DRA Annual International Conference On
Developed India @2047: Global Pathways for Sustainable Socio- Economic, Linguistic, Science and Technological Transformation

Ind. Jr. of Mod. Res. and Rev *PEER-REVIEWED JOURNAL* *Volume 4 [Special Issue 1] Year 2026*

Indian Journal of Modern Research and Reviews

This Journal is a member of the *'Committee on Publication Ethics'*

Online ISSN:2584-184X

Research Article

Catalysts of Change: NGOs and Agricultural Transformation in India

Dr. Gandharva Pednekar [1*], Dr. Purushottam Bhandare [2]
[1] Sr. Manager, Give Grants
[2] Senior Fellow, Peace Economy Project

Corresponding Author: *Dr. Gandharva Pednekar

DOI: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.19663046

Abstract

India's agricultural sector employs nearly half of the national workforce, yet continues to face persistent challenges of low productivity in rain-fed regions, vulnerability to climate change, and entrenched rural poverty. Against this backdrop, this paper examines the role of five leading non-governmental organizations CInI (Tata Trusts), Global Vikas Trust, Watershed Organisation Trust (WOTR), PRADAN, and the Swades Foundation in driving agricultural transformation through holistic, community-centered interventions.

The achievements of these organizations illustrate the breadth of their impact. CInI's "Lakhpati Kisan" initiative has enabled tens of thousands of farming families to achieve dignified annual incomes, while WOTR has expanded cropping systems and watershed management to restore degraded lands. Global Vikas Trust has spearheaded massive tree plantation campaigns, integrating forestry with agriculture to enhance ecological resilience and farmer incomes. PRADAN has mobilized more than eighty thousand Self-Help Groups, empowering women and landless farmers through collective savings, credit, and diversified livelihoods. Swades Foundation has advanced its "4E Model" by linking agriculture with education, health, and water systems, strengthening community institutions and preparing them for eventual self-reliance.

Methodologically, this study employs thematic analysis of secondary sources, drawing on reports and evaluations produced between 2023 and 2026. The analysis highlights how multi-component strategies combining technology adoption, institutional capacity building, market integration, and ecological sustainability create pathways for productivity growth, equity, and resilience. These NGO-led models demonstrate that agricultural transformation is most effective when rooted in community ownership, integrated across sectors, and aligned with broader policy frameworks, offering replicable blueprints for inclusive rural development.

Manuscript Information

- **ISSN No:** 2584-184X
- **Received:** 10-03-2026
- **Accepted:** 16-04-2026
- **Published:** 20-04-2026
- **MRR:**4(SP1); 2026: 98-105

- **Plagiarism Checked:** Yes
- **Peer Review Process:** Yes

How to Cite this Article

Pednekar G, Bhandare P. Catalysts of Change: NGOs and Agricultural Transformation in India. Indian J Mod Res Rev. 2026;4(SP1):98-105.

Access this Article Online

www.mrrjournal.in

KEYWORDS: NGOs, Agricultural Transformation, Climate-Resilient Agriculture, Rural Development, Tribal Empowerment, Sustainable Farming

INTRODUCTION

In India's agricultural community, there's a looming crisis in the form of a paradox, where technological progress operates alongside inequities in the system itself. About 60% of the culturable command area in India is rainfed and supplies a third of irrigated crops (IGIDR, 2018) [5]. More than 100 million small farmers in the country, especially in the tribal areas, are faced with degraded land, unreliable monsoons, as well as inaccessibility of market outlets, forcing them into cyclical poverty (ICRISAT, 2023) [6]. Initiatives such as the 'PM-KUSUM and PMKSY are well-meaning but don't necessarily extend to the marginal farmer.'

In this scenario, Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) come into prominence as key facilitators, connecting state and citizenry gaps via grassroots innovation and participation. Instead of state-led deliveries, NGOs use strategies based on grassroots expertise and ecological localized factors. This research work highlights five model NGOs, named CInI (Collectives for Integrated Livelihood Initiatives), Global Vikas Trust, WOTR, PRADAN, and Swades Foundation, because of their reach of 100,000+ households, geographical spread including tribal, rainfed, eastern, and western parts of India, and awards received, which validate trustworthiness and workability.

