

JPAM UPDATE
News on Action Towards Joint Protected Area Management

No's 1 -17
September 1994 - July 1998

...\ak\jtmng\update\final\onefile.doc

Notes:

- This file version does not follow page numbering, page layout, fonts, etc. as they appear in hard copies of the Update
- The entire file has been reduced to GeoSlab703 Lt BT font in 10 point. (This will appear as Times New Roman in systems where GeoSlab is not installed)

Ashish Kothari
Project Director

23 November,1994

Dear Friend,

As was decided in our September meeting on Exploring Joint Protected Area Management, we shall be starting with a regular Update to inform you of all the activities being undertaken within the purview of joint or participatory management of protected areas. Enclosed please find the first of these Updates.

This Update is based on the information received or gathered by us since the workshop in September. It is possible that we have missed out on other follow-up being carried out by some of you; please inform us immediately so that we can include it in the next Update.

Your comments on the Update are also eagerly awaited. Most important, however, PLEASE DO KEEP INFORMING US OF RELATED ACTIVITIES AND ANY OTHER INFORMATION WHICH YOU THINK WOULD BE OF USE TO OTHERS AND WHICH SHOULD BE INCLUDED IN FUTURE ISSUES.

Mean while, I hope you have received the notice and invitation to the Protect Forests Protect Forest Dwellers Yatra that some of us are proposing to hold in January-February. If you have not already responded, Please do so immediately, as planning time is very short.

Thanking You, with regards,

Sincerely,

(Ashish Kothari)

ak\jtmng\update.ltr

JPAM UPDATE

No. 1

November 1994

1. Action in specific protected areas:

* In sariska, Tarun Bharat Sangh has taken the responsibility of helping the Forest Department to shift two villages from the core area, as part of a larger process of exploring joint management possibilities. Contact: Rajendra Singh, Tarun Bharat Sangh, Bhikampura-Kishori, via Thanagazi, Alwar 301002, Rajasthan.

** Similarly, the Gujarat Ecology Commission (GEC) and Shankar Narayan have sent proposals to IDRC for JPAM follow-up in Gir. Contact: Bharat Pathak, Gujarat Ecology Commission, Geri campus, Race Course Rd., Vadodara 390007, Gujarat.

*** For Bhimashakar, at the request of Ekjoot Sanghatan, the Forest Department has agreed to organise a meeting between the officials and villagers, possibly sometime in December.

2. Regional Meetings:

* Meeting have been held or are scheduled to be held at various regional centers. For Gujarat and Rajasthan, CCE has proposed a meeting in December for coordination and follow-up in these two states. Oral proposals about such meetings have also come up from Karnataka, Assam, and Uttar Pradesh. Contact for Gujarat/Rajasthan meetings: Sachin Sachdeva, Centre for Environmental Education, 24 Jawahar Nagar, Sawai Madhopur 322201, Rajasthan; Kiran Desai, Centre for Environment Education, Taltaj Takra, Ahmedabad 380054, Gujarat.

3. Research projects:

* B.M.S Rathore (WII), G.Raju (VIKSAT), and Vinod Risi (MoEF) have volunteered to help in the documentation of past experiences in JFM in their respective states. Seema Bhatt (WWF) has expressed interest in working on expanding the concept of protected areas, while B.J.Krishnan (Save Nilgiris Campaign) has Volunteered to look into the legal and policy changes required for JPAM. IIPA has proposed research on institutional and policy arrangements, and to

analyse the experiences from other countries.

4. Coordination between Government Agencies in /around PAs:

* Sachin Sachdeva (CCE) has agreed to coordinate with B.M.S.Rathore and Praveen Pardeshi (Collector, Latur), in exploring possibilities of integrating various governmental programmes and agencies with PA management activities.

5. Protect Forests Protect Forest Dwellers Yatra

A Yatra has been proposed along some national Parks and Sanctuaries in Western India, to conduct a dialogue between local people of various areas, and between these people and the Forest Department. Invitations for this yatra, along with the proposed schedule, have already been mailed off. Contacts: Rajendra Singh (as above); Anand Kapoor, Ekjoot Sanghatan, P.O. Narodi, Tal. Ambegaon, Dist. Pune 410503, Maharashtra; Ashish Kothari (IIPA).

