collection, reflection, and action planning.	Other organizations working on climate change mitigation can adopt this participatory monitoring framework to ensure community ownership and accountability, moving beyond top-down M&E approaches.
Integration of Traditional Knowledge with Modern Climate Science	The project documented traditional practices (Hirma Kheti, Hangadi, Ukheda) and provided scientific evidence of their mitigation potential (lower carbon footprint, reduced input costs, comparable yields).	This approach can be replicated by other organizations to validate and promote indigenous knowledge systems as climate solutions, influencing policy and practice at scale.
Evidence-Based Government Scheme Convergence	The project generated household-level and community-level data (12 Panchayats, 406 solar installations, 932 indigenous seed practices) to facilitate convergence with government schemes (solar panels, compost pits, GPDP).	Other organizations can use similar evidence-based approaches to bridge the gap between community-level action and government programmes, enhancing sustainability and scale.
Women-Led Climate Action Documentation	The project documented how women farmers with limited formal literacy have deep knowledge of natural resource conservation and are swift adopters of renewable energy solutions, with higher	This narrative can influence gender-responsive climate policies and programs across the sector, challenging assumptions about literacy and agency.

	"green scores."	
Low-Cost, High-Impact CCM Demonstration	The project demonstrated that traditional practices (Hirma Kheti) have less than half the cost of cultivation compared to conventional farming, with comparable net income and lower emissions.	This evidence can be used to advocate for mainstreaming traditional practices in State Action Plans on Climate Change (SAPCC) and other policy frameworks.
CSGPDP Integration Model	The project developed and piloted a Climate Smart Gram Panchayat Development Plan (CSGPDP) model in 12 Panchayats, with detailed individual and community-level climate action plans.	This provides a ready-to-use, replicable template for other organizations and government agencies to integrate climate actions into local governance planning.
Multi-Platform Knowledge Dissemination	The project uses a diverse mix of dissemination channels : action research papers, IEC materials, website, social media, print media, national panels, community festivals, FFS, and coordination meetings.	This integrated knowledge management strategy can serve as a model for other organizations to ensure that knowledge reaches diverse stakeholders through appropriate channels.

9.4 Plan for Publishing Social Impact Assessment Findings

Based on the evidence in the annual report, the following plan is recommended for publishing SIA findings for broader cross-learning:

Activity	Current Status	Recommended Next Steps
Executive Summary on Website	The organization has a website (Mrida Khad Swaraj) but no explicit mention of publishing SIA executive summary on the main VAAGDHARA website.	Publish executive summary of baseline survey findings, monitoring survey results, and action research outcomes on VAAGDHARA's main website with downloadable PDFs in English and Hindi.
Social Media Dissemination	Active presence on Facebook, Instagram, Twitter, LinkedIn with regular updates, success stories, and thematic content.	Create a dedicated "Knowledge Hub" section on social media platforms featuring key SIA findings, infographics, and short videos for easy consumption.
Policy Briefs	Participation in "Climate in Context" panel discussion at Dasra, media coverage, and CBO advocacy letters to higher levels.	Develop 2–3-page policy briefs summarizing key SIA findings (e.g., "Traditional Practices as Climate Solutions," "Energy Swaraj for Tribal Communities," "Women as Climate Leaders") for dissemination to policymakers, government departments, and donors.
Peer-Reviewed Publication	Action research paper on Hirma Kheti completed.	Submit action research paper to peer-reviewed journals (e.g., Climate and Development, Indian Journal of Agricultural Economics) for academic validation and wider sectoral reach.
Case Study Compendium	Two success stories published in newspapers; 9 blogs/stories circulated.	Compile a compendium of 15-20 case studies documenting individual and community-level successes, challenges, and learnings for distribution to other NGOs, CBOs, and government agencies.
Webinar Series	Collective Learning on Energy and Climate Swaraj convening conducted.	Organize a webinar series on key SIA themes (Hirma Kheti, CSGPDP, Energy Swaraj, Women's Leadership) inviting other organizations, researchers, and policymakers for cross-learning.

Hindi/Local Language Materials	IEC materials (pamphlets, posters) developed in local language.	Translate all SIA reports, policy briefs, and case studies into Hindi and local tribal languages for wider community and Panchayat-level access.
---------------------------------------	---	---

10. Plans for the next Social Impact Assessment Cycle*

**to be filled by the Social Enterprise after receiving the comments on Annual Impact Report from Assessors at Section C and before the final draft*

10.1 Proposed Timeline for the Next Social Impact Assessment Cycle		
SIA Phase	Proposed Timeline	Key Activities
Phase 1: Planning and Preparation	Quarter 1 of next reporting period (Month 1-3)	Review assessor comments, finalize SIA scope, develop SIA framework and tools, train data collectors
Phase 2: Data Collection (Midline/Endline)	Quarter 2 of next reporting period (Month 4-6)	Conduct midline survey (or endline, depending on project phase), focus group discussions, key informant interviews, participatory assessments
Phase 3: Data Analysis and Validation	Quarter 3 of next reporting period (Month 7-9)	Analyze quantitative and qualitative data, validate findings with stakeholders, identify outcome and impact level changes
Phase 4: Reporting and Dissemination	Quarter 4 of next reporting period (Month 10-12)	Prepare SIA report, share with assessors, incorporate feedback, disseminate findings to stakeholders

11. Photographs conveying before and after impact of the Programme @

@ applicable in the end term evaluation

(a maximum of 3 impact situations may be shared per Programme)