Approach to the study

This study explores how non-governmental organizations (NGOs) drive agricultural change in India. It highlights strategies that raise productivity and farmer incomes, while adapting to local contexts such as tribal regions, rainfed zones, and coastal ecosystems. These tailored approaches show how socio-economic and ecological conditions shape interventions. The paper also examines how NGO innovations scale up, noting both enabling mechanisms and barriers that limit wider adoption. It considers how grassroots practices can be integrated into national policies, bridging local experimentation with broader agricultural planning. The central argument is that integrated NGO models combining technology, strong institutions, market linkages, and ecological sustainability create equitable and scalable pathways for rural transformation. Such interventions improve community livelihoods and provide replicable frameworks for government programs, supporting inclusive development at a national level.

This expanded analysis synthesizes secondary data from official NGO reports, award citations (FICCI, Krishi Ratna, World Bank), peer-reviewed literature on Indian agriculture (ICRISAT, IGIDR), and government frameworks (NITI Aayog, ICAR). The study period focuses on 2015-2026, capturing recent developments. Qualitative thematic analysis identifies common intervention patterns, regional adaptations, and systemic enablers. Quantitative metrics (income, yield, institutional growth) extracted from NGO reports are cross-referenced with published studies. Limitations include reliance on self-reported data (potential attribution bias), absence of primary field surveys, and regional data gaps for remote areas. Ethical considerations prioritize publicly available sources; confidentiality maintained where applicable.

Agricultural Challenges in Contemporary India

Post-independence, India's Green Revolution dramatically raised food production, shifting from scarcity to self-sufficiency (ICRISAT, 2023) [6]. However, gains concentrated in irrigated wheat-rice belts (Punjab, Haryana), leaving rainfed agriculture home to 70% of farmers largely behind. Yields in rainfed zones languish at 0.8-1.5 tonnes/hectare versus 3-4 in irrigated systems. Climate change compounds vulnerabilities: unpredictable monsoons, rising temperatures, and extreme weather events (droughts, floods) devastate livelihoods in fragile ecosystems. Structurally, Indian agriculture faces fragmentation (average landholding 1.2 hectares), weak backward linkages (input access), poor forward linkages (market channels), and gendered inequities (women cultivate 40% land but control <10% resources). Migration-driven labor shortages and youth disengagement further challenge productivity (Bennike & Blumstein, 2015) [1].

NGO Evolution and Roles

The evolution of non-governmental organizations (NGOs) in Indian agriculture has closely mirrored broader policy transformations. Prior to the economic liberalization of 1991, NGO activity was largely oriented toward issues of land rights, food security, and subsistence concerns. In the post-liberalization era, however, the emphasis shifted toward market integration, value chain development, and the facilitation of farmer participation in increasingly globalized agricultural systems (World Bank, 2014) [14].

Contemporary NGOs have adopted complex, multi-dimensional models that integrate technological, institutional, and social innovations. Technology transfer initiatives promote precision irrigation methods such as drip and sprinkler systems, the dissemination of improved seed varieties, and the adoption of organic practices. Parallel to this, institution-building efforts have fostered the creation of Self-Help Groups (SHGs), Farmer Producer Organisations (FPOs), and cooperatives, thereby strengthening collective agency and bargaining power. Market system interventions further extend these efforts by embedding farmers within value chains, supporting processing enterprises, and facilitating e-commerce linkages that expand market access.

Equally significant are investments in capability building, which encompass farmer training, peer-learning platforms, and leadership development programs designed to enhance local knowledge and agency (Dogan &Winpenny, 2014) [2]. Social inclusion remains a critical dimension, with NGOs actively promoting gender equity, caste sensitivity, and youth engagement to ensure that agricultural transformation is both equitable and sustainable.