6. Follow-up Coordination

An informal meeting was held at IIPA on October 28 regarding steps needed to facilitate and coordinate the various follow-up actions emerging from the September Workshop. Persons who were present: Dr.H.Ramachandran (LBSNAA), Ashok Chaudhary (VIKALP), Sachin Sachdeva (CCE), Seema Bhatt (WWF), Vinod Rishi (MOEF), Ashish Kothari, Saloni Suri, and Neena Singh (IIPA), and Michael Loevinsohn (IDRC). It was felt that a small steering group would help in this coordination. Proposed members for this group are: Vinod Rishi/ Kishore Rao (MOEF), Representative of WII, Representative of WWF, Bittu Sehgal (IPT), Ashok Chaudhary (VIKALP), Kiran Desai (CCE), H.Ramachandran (LASNAA), Rajendra Singh (TBS), Ashish Kothari (IIPA), Seshagiri Rao (IISc), and Michael Loevinsohn (IDRC). The LBS Academy has also proposed to host a small secretariat for this coordination work, and to hold a corpus fund which could be tapped by those involved in the follow-up activities. Comments and ideas on this would be greatly appreciated.

JAPM Update 1 was prepared By Neena Singh, Saloni Suri, and Ashish Kothari. Ideas and comments may please be addressed to Ashish Kothari, Indian Institute of Public Administration, I.P. Estate, New Delhi 110002. Ph: 3317309; Fax:3319954; Email:akothari@unv.emet.in.

ak/jtmng\update1

Ashish Kothari
Project Director

Dear friends,

20 January, 1995

As was decided in our September meeting on Exploring Joint Protected Area Management (JPAM), we shall be sending a regular Update to inform you of all the activities being undertaken within the purview of joint or participatory management of protected areas. Enclosed please find the second of these Updates.

Your comments on this and the first Update are eagerly awaited. Most important, however, PLEASE DO KEEP INFORMING US OF JPAM RELATED ACTIVITIES AND ANY OTHER INFORMATION WHICH YOU THINK WOULD BE OF USE TO OTHERS, AND WHICH SHOULD BE INCLUDED IN FUTURE ISSUES.

Thanking you, with regards,

Sincerely,

(Ashish Kothari)

ak\jtmng\update2.ltr

JPAM UPDATE

No. 2

January 1995

1. Action in specific protected areas

Though there appears to be action on the ground in some of the six PAs discussed at the September 1994 workshop, no specific details are available. P.R. Seshagiri Rao, Indian Institute of Science has reported that, independently of this initiative, there is a move towards joint management of Nagarahole National Park. He has promised to send details, or request the concerned forest officers and NGOs to send us a write-up.

2. Regional Meetings

a. The Centre for Environment Education and other groups in collaboration with the Forest Department had planned a regional workshop on joint management in early January, at Sawai Madhopur. However, due to the upcoming elections, it was felt that many people may not be able to participate. The meeting has been postponed to mid-February; exact dates are not yet fixed. Contact: Sachin Sachdeva, Centre for Environment Education, 25 Jawahar Nagar, Sawai Madhopur, Rajasthan. Ph: 07462-20210.

b. A proposal for a regional meeting in the North-east has been made by Dhruvad Choudhry of the G.B. Pant Institute. This is to be considered by the funding Steering Committee (see below) in March. Dates and venue are yet to be fixed. Contact: Dhruvad Choudhry, Scientist-in-Charge, G.B Pant Institute of Environment and Development, North-eastern Unit, OB 49 Naga Shopping Arcade (Supermarket complex), Dimapur - 797112, Nagaland.

