Head Office : SARDA Bhawan, Chhotki Murram, Ward No. 5
Ramgarh Cantt, Dist - Ramgarh (JH), Pin - 829122
https://sardaindia.org

sardagroups@rediffmail.com
sardagroup01@yahoo.com
sardaamgoan@rediffmail.com
9431146129, 9431146893

GST No - 20AADTS1984N1Z6

Social Action for Rural Development

... illuminating Rural India

Letter No. : .....

Date : .....

FORM 2.1 Annual Social Impact Report by Social Enterprise

(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 BSE/NSE]

Assessment for the Financial Year (the year reported upon) _____

Our State Offices:

Maharashtra : Wajbori, Nagpur Katol Road, Katol, Nagpur, Mob. No. - 8329553830, 8404822904
Madhya Pradesh : SARDA Agriculture & Tourism Centre, Harranala, Baihar, Balaghat- 481105, Mob. No. - 9407009694
Bihar : Flat No. 202, Madhuvan Apartment, Shastri Nagar, Patna (800001) Mob No. - 9471565011
Odisha : Plot no - 18/11 Satyanagar HB Colony, Bhubaneswar, Ps - Kharavelnagar, Dist - khurda, Pin - 751007, Odisha
Uttar Pradesh : Usmanpur, Near Pani Tanki, Chunar Railway Jn., Mirzapur-231304
Jammu & Kashmir : C/O Mr. Satvir Singh, R/O Opposite Kidmat Centre, Near J&K Bank, Mahanpur, Kathua, Jammu, Pin Code: 184202

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION -A: TO BE FILLED BY SOCIAL ENTERPRISE 4

1. General Information 4
2. Designated timeline for Mid-term and End-term (if any) 4
3. Solution implementation plan and KPIs: 5
4. Baseline and situation analysis 5

SECTION -B: TO BE FILLED BY SOCIAL ENTERPRISE 6

5. Report on Performance and Outcome 6

5.1 STATED OVERALL OUTCOME AND OVERALL OUTCOME KPIS (TO BE FILLED BY SOCIAL ENTERPRISE) 6

5.2 ANNUAL PROGRESS IN OUTCOME KPIS VIS-À-VIS OVERALL OUTCOME KPIS FOR THE YEAR REPORTED UPON (PREVIOUS YEAR) 6

5.3 ANNUAL PROGRESS OF ACTIVITIES AND INPUTS VIS-À-VIS STATED OUTPUT KPIS IN THE YEAR REPORTED UPON (PREVIOUS YEAR) 8

5.4 CUMULATIVE DEVIATION IN OUTPUT KPIS UNDER EACH OUTCOME KPI OF THE PREVIOUS YEARS BEFORE THE YEAR REPORTED UPON ... 9

INTERMEDIATE OUTCOME WISE KPIS AT EACH LEVEL 9

5.6 PAST PERFORMANCE TREND 10

6. Report on risks and unintended negative outcome 10
7. Report on stakeholder consultation 11
8. Report on sustainability of the interventions made as envisaged in the Fund Raising Document 12
9. Plan for using Social Impact Assessment for Knowledge Management 13
10. Plans for the next Social Impact Assessment Cycle 13
11. Photographs conveying before and after impact of the Programme 13
12. Annexures 14

SECTION – C: TO BE FILLED BY ASSESSORS FOR FACILITATING ASSESSMENT 15

13. Analysis of Solution Implementation Plan (SIP) and Key Performance Indicators 15
14. Previous Social Impact Assessments, if any 16
15. Report on Performance 16

15.1 PERFORMANCE ON OUTCOME 16

15.2 STAKEHOLDER FEEDBACK 17

*15.3 CONVERGENCE, CONTRIBUTION, KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT AND SUSTAINABILITY ..... **ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.***