This integrated approach finds conceptual articulation in ICRISAT's MITrA framework, which emphasizes the "4Cs": Consortiums, or multi-stakeholder partnerships that leverage diverse expertise; Convergence, which aligns NGO initiatives with government schemes and policies; Capacity, referring to skill development and knowledge enhancement; and Collective action, which underscores the importance of community-driven agency (ICRISAT, 2023) [6]. Together, these elements illustrate how NGOs have evolved from rights-based advocacy to sophisticated, systemic interventions that address the technological, institutional, and social dimensions of agricultural development in India.

Key Intervention Categories

a) **Climate-Resilient Agriculture (CRA):** Interventions such as rainwater harvesting, mulching, and agroforestry mitigate climate risks while lowering input costs by 30–50%, thereby strengthening farmers' adaptive capacity (Hellin & Camancho, 2016) [4].

b) **Productive Institutions:** Farmer Producer Organisations (FPOs) consolidate demand, facilitate credit access, and link producers to markets, while Self-Help Groups (SHGs) generate social capital and support women's asset creation. Evidence indicates that FPO membership yields income premiums ranging from 20–40%.

c) **Technology Adoption:** Tools including drip irrigation, solar pumps, GIS-based mapping, and digital platforms accelerate uptake by reducing information asymmetries and enabling real-time monitoring.

d) **Sustainable Intensification:** Practices such as vermicomposting, bio-fertilizer application, and integrated pest management enhance soil health and curb chemical dependence, a critical intervention given that 70% of national drylands are degraded.

Research Gaps

Despite notable advances in NGO-led agricultural interventions, several critical gaps persist within the existing literature. Evidence on scaling mechanisms remains largely confined to pilot projects, with limited insights into how successful models can be replicated at scale. Tribal agricultural systems, which represent unique socio-ecological contexts, are under-represented in both empirical studies and policy discourse. Similarly, data on the long-term sustainability of NGOs following donor withdrawal is sparse, raising questions about institutional resilience and continuity. Policy silos further constrain convergence between NGO innovations and government schemes, thereby limiting opportunities for systemic integration. In addition, significant data gaps exist regarding gender equity and youth engagement, both of which are essential for inclusive agricultural transformation (Phadke, Singh & Menon, 2024) [10]. Collectively, these limitations frame the case studies presented in this research, offering a comparative context through which the strengths and shortcomings of NGO interventions can be critically assessed.

METHODOLOGY

This study adopts a qualitative-dominant mixed-methods design, integrating thematic analysis with selective quantitative metrics to examine NGO-led agricultural interventions. Data were drawn from official NGO reports, award citations, secondary literature, and government statistics, ensuring triangulation across diverse sources. Five NGOs were purposively selected based on scale of outreach, geographic diversity, award recognition, innovation scope, and data availability, thereby enabling comparative analysis across tribal, rainfed, and multi-regional contexts. The analytical framework identifies recurring patterns in intervention strategies, institutional processes, outcomes, enabling factors, and barriers, while quantitative indicators capture income gains, productivity shifts, institutional growth, natural capital restoration, and social equity. Limitations include attribution challenges due to self-reported impacts, regional data gaps, cross-sectional scope, and constraints on generalization beyond the selected cases. Ethical considerations guided the study, with reliance on publicly available materials, respect for organizational autonomy, and careful attribution distinguishing NGO contributions from those of government, private sector, and community actors.

Case Studies of Select NGOs

This core section details each NGO's strategies, processes, evidence bases, and systemic implications, revealing common patterns and regional innovations.

a) CInI (Collectives for Integrated Livelihood Initiatives): The Lakhpati Kisan Model

Tata Trusts, India's largest philanthropic organization, established the Collectives for Integrated Livelihood Initiatives (CInI) as its agricultural arm in tribal central India. In 2015, it launched *Mission 2020 – Lakhpati Kisan: Smart Villages*, aimed at enabling irreversible poverty exit by ensuring annual farmer incomes of ₹100,000 or more—twice the national rural average. Operating across 13 districts in Jharkhand, Odisha, Maharashtra, and Gujarat, with replication in Rajasthan and Uttarakhand, the program has directly reached 110,000 households and created 45,000 "Lakhpati Kisans" within six years.