3. Jungle Jivan Bachao Yatra

The Jungle Jivan Bachao Yatra, which was reported in the first Update, and about which two circulars have been sent to readers, has commenced from Sariska National Park on January 15. As reported earlier, this Yatra is being taken with the primary purpose of initiating a dialogue between local people of various areas, and between these people and the Forest Department. Having already traveled through Rajasthan, the Yatra will over the next few weeks cover national parks and sanctuaries in Gujarat, Maharashtra, Madhya Pradesh, and Uttar Pradesh. While a detailed schedule has already been sent earlier, members wishing to join on a specific stretch can contact us, or the following state coordinators: Rajasthan: Rajendra Singh, Tarun Bharat Sangh, Bikampura - Kishori, via Thanaghazi, Alwar, Rajasthan, Ph:014652/4443; Maharashtra: Anand Kapoor, Maharashtra Arogya Mandal, Bhimashankar Project, P.O. Narodi, Tal. Ambegaon, Dist. Pune 410503B, Maharashtra, Ph: 02133/4263; Madhya Pradesh: Indu Netam, Ekta Parishad, 11, Shamlu Hills, Bhopal, or Bittu Sahgal, Sanctuary Magazine, 602 Maker Chambers V, Nariman Point, Bombay, Ph: 2830061/81 (O) & 3633471 (R).

Short statements are being issued at every point of the Yatra, with details of the Yatra's main observations regarding the protected areas visited. A full report will be prepared at the end. Copies of the statements can be had from us, or from Bittu Sahgal (as above).

4. Meeting of Fund Steering Committee

As you may recall from Update1, a fund Steering Committee was to be set up to deliberate on the proposals received on JPAM. An initial list of 9 members had been proposed, namely Vinod Rishi/ Kishore Rao (MOEF), Representative of WII, Representative of WWF, Bittu Sehgal (IPT), Ashok Chaudhary (VIKALP), Kiran Desai (CCE), H.Ramachandran (LBSNAA), Rajendra Singh (TBS), Ashish Kothari (IIPA), Seshagiri Rao (IISc), and Michael Loevinsohn (IDRC). Under a proposal entitled "New Directions in Conservation of Wild Habitats", Prof. Ramachandran from LBSNA had outlined the structure and functions of Steering Committee. IDRC has given an initial grant of Rs. 23 lakhs for JPAM work, which this Committee is to disburse. This fund has been called the "New Directions in Conservation Fund (NDCF)".

There was a meeting of the Steering Committee in Dehra Dun on January 3, 1995 in which the following proposals for funding were discussed.

i. Shankar Narayan's proposal on "Protected Area Management Strategy for the Gir National Park, in Gujarat" (no amount specified).

ii. The Gujarat Ecological Commission's proposal of initiating a pilot Environmental Awareness and Communication programme for Junagadh (Gir). GEC says it can take up JPAM for the area due their strong existing networking of NGOs in Gir and surrounds (Rs. 32 lakhs).

iii. IIPA's proposal on "Towards Participatory Management of Protected Areas", which includes research and networking as a follow-up to the September workshop (Rs. 11 lakhs).

iv. Dr. Ramachandran's proposal to produce a newsletter on JPAM, at the Lal Bahadur Shastri Academy, Mussoorie (Rs. 2 lakhs).

v. Ashish Kothari's proposal for part funding of the Jungle Jivan Bachao Yatra (Rs. 60,000).

While the last two were accepted in principle, revisions of the other proposals have been sought before a decision is taken. A formal note on this is awaited from Dr. Ramachandran, Chairman of the Committee.

5. Follow-up Coordination Group

At an informal meeting held at IIPA on October 28 regarding steps needed to facilitate and coordinate the various follow-up actions emerging from the September workshop (reported in Update 1), it was decided to have a small and informal coordinating group. Suggested names were: Vinod Rishi/ Kishore Rao (MOEF), Representative of WII, Representative of WWF, Bittu Sehgal (IPT), Ashok Chaudhary (VIKALP), Kiran Desai (CCE), H.Ramachandran (LBSNAA), Rajendra Singh (TBS), Ashish Kothari (IIPA), Seshagiri Rao (IISc), and Michael Loevinsohn (IDRC). The suggested composition is very similar to the fund Steering Committee named above. However, it was stressed that the two functions should be separated, since the Steering Committee is meant only for the purposes of disbursing the NDCFund, while the overall coordinating group should be helping with the entire JPAM effort in various ways.