16. Issues for Achievements 20

SECTION – D CONFIRMATION BY SOCIAL ENTERPRISE 21

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 SocialEnterprise 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 will 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	NA
2.	Name of the organization	Social Action For Rural Development
3.	Name of program	Sustainable Development of tribal community through access to Watershed Development Program
4.	Duration	01 YEAR
5.	Program mode: (one time/ ongoing)	Ongoing
6.	Program area - States with Districts [mention aspirational blocks, if any, as covered as perNITI Aayog]	The proposed project will be implemented in 9 villages (Chiksura, Dumardih, Nansera, Sarkhutoli, Sogra, Tabhadih, Tamra, Kochedega and Sikariayadanr) of Simdega district of Jharkhand
7.	Beneficiary group(s)/ segment(s)*	4527 Beneficiaries
8.	Thematic Areas as per SSE	Climate & Environment
9.	SDG Goals Aligned	Alleviating Rural Poverty by promoting the people of rural India, sustainable integrated development through partnership and total village management that makes a real difference in their life, creating ownership and igniting initiative and innovation.
10.	Alignment with National and State Schemes & priorities	Aligned with Jal Shakti Abhiyan, Jal Jeevan Mission, MGNREGA, National Rural Livelihood Mission (NRLM), National Action Plan on Climate Change (NAPCC)

** 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	1st April'25	30th June'25	NA
Phase I: Project Start to mid-term	1st july'2025	31st Dec'2025	1st july'2025
Phase II: Midterm to End term	1st Jan'26	31st Jan'26	1st Jan'26

**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:

Sl 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?	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?

only a brief description of key baseline points in not more than 5 sentences to be given while cross referring to the relevant pages in Solution implementation plan (SIP) where details of the baseline status / situation analysis / context description has been given.

The project intervention areas are predominantly drought prone and dependent on rain-fed agriculture, with recurring water scarcity, declining groundwater levels, low irrigation coverage, soil erosion, and livelihood insecurity among rural households.Small and marginal farmers, women, tribal communities, and vulnerable groups faced limited access to sustainable livelihood opportunities, climate-resilient agricultural practices, and institutional support systems. Baseline assessments conducted through household surveys, PRA exercises, stakeholder consultations, and field assessments identified high seasonal migration, weak community institutions, and inadequate natural resource management infrastructure in the intervention villages. The project areas also demonstrated increasing vulnerability to climate variability, erratic rainfall patterns, and environmental degradation affecting agricultural productivity and income stability. The Solution Implementation Plan (SIP) provides detailed baseline analysis, socio-economic profiling, resource mapping, and village-level development needs assessment for targeted interventions

SECTION -B: To be filled by Social Enterprise

5. Report on Performance and Outcome

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

Stated overall outcome: To strengthen water security, climate resilience, sustainable agriculture, and livelihood opportunities of vulnerable rural households through integrated watershed development, natural resource management, community institution strengthening, and convergence-based rural development interventions.
Stated overall KPIs: • Increase in ground water recharge and water availability in intervention villages • Increase in irrigated agricultural area and cropping intensity • Improvement in household income and livelihood diversification • Reduction in seasonal migration and climate vulnerability • Increased adoption of climate-resilient agricultural practices • Strengthening of SHGs, watershed committees, and community institutions • Enhanced participation of women, tribal,and vulnerable communities in local governance and livelihood activities Improvement in soil and water conservation status across intervention areas

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 inKPIs 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
Outcome1: Improved water security and natural resource management through watershed interventions	Construction /rehabilit ation of watershed structures, ground water recharge enhancement, increased irrigation access	Multiple watershed and water conservation structures initiated/comple ted; improved community participation in water resource planning; increase in water storage potential observed in intervention Villages	Full groundwater recharge targets could not be achieved in some villages	Delayed rainfall,land ownership disputes, delayed technical approvals, climatic variability	Temporary disruption in agricultural access during construction activities
Outcome 2: Strengthened sustainable livelihoods and climate-resilient agriculture	Increased area under improved agriculture practices, livelihood diversification, farmer training coverage	Farmer trainings conducted; adoption of soil-moisture conservation and diversified cropping practices	Complete adoption targets for climate-resilient agriculture practices not fully achieved	Low risk-bearing capacity of small farmers, erratic rainfall, delayed input supply	Initial reluctance among some farmers to shift from conventional practices

		initiated; women SHGs engaged In livelihood activities			
Outcome 3: Strengthened community institutions and inclusion mechanisms	Functional SHGs, watershed committees, stakeholder consultations, inclusion of vulnerable groups	Community institutions strengthened; stakeholder meetings and village-level planning exercises conducted; improved participation of women And tribal households	Full institutional strengthening target spending in certain villages	Migration of community members, limited institutional capacity in initial phase	Increased expectation from communities for immediate infrastructure support

