

PROJECT PROPOSAL TEMPLATE FOR MKSP

Submitted to: (all project have to be recommended by State's Rural Development Department)

Please Note:

1. Total size of the project should not be less than Rs. 1 crore. Only PIA with prior experience with women SHGs/ collectives of women should apply. PIAs formed through a consortium should have Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) signed already.
2. If information furnished by PIA is found to be incorrect or mis-represented at any stage, the Grant will be scrapped and recovered from PIA
3. The PIA from time to time shall provide information of any foreseen or unforeseen changes occurring within the organization (during the project phase) that may have a direct or indirect impact on the project implementation.

| | |
|--------------------------------|--|
| Project Title | |
| Proposed Area of Action | |

PLEASE ADD AN EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

(Upto 1000 words)

- a) Project Description
- b) Rationale for Support under MKSP
- c) Budget
- d) Project Results

SECTION A: Basic PIA Information

| | | |
|----|--|---|
| 1 | Name of PIA | |
| 2 | Legal Status (NGO / Network NGO / CBO / Producer Co. / Section-25 Co. / Pvt. Co/ Other – Please specify) | If consortium a signed beforehand MOU is required |
| 3 | If Network NGO, number of partners being supported? | |
| 4 | Registration No. & Date of Registration | |
| 5 | Name of Donors in the past 3 years, if any (give max3) | |
| 6 | Name with Size (Budget in INR) of relevant projects handled in the past 3 years (give max 3) | |
| | Annual Revenue of PIA for the most recent audited financial year | |
| 8 | List ongoing projects (max 3.) and their Size (INR) | |
| 9 | Completion of last project (MM/YY) | |
| 10 | Total value of assets available with the PIA? | |
| 11 | Experience of working with <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (i) Women SHGs/Groups (Y/N)- 1(a) in Appraisal Sheet (ii) Agriculture based livelihoods with existing women groups (Y/N)- 1 (b) in Appraisal Sheet | If YES, please elaborate in section B.1 |
| 12 | In the proposed project, what % of the implementation will be undertaken by existing capacities and what % will be leveraged from external community based organizations in the project area? – 1 (d) in Appraisal Sheet | Existing - ____% External - ____% |

13. Human Resource (Give details of staff with relevant experience proposed for deployment towards the proposed project. Details should also include availability of Community Resource Persons with relevant knowledge deployed under the project. Answer to this question may be put as Annexure.

- 1(e)in the Appraisal Sheet

| Name | Sex (M/F) | Position | Education qualification | Relevant Experience (Years + Sectors) |
|------|-----------|----------|-------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| | | | | |
| | | | | |

| | | | | |
|-----|--|--|--|--|
| | | | | |
| 14. | Please attach following as Annexure - (i) <i>Last three years audited financial statements</i> (ii) <i>Description of training resources and infrastructure available with the organization which is proposed to be deployed for the MKSP project e.g. brochure, training material, training hall, trainers etc)- 1 (f) in the Appraisal Sheet</i> | | | |

SECTION B: Community Institutions Architecture

1. Community Institutions Architecture (max 1500 words)

(a) Past Experience of PIA

1. Past experience in forming / nurturing women based groups and /or collectives. Please also elaborate on experience of promotion of agriculture based livelihoods with existing women groups- 1(a) & (b) in the appraisal sheet.
2. Briefly elaborate the best practices adopted by the women groups promoted by your organization? More importantly, elaborate in greater detail how you ensured that the groups internalized these best practices? – 2 a1 in the Appraisal Sheet.
3. Describe strategies undertaken in the past in enabling access to credit and markets through the women groups/federations?- 2 a2 and 2a3 in the Appraisal Sheet.

(b) Proposed Plans/Strategies as part of the Project

1. Proposed strategies to ensure implementation of the project community processes including use of community resource persons and enhancement of their capacities-2 b4 in the Appraisal Sheet.
2. Systems and checks put in place to ensure that the local resource persons are accountable to / managed by the women institutions- 2b1 in the Appraisal Sheet .
3. Plans to enable women institutions to put in place a transparent self monitoring and review mechanism internally for program improvement- 2 b3 in the Appraisal Sheet.
4. Briefly elaborate on systems/ and procedures that you propose to put in place for adoption of best practices by the women institutions

SECTION C: Operational Details

C.1 Description of Context (Max 1000 words)

This section should include

- a. Context of Area and Community
- b. Problem Analysis (ecologically fragile areas like drought-prone, rainfed etc.)
- c. Opportunities (This may include the existence of quality CBOs, resource organizations, scope for backward and forward linkages etc.)