The above are only suggested names for the coordinating

group. However, it is essential that the process of deciding this be democratic. If you have any suggestions for changes in this composition (additions or deletions of names), please send them in to us as soon as possible. As there are already a considerable number of follow-up activities going on, it would be necessary to have this group up and running as soon as possible. Please treat this as urgent. Any suggestions on the functioning and role of this group would also be most welcome.

6. Workshop Report

A detailed (50 pages) report on the deliberations at the JPAM workshop held in September 1994 has been completed. However, as there is no fund available yet to have the report reproduced or published, we are unable to immediately make it available to participants of the Workshop. Hopefully, some funds will come our way soon for this purpose. Meanwhile, copies are available for reference at the IIPA office.

JPAM Update 2 was prepared By Neena Singh, Saloni Suri, and Ashish Kothari. Ideas and comments may please be addressed to Ashish Kothari, Indian Institute of Public Administration, I.P. Estate, New Delhi 110002. Ph: 3317309; Fax:3319954; Email:akothari@unv.ernet.in. Please note that there may not be another Update for some months, as our funding situation is rather poor.

ak/jtmng/update2

1. Action in Specific Protected Areas:

a. M.L. Ramprakash, Conservator of Forests (Bangalore), has put in a proposal to the PCCF suggesting that one of the vulnerable ranges in the Bandipur National Park be taken up for Joint Management with tribals living in the area, as a voluntary organisation Vivekanand Yuvak Kendra has done some work with the locals of the area. The proposal is to make Tribal Forest Committees in Bandipur with the help of this local organisation, and entrust full protection of the park to these committees. There would be arrangements to allow the committee to harvest NTFP, work bamboo clumps and collect stag horns etc., on the basis of the Joint Management plan and market them. The proceeds from this will go to meet the expenditure of a well planned social and economic development of the tribals in the region. It is heartening that a forest officer has, on his own, initiated this move. For details, please contact Mr. M.L. Ramprakash, Conservator of Forests (D), Office of the Principal Conservator of Forests, Aranya Bhavan, Bangalore.

b. A unique experiment of community participation in planning resource utilization from within a National Park was carried out in the Bwindi Impenetrable National Park, Uganda. In 1991, a decision was taken to identify 20% of the park as multiple use area, in which surrounding communities would have access to NTFPs on a sustainable basis. The species to be selected for utilization, their quantity and users were decided through community discussions using PRA and JFM techniques. The observations have shown that suspicion and mistrust from both sides has been replaced by a fruitful working relationship. Uganda National Parks is now developing a resource sharing policy applicable to all Ugandan Parks. Details of this project can be obtained from: Robert Wild, Development Through Conservation Project, CARE Uganda, PO Box 7280, Kampala, Uganda. Fax: 256 41 258 569.

c. Justice Poti's IPT investigation report on Rajaji will be ready this month. Justice Poti will be visiting Rajaji again, end of March or early April.

d. Stan Thekaekara and Anita Verghese of ACCORD have framed a proposal to work on a long term sustainable programme that makes the tribals living in Gudalur district, near the Madumalai Wildlife Sanctuary, a part of the management of the Park. Please contact them at Action for Community Organisation, Rehabilitation and Development, Accord House, Health Camp, Gudalur, Nilgiris, Tamil Nadu-643211.

e. A proposal has been received by the Steering Committee, from R. J. Ranjit Daniels on peoples' involvement in the conservation of biodiversity in protected areas. His study area is also the Nilgiri Biosphere Reserve. Contact: M.S.Swaminathan Research Foundation, 14, Second Main Road, Kottur Gardens, Kotturpuram, Madras- 600085.

f. S.K. Mukherjee, Director, Wildlife Institute of India, has framed a proposal on the need for relocation of villages and ecodevelopment planning in the Gumti Wildlife Sanctuary, Tripura. Contact: WII, P.O Box 18, Chandrabani, Dehradun-248001.

2. Regional / State Level Activities

a. Rajasthan: The Centre for Environment Education (CEE), in collaboration with the Forest Department and IDRC had a regional workshop on "Joint Protected Area Management and Micro Planning for Protected Areas" from 14th to 16th of February, '95 at Sawai Madhopur. This meeting was attended by the local NGOs working in and around PAs in Rajasthan. Based on discussions in the workshop, the follow up actions were:

-CEE would initiate a consultation process within the Forest Department. -ASTHA would help in initiating a dialogue among the local people in 3-4 PAs in South Rajasthan, to discuss JPAM.