CInI's strategy is multi-prototypical, tailored to agro-ecological diversity. Agricultural interventions include precision farming, crop diversification, improved input packages, and irrigation infrastructure that expanded cultivation across 15,000 acres and secured year-round water for 40,000 households. Livestock integration, particularly involving women, supplements incomes, while non-timber forest produce such as lac, honey, and medicinal plants provides off-season stability. Watershed management and community water governance further restore degraded lands.

Technology-driven scaling has been transformative, with digital tools such as the Lakhpati Kisan App, Samiti Management

Committee App, and GIS mapping enabling real-time advisory services, collective planning, and precise monitoring. Institutional architecture emphasizes community leadership through village samitis, cluster-level FPOs, and apex governance bodies, supported by 250 trained rural entrepreneurs. Beyond agriculture, CInI integrates education, health, social welfare, and financial inclusion for 20,000 households, addressing vulnerabilities holistically.

Quantified impacts demonstrate accelerated livelihood transformation, while the 2030 roadmap envisions scaling to one million households, decentralized block-level hubs, progressive community ownership, and convergence with government schemes to embed the Lakhpati model nationally (Tata Trusts, 2023) [12].

b) Global Vikas Trust: Ecological Regeneration Pathway

Global Vikas Trust positions itself as a pioneer of environment-centric agricultural development, advancing the principle that trees, soil, and water form the foundation of sustainable livelihoods. In contrast to capital-intensive, technology-only models, its interventions emphasize ecological restoration as the basis for productivity and resilience. The Trust's work is organized around three pillars. First, massive tree plantation campaigns have integrated forestry with agriculture, with over 40 million trees planted, including fruit-bearing, timber, and fodder species. These efforts generate systemic benefits such as carbon sequestration, erosion control, biodiversity corridors, and additional income streams, particularly through women-led fruit processing. Second, organic and zero-waste farming transitions farmers to chemical-free systems via protocols that promote vermicomposting, bio-pesticides, crop residue management, and mulching. These practices reduce costs by 30–50%, secure organic price premiums of 15–20%, and enhance soil carbon stocks, with adaptations tailored to dryland, coastal, and rainfed contexts. Third, water security initiatives restore hydrology through watershed management, rainwater harvesting, and micro-irrigation, expanding irrigated area by 20–30% and reducing women's water-fetching burden significantly (GVT, n.d.).

c) Watershed Organisation Trust (WOTR): Climate-Resilient Agriculture in Rainfed Zones

The Watershed Organisation Trust (WOTR) has strategically positioned itself to address India's rainfed agriculture crisis, particularly acute in Maharashtra where 70% of farmers depend on rainfed systems that yield only one-third of irrigated benchmarks. Its explicit focus is on Climate-Resilient Agriculture (CRA), building production systems capable of withstanding temperature fluctuations, erratic rainfall, and soil degradation. Core operations are concentrated in Ahmednagar and Aurangabad districts, reaching over 16,000 households and organizing 39 Farmer Producer Organisations (FPOs), with watershed management interventions spanning multiple villages.

WOTR's interventions rest on three pillars. Watershed management includes soil and water conservation structures, hillside stabilization, and community reservoirs governed by user groups to ensure equitable access. Climate-resilient cropping systems diversify production through legumes, oilseeds, horticulture, and livestock layering, reducing risk and stabilizing incomes. Precision practices such as mulching, vermicomposting, drip irrigation, and integrated pest management enhance efficiency, conserve resources, and restore soil health.

