



Balancing Livelihood Costs and Transition Benefits: A Case Study of the Green India Mission in Odisha

1. Name of proposing Party or organization.

South Asian Forum for Environment (SAFE) (1)

2. Brief description of the proposed study:

The National Mission for a Green India (GIM) under the National Action Plan on Climate Change combines ecosystem restoration with climate mitigation through enhancement of forest carbon sequestration. It also seeks to create employment through nursery raising, plantation and maintenance work, even as restoration activities can alter existing access to farmland, grazing land and forest produce on which many rural households depend. Odisha offers a strong setting to examine these effects. The state accounts for 20,711 hectares of plantation and restoration work under GIM, the third-largest area among participating Indian states (MoEFCC, 2026). Implementation is dispersed across 15 forest divisions- Balangir, Kalahandi North, Sundargarh and Nabarangpur- differing in forest dependence, land pressure and livelihood base. However, existing evidence points to a problem. Although in a survey of 60 households in Balangir, 30% noted improved woodland extent and stronger ecological condition, 20% pointed to climate-mitigation gains, and 15% reported livelihood benefits from nursery, planting and forest-upkeep tasks, they flagged genuine costs- 30% cited displacement or limited entry to forest-based resources, 20% pointed to conflicting land claims, and 13% linked disrupted livelihoods to reduced use of grazing tracts and farmland (Jena et al., 2025). However, the study covers one district, uses a small sample, groups occupations simply as farm or off-farm, does not establish whether cost-bearing households receive GIM employment or livelihood benefits, whether these offset livelihood costs, whether the work provides adequate pay, continuity and protection, or how outcomes differ across livelihood systems. Hence, the proposed case study will assess whether GIM-generated employment and livelihood benefits provide adequate and decent economic adjustment for cultivation, livestock and NTFP-dependent households across three contrasting locations in Odisha, differing in livelihood dependence and land-use context. Objectives and methodology 1. Quantifying livelihood exposure and costs:



Participatory Resource Mapping, Seasonal Calendars, and household income accounting adapted from the CIFOR Poverty Environment Network methodology will estimate the resulting livelihood costs through changes in cash and subsistence values among cultivation, livestock, and NTFP-dependent households. 2. Assessing the adequacy and distribution of transition benefits: Benefit Incidence Analysis will examine the distribution of GIM employment and livelihood benefits, while household-level distributional analysis will compare these with estimated livelihood costs. International Labour Organization decent-work dimensions- remuneration, continuity, occupational safety and social protection- will assess whether GIM work constitutes viable adjustment. One suitable GIM site per landscape will be screened for carbon-finance readiness and its potential to strengthen just transition through community benefit sharing beyond short-term employment. 3. Explaining variation in household outcomes: Cross-tabulation and multinomial logistic regression will test how livelihood dependence, gender, landholding, access to GIM work, employment duration and programme benefits shape whether households experience uncompensated loss, partial adjustment or net gain Expected outcomes The study will identify livelihood groups facing the greatest transition costs to improve targeting; determine whether GIM employment and livelihood benefits provide adequate, decent adjustment, and whether carbon-finance readiness could strengthen community benefit sharing; and identify factors shaping favourable or adverse outcomes to strengthen equitable just-transition planning for land-based climate mitigation.

3. United Nations region to be covered by the case study:

Asia-Pacific;

4. Country or countries to be covered by the case study

India

5. Area of the case study:

Managing workforce transitions ;

6. Expected duration for completion of the case study (in months):

8-10 months



7. *Contribution of the submitting organization*

Technical inputs;Field access and community networks across selected Odisha landscapes, Community-level participatory research and livelihood assessment, Household socio-economic data collection, Quantitative and qualitative data analysis, Cross-site comparison, interpretation and validation, Preparation of the case study and policy-focused dissemination;Authorship;

8. *Can the study be developed without financial support from the UNFCCC?*

No

9. *If no, please provide the estimated range of required financial support in USD (Please note that the UNFCCC is not a donor organization and has limited funding):*

7800

10. *Please provide the status of any preliminary work undertaken that could serve as a basis for the study, including a link to any available reports, if available.*

<https://iucn.org/news/india/201709/new-farming-methods-secure-livelihoods-communities-india>



Framework Convention on
Climate Change