-CEE would take up the responsibility of having a JPAM update at the Rajasthan level.

-JPAM would be put forward at the Gujarat level meeting on PA management in May at Ahmedabad (see below).

-Concrete proposals of JPAM in Ranthambhore, Phulwari ki Na, Jaisamand and others need to be further built upon.

-CEE would establish an independent fact finding team to investigate bamboo felling in Shoolpaneshwar Sanctuary in Gujarat.

It was mutually decided by the gathering that a simple discussion note on JPAM for widespread distribution in local languages was needed. It was also expressed that a workshop with forest guards and local people be organised.

A Rajasthan state coordination committee for JPAM was formed, consisting of: Sachin Sachdeva (CEE), Rajendra Singh (Tarun Bharat Sangh), Ganesh Purohit (Jagran Jan Vikas Samiti), Rajiv Khandewal, Shakti Mohan, Rakesh Faujdar (Keoladev Research Foundation), Laksman Lal Rawal or Govardhan (Prayas), Representative of the Forest Department, Lalu Ram, and Bhanwar Singh Chandana (ASTHA). Please contact Sachin Sachdeva, CEE, 25, Jawahar Nagar, Sawai Madhopur-322001.

b. Maharashtra: The NGOs in Maharashtra are organising a meeting on people and protected areas of the state, at Koregaon, between 4th and 6th of April. Contact B.J. Avinash, Satyashodh, At and Post Koregaon, Dist. Satara-415501, Ph: 02163/20452

c. Gujarat: JPAM is to be one of the topics to be discussed at a meeting on the state of Gujarat's PAs, being organised jointly by CEE, GEC, and the state Forest Department. The meeting will be in May. For details, please contact: Preethi Nambiar, CEE, Thaltej Tekra, Ahmedabad.

d. Bharat J.Pathak of Gujarat Ecological Commission (GEC), has suggested to form Coordination Committees at the state level, with one or two official representatives of concerned departments. Such state level groups would be able to give greater consideration to local variations.

3. Jungle Jivan Bachao Yatra

About 35 villagers, activists, and researchers started on

a unique journey, on 14 January, from Sariska National Park in Rajasthan. The Jungle Jivan Bachao Yatra was aimed at initiating a dialogue between various local communities living in and around national parks and sanctuaries, as also between these communities and the Forest Department. In its 45 days of travel, covering about 15,000 km., the Yatra has passed through about 18 national parks and sanctuaries in Rajasthan, Gujarat, Maharashtra, Madhya Pradesh, and Uttar Pradesh. The yatra held its final programme over two days on February 28 and March 1, in Delhi.

The full report of the Yatra is under preparation. A report of the follow-up actions decided on at the final sammelan in Delhi, is available with IIPA on request. Meanwhile, the final conclusions and recommendations of the Yatra are summarized below.

Major Observations

While each of the protected areas (PAs) visited by the Yatra has presented a unique set of issues and problems, and there is no attempt to generalize on the basis of the limited observations during the Yatra (please see enclosed note 'Major Issues in Each Protected Area Visited by the Yatra'), some common themes have come up time and again:

1. There is in many places a strong readiness amongst local communities to participate in conservation and natural resource management of the habitats and wildlife of these areas; indeed, in many places, they have not only traditionally been protecting forests (e.g. sacred forests in Bhimashankar Sanctuary), but have also in recent times waged struggles against destructive forces like mining. The example of Sariska Tiger Reserve, where villagers organised themselves to stop several hundred mines, was highlighted during the Yatra.
2. However, there is also a strong feeling of alienation among local communities, as their traditional access to the forests has been curtailed by the imposition of the Wildlife Protection Act. In many places, the Yatra found people pointing to the "government's forests", or the "sarkari tiger", and expressing their inability or unwillingness to help in their conservation if there is no reciprocal acceptance of their access to forest resources. The Yatra got the feeling that support for conservation can only be achieved if the legitimate rights and needs of these communities are guaranteed.
3. Forest officials are opening up to involving people in the conservation of these areas; the Yatra met several officers who were categorical that they could not on their own save wildlife. The Yatris feel that this could be a basis for government to accept a central role to local communities in the management of protected areas.
4. Most disturbing is the hypocritical nature of government

policies with regard to critical wildlife habitats: on the one hand local forest-dwelling communities are being denied their traditional rights and access to forest resources, in the name of wildlife conservation, while on the other hand the same areas are being opened up to commercial uses and elite tourism. Examples include Sariska (mining), Gir (temple trust), Bhimashankar (temple complex), and Shoolpaneshwar (bamboo felling for paper mill).

5. Indeed, the Yatra found that the greatest threat to forests and wildlife in these protected areas is from commercial demands and development projects, especially mining, dams, illegal logging, poaching, encroachment. Forest Department officials expressed their limitations, as government functionaries, in single-handedly countering strong commercial and vested interests; local communities also admitted that on their own, they would not be able to stop such destruction.

Conclusion and Recommendations

From the above observations, it appears to the Yatris that conservation of wildlife and natural habitats can only be achieved if there is strong and sustained cooperation between local communities, forest officials, conservation and social action groups, and independent ecologists. Such cooperation will require the following:

1. A clear and strict national policy not to allow industrial, urban, and commercial pressures to impinge on PAs, including a ban on denotification of PAs for such purposes;
2. An official recognition of the legitimate resource rights and needs of local traditional communities, and measures to meet these needs;
3. A central role for local communities in the planning, protection, and monitoring of protected areas, including in the determination and enforcement of inviolate core zones and sustainable use buffer zones;
4. Planning the management of protected areas based on a healthy interaction between formal ecological science and traditional knowledge, learning especially from traditional practices which have helped to conserve and sustainably use natural resources.
5. Greater sharing of the benefits of protected areas, including biomass rights, tourism income, employment in wildlife/forest related work, alternative livelihood opportunities, and others.

JPAM Update 3 was prepared by Neena Singh, Saloni Suri, and Ashish Kothari. Ideas and comments may please be addressed to Ashish Kothari,

Indian Institute of Public Administration, I.P. Estate, New Delhi 110002. Ph: 3317309; Fax:3319954; Email:akothari@unv.ernet.in.

ak/jtmng/update3

JPAM UPDATE
News on Action Towards Joint Protected Area Management

No. 4

May 1995

1. News from Specific Protected Areas

Rajaji: The IPT Report

Last year, The Indian Peoples Tribunal on Environment and Human Rights (IPT) had requested Justice P.S. Poti (former Chief Justice of the Kerala and Gujarat High Courts) to bring out a comprehensive report on the problems in the Rajaji National Park along with suitable recommendations. Justice Poti has finalised an Interim Report which was released to villagers, NGOs, and Wildlife Institute of India (WII) personnel at Buggawala village, near Rajaji National Park, on the 22nd of April. The major recommendations of the report are as follows:

i. **A multi-agency team** to be set up to follow up on the IPT recommendations, comprising government officials, villagers, local NGOs and individual scholars/ ecologists. This team would accumulate dependable data and information for future reference, and help to push the implementation of the recommendations.

ii. On the **Gujjar issue**, the report has three recommendations:

- a) Those Gujjars who continue to migrate and are unwilling to shift should be allowed to continue with their traditional way of life.
- b) Those who have become stationery and do not want to shift should be encouraged to develop fodder plantations..
- c) Genuine and previously acceptable rehabilitation measures should be provided for those who want to move out.

iii. For **Taungya and Baan workers as well as for other villages**:

- 1) The process of compensation for human/livestock injury or death should be simple and expeditious.
- 2) The taungya villages should be converted into revenue villages along with conferring of Haqdari rights.
- 3) Haqdari rights of Baan workers should be protected, and a restricted system of harvesting bhabbar grass from within the park should be restarted, along with bhabbar plantations in the peripheral areas.
- 4) Every village should have a Van Suraksha Samiti consisting of village representatives, Gujjars and Forest Officials.