Market systems are strengthened through FPOs that aggregate supply, negotiate prices, and enable value addition via cold storage and processing units. Digital platforms and certification pathways further enhance market access. Quantified impacts include a 121% expansion in triple-cropping areas, 25% growth in horticulture, yield improvements of 15–25%, and significant gender equity with women comprising half of FPO membership (WOTR, 2023) [13].

d) PRADAN: Women-Centric Livelihoods via SHGs

PRADAN (Professional Assistance for Development Action) has established itself as a pioneering organization in women-centered rural development, positioning women as central agents of change. Operating across eight states Jharkhand, Odisha, Bihar, West Bengal, Uttarakhand, Chhattisgarh, Telangana, and Andhra Pradesh PRADAN reaches more than one million individuals through over 80,000 Self-Help Groups (SHGs), largely composed of landless and marginal women farmers. Its institutional model, articulated as *Organize–Enable–Engage (3E)*, integrates grassroots organization, livelihood diversification, and systemic engagement.

The first pillar, *Organize*, focuses on SHG formation and strengthening, where groups of 10–20 women collectively save and build solidarity. These groups evolve from savings clubs into credit intermediaries and livelihood enterprises, supported by federated structures at block and district levels that enable policy advocacy. The second pillar, *Enable*, diversifies livelihoods through agricultural innovations such as the System of Rice Intensification (SRI), vegetable gardening, pisciculture, and small livestock rearing, alongside non-agricultural enterprises in food processing, crafts, and services. Infrastructure support includes bulk input procurement, shared equipment, farmer field schools, and peer-led extension services. The third pillar, *Engage*, links SHGs to financial systems, government transfers, and market networks. Producer collectives negotiate better prices, while direct contracts and digital platforms expand market access and margins.

Quantified impacts demonstrate significant empowerment: SHG proliferation, income gains of 50–100%, asset creation, skill training, improved girls' education, and reduced migration. PRADAN's influence extends to policy, shaping gender-responsive MGNREGA design, SHG-bank linkage protocols, para-professional extension models, and social protection schemes. Its approach exemplifies how grassroots women's

institutions can drive systemic agricultural and social transformation (PRADAN, n.d.) [9].

e) Swades Foundation: Holistic Rural Transformation

The Swades Foundation, headquartered in Maharashtra, advances a holistic rural development agenda through its distinctive *4E Model* Engage, Equip, Empower, Exit designed to strengthen community agency while ensuring organizational sustainability. The first pillar, *Engage*, emphasizes participatory diagnosis and trust-building, with long-term village presence and dialogue platforms enabling communities to identify priorities across agriculture, health, education, and water. The second pillar, *Equip*, focuses on capacity building and resource access. In agriculture, over 3,000 farmers have been trained in crop production, horticulture, livestock, and fisheries, supported by regenerative practices such as conservation agriculture and integrated nutrient management. Farmer-managed machinery centers and market linkage training further enhance productivity and market access. Non-agricultural livelihoods are strengthened through the mobilization of 1,417 SHGs, skill training in tailoring, dairy collection, and transportation, and the development of micro-enterprises.

The third pillar, *Empower*, consolidates institutional maturity, with SHGs evolving into livelihood organizations, federated structures amplifying collective voice, and community-led monitoring embedding accountability. Leadership development has enabled women to emerge as resource persons and local representatives. The final pillar, *Exit*, ensures sustainability through progressive community ownership, integration with government schemes, and market-based mechanisms that reduce donor dependency, with Swades transitioning into a facilitative role.

Quantified impacts include the addition of over ₹100 crores to rural GDP, doubling of beneficiary incomes, empowerment of 70,000 women, and ecological restoration through 100,000 trees planted and 5,000 hectares under regenerative practices. Innovative elements customized machinery, agroforestry systems, digital tools, and health-agriculture linkages underscore Swades' integrated approach to comprehensive rural transformation (Swades Foundation, n.d.) [11].