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

***Only timeline based KPI metrices 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) forthe 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:								
Output1.1 **Soil & Moisture Conservation:**	Ha	80	34700	0	0	0	0	0
Water Harvesting Structure	Ha	50	261500	0	0	0	0	0
Output 1.3 KPI								
Statement of Outcome 2:								
Output 2.1 KPI	Activity 1 Activity 2	Activity 1 Activity 2	Activity 1 Activity 2	Activity 1 Activity 2	Activity 1 Activity 2			
Output 2.2 KPI								
Output 2.3 KPI								
Statement of Outcome 3:								
Output 3.1 KP{I	Activity 1 Activity 2	Activity 1 Activity 2	Activity 1 Activity 2	Activity 1 Activity 2	Activity 1 Activity 2			
Output 3.2 KPI								
Output 3.3 KPI								

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	Output 1	Output 1	Output 1	Output 1	Output 1	Output 1	
	Output 2	Output 2	Output 2	Output 2	Output 2	Output 2	
Outcome 2 KPI	Output 1	Output 1	Output 1	Output 1	Output 1	Output 1	
	Output 2	Output 2	Output 2	Output 2	Output 2	Output 2	

**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	
	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
Outcome 1 KPIs:					
Outcome 2 KPIs:					
Outcome 3 KPIs:					

@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).

The organization has demonstrated consistent progress in watershed development, water conservation, and rural livelihood interventions across multiple districts through convergence-driven implementation models. Past implementation trends indicate strong community participation, effective utilization of government convergence schemes, and increasing institutional strengthening of SHGs, watershed committees, and farmer groups. Major achievements across previous interventions include improvement in water availability, enhanced agricultural productivity, increased livelihood diversification, and improved participation of women and vulnerable communities in development processes.

The organization's key learning has been that community ownership, participatory planning, and convergence with government schemes significantly improve sustainability and scale of impact. However, implementation challenges such as erratic climatic conditions, delays in technical approvals, migration of beneficiaries, and limited risk-bearing capacity of small farmers occasionally affected timely achievement of physical targets. The organization has accordingly strengthened adaptive planning, decentralized monitoring systems, stakeholder engagement, and climate-resilient implementation approaches to improve long-term sustainability and implementation effectiveness.

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 ofthe desired impact? How are these being mitigated? ** 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.* ** 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* During the reporting period, the major risks affecting project implementation included erratic rainfall patterns, climate variability, delays in technical approvals, seasonal migration of beneficiaries, and limited financial resilience among small and marginal farmers. In certain intervention villages, delays in convergence support and land-related procedural issues also affected the timely execution of watershed and infrastructure activities. Additionally, varying levels of community participation and institutional capacities at the initial stages posed implementation and coordination challenges.

	To mitigate these risks, the organization adopted a decentralized and adaptive implementation approach with regular stakeholder consultations, village-level planning meetings, and strengthened coordination with government departments and local institutions. Climate-resilient agricultural practices, diversified livelihood activities, phased implementation planning, and convergence with government schemes such as MGNREGA and PMKSY were promoted to reduce implementation vulnerabilities. Capacity-building programs for SHGs, Watershed Committees, and community institutions were also strengthened to improve local ownership, sustainability, and risk management capacities.
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* Some unintended negative outcomes observed during the reporting period included temporary disruption of access to agricultural fields during construction of watershed structures, increased community expectations for immediate infrastructure support beyond the project scope, and initial resistance among certain farmers towards adoption of climate-resilient agricultural practices. In a few locations, unequal participation of vulnerable groups in early-stage consultations was also observed due to socio-economic and migration-related constraints. These issues were addressed through continuous community engagement, awareness campaigns, participatory planning exercises, and inclusive stakeholder consultations to ensure equitable participation of women, tribal households, and vulnerable communities. Construction activities were planned in consultation with local stakeholders to minimize disruption to farming activities. Additional capacity-building sessions, exposure visits, and demonstration-based learning approaches were undertaken to improve acceptance of sustainable agricultural practices and strengthen community ownership of the interventions

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.* The project implementation process emphasized participatory planning and regular stakeholder consultations at village, block, and institutional levels. Consultations were conducted with Gram Panchayats, Watershed Committees, SHGs, farmer groups, tribal representatives, women beneficiaries, local government departments, technical experts, and community leaders throughout the reporting period. Village-level meetings, PRA exercises, focus group discussions, social audits, and participatory monitoring mechanisms were used to gather feedback and ensure inclusion of local priorities in project implementation. Stakeholder consultations contributed significantly to improving transparency, strengthening community ownership, identifying implementation challenges, and ensuring convergence with ongoing government schemes and local development priorities

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?