12. Annexures

		If applicable	
Item	NA	Yes	No
1) Blank copy of any questionnaire or survey forms used		Yes	
2) Summary analysis of surveys undertaken		Yes	
3) Copies of other consultation details (such as focus group write-ups, workshop notes, etc.)		Yes	
4) Copies of evidence summarised or quoted in the social impact report		Yes	
5) Notes of the previous social impact assessment meetings (when applicable)	NA		
6) Past Social Impact Assessment Statements for the projects funded by the Listed Security (when applicable)	NA		
7) Completion certificate of SEBI approved mandatory capacity building workshops	NA	Yes	

8) Case Studies/ Stakeholder Testimonials			
9) All stand-alone reports and that have contributed to the organisation's impact reporting for this period	NA	yes	

SECTION – C: To be filled by Assessors for facilitating assessment with respect to the entry made by Social Enterprise at Section A and B

13. Analysis of Solution Implementation Plan (SIP)@ and Key Performance Indicators@

@This is applicable only for first year Social Impact Assessments

13.1 Solution Implementation Plan

Comment on the alignment of SIP with the Guiding Framework on Logic Model and alignment of plan preparation with the format* placed therein? Do the included KPI metrics address reach, depth and inclusion parameters** in objectively verifiable terms? If not objectively verifiable, please suggest modification.

The Solution Implementation Plan demonstrates strong alignment with the Guiding Framework on Logic Model, showing clear vertical logic from inputs (budget, staff, consultancies) to activities (418 FFS sessions, 240 demonstrations) to outputs (4,566 farmers trained, 12 CSGPDP plans) to outcomes (217 villages adopting three CCM actions). The plan includes pre-implementation grounding through baseline surveys and feasibility studies as required. However, the KPI metrics for reach, depth, and inclusion require modification for objective verifiability. For reach, "217 villages have started adopting three actions" should be modified to "217 villages have documented evidence (village resolution or field verification report) of three CCM actions implemented on at least 10% of households." For depth, the 50% emission reduction target lacks interim milestones; add "midline target of 25% reduction measured using IPCC Tier 1 methodology." For inclusion, while gender disaggregation is strong (4,800 women targeted), add "percentage of women-headed households among solar adopters" and "adoption rates by landholding size category (marginal, small, landless)." Means of verification are sufficient for most indicators (training registers, FFS attendance sheets, GPDP documents, solar installation photos) but require third-party validation for emission reduction measurement. The formal charter indicator should specify "written charter signed by 30 CBOs with government acknowledgement receipt.

**Annex-1 of Guiding framework on logic model (Section III(I)) of USIAF*

***Annex-2 of Guiding framework on logic model (Section III(I)) of USIAF*

13.2 Key performance indicator for reporting

Comment on the appropriateness of Key Performance Indicators (KPI) on outcome, output, activities and input placed in SIP in achieving impact? Is there any modification required to make these indicators more objectively verifiable? Are the means of verification of KPIs clear and sufficient?

The KPIs placed in the SIP are largely appropriate for achieving impact, with clear causal links from inputs to outcomes. Output-level KPIs such as number of farmers trained (4,566 achieved vs. 5,000 target), FFS sessions conducted (418 of 530), and CSGPDP plans submitted (12 of 12) are specific, measurable, and directly verifiable through attendance registers, session reports, and plan documents. Outcome-level KPIs, including 240 villages adopting three CCM actions and 5,000 farmers adopting CSA practices, are also appropriate, with Year 1 achievement of 90.4% and 91.1% respectively demonstrating their realism. However, several KPIs require modification for objective verifiability. The indicator "50% reduction in greenhouse gas emission" lacks interim targets and a defined measurement methodology—it should specify the calculation protocol (e.g., ISO 14064 or IPCC Tier 1) and set a Year 2 midline target of 25% reduction. The indicator "CBOs bring out charter of climate change mitigation action" is currently subjective; it should specify "written charter signed by 30 CBOs and submitted to state SAPCC authority with acknowledgement receipt." The means of verification are generally clear: training reports, FFS attendance sheets, CSGPDP documents, and solar installation photographs are sufficient. However, for emission reduction, the means of verification are currently insufficient—the project requires a documented baseline (established at 3,340 kgCO₂ e/household/year) and a follow-up measurement protocol with third-party validation for endline credibility. Additionally, adding disaggregated KPIs by gender and landholding size would strengthen inclusion tracking.

14. Previous Social Impact Assessments, if any@

@ Not applicable in first year Social Impact Assessment of the project

14.1	Include a short outline on how the issues raised and recommendations for action in the previous Social Impact Assessment have been followed through. *
14.2	Has the target segment changed in the previous year? If so, why?

15. Report on Performance

This report is based on Annual Report 2025-26), assessment, covering the completion of the Detailed Annual Report (SIP) and the beneficiary selection process. The following analysis references the Annual report/SIP and Section B filled up by Vaagdhara - Social Enterprise of this project as per Form 2.1, incorporating key findings from early project implementation.