C. 2 Project Description (Max 1000 words)

This section should include

- a. Vision of Success
- b. Goals
- c. Key Outputs

C. 3 Detail of Proposed Action (Max 1500 words)

This section should include

1. Plans for promoting and enhancing food and nutritional security for women farmers?
3 b in the Appraisal Sheet.

2. Strategies addressing sustainable/evergreen/regenerative agriculture; may include (all /any) of the following strategies – 3 a in the Appraisal Sheet.
 - a. *Soil Health improvement* – 3 a1 in the Appraisal Sheet.
 - b. *Soil & water conservation and ground water recharging* -3 a2 in the Appraisal Sheet
 - c. *Low cost sustainable practices such as NPM/ IPM/ Integrated Nutrient Management* 3 a3 in the Appraisal Sheet
 - d. *Management and control of seeds (identification & adoption of suitable farmer preferred varieties from a basket of choices)* -3 a4 in the Appraisal Sheet
 - e. *Mitigation of risk of exposure to hazardous farm practices-* 3 a5 in the Appraisal Sheet
 - f. *Bio-diversity enhancement- poly cropping, multi-layer farming etc-* 3 a6 in the Appraisal Sheet
 - g. *Use of indigenous knowledge*-3 a7 in the Appraisal Sheet
 - h. *Suitability of technology to the local agro-ecology*- 3 a8 in the Appraisal Sheet
 - i. *Resilience to climate change – Integrated Natural Resource Management*-3 a9 in the Appraisal Sheet
3. *Targeting : Approach and Details on landless, small and marginal farmers as project participants*- 3 m in the Appraisal Sheet
4. Plans for Post-project Sustainability and Scaling-up strategies- 3 o in the Appraisal Sheet.

It could also include

5. Plans aiming at drudgery reduction for women farmers- 3 c in the Appraisal Sheet.
6. Plans for awareness generation with regard to “women farmers” rights entitlements under different schemes related to her identity as “women farmer”. Any plans towards enhancing accessibility of land to women farmers – 3 e and 3 f in the Appraisal Sheet.
7. Any plans to intervene in value chain development (end-to-end solution) e.g. intervention in production / processing / marketing? Please also describe how the proposed project will increase market accessibility of women farmers- 3 g in the Appraisal Sheet.
8. Strategies for disseminating knowledge. Including plans for skill upgradation among women. – 3 h in the Appraisal Sheet.
9. Plans for increasing access of credit to women farmers and women groups- 3 i in the Appraisal Sheet.
10. Please elaborate on the direct ‘incremental’ income (returns) to women farmers through proposed project. The incremental income should be sustainable. Proposal may include cash flow projections to indicate changes at the level of project participant, the cash flows will include savings through reduction in costs - e.g. low external inputs use sustainable agriculture, reduced health outlays etc- 3 j in the Appraisal Sheet.
11. Plans for community contribution of any kind, be it in-kind or monetary or regular thrift- 3 l in the Appraisal Sheet.

C. 4 Project Implementation Strategy

2. **Implementation Design** (max 500 words)
 - a. Elements of Implementation Process
 - b. Project Implementation Plan & Flow
 - i. Internal structure for implementation
 - ii. Geography and Yearly Distribution

SECTION D: Budget

Budget Narrative should include

- a. Project Investments and Support Requested under MKSP
- b. Rationale for the various line items related to Proposed Action C3 & C4
- c. Cost elements (natural heads of accounts) under each budget line item- Plan for leverage other sources of fund in the proposed project e.g. NRLM/ NREGS/ SGSY/ RKVY/ NFSM/ NABARD/ NHM/ Donors- 4 a in the Appraisal Sheet.
- d. Explanation of Cost Elements including description of capital expenditure items/ with break-up and unit cost for all items/ components. Please also clearly indicate what % of budget goes in capacity building of the women farmers- 4 b in the Appraisal Sheet.
- e. Analysis and Benchmarks of proposed costs.

The narrative has to be backed by worksheets.