Table 1: Comparative Analysis: Synergies and Differentiation

Dimension	CInI	Global Vikas	WOTR	PRADAN	Swades
Primary Focus	Tribal income (Lakhpati)	Ecological regeneration	Rainfed resilience	Women SHG livelihoods	Holistic rural development
Geographic Base	Central India (tribal)	Multi-region (eco-zones)	Maharashtra rainfed areas	Eastern plains (8 states)	Maharashtra rural
Scale (beneficiaries)	110,000+ households	State-level	16,000 farmers	1M+ individuals (80K SHGs)	Intensive villages
Tech Innovation	Apps (Lakhpati/SMC), GIS	Agroforestry, organics	FPCs, precision CRA	SRI, group enterprises	Custom machinery, apps
Institution Type	FPOs, collectives	Farmer groups, producers	FPOs (39)	SHGs, federations	SHGs, federations
Sustainability Exit	Apex community ownership	Market-linked groups	FPO self-reliance	SHG federation autonomy	4E progressive independence
Income Impact	₹1L+ (Lakhpati)	30-50% gains (cost-cuts)	50-100% (FPC members)	50-100% (SHG enterprises)	100%+ (2x via collectives)
Women Engagement	40-50% (livestock focus)	50% (farming/processing)	50% (FPC leadership)	80%+ (core constituency)	60%+ (SHG-centered)
Regional Replicability	Tribal model portable	Eco-zones specific	Rainfed-focused	Plains/high-rainfall suitable	Village-model generalizable

Impact Analysis, Challenges, and Systemic Barriers

Across five NGOs, evidence demonstrates significant transformation in rural livelihoods and agricultural resilience. Economically, household incomes have risen by 50–100%, with benchmarks such as the Lakhpati Kisan model, FPO premiums of 20–40%, and SHG enterprises doubling earnings. Collectively, over 250,000 households have directly benefited, with multiplier effects extending to millions. Productivity gains are equally notable: crop yields have increased by 15–121%, cropping intensity in rainfed areas has shifted from single to double cropping, and irrigated land has expanded by more than 15,000 acres, alongside 20–30% increases in targeted regions. Institutional growth is marked by the proliferation of 39 FPOs, 80,000+ SHGs, 1,417 Swades groups, and 60+ clusters, mobilizing 250,000 para-professionals and leaders. Environmental restoration includes 40 million trees planted, widespread compost adoption, and watershed structures enhancing hydrological resilience. Social equity is evident in women's participation (40–80%), asset creation, inclusion of marginalized communities, and youth engagement through digital and enterprise platforms.

a) **Funding and Sustainability:** NGOs continue to depend heavily on donor grants from foundations and international agencies, raising concerns about sustainability once external support ends. Rising costs linked to technological investments such as apps, GIS systems, and training—require recurrent capital expenditure that communities often cannot absorb. Moreover, premature withdrawal risks institutional regression, while prolonged NGO presence can foster dependency.

b) **Scalability and Replication:** Models tailored to specific agro-ecological contexts tribal, rainfed, or plains—face challenges when adapted elsewhere. Human capital shortages also constrain scale, as para-professionals and trainers require extended capacity building. Geographic spread is limited by high travel costs and communication barriers in remote areas, while last-mile connectivity gaps persist. Furthermore, scaling often relies on good practices rather than rigorous causal evidence, given the paucity of robust impact evaluations.

c) **Policy and Institutional Silos:** Government schemes such as PMKSY and PM-KUSUM are frequently designed without NGO input, creating procedural mismatches that

hinder convergence. Bureaucratic rigidities, including land-size conditionalities, exclude marginal farmers central to NGO work. Monitoring systems remain disjointed, with government M&E frameworks misaligned to NGO approaches, and political cycles disrupt long-term strategies.

d) **Climate Risks and Ecological Limits:** Extreme droughts and floods often exceed the adaptive capacity of CRA systems, while insurance coverage remains inadequate. Irrigation expansion faces limits in overexploited aquifers, intensifying water scarcity. Even sustainable intensification can reduce wild ecosystems, complicating conservation-agriculture balances. Climate-driven migration persists, with off-farm opportunities insufficient to absorb displaced labor (Hellin & Camacho, 2016) [4].

e) **Equity and Inclusion Gaps:** Women's asset creation occasionally provokes domestic resistance, with limited support systems for violence mitigation. Caste hierarchies sometimes marginalize SC/ST members, as affirmative action is inconsistently embedded. Youth engagement remains weak, as agriculture is perceived as unattractive despite digital tools, leading to continued migration. Regional disparities also persist, with coastal and north-eastern zones under-served and models struggling to adapt across diverse agro-ecologies.

Comparative analysis reveals enabling patterns

a) **Multi-Sector Integration:** Agriculture by itself is not sufficient to drive transformation; linking interventions with health, education, and water systems amplifies overall impact and reduces household vulnerability.

b) **Technology + Institutional Anchoring:** Technologies such as mobile applications, GIS tools, and precision farming practices are effective only when embedded within Self-Help Groups or Farmer Producer Organisations that provide accountability and collective ownership; technology deployed without institutional support often fails.

c) **Community Ownership Early:** NGOs achieve greater success when beneficiaries are involved in the design phase rather than only in implementation, with apex community leadership proving critical for long-term sustainability.

d) **Market-Centric rather than Charity:** Models driven by profit motives such as FPOs, value chains, and producer collectives tend to be more durable and resilient than approaches dependent on subsidies or charity (Kurosaki, 2017) [7].

e) **Regional Adaptation:** Agricultural models must be adapted to specific contexts, as tribal-focused initiatives in central India (CInI) differ significantly from rainfed strategies in Maharashtra (WOTR) or plains-based approaches in PRADAN; a one-size-fits-all model is ineffective.

f) **Exit and Sustainability Strategy:** Organizations are most successful when exit strategies are planned from the beginning rather than treated as an afterthought, allowing community institutions to progressively assume responsibility and ensure continuity.

CONCLUSION

The comparative analysis of five leading NGOs highlights several enabling patterns that underpin successful agricultural transformation. First, multi-sector integration emerges as essential, as agriculture alone proves insufficient; linkages with health, education, and water systems amplify impacts and reduce household vulnerability. Second, technology achieves meaningful outcomes only when anchored within institutions such as SHGs and FPOs, ensuring accountability and collective ownership; apps, GIS tools, and precision practices often fail when deployed in isolation. Third, community ownership from the outset is critical, with sustainability most evident where beneficiaries participate in design rather than merely in implementation, and apex community leadership drives long-term continuity. Fourth, market-centric approaches demonstrate greater durability than charity-driven models, as FPOs, value chains, and producer collectives motivated by profit capture margins more effectively than subsidy-dependent interventions. Fifth, regional adaptation is indispensable, with tribal models in central India (CInI) differing significantly from rainfed systems in Maharashtra (WOTR) or plains-based interventions (PRADAN), underscoring the limits of one-size-fits-all strategies. Finally, exit and sustainability strategies prove most effective when planned from inception, enabling community institutions to progressively assume responsibility and reducing dependency on external actors.

The experiences of five leading NGOs CInI, Global Vikas Trust, WOTR, PRADAN, and Swadescollectively demonstrate that agricultural transformation in India is both achievable and sustainable when pursued through integrated, community-driven approaches. Their models highlight the importance of appropriately scaled technologies, such as drip irrigation, mobile applications, and climate-resilient agriculture practices, deployed through community institutions to ensure accessibility and adoption. Equally critical is the multiplication of grassroots organizations, including Farmer Producer Organisations and Self-Help Groups, which enable collective bargaining and foster durable livelihood systems. By embedding producers within market systems, these NGOs have facilitated direct linkages to buyers, allowing collectives to capture margins historically appropriated by intermediaries. Their emphasis on ecological sustainability, through agroforestry and regenerative practices, secures long-term resource viability while advancing resilience. Social inclusion remains central, with women-led SHGs, tribal-focused interventions, and outreach to marginalized communities ensuring equity in outcomes. Finally, policy engagement has enabled these organizations to

influence government schemes, embedding NGO-informed designs into broader institutional frameworks.

Way Forward

a) **Institutional Convergence and Sustainable Financing:** Agricultural transformation requires a formal architecture for government–NGO collaboration. A national consortium with mandated NGO representation in flagship schemes would embed grassroots perspectives into policy design. Joint monitoring frameworks and redesigned programs could better serve smallholders, tribal farmers, and landless populations. To ensure long-term viability, dedicated financing is essential: capitalization funds for FPOs, patient capital for SHGs, and sustainability grants for NGOs would strengthen collective institutions, reduce donor dependency, and enable adaptive capacity.

b) **Technology, Climate Resilience, and Inclusion:** Scaling impact depends on integrating technology with community institutions. Unified digital platforms, GIS-linked land records, and standardized extension services would democratize access to knowledge, while training academies would professionalize para-workers. Climate-resilient agriculture must be mainstreamed through clear adoption targets, ecosystem service incentives, and expanded insurance coverage. Women's empowerment remains central, with SHGs and women-only FPOs positioned as key vehicles for credit, enterprise, and nutrition-linked interventions, ensuring equity and intergenerational benefits.

c) **Replication, Monitoring, and Future Vision:** Proven NGO models should be replicated across diverse regions, supported by technical assistance and state-level federations that align NGOs, government, and private actors. Real-time monitoring systems and university partnerships would generate evidence for adaptive learning and scalability. By 2027, scaled interventions could double incomes for the poorest farmers, deepen collective institutions, restore ecological resources, and empower millions of women (NITI Aayog, 2022) [8]. Looking toward 2030, NGOs should evolve into mainstream development infrastructure, with community-led institutions as primary service providers, technology platforms as public utilities, and farmers recognized as co-designers of solutions rather than passive recipients.

REFERENCES

1. Bennike J, Blumstein J. Farmer income in India: challenges and opportunities. Washington (DC): World Bank Publications; 2015.
2. Collinson M, Doğan M, Winpenny J. Farmer participation in learning networks: evidence from India and sub-Saharan Africa. International Journal of Rural Development. 2014;28(4):432-451.
3. Global Vikas Trust. Environmental and livelihood initiatives. [Internet]. Available from: https://www.globalvikastrust.org/
4. Hellin J, Camacho C. Towards climate-smart agricultural production systems: a review of adaptation and mitigation instruments in agriculture. Environmental Reviews. 2016;24(2):89-112.
5. Indira Gandhi Institute of Development Research. Agricultural transformation in India: growth, sustainability, and equity. IGIDR Working Paper No. WP-2018-026. 2018. Available from: https://www.igidr.ac.in/pdf/publication/WP-2018-026.pdf
6. International Crops Research Institute for the Semi-Arid Tropics. Mission India for Transforming Agriculture (MITrA): consortium approaches to convergence. 2023. Available from: https://oar.icrisat.org/9745/
7. Kurosaki T. Small-scale farmer livelihoods and agricultural value chains in sub-Saharan Africa and South Asia: a review of evidence. Journal of Agricultural Economics. 2017;48(3):234-267.
8. National Institution for Transforming India. Doubling farmers' income 2022: progress and strategy. New Delhi: Government of India; 2022.
9. PRADAN. Mobilizing rural livelihoods through self-help groups. [Internet]. Available from: https://www.pradan.net/
10. Phadke S, Singh R, Menon K. Assessing the role of NGOs in Bundelkhand's agricultural transformation: evidence from participatory impact assessment. Mathematical Journal of Agricultural Research. 2024;9(4):123-145.

11. Swades Foundation. Rural development through integrated livelihoods: the 4E model. [Internet]. Available from: https://swadesfoundation.org/
12. Tata Trusts. Lakhpati Kisan Initiative: five years of impact in tribal India. 2023. Available from: https://www.tatatrusts.org/our-work/livelihood/agriculture-practices/lakhpati-kisan-initiative
13. Watershed Organisation Trust. Climate-resilient agriculture and farmer producer organisations in rainfed India. 2023. Available from: https://wotr.org/agriculture/
14. World Bank. Rural livelihoods programs in India: lessons from implementation. South Asia Regional Report. 2014. Available from: https://thedocs.worldbank.org/