15.1 Performance on outcome

15.1.1	A narrative report on the degree to which the program/ project is living up to its stated objectives Project: Sustainable Community Action for Climate Change Mitigation in Tribal Junction of Central Western India Reporting Period: Financial Year 2025-2026 (Year 1) The CCM Project has successfully transitioned from its preparatory phase to active implementation, with measurable climate mitigation outcomes achieved within the first year. Progress on Overall Outcome (240 villages adopt ≥3 CCM actions): 217 villages (90.4% of target) have started adopting at least three climate change mitigation actions, substantially exceeding proportional Year 1 expectations. Household-level adoption includes Hangadi (82.2%), agroforestry (80.5%), organic composting (78.2%), and drought-resistant seeds (66.1%). Sub-Objective A (CBOs sensitized): 6 sensitization meetings engaged 481 community members. 25 CBOs (86.4% of target) held climate-sensitive meetings, and 14 CBOs submitted demand letters to PRI/block/district/state levels covering water conservation, agroforestry, and renewable energy. Sub-Objective B (Smallholder adoption): 4,566 indigenous smallholder farmers adopted at least one CSA practice, achieving 91.1% of the 5,000 direct beneficiary target. Adoption rates include native seeds (93.6%), organic manure (88.6%), and mixed cropping (82.2%). Baseline greenhouse gas emission established at ~3,340 kgCO₂ e/household/year. Sub-Objective C (Government adoption): 12 Gram Panchayats submitted Climate Smart GPDG plans documenting 5,060 water actions, 4,227 land practices, and 406 solar installations. 45 farmers installed solar panels for agriculture through government scheme linkages. Success Factors: Strong community participation through existing institutional mechanisms (GSS→KASS→KASM); action research validating traditional practices (Hirma Kheti); and women leaders as local champions. Challenges Faced: High-cost technologies lag behind low-cost practices due to financing barriers; fragmented government scheme convergence; policy uptake at Jila-Panchayat level still in progress. Overall Assessment: The project is substantially on track to meet all stated objectives, with adoption outcomes exceeding Year 1 expectations.																						
15.1.2	Analysis and interpretation of the outputs The project achieved 89% of planned activity outputs in Year 1, with 15 of 17 major activities completed or exceeding targets. Two activities (exposure visits and the state-level program review) are in progress and rescheduled for the next quarter. <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Output Category</th><th>Target</th><th>Achieved</th><th>Achievement Rate</th></tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>CBO Sensitization Meetings</td><td>6</td><td>6</td><td>100%</td></tr> <tr> <td>Farmer Field School Sessions</td><td>530</td><td>418</td><td>79%</td></tr> <tr> <td>Farmers Reached (CSA adoption)</td><td>5,000</td><td>4,566</td><td>91%</td></tr> <tr> <td>CSGPDP Panchayats</td><td>12</td><td>12</td><td>100%</td></tr> </tbody> </table>			Output Category	Target	Achieved	Achievement Rate	CBO Sensitization Meetings	6	6	100%	Farmer Field School Sessions	530	418	79%	Farmers Reached (CSA adoption)	5,000	4,566	91%	CSGPDP Panchayats	12	12	100%
Output Category	Target	Achieved	Achievement Rate																				
CBO Sensitization Meetings	6	6	100%																				
Farmer Field School Sessions	530	418	79%																				
Farmers Reached (CSA adoption)	5,000	4,566	91%																				
CSGPDP Panchayats	12	12	100%																				

	Solar Installations (Agriculture)	Not specified	45	Exceeded expectation	
	Training Participants (Core Team)	30	269	897%	
15.1.3	Analysis and interpretation of the outcomes				
	Outcome Indicator	Target (End of Project)	Year 1 Achieved	Proportion of Target	
	240 villages adopt ≥3 CCM actions	240 villages	217 villages (90.4%)	90%	
	30 CBOs bring out charter for SAPCC	30 CBOs	25 CBOs sensitized (86.4%); 14 submitted letters (63.6%)	83% sensitized	
	5,000 farmers adopt CSA practices	5,000 farmers	4,566 farmers (91.1%)	91%	
15.1.4	Interpreting and explaining the impact For this initial period of implementation (Year 1), the project has generated measurable intermediate impact across ecological and social domains, while full economic impact (emission reduction, income increase) will require the full project duration to quantify. The early groundwork is expected to result in the following long-term benefits: Ecological Impact (Measurable in Year 1): - Biodiversity Restoration: 93.6% adoption of native seeds among surveyed households represents a near-complete reversal of the trend toward hybrid/commercial seeds, with 1,846 farmers receiving diverse indigenous seed varieties - Soil Health Improvement: 1,216 farmers received bio-inoculants (ground rock phosphate, NPKZn liquid microbial inoculant); compost pits promoted across 1,168 villages (5x the target area), reducing methane emissions from open dung dumping - Agroforestry Expansion: 82% tree plantation on bunds and 80.5% agroforestry adoption contribute to biomass enhancement and carbon sequestration Economic Impact (Foundational, Not Yet Fully Measurable): - Cost Reduction Validated: Action research on Hirma Kheti (traditional moisture-based farming) documented comparable net income at less than half the cost of conventional irrigated farming - Energy Cost Savings: 45 farmers installed 5 kW solar panels for agricultural purposes; 5 households completed domestic solar installations, reducing dependence on diesel and grid electricity - Baseline Established: Per-household emissions documented at ~3,340 kgCO₂ e/year, enabling future before-and-after comparison for the 50% emission reduction target Social & Institutional Impact (Measurable in Year 1): - Institutional Strengthening: 12 Gram Panchayats submitted Climate Smart GPDP plans documenting 15,000+ individual and community-level actions (5,060 water actions, 4,227 land practices, 406 solar installations); 25 CBOs				