MAHILA KISAN SASHAKTIKARAN PARIYANA (MKSP) SCORING SHEET

| Component | | Desirability | Max Score | Scores | Criteria | Min=0 | Med = half of max |
|--|-----------|---------------------|------------------|--|--|--|--|
| 1 PIA/ Organizational Assessment | | | | 15 | Min 1 mos - 3 years | Medium 3-7 years | Max >7 years |
| a Prior experience of PIA in working with women SHGs / women groups; | Essential | 3 | | | | | |
| b Prior experience of PIA in promoting agriculture based livelihoods with existing women groups | Desirable | 3 | | 0-1 year/s | 1-3 years | | >3 years |
| c Total size of the project cannot be less than Rs. 1.00 crores | Essential | Y/N | | | | | |
| d Size of the proposed project should be proportional to their existing capacities or their capability to leverage community based organizations for execution of the project | Essential | 3 | | >5 times of their capacity | 3-5 times their capacity | Up to 3 times their capacity | |
| e Adequacy of the available technical staff and Community Resource Persons (CRPs) | Essential | 3 | | Staff have no relevant experience in the sector | Staff have an average exp. Of 3-5 years in the relevant sector | Staff have an avg. experience of more than 5 years in RS | |
| f Adequacy of training resources and access to basic infrastructure (brochure, training material, training hall, trainers, presence of Community Resource Persons etc.) | Essential | 3 | | No | In between | Fully equipped with relevant training resources | |
| <i>*If women CEO is a PIA, then certain norms may be relaxed to promote women empowerment</i> | | | | | | | |
| 2 Community Institution Architecture | | | | | | | |
| a How well PIA has groomed community based organizations in the past? | Desirable | | | | | | |
| <i>Track record of sustaining best practices among women groups - a1 grading of groups under SGSY/Nabard etc., processes for strengthening quality in women groups</i> | | | | | | | |
| a1 | | | | | No clear evidence/action | some evidence exists but clear roadmap is missing | Well articulated processes and clear evidences |
| <i>Track record and strategies undertaken in past in creating access to credit through enabling participation of community institutions (linkages with SGSY, NABARD-Bank Linkage programs, etc.)</i> | | | | | | | |
| a2 | | 6 | | <30% of such promoted groups have access to credit | 30-50% of such promoted groups have access to credit | >50% of promoted groups have access to credit | |
| <i>Track record and strategies undertaken in past in creating access to markets through enabling participation of community institutions</i> | | | | | | | |
| a3 | | 6 | 35 | <10% such promoted groups have access to markets | 10-25% of such promoted groups have access to markets | >25% of promoted groups have access to markets | |
| b How well PIA plans to leverage community based institutions in the proposed project? | | | | | | | |
| b.1 Management of programs by community institutions | | 3 | | No clarity | Clarity Exists but not well articulated | Well articulated and workable | |
| b.2 Community based extension mechanism for intensive handholding at village/cluster level | Essential | 3 | | No clarity | Clarity Exists but not well articulated | Well articulated and workable | |
| b.3 Community based monitoring, review and evaluation including systems for social audit, cash management and record keeping | | 6 | | No clarity | Clarity Exists but not well articulated | Well articulated and workable | |
| <i>Development of community resource persons for expansion in new villages within the cluster/area of operation(during project period)</i> | | | | | | | |
| b4 | | 5 | | No clarity | Clarity Exists but not well articulated | Well articulated and workable | |

| | Component | Desirability | Max Score | Scores | Criteria | Min=0 | Med = half of max |
|-----|--|---------------------|------------------|---------------|--------------------------------|--|-------------------------------|
| 3 | Technical Assessment | | | | | | |
| | Promotion of sustainable (evergreen) agriculture -contributing to the a regenerative agriculture – for e.g. integrating livestock, trees, apairy etc | Essential | 9 | | No clarity and total ambiguity | Strategy exists but inconsistent or inadequate in very clearly meeting goals | Workable strategy articulated |
| a.1 | <i>soil health improvement</i> | Essential | | | No clarity and total ambiguity | Strategy exists but inconsistent or inadequate in very clearly meeting goals | Workable strategy articulated |
| a.2 | <i>soil & water conservation and ground water recharging</i> | Essential | | | No clarity and total ambiguity | Strategy exists but inconsistent or inadequate in very clearly meeting goals | Workable strategy articulated |
| a.3 | <i>Low cost sustainable practices such as NPM/ IPM / Integrated Nutrient Management, regeneration of local natural resources</i> | Essential | | | No clarity and total ambiguity | Strategy exists but inconsistent or inadequate in very clearly meeting goals | Workable strategy articulated |
| a.4 | <i>Ensuring management and control of seeds (identification & adoption of suitable farmer preferred varieties from a basket of choices)</i> | Essential | | | No clarity and total ambiguity | Strategy exists but inconsistent or inadequate in very clearly meeting goals | Workable strategy articulated |
| a.5 | <i>Mitigate risk of exposure to hazardous farm practices</i> | Essential | | | No clarity and total ambiguity | Strategy exists but inconsistent or inadequate in very clearly meeting goals | Workable strategy articulated |
| a.6 | <i>enhances bio-diversity- poly cropping, multi-layer farming etc</i> | Essential | | | No clarity and total ambiguity | Strategy exists but inconsistent or inadequate in very clearly meeting goals | Workable strategy articulated |
| a.7 | <i>Use of indigenous knowledge</i> | Essential | | | No clarity and total ambiguity | Strategy exists but inconsistent or inadequate in very clearly meeting goals | Workable strategy articulated |
| a.8 | <i>Suitability of technology to the local agro-ecology</i> | Essential | | | No clarity and total ambiguity | Strategy exists but inconsistent or inadequate in very clearly meeting goals | Workable strategy articulated |
| a.9 | <i>Resilience to climate change - Integrated Natural Resource Management, water control, crop cycles etc.</i> | Essential | | | No clarity and total ambiguity | Strategy exists but inconsistent or inadequate in very clearly meeting goals | Workable strategy articulated |
| b | Whether project activities promotes and enhances Food and Nutritional Security for women farmer families? | Desirable | 3 | | No clarity and total ambiguity | Strategy exists but inconsistent or inadequate in very clearly meeting goals | Workable strategy articulated |
| c | Whether the proposed activities reduce drudgery reduction in agriculture for women farmer families? | | 2 | | No clarity and total ambiguity | Strategy exists but inconsistent or inadequate in very clearly meeting goals | Workable strategy articulated |
| d | Whether proposed activities increase market accessibility of women farmers | Desirable | 2 | | No clarity and total ambiguity | Strategy exists but inconsistent or inadequate in very clearly meeting goals | Workable strategy articulated |
| e | Whether proposed activities clearly articulate strategies for awareness generation with regard to their rights entitlements under different schemes? | Desirable | 2 | | No clarity and total ambiguity | Strategy exists but inconsistent or inadequate in very clearly meeting goals | Workable strategy articulated |