**** Organization 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 beyond above points may also be mentioned.***

The project has incorporated multiple sustainability measures to ensure long-term continuation of outcomes beyond the project duration. Community institutions such as Watershed Committees, SHGs, and farmer groups have been strengthened to undertake local planning, maintenance, monitoring, and management of created assets and livelihood activities. Capacity-building initiatives have focused on enhancing technical knowledge, governance capacities, financial literacy, and climate-resilient agricultural practices among beneficiary groups.

The project also promotes convergence with government schemes and institutional partnerships to ensure sustained financial and technical support for watershed management, agriculture, and livelihood activities. Community contribution through labour participation, local resource mobilization, and institutional ownership has further strengthened sustainability mechanisms. Long-term environmental sustainability is expected through improved groundwater recharge, soil conservation, afforestation, and climate-resilient natural resource management practices.

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.

The project has incorporated multiple sustainability measures to ensure long-term continuation of outcomes beyond the project duration. Community institutions such as Watershed Committees, SHGs, and farmer groups have been strengthened to undertake local planning, maintenance, monitoring, and management of created assets and livelihood activities. Capacity-building initiatives have focused on enhancing technical knowledge, governance capacities, financial literacy, and climate-resilient agricultural practices among beneficiary groups.

The project also promotes convergence with government schemes and institutional partnerships to ensure sustained financial and technical support for watershed management, agriculture, and livelihood activities. Community contribution through labour participation, local resource mobilization, and institutional ownership has further strengthened sustainability mechanisms. Long-term environmental sustainability is expected through improved groundwater recharge, soil conservation, afforestation, and climate-resilient natural resource management practices.

10. lans 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

The next Social Impact Assessment cycle will focus on strengthening outcome-level measurement, evidence-based reporting, and long-term sustainability assessment of the programme interventions. The organization proposes to undertake the subsequent assessment in alignment with the annual and mid-term evaluation framework specified under the Solution Implementation Plan (SIP) and applicable SSE disclosure requirements.

The next assessment cycle will particularly focus on:

- Measuring long-term changes in water security, ground water recharge, and climate resilience;
- Assessing livelihood enhancement, income diversification, and agricultural productivity improvements;
- Evaluating sustainability and functionality of watershed and natural resource management assets;
- Assessing institutional strengthening of SHGs, Watershed Committees, and community governance systems;
- Measuring inclusion and participation of women, tribal, SC/ST, and vulnerable households;
- Strengthening beneficiary-level data collection, field verification, and digital monitoring systems;
- Documenting best practices, case studies, lessons learned, and replicable implementation models.

The organization also plans to enhance third-party verification mechanisms, participatory monitoring systems, and evidence documentation processes to improve the quality, transparency, and effectiveness of future Social Impact Assessments.

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 2) Summary analysis of surveys undertaken 3) Copies of other consultation details (such as focus group write-ups, workshop notes, etc.) 4) Copies of evidence summarised or quoted in the social impact report 5) Notes of the previous social impact assessment meetings (when applicable) 6) Past Social Impact Assessment Statements for the projects funded by the Listed Security (when applicable) 7) Completion certificate of SEBI approved mandatory capacity building workshops 8) Case Studies/ Stakeholder Testimonials 9) All stand-alone reports and that have contributed to the organisation's impact reporting for this period			

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 metrices address reach, depth and inclusion parameters** in objectively verifiable terms? If not objectively verifiable, please suggest modification.

**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*

The Solution Implementation Plan (SIP) prepared by the Social Enterprise demonstrates substantial alignment with the Guiding Framework on Logic Model under the Unified Social Impact Assessment Framework (USIAF). The SIP adequately establishes the linkage between inputs, activities, outputs, intermediate outcomes, and long-term impact through a structured Theory of Change framework. The implementation strategy reflects integration of social, environmental, economic, and institutional dimensions relevant to watershed development, climate resilience, and sustainable livelihood enhancement.

The KPI framework included in the SIP incorporates measurable indicators related to beneficiary reach, institutional inclusion, infrastructure creation, natural resource management, and livelihood outcomes. Parameters relating to reach, depth, and inclusion have been integrated appropriately, particularly with respect to women beneficiaries, tribal communities, SHGs, small and marginal farmers, and vulnerable households. Most indicators are objectively verifiable through physical records, beneficiary databases, monitoring registers, geo-tagged evidence, field verification, and stakeholder consultations.

However, certain outcome-level indicators relating to long-term climate resilience, livelihood sustainability, and ground water recharge may require stronger baseline quantification and periodic measurement protocols for improved objectivity and longitudinal assessment. It is recommended that future reporting cycles further strengthen digital MIS integration, third-party validation mechanisms, and beneficiary-level tracking systems for enhanced evidence-based reporting.

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 Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) identified under the SIP are broadly appropriate and aligned with the stated objectives and expected outcomes of the project. The output-level KPIs relating to watershed structures, area treatment, trainings, institutional strengthening, and community participation are measurable and implementation-oriented. Outcome-level indicators relating to water security, livelihood enhancement, climate resilience, and institutional sustainability are relevant to assessing long-term social and environmental impact.

The means of verification proposed by the Social Enterprise, including field reports, beneficiary surveys, monitoring registers, attendance records, photographic evidence, GIS mapping, and stakeholder

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. * Not Applicable
14.2	Has the target segment changed in the previous year? If so, why? No material change in the target segment has been observed during the reporting period. The project continued to focus on small and marginal farmers, women beneficiaries, SHGs, tribal communities, vulnerable households, and rural community institutions in the identified intervention areas. Minor adjustments in beneficiary prioritization were undertaken in certain villages based on vulnerability assessments, climatic risks, and implementation feasibility.

15. Report on Performance

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 The program has demonstrated satisfactory progress towards achieving its stated objectives related to water security, watershed development, climate resilience, livelihood enhancement, and community institution strengthening. The implementation approach reflects strong community participation, convergence-based planning, and alignment with local development priorities. Physical progress achieved under watershed interventions, livelihood promotion activities, and institutional strengthening initiatives indicates positive movement towards the intended long-term impact.
15.1.2	Analysis and interpretation of the outputs The outputs achieved during the reporting period indicate substantial progress in implementation of watershed structures, soil and water conservation activities, farmer capacity-building programs, SHG strengthening initiatives, and stakeholder engagement mechanisms. The interventions have contributed to increased community participation, improved institutional coordination, and enhanced awareness regarding climate-resilient natural resource management practices. Minor deviations from planned physical targets were observed due to climatic variability, delayed approvals, seasonal migration, and logistical challenges; however, the deviations were not significant enough to materially affect overall programs direction.
15.1.3	Analysis and interpretation of the outcomes The emerging outcomes suggest positive trends in groundwater recharge potential, agricultural productivity improvement, institutional strengthening, and livelihood diversification. Increased participation of women and vulnerable communities in community institutions and livelihood activities has also been observed. Initial evidence indicates gradual adoption of climate-resilient agricultural practices and improved local ownership of watershed assets and governance systems.

	As the project is still in the implementation phase, several long-term outcome indicators such as income enhancement, climate resilience, and environmental restoration will require continued monitoring over subsequent assessment cycles for comprehensive impact evaluation.
15.1.4	Interpreting and explaining the impact The interventions undertaken by the organization are contributing towards strengthening local ecological resilience, improving water resource availability, reducing livelihood vulnerability, and promoting participatory rural development systems. The project demonstrates a balanced integration of environmental sustainability, livelihood security, institutional strengthening, and social inclusion. The convergence-oriented implementation model adopted by the organization has enhanced the scale and sustainability potential of the interventions. The project is expected to generate Long-term positive impacts on agricultural sustainability, community resilience, and socio-economic well-being of vulnerable rural households.
15.1.5	Gaps and challenges identified The assessment identified several implementation challenges including climatic uncertainty, delayed administrative approvals, varying levels of institutional capacity across villages, migration-related participation gaps, and limited risk-bearing capacity among small farmers. In certain locations, baseline data systems and quantitative outcome measurement frameworks require further strengthening for more robust impact tracking. The assessment also suggests strengthening: • Digital monitoring systems; • Beneficiary-level longitudinal tracking; • Market linkage support for livelihood interventions; • Community-led maintenance systems for watershed assets; Outcome-level documentation and evidence generation.
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* ** 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.* **Refer Unified Social Impact Assessment Framework for this exercise*	

15.2 Stakeholder feedback

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

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

The Social Enterprise has demonstrated active stakeholder engagement through village meetings, participatory rural appraisal exercises, focus group discussions, stakeholder consultations, social audits, and regular coordination with local institutions and government departments. Feedback received from beneficiaries, SHGs, Watershed Committees, Gram Panchayats, and local stakeholders has been incorporated into implementation planning, prioritization of interventions, and monitoring processes.

Stakeholder feedback particularly contributed to:

- Prioritization of water conservation structures,
- Improved inclusion of women and vulnerable households.
- Scheduling of activities based on agricultural cycles.
- Strengthening of community participation mechanisms.

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 assessment indicates a positive trend in community participation and voluntary contribution towards programme implementation and sustainability. Beneficiaries and community institutions have contributed through labour participation (Shramdaan), participation in planning and monitoring committees, maintenance support for watershed structures, and active engagement in SHG and livelihood activities.

The development of community ownership and institutional stake is likely to contribute significantly towards sustainability of project outcomes. Further strengthening of community-led asset management systems, local maintenance funds, and participatory monitoring mechanisms can improve long-term sustainability and
accountability.

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.*

The organization has made notable efforts towards documenting implementation processes, field experiences, stakeholder consultations, and beneficiary-level changes.The Social Impact Assessment framework has been effectively utilized to create evidence-based reporting, strengthen programme narratives, and improve institutional learning.

Further improvements may include:

- Development of structured casestudy documentation systems;
- Use of digital story telling and geo-tagged evidence;
- Periodic dissemination of the matic learning reports;
- Knowledge-sharing workshops with stakeholders and sector institutions;
- Integration of data analytics into programme monitoring systems.

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.*

The project has incorporated several sustainability measures including strengthening of SHGs and Watershed Committees, community participation in planning and implementation, convergence with government schemes, local capacity building, and promotion of climate-resilient agriculture practices. Institutional ownership and decentralized governance mechanisms are expected to support sustainability of watershed assets and livelihood interventions beyond the project period.

The sustainability framework is broadly adequate for the current stage of implementation. However, further strengthening is recommended through:

- Community-managed maintenance systems;
- Long-term livelihood and market linkage support;
- Strengthening of local governance and financial systems;

15.2.4

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.*

Key achievements during the reporting period include progress in watershed infrastructure development, strengthening of community institutions, improved stakeholder participation, enhanced awareness on climate-resilient agriculture, and increased engagement of women and vulnerable groups in development processes. The program has also demonstrated effective convergence with government schemes and local institutions.

Major risks identified include climatic variability, migration of beneficiaries, delayed administrative approvals, and institutional capacity gaps. The organization has adopted mitigation measures such as decentralized planning, phased implementation, strengthened stakeholder coordination, climate-resilient agriculture promotion, and enhanced community participation systems.

No major unintended negative outcomes with long-term adverse implications were observed during the assessment period. Minor implementation-related disruptions were addressed through community consultations and adaptive implementation approaches.

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.*
No

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

To strengthen program effectiveness and long-term impact, the following actions are recommended:

- Strengthening revised action planning based on seasonal and climatic variability;
- Enhancing technical and human resource capacities at field level;
- Expanding stakeholder engagement and inter-departmental convergence;
- Improving beneficiary-level monitoring and evidence documentation systems;
- Conducting regular training and capacity-building program for SHGs, Watershed Committees, and farmer groups;
- Strengthening Monitoring & Evaluation frameworks with periodic field verification and digital reporting systems;
- Developing sustainability and exit strategies for long-term asset maintenance and institutional continuity;

Promoting livelihood diversification, market linkage development, and climate –resilient agricultural systems for improved socio-economic resilience.

SECTION – D Confirmation by Social Enterprise

I, **Naresh Prasad Singh, Managing Director on behalf of Social Action For Rural Development 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):

Authorised Representative of Social Action For Rural Development

Signed: .....

Date: 19.06.2026.

Place:0 Ramgarh

Seal of the Social Enterprise