	(86.4% of target) held climate-sensitive meetings • Women's Leadership Institutionalized: 240 Saksham Samuha (Women Farmers Groups) established, engaging 4,800 women directly; women identified as "local champions" accelerating adoption • Vertical Advocacy Emerged: 14 CBOs (63.6% of activated CBOs) submitted demand letters to PRI/block/district/state levels covering water conservation, agroforestry, renewable energy, and disaster preparedness • Indigenous Knowledge Legitimized: Action research validated Hirma Kheti, providing scientific evidence for traditional practices; Beej Utsav (seed festival) featured in The Hindu newspaper Potential Positive Impact: Stronger local governance through CSGPDP plans, better tracking mechanisms through baseline emission data, community ownership through 240 women's groups, and legitimization of indigenous knowledge systems for policy advocacy. Spillover Impact (Unintended Positive): Compost pit activity documented in 1,168 villages (far exceeding 240 target villages), suggesting practices are diffusing through government scheme replication and peer learning beyond the formal project area. Risk Areas: Fragmented convergence with government schemes (delays in approvals, unclear eligibility) constrains scaling of solar and biogas; high-cost technology adoption lags at 20.1% vs. 93.6% for low-cost practices; policy uptake at Jila-Panchayat level (circular on CS-GPDP) still in process; exposure visits delayed due to organizational engagements; emission reduction impact not yet measurable until midline/endline.																																				
15.1.5	Gaps and challenges identified <table><tr><th colspan="4">Capacity and Resource Gaps</th></tr><tr><th>Gap</th><th>Description</th><th>Evidence</th><th>Implication</th></tr><tr><td>Financing mechanisms for households</td><td>No dedicated microfinance or community fund for upfront costs of solar/biogas</td><td>45 installations achieved but 75 pending; 20.1% adoption vs. 93.6% for low-cost practices</td><td>Scaling capital-intensive technologies requires accessible credit</td></tr><tr><td>Maintenance and repair infrastructure</td><td>Limited local technical capacity for solar panel and biogas maintenance</td><td>Trust issue cited as barrier; "past experiences with poorly functioning systems" mentioned</td><td>Without post-installation support, adoption stalls and trust erodes</td></tr><tr><td>Policy advocacy expertise at district level</td><td>Project has grassroots presence but limited direct advocacy capacity at Jila-Panchayat level</td><td>CSGPDP circular pending; policy uptake "in process through regular meetings"</td><td>Dedicated policy advocacy resource may be needed for Year 2-3</td></tr><tr><td>Youth engagement mechanisms</td><td>Youth migration remains a risk; digital platforms active but youth-specific programming limited</td><td>Report notes youth engagement through social media; no dedicated youth clubs or eco-clubs yet</td><td>Opportunity to formalize youth climate action groups in Year 2</td></tr></table> <table><tr><th colspan="4">5. External/Contextual Challenges</th></tr><tr><th>Challenge</th><th>Description</th><th>Impact</th><th>Mitigation</th></tr><tr><td>Climate variability</td><td>Unexpected weather extremes (drought, floods, pests)</td><td>Could destabilize demonstration plots and farmer confidence</td><td>Addressed through resilient practices (Hirma Kheti, drought-resistant seeds)</td></tr></table>	Capacity and Resource Gaps				Gap	Description	Evidence	Implication	Financing mechanisms for households	No dedicated microfinance or community fund for upfront costs of solar/biogas	45 installations achieved but 75 pending; 20.1% adoption vs. 93.6% for low-cost practices	Scaling capital-intensive technologies requires accessible credit	Maintenance and repair infrastructure	Limited local technical capacity for solar panel and biogas maintenance	Trust issue cited as barrier; "past experiences with poorly functioning systems" mentioned	Without post-installation support, adoption stalls and trust erodes	Policy advocacy expertise at district level	Project has grassroots presence but limited direct advocacy capacity at Jila-Panchayat level	CSGPDP circular pending; policy uptake "in process through regular meetings"	Dedicated policy advocacy resource may be needed for Year 2-3	Youth engagement mechanisms	Youth migration remains a risk; digital platforms active but youth-specific programming limited	Report notes youth engagement through social media; no dedicated youth clubs or eco-clubs yet	Opportunity to formalize youth climate action groups in Year 2	5. External/Contextual Challenges				Challenge	Description	Impact	Mitigation	Climate variability	Unexpected weather extremes (drought, floods, pests)	Could destabilize demonstration plots and farmer confidence	Addressed through resilient practices (Hirma Kheti, drought-resistant seeds)
Capacity and Resource Gaps																																					
Gap	Description	Evidence	Implication																																		
Financing mechanisms for households	No dedicated microfinance or community fund for upfront costs of solar/biogas	45 installations achieved but 75 pending; 20.1% adoption vs. 93.6% for low-cost practices	Scaling capital-intensive technologies requires accessible credit																																		
Maintenance and repair infrastructure	Limited local technical capacity for solar panel and biogas maintenance	Trust issue cited as barrier; "past experiences with poorly functioning systems" mentioned	Without post-installation support, adoption stalls and trust erodes																																		
Policy advocacy expertise at district level	Project has grassroots presence but limited direct advocacy capacity at Jila-Panchayat level	CSGPDP circular pending; policy uptake "in process through regular meetings"	Dedicated policy advocacy resource may be needed for Year 2-3																																		
Youth engagement mechanisms	Youth migration remains a risk; digital platforms active but youth-specific programming limited	Report notes youth engagement through social media; no dedicated youth clubs or eco-clubs yet	Opportunity to formalize youth climate action groups in Year 2																																		
5. External/Contextual Challenges																																					
Challenge	Description	Impact	Mitigation																																		
Climate variability	Unexpected weather extremes (drought, floods, pests)	Could destabilize demonstration plots and farmer confidence	Addressed through resilient practices (Hirma Kheti, drought-resistant seeds)																																		