iv. About **industrial and urban pressures**:

- a) Feasibility of relocating existing industries around Rajaji should be urgently considered.
- b) All proposed new structures and those under construction along the periphery of the park should be prohibited.
- c) A moratorium on conversion of agricultural or forest land around the park to non-agricultural or non-forest use should be declared.

v. As far as the creation of the **Elephant Corridor** was concerned, the Central and the Uttar Pradesh Government should immediately take up the issue and bring out a coordinated action plan.

vi. **Regeneration** of degraded areas should be with indigenous species; some forest areas should be left untouched, in consultation with villagers.

vii. The report recommends **improvement in the**

service conditions of the Officers and Staff of the Forest Department, who work under great stress and suffer from lack of motivation.

The report concludes that **participatory forest and protected area management** should be preferred over the current system.

2. Regional/State News

Orissa

Close on the heels of the 5-state Jungle Jivan Bachao Yatra, a 41 day Jana Jungle Chetna Yatra is being started in Orissa, from Simlipal Tiger Reserve, on the 2nd of May. It will be passing through the forest- tribal-mining-industrial areas, and the eastern coast of the state, finally reaching Bhubaneshwar on June 11, 1995. The yatra is being organised by the Life and Forest Movement (LFM). For details, please contact: Manoj Pradhan, Secretary General, Life and Forest Movement, N- 1/188, I.R.C. Village, Bhubaneshwar-751015.

Maharashtra

The Koregaon meeting on issues related to protected areas of Maharashtra was held as scheduled, on 4-6th of April. The report on the meeting is awaited. For details, contact B.J Avinash, Satya Shodh, Post Koregaon, Dist. Satara-415501, Ph. 02163-20452.

3. National News

Jungle Jivan Bachao Yatra

Readers may recall our reports on the Jungle Jivan Bachao Yatra in previous JPAM Updates. The follow-up action plans of the Yatra have been finalised after inputs from all state coordinators. The detailed list is attached as an appendix.

New Directions in Conservation Fund

Readers will recall that after the JPAM Workshop at IIPA in September 1994, the International Development Research Centre (IDRC) had offered support for follow-up activities. Subsequently a consolidated fund was proposed with seed money from IDRC. This " New Direction in Conservation Fund" (NDCF) was to be administered through the Lal Bahadur Shastri National Academy of Administration, Mussoorie on the basis of the recommendations of a Steering Committee. Unfortunately, the NDCF has not been given approval by the Government of India. The reasons are still unclear, but it is believed that it was because of objections raised by one of the concerned Ministries. This could be a serious setback as many follow-up proposals have already come in for funding (as reported in earlier JPAM Updates). Readers who have suggestions for alternative sources of funds are requested to write to us.

4. International news

In continuation of our attempt to apprise you of different conservation strategies being adopted in various countries, the ultimate objective being to learn from such experiences and perhaps apply them after modifying them according to local needs, the following is a case study.

Cahuita National Park, Costa Rica

The Cahuita National Park encompasses 1,100 hectares of land, 600 hectares of coral reef and a twelve-mile offshore marine zone situated along the south Atlantic coast of Costa Rica.

The relations between the local residents and the National Park Service have been strained since its establishment. Cahuita was established as a .pa

(contd.)

National Monument by an executive decree in 1970, without any consultation with the local residents. The landowners were asked to sell their land, which they naturally considered an imposition by outside authorities. At present, 87% of the land is under private ownership. In 1977, after local residents carried their grievances to the President, a committee of the Government and the community leaders was set up, which recommended a compromise by which local residents would be allowed to continue exploiting park resources at current rates, using traditional methods, within regulations established by the Park service.

However, the subsequent law, which changed the status of the monument to a national park, did not refer to the commission's recommendations. Although the Park Service had an administrative agreement with community representatives, neither the commission's recommendations nor the legal rights of the local people were guaranteed by law. This led to intensification of the resource conflicts. Increasing exposure to the urban way of living has also in many ways broken down traditions, and the park resources are now being used unsustainably.

In an attempt to improve park management, there were recommendations that the Cahuita Park be divided into six zones.

1. **The Primitive Zone** or what can be called the core zone, where protection is the strictest.
2. **The Extensive Use Zone** which refers to natural areas that may be subject to limited alterations and resource exploitation.
3. **The Cultural History Zone** which includes areas of historical, archaeological, and cultural features that deserve preservation and interpretation.
4. **The Intensive Use Zone** which will allow visitor access and certain activities conducive to the conservation objectives.
5. **The Rehabilitation Zone** encompassing areas in which vegetation and soils have substantially altered and where exotic plant and animal species are to be replaced by indigenous ones.
6. **The Special Zone** used for administration and other uses that are in themselves incompatible with conservation objectives but are necessary for effective park management.

The park management, therefore, involves three major areas: resource management and protection, public use, and general operation of the area. In all the three aspects, the objective is to involve the local people in benefit sharing, and as consultants in designing, construction and utilization of park infrastructure as well as in park management plans. This is important because majority of the land is locally owned. The park is being planned as a regional centre for promoting and perpetuating local cultural values, and the local people are being encouraged to preserve these cultures and share them with visitors.

Source: Kutay, Kurt (1991). Cahuita National Park, Costa Rica: A Case Study in Living Cultures and National Park Movement, in P.C. West and S.R. Brechin (eds.), Resident People and National Parks, University of Arizona Press, Tuscon.

JPAM Update is produced as a follow-up to the Workshop on Exploring the Possibilities of Joint Protected Area Management (JPAM), organised at Delhi in September 1994. JPAM Update 4 was prepared By Neena Singh, Saloni Suri, and Ashish Kothari. Ideas and comments may please be addressed to Ashish Kothari, Indian Institute of Public Administration, I.P. Estate, New Delhi 110002. Ph: 3317309; Fax:3319954; Email:akothari@unv.ernet.in.

APPENDIX

JPAM UPDATE 4

JUNGLE JIVAN BACHAO YATRA FOLLOW-UP

At the end of the 45-day Jungle Jivan Bachao Yatra, which passed through 18 national parks and sanctuaries in five states, the participants and associated groups and individuals held a two-day Sammelan at Delhi on 28 February-1 March. After a detailed reporting of the Yatra, and an internal and outside evaluation of the fulfillment of its objectives, a series of concrete follow-up action points were discussed. These

points are given below, in summarised form.

STATE LEVEL FOLLOW UP ACTIONS

MAHARASHTRA

State level

1. A State level meeting of NGOs, communities, and Forest Department at Koregaon in Maharashtra was scheduled from 4th to 6th April (Already held; report awaited).
2. WWF will help with information on Protected Areas in the Western Ghats and in concrete actions.

Bhimashankar

1. A Yatra took place through 16 villages of Bhimashankar from the 22nd of March, to spread the message of the Jungle Jivan Bachao Yatra (Report awaited).
2. Another Yatra is proposed from Bhimashankar to Kalsubai Sanctuary in April- May.
3. In Bhimashankar there is an attempt to get the involvement of the Forest Department, local people, voluntary organisations, and independent observers to plan a peoples' sanctuary, which can extend beyond the existing boundaries. Many villages outside will declare their own sanctuaries with their own rules.

Koyna

1. The Indian Institute of Public Administration (IIPA) will help to assess the legal status of land use in Koyna.
2. Since Satyashodh, an NGO working in Koyna, is new, there are no concrete commitments from them yet. However, they will try to help implement the two resolutions which local villagers made during the Yatra: that they would not permit any sale/transfer of forest produce and forest land by the Forest Department without their permission, and that they would themselves not sell any private or village land to outsiders.

Borivalli

1. The Indian People's Tribunal on Environment and Human Rights (IPT), will to move a case against the quarries here.
2. IPT will also take up the cause of the Warli tribals, staying inside the park, whom the Forest Department is proposing to oust.

Radhanagri

1. IPT will explore possibilities of filing a case against bauxite mining here.

GUJARAT

State level

1. There will be a State level meeting on PAs at CEE in May 1995. The Yatra and Joint Protected Area Management (JPAM) will be discussed.
2. The magazine, Vasundhