



Sustainable Livelihoods and Biodiversity in Developing Countries

Scenario and Stakeholder Workshop Report - India -

**Milestone 3.3: Third Stakeholder Workshop
Milestone 8.2 Second Version of Scenarios**

June 2011

SOPPECOM

For more information visit our website:
<http://www.livediverse.eu>



Seventh Framework
Programme (FP7/2007-
2013) under grant
agreement No. 211392

Case study Reports for Warana Basin
Milestone 3.3 Third Stakeholder Workshops/ Milestone 8.2 Second Version of
Scenarios

Acknowledgement: The research leading to these results has received funding from the European Community's Seventh Framework Programme [FP7/2007-2013] under grant agreement n° 211392

1. Introduction

Aims and objectives of the meetings

The objective of the meeting was to discuss and verify with the various stakeholders the scenarios and the major drivers for the Warana basin that had been developed as part of WP3 and 8 interactions earlier. It was expected that their feedback would provide details, serve to verify trends and their strengths and would also serve to mark out specific impacts and opinions of the different stakeholder groups.

Stakeholder types covered

A key aim was to cover as wide a spectrum of stakeholder groups as possible within the constraints of time and effort available. The following groups were broadly covered: farmers from the basin, their leaders, displaced persons, government officials, experts and civil society actors and the vulnerable communities from the area. It was intended to include as many representative farmer sections and their representatives as possible, including those who have been displaced from the upper reach of the basin. Besides these, there was an attempt to carry out separate interactions with the vulnerable communities in the area: the Dhangars, Bhois, Bagdis, Buruds, Gosavis and Kaikadis. Some of them have been displaced by the dam and/or national park and are now rehabilitated in the lower part of the basin. The rest of the communities are spread along the middle and higher reaches of the basin. In the village of Amba there is an initiative on the part of the villagers as well as the Gram Panchayat to develop some kind of participative eco-tourism. There was therefore a special interaction organised in this respect. Among the government officials the relevant departments like forest, agriculture, mining and pollution departments were contacted. Some of the experts and civil society actors in the area were also contacted.

Types of interaction

A degree of experience was gained from our earlier stakeholder interactions. Earlier attempts were directed at organising stakeholder forums or meetings which brought

together all the stakeholders. However, it was found that though in the long run such meetings did have a role to play it could have negative effects in the short run. Many government officials were likely to be inhibited in such large gatherings and would be able to speak more freely in individual one-on-one interactions. Some of the experts often had important points to make but those were too technical or time consuming to be adequately expressed in such meetings. At times, sharp conflicts between a few stakeholders would tend to dominate the discussion to the exclusion of many other points. Some of the more vulnerable groups could not express themselves as freely as they would have wished.

In view of this it was decided to adopt a flexible policy in relation to the type of interaction to be carried out with respect to the different stakeholders. One-on-one discussions were organised with the government officials. Unfortunately, one of the officials fell ill and had to be admitted to the hospital (the Agricultural Officer for the district), another had just gone on a long vacation while the Officer in Charge of the National Park had been transferred. These officials will be contacted separately. One-on-one meetings were also organised with the experts. Meetings were held with Prof. Bachulkar and Prof Jay Samant, both of whom are also civil society actors and part of the case study committee.

Since the vulnerable communities had already been covered in exhaustive detail during the individual interviews, it was decided to focus of one or two important persons from each of these communities for the stakeholder interaction. However, two large group interactions were conducted; one with the villagers in village Amba and one with farmers and farmer representatives.

Scenario outlines

At each of the meetings, the participant(s) were presented a short description of the main drivers impacting biodiversity within the region. The description of these drivers was based on the scenarios developed as part of WP8. The major drivers included the following – a) climate change - changing rainfall patterns, b) urbanisation -- actual development of urban characteristics as also urban aspirations, c) commercialisation -- from market share of crops to market influences on culture, d) infrastructure development and growth of chemical farming, mining etc. Participants were then asked to comment on/or respond to the drivers, their intensity, their specific experiences in this respect and possible ways to avoid negative impacts on biodiversity and livelihoods.

2. Third round of stakeholder meetings

SOPPECOM organized 10 meetings with stakeholders.

✓ **Group meetings:**

SOPPECOM organized two collective meetings. A first meeting was organized at Sonarli Vasahat in village Bhendavade. All participants were earlier residents of Sonarli village which was situated near Khundlapur and was part of submergence due to the Chandoli dam. The discussions revolved around the environmental and social changes brought by the relocation; commercialization as a strong driver with pros and cons; the negative impacts of pesticide and fertilizers in the area. Finally, they discussed about how they would like to change the situation.



A second meeting was organized in Hotel Greenland with farmers and displaced persons due to dam and the national park and their representatives and leaders. They talked about how climate change is affecting the area. For them, there is certainly a clear trend towards urbanization, and pollution is a major issue.



✓ **One-one-one meetings**

Besides group meetings, SOPPECOM also met others stakeholders either individually or in very small groups.



Meetings took place with households like in Kaikadi vasti in Sarud village on a one-on-one basis. The householder and the old man both agreed strongly with the trend in climatic change; commercialization as a major driver but like previous meetings,

they also underlined the benefits from it. A following meeting was organized in Bhoi Vasti in Sarud village where 3 stakeholders discussed the impacts of the changes in rainfall pattern on agriculture and fishing. SOPPECOM team also discussed the main drivers in Burud vasti in Malkapur.

Meetings were also organised with two Professors to grasp a more academic feedback on the drivers.



A meeting with the administrative body in charge of water control was also organised. It took place with the MPCB Area Officer in order to discuss about the monitoring and the water quality of the river basin.

Two meetings were organized with the representatives of the Panchayat. A meeting took place at the Gram Panchayat office in Amba village, mainly with deputy, GP representatives and teachers. They all agreed that change in rainfall patterns was one of the most important drivers for the region. The main issues discussed were about the role of the Forest department, the wildlife encroachment on human settlement and how to prevent it; the impact of mining; the need and potential to support a tourism and development based on biodiversity.



The last meeting was organized with the Sarpanch (Panchayat representative) of Kundalapur village, located on the periphery of the Chandoli National park. The main issue discussed was wildlife encroachment. He agreed that rainfall pattern has changed but according to him, urbanisation and commercialisation are not major drivers in the village.

3. Conclusion

All of the participants confirmed that the drivers that had been chosen for the scenarios were indeed the major drivers having an impact on the area. Government officials tended to point out the circumscribed nature of their action as specified by law. The primary stakeholders, however, brought up many more issues related to their livelihoods. At the same time, some of the stakeholders were more interested in their narrow interests and did not really engage with the larger issues related to biodiversity and livelihoods and the impact that the drivers had.

The strategy of approaching individual stakeholder groups and individuals worked well in bringing out many features and many aspects of the situation within the basin. These discussions will be valuable in scenario development and refinement. However, there is a need to have a common stakeholder meeting at which the final scenarios and possible actions can be collectively discussed and debated so as to explore broadly a possible consensus around issues and social and policy options in relation to them. All stakeholders welcomed the idea and agreed to participate in such a meeting. The meeting is tentatively being planned for November or December 2011.