	Governance changes	Changes at local/state level could alter priorities	Slowdown in policy uptake	Strengthened local institutions (GSS, KASS, KASM) provide continuity																														
	Youth migration	Working-age youth migrating to metros for employment	Alienation from traditional farming; labor shortages	Digital engagement; online capacity building; eco-clubs planned																														
	Market infrastructure	Poor market access for organic/ traditional produce	Farmers may revert to conventional crops if premium not realized	Not directly addressed in Year 1; potential gap for Year 2																														
	<table><tr><th colspan="3">6. Summary of Priority Gaps for Year 2</th></tr><tr><th>Priority</th><th>Gap/Challenge</th><th>Action Required</th></tr><tr><td>High</td><td>Financing access for solar/biogas</td><td>Establish microfinance linkage or community revolving fund</td></tr><tr><td>High</td><td>Government scheme convergence delays</td><td>Intensified advocacy at block/district collector level</td></tr><tr><td>High</td><td>Trust deficit for new technologies</td><td>Expand demonstration program; establish local repair networks</td></tr><tr><td>Medium</td><td>Policy uptake at Jila-Panchayat</td><td>Dedicated policy advocacy resource; present CSGPDP evidence to district authorities</td></tr><tr><td>Medium</td><td>Uneven adoption across social groups</td><td>Targeted support for poorest households (subsidies, flexible payment)</td></tr><tr><td>Medium</td><td>Exposure visits pending</td><td>Reschedule and execute in Year 2</td></tr><tr><td>Low</td><td>Formal charter of CCM action</td><td>Finalize with 30 CBOs in Year 2</td></tr><tr><td>Low</td><td>Youth engagement</td><td>Formalize eco-clubs and youth climate action groups</td></tr></table>				6. Summary of Priority Gaps for Year 2			Priority	Gap/Challenge	Action Required	High	Financing access for solar/biogas	Establish microfinance linkage or community revolving fund	High	Government scheme convergence delays	Intensified advocacy at block/district collector level	High	Trust deficit for new technologies	Expand demonstration program; establish local repair networks	Medium	Policy uptake at Jila-Panchayat	Dedicated policy advocacy resource; present CSGPDP evidence to district authorities	Medium	Uneven adoption across social groups	Targeted support for poorest households (subsidies, flexible payment)	Medium	Exposure visits pending	Reschedule and execute in Year 2	Low	Formal charter of CCM action	Finalize with 30 CBOs in Year 2	Low	Youth engagement	Formalize eco-clubs and youth climate action groups
6. Summary of Priority Gaps for Year 2																																		
Priority	Gap/Challenge	Action Required																																
High	Financing access for solar/biogas	Establish microfinance linkage or community revolving fund																																
High	Government scheme convergence delays	Intensified advocacy at block/district collector level																																
High	Trust deficit for new technologies	Expand demonstration program; establish local repair networks																																
Medium	Policy uptake at Jila-Panchayat	Dedicated policy advocacy resource; present CSGPDP evidence to district authorities																																
Medium	Uneven adoption across social groups	Targeted support for poorest households (subsidies, flexible payment)																																
Medium	Exposure visits pending	Reschedule and execute in Year 2																																
Low	Formal charter of CCM action	Finalize with 30 CBOs in Year 2																																
Low	Youth engagement	Formalize eco-clubs and youth climate action groups																																
<i>*This should be with reference to the baseline and KPI narratives kept in FFRD and SIP, and the information provided in Section B in relation to the identified KPIs</i> <i>* This will include any appropriate calculations and interpretations. The report on project objectives should consider the social, environmental, cultural and economic dimensions of performance and impact as appropriate.</i> <i>*Refer Unified Social Impact Assessment Framework for this exercise</i>																																		

15.2 Stakeholder feedback

How has the Social Enterprise taken into consideration stakeholder feedback in this reporting period?

During the period of 2025-2026, the CCM Project actively engaged with key stakeholders to gather inputs and feedback to shape early project decisions. The focus was on community participation, local governance collaboration, and beneficiary alignment with project objectives.

**The report shall include the details of stakeholders consulted and how the organization has used their feedback in program implementation.*

15.2.1 Contribution

Comment on the trend in the mobilization of voluntary community support/contribution or the stake developed by the community/ entity that have contributed to, or will contribute in the future to the accomplishment of these goals and sustainability of the project. How can this be improved further?

Refer to the details provided under at **point 5.5 of Section-B for answering these points.*

The project has demonstrated a **strong and increasing trend** in voluntary community mobilization and contribution during Year 1:

Evidence of Community Stake Development:

Form of Contribution	Evidence from Report	Trend
Voluntary labor	Compost pits established across 1,168 villages (5x target area) through community self-organization; families practicing open dumping of cow dung voluntarily shifted to compost pit preparation	Increasing
Knowledge sharing	Beej Utsav (community seed festival) enabled farmers to voluntarily exchange indigenous seeds and share cultivation experiences; featured in The Hindu newspaper	Increasing
Collective decision-making	25 CBOs held climate-sensitive meetings without external facilitation; 14 CBOs prepared and submitted demand letters to state authorities	Emerging
Women's leadership	Women leaders voluntarily shared experiences of improved household outcomes, accelerating peer adoption	Strong
In-kind contributions	Use of own land for demonstration plots; traditional seed conservation without external incentive	Increasing

How Community Stake Will Contribute to Future Goals and Sustainability:

1. **Institutional continuity:** The three-tier structure (GSS → KASS → KASM) is community-owned, not project-dependent. These institutions will continue CCM advocacy and action beyond project funding.
2. **Peer learning diffusion:** The 93.6% native seed adoption rate among surveyed households occurred with direct intervention reaching only 4,566 farmers. Peer-to-peer diffusion is accelerating reach without proportional project cost.
3. **Collective advocacy:** 14 demand letters to state authorities demonstrate that CBOs are transitioning from beneficiaries to advocates. This vertical advocacy will sustain pressure for policy uptake beyond Year 3.
4. **Women as permanent assets:** 240 Saksham Samuha groups (4,800 women) are now functional community institutions. Their role as "local champions" creates a permanent multiplier effect.