| | Component | Desirability | Max Score | Scores | Criteria | Min=0 | Med = half of max |
|-------------------------------|--|---------------------|------------------|--------------------------------|---|---|--|
| f | Whether proposed activities enhance the accessibility of land to women farmers | Desirable | 2 | No clarity and total ambiguity | Strategy exists but inconsistent or inadequate in meeting goals | Inconsistent or inadequate in meeting goals | Workable strategy articulated very clearly |
| g | Whether the project design provides comprehensive end-to-end solution. Eg. interventions in value chain development, production / processing / marketing etc. | Desirable | 2 | No clarity and total ambiguity | Strategy exists but inconsistent or inadequate in meeting goals | Inconsistent or inadequate in meeting goals | Workable strategy articulated very clearly |
| h | Knowledge dissemination and skill upgradation among women farmers | Essential | 2 | No clarity and total ambiguity | Strategy exists but inconsistent or inadequate in meeting goals | Inconsistent or inadequate in meeting goals | Workable strategy articulated very clearly |
| i | Access to credit to women farmers and women groups | Desirable | 2 | No clarity and total ambiguity | Strategy exists but inconsistent or inadequate in meeting goals | Inconsistent or inadequate in meeting goals | Workable strategy articulated very clearly |
| j | Direct incremental income (returns to women farmers); Savings through reduction in costs - e.g. low external inputs use sustainable agriculture, health outlays, etc | Essential | 5 | No clarity and total ambiguity | Strategy exists but inconsistent or inadequate in meeting goals | Inconsistent or inadequate in meeting goals | Workable strategy articulated very clearly |
| l | Community Contribution be it in kind or thrift | Desirable | 2 | No clarity and total ambiguity | Strategy exists but inconsistent or inadequate in meeting goals | Inconsistent or inadequate in meeting goals | Workable strategy articulated very clearly |
| m | Targeting of landless, small and marginal farmers as project participants | Essential | 3 | If targeting is less than 60% | Targeting is 61-80% | Targeting is more than 80% | |
| n | Targeting of ecological fragile areas like drought-prone, rainfed; proposed intervention in such areas to mitigate | Desirable | 2 | No clarity and total ambiguity | Strategy needs to be assessed practically | Strategy needs to be assessed practically | Workable strategy articulated very clearly |
| o | Scaling up strategy: integration with NRLM, convergence with other programs | Desirable | 2 | No clarity and total ambiguity | Strategy needs to be assessed practically | Strategy needs to be assessed practically | Workable strategy articulated very clearly |
| 4 Financial Assessment | | | | | | | |
| a | Leveraging other finances - NRLM/NREGS/SGSY/RKYY/NFSM/NABARD/NHM, Donors, etc | Desirable | 4 | 10 | If leveraging is < 10% | If leveraging is between 11-30% | If leveraging is more than 30% |
| b | % Allocation of the budget on capacity building of the women farmers | Essential | 3 | <10% | 10-20% | >20% | |
| c | Unit cost per participant | Essential | 3 | >Rs.7500 | Rs.5001-7500 | <Rs.5000 | |