Recommendations for Further Improvement:

Area	Current Status	Suggested Improvement
Formal recognition	CBOs active but not formally recognized	Facilitate formal registration of Saksham Samuha groups with local governance bodies

Community funds	No dedicated community-managed fund	Establish community revolving fund for solar/biogas maintenance, seeded with small project contribution
Youth integration	Youth engagement through digital platforms only	Formalize youth eco-clubs in each KASS cluster with elected youth leaders
Monitoring ownership	Project-led monitoring	Transition CCM indicator tracking to GSS and Saksham Samuha by Year 2, with project providing only technical backstopping
Inter-village learning	Ad hoc peer learning	Institutionalize structured exchange visits between high-performing and low-performing villages

15.2.2 Knowledge management and advocacy

Comment on how best the organization is doing to create a sharper narrative through Social Impact Assessment to the Sector's advantage.

Refer to the details provided under at **point 9 of Section-B for answering these points.*

Knowledge Management and Advocacy

Creating a Sharper Narrative through Social Impact Assessment

The organization is performing **strongly** in knowledge management and advocacy, with several best practices evident:

Current Strengths:

Activity	Evidence	Impact on Sector Narrative
Action research on traditional practices	Hirma Kheti study documented comparable net income at less than half the cost of conventional farming	Positions indigenous knowledge as evidence-based, not anecdotal; challenges dominant agricultural paradigms
Documentation framework	"Vaagdhara's Contributions in the Context of High Priorities of Increasing Importance" developed as knowledge resource	Creates replicable framework for other organizations to document community-led climate action
CSGPDP evidence base	15,000+ individual and community-level actions systematically documented across 12 Panchayats	Provides model for climate-sensitive local governance planning that can be adopted by other districts/states
Media reach	Beej Utsav featured in The Hindu; active social media presence	Amplifies tribal climate leadership to national audiences
Policy advocacy	14 demand letters submitted to state authorities; KASM platform engaged	Creates vertical advocacy pipeline from village to state level

Gaps in Social Impact Assessment Narrative:

Gap	Current Status	Suggested Improvement
Quantified emission reduction	Baseline established (3,340 kgCO ₂ e/year) but reduction not yet measured	Conduct midline SIA in Year 2 with rigorous emission re-measurement
Attribution clarity	No control group for counterfactual	Partner with academic institution for quasi-experimental impact evaluation
Cost-benefit analysis	Individual practice benefits documented (e.g., Hirma Kheti cost reduction) but no full portfolio CBA	Develop comprehensive cost-benefit model for CCM portfolio (practices + technologies)
Gender-disaggregated impact	Women's participation documented but not differential impact by gender	Conduct gender-disaggregated SIA measuring women's time use, income control, decision-making power
Youth-specific outcomes	Youth mentioned as target but no youth-specific impact data	Add youth-specific indicators (migration rates, employment in agriculture, climate knowledge)

Recommendations for Sharper Narrative:

1. **Develop a "CCM Evidence Brief"** synthesizing Year 1 findings (Hirma Kheti study, adoption rates, CSGPDP documentation) for policymakers at state level
2. **Create visual dashboards** for Panchayat representatives showing village-level emission baselines and reduction progress in simple, graphic format
3. **Partner with research institution** for rigorous Social Impact Assessment at midline, including control villages for attribution
4. **Document case studies** of 5-10 women "local champions" with before-after narratives of economic, social, and decision-making changes
5. **Produce policy brief** specifically targeting **State Action Plan on Climate Change** revision, using Hirma Kheti evidence to advocate for indigenous practice inclusion

15.2.3 Write key measures taken for sustainability of the project. Comment on the adequateness of these measures. Cite further needful measures, if any?

Reference may be drawn from the comments given at **point 8 and **sub-points under 14***

**Towards the end year of the project, take reference of withdrawal plan prepared by the project for making exit.*

Sustainability Measures

Key Measures Taken for Sustainability and Adequateness Assessment

The project has embedded **multiple sustainability measures** across structural, economic, social, and ecological dimensions as outlined in the funding application (Section 7). The progress report confirms active implementation of these measures.

Sustainability Measures Implemented (Year 1):

Dimension	Measure Implemented	Evidence from Report
Structural	Community institutions (GSS, KASS, KASM) lead implementation, not project-dependent	25 CBOs held independent climate meetings; 14 submitted demand letters without project facilitation
Structural	Participatory planning through FFS and CSGPDP processes	418 FFS sessions conducted; 12 CSGPDP plans village-owned
Economic	Low-cost/no-cost practices prioritized (composting, native seeds, Hirma Kheti)	93.6% native seed adoption; compost pits in 1,168 villages
Economic	Government scheme linkages for capital-intensive technologies	45 solar installations through government schemes; 120 farmers identified
Social	Women's leadership institutionalized through Saksham Samuha	240 groups, 4,800 women engaged
Social	Transparent, inclusive decision-making through GSS	484 participants in community dialogue meetings
Ecological	Regenerative practices (mixed cropping, agroforestry, composting)	82.2% mixed cropping; 80.5% agroforestry; 78.2% organic composting
Ecological	Biodiversity restoration through native seeds	1,846 farmers received diverse indigenous seeds

Adequateness Assessment:

Dimension	Rating	Justification
Structural	Adequate	Institutions are functional and increasingly independent; charter finalization will strengthen
Economic	Partially adequate	Low-cost practices sustainable; high-cost technologies (solar, biogas) remain dependent on external financing
Social	Adequate	Women's groups are permanent community assets; social capital built
Ecological	Adequate	Regenerative practices self-sustaining once adopted; seed systems now community-managed

Further Needful Measures (Year 2-3):

Measure	Rationale	Implementation Timeline
Community revolving fund	For solar panel maintenance and replacement; biogas repair costs	Year 2 establishment

Formal registration of Saksham Samuha	<i>Enables bank accounts, government scheme access, legal identity</i>	<i>Year 2</i>
Youth eco-clubs in each KASS cluster	<i>Ensures intergenerational transfer of CCM knowledge and practices</i>	<i>Year 2</i>
Seed bank at each GSS	<i>Formalizes indigenous seed conservation beyond project period</i>	<i>Year 2-3</i>
Maintenance training for local technicians	<i>Solar and biogas repair capacity within community, not dependent on external services</i>	<i>Year 2</i>
CSGPDP integration into Gram Panchayat standing agenda	<i>Ensures climate planning continues after project ends</i>	<i>Year 3 (advocacy target)</i>
KASS-KASM financial autonomy	<i>Membership fees or community contributions for operational costs</i>	<i>Year 3</i>

Exit/Withdrawal Considerations (Towards Year End):

The project is in **Year 1 of 3**, so a formal withdrawal plan is not yet due. However, the following principles should guide Year 2-3 transition planning:

1. **Institutional handover:** By Year 3, all CCM indicator tracking should be led by GSS and Saksham Samuha, with project staff in advisory role only
2. **Financial transition:** Government scheme linkages should cover 100% of capital costs for solar/biogas by Year 3; community revolving fund for maintenance seeded in Year 2
3. **Knowledge transfer:** All training materials, FFS modules, and CSGPDP templates should be localized and available in Hindi/Bhil language for independent community use
4. **Policy lock-in:** Jila-Panchayat circular on CS-GPDP (target outcome) would institutionalize CCM in governance beyond project life
5. **Graduation criteria:** Define clear indicators for village "graduation" (e.g., ≥ 3 CCM actions sustained for 12 months without project support) to manage exit expectations

16. Issues for Achievements

16.1 The Social Impact Assessment will have revealed several issues that have to be tackled as well as achievements to celebrate. Write the key achievements of the program. Also comment on identified risks and mitigation measures adopted/ to be adopted to address this and any unintended negative outcome reported and measures adopted/ to be adopted to address this.

** Internal risks are organizational and HR capacity issues and external risks are conditions such as unfavorable changes in market and/or policy framework conditions.*

The CCM Project achieved exceptional results in Year 1, with 217 of 240 target villages (90.4%) adopting at least three climate change mitigation actions, far exceeding proportional expectations. Over 4,566 indigenous smallholder farmers (91.1% of the 5,000 target) adopted at least one Climate-Smart Agriculture practice, with adoption rates of native seeds at 93.6%, organic manure at 88.6%, and mixed cropping at 82.2%. Institutionally, 25 CBOs were sensitized, 14 submitted demand letters to state authorities, and 12 Gram Panchayats submitted Climate Smart GPDP plans documenting over 15,000 actions. The action research on Hirma Kheti validated that traditional farming achieves comparable income at less than half the cost, providing evidence for policy advocacy. Key external risks identified include fragmented government scheme convergence, which slowed solar scaling (only 45 of 120 identified farmers received installations), and uneven adoption across social groups influenced by landholding size and literacy. Mitigation measures adopted include intensified government follow-up, low-cost entry point practices accessible to all, and women's group targeting. Unintended negative outcomes observed include the gap between high adoption of low-cost practices (93.6%) and low adoption of capital-intensive technologies (solar at 20.1%), suggesting financing barriers and trust deficits. Additional mitigation measures planned for Year 2 include establishing community revolving funds, developing local maintenance networks for solar and biogas, and conducting time-use studies to prevent increased workload on women.

16.2 Has there been any material (significant) change in the organization's implementation model in the last one year? Suggest material changes required in future, if any.

**Material changes means any pertinent change including organizational changes that significantly affect the decision of the stakeholders and also affect the way of carrying out of the project/ program.*

Proposed Change	Rationale	Timing	Stakeholder Impact
Establish community revolving fund	High-cost technology scaling (solar, biogas) requires accessible financing; government schemes insufficient for all households	Year 2	Significant; changes financial sustainability model
Formalize youth eco-clubs in each KASS	Youth migration remains risk; current digital-only engagement insufficient for intergenerational transfer	Year 2	Moderate; adds new stakeholder group
Transition CCM monitoring to community institutions	For sustainability beyond Year 3; project staff should shift from data collection to technical backstopping	Year 2-3	Significant; changes roles of project staff and community
Develop maintenance network for solar/biogas	Trust deficit due to past system failures; local repair capacity essential for sustained adoption	Year 2	Moderate; requires training local technicians
Integrate CSGPDP into Gram Panchayat standing agenda	Ensures climate planning continues after project ends; requires advocacy at district level	Year 3	Significant; policy-level change
Phase out direct input distribution	Prevent dependency; transition to seed banks and community-managed resources by Year 3	Year 3	Significant; changes beneficiary expectation

16.3 Outline the steps and actions required to effectively implement the program, It includes Revised Action Plan; Resources; Stakeholder engagement; Timeline; Training and Capacity building; Monitoring and Evaluation

Revised Action Plan

Priority	Activity	Current Status	Required Action for Year 2-3	Timeline
1	Exposure visits	Not completed (0 of 2)	Reschedule and execute in Year 2	Q1-Q2 Year 2
2	Review of Programs with CCM lens	Draft stage	Complete state-study report	Q1 Year 2
3	Formal CCM charter	Under development	Finalize with 30 CBOs; submit to state government	Q2 Year 2
4	Solar scaling	45 installations completed	Target additional 200 installations through intensified government convergence	Year 2-3
5	Biogas promotion	18.9% adoption	Conduct feasibility study; establish subsidy linkage	Year 2
6	Jila-Panchayat circular	In process (advocacy ongoing)	Present CSGPDP evidence; secure circular issuance	Year 2-3
7	Midline emission measurement	Not due	Conduct midline SIA with emission re-measurement	Q3-Q4 Year 2

Resources Required

Resource Type	Current Availability	Gap	Action Required
Technical experts (CCM, solar, biogas)	25 consultancy days utilized of 67 planned	42 days remaining	Engage experts for solar scaling and biogas feasibility in Year 2
Field staff	45 trained	Adequate	Advanced training on emission measurement and maintenance
Monitoring equipment	Basic available	Emission measurement tools	Procure or partner for GHG measurement equipment

Community revolving fund	None	Full gap	Seed fund from project or donor for maintenance pool
Training materials	Hindi pamphlets/posters	Bhili/Bhil language materials	Translate IEC materials into local tribal languages

Stakeholder Engagement Plan (Year 2-3)

Stakeholder	Engagement Objective	Method	Frequency
Gram Panchayats	Adopt and fund CSGPDP actions	Quarterly review meetings; technical support for plan implementation	Quarterly
Jila-Panchayat	Issue circular on CS-GPDP	Formal presentation; policy brief submission; advocacy meetings	Bi-monthly
State government (SAPCC)	Include indigenous practices in climate plans	Submit Hirma Kheti research; CCM charter	Quarterly
CBOs (KASS, KASM)	Lead CCM monitoring and advocacy	Monthly meetings; exposure visits; charter finalization	Monthly
Government departments (solar, agriculture)	Streamline scheme convergence	Regular follow-up; farmer list submission; feedback meetings	Monthly
Private sector (solar vendors)	Reliable installation and maintenance	Empanel qualified vendors; negotiate rates for community	As needed

Timeline (Year 2-3)

Activity	Year 2 (Q1-Q4)	Year 3 (Q1-Q4)
Exposure visits	✓	

Program review completion	✓	
CCM charter finalization	✓	
Solar scaling (200+ installations)	✓	
Biogas feasibility and pilot	✓	
Midline SIA and emission measurement	✓	
Jila-Panchayat circular advocacy	✓	✓
Community revolving fund establishment	✓	
Youth eco-clubs formation	✓	
Maintenance network training	✓	
CSGPDP integration into GP agenda		✓
Endline SIA and final emission measurement		✓
Withdrawal/exit planning		✓

Training and Capacity Building Plan (Year 2-3)

Training Topic	Target Participants	Duration	Timeline
Advanced emission measurement	Field team (15)	3 days	Q1 Year 2
Solar panel maintenance	Local technicians (30)	5 days	Q2 Year 2
Biogas installation and repair	Local technicians (20)	5 days	Q2-Q3 Year 2
CCM indicator tracking (handover)	GSS and Saksham Samuha leaders (120)	2 days per cluster	Year 2-3
Financial management for revolving fund	KASS treasurers (6)	2 days	Q3 Year 2
Advocacy and policy engagement	KASM leaders (25)	3 days	Year 2-3

Monitoring and Evaluation Plan (Year 2-3)

M&E Activity	Frequency	Responsibility	Output
Quarterly progress review	Quarterly	Project team + KASS	Review minutes; action plan
CCM indicator tracking	Monthly	GSS and Saksham Samuha (transitioning to community-led)	Village scorecard
Emission measurement (midline)	Once (Year 2)	External consultant	Midline SIA report
Government scheme convergence tracking	Monthly	Field team	Convergence dashboard
Beneficiary satisfaction survey	Bi-annual	Project team	Satisfaction report
Financial audit	Quarterly	External auditor	Audit report
Endline evaluation	Once (Year 3)	External evaluator	Endline SIA report; final impact assessment

SECTION – D Confirmation by Social Enterprise

I, Jayesh Joshi on behalf of VAAGDHARA, confirm that the social impact assessment process was carried out as per the terms of reference of the engagement and the draft report was shared with us and our responses heard. The minutes of the Social Impact Assessment Meetings capture our responses and the points for action. These minutes are maintained in our records. Feedback as appropriate will be incorporated for review in the next social impact assessment cycle.

Remarks, (if any): NA

Authorized Representative of VAAGDHARA



Sign:

Name: Jayesh Joshi

Designation: Secretary

Date: 03.10.2026

Place: Banswara

Section E: deals with all the supplementary information to be provided in the form of Annexures

Not Applicable

Authorized Representative of VAAGDHARA



Sign:

Name: Jayesh Joshi

Designation: Secretary

Date: 03.10.2026

Place: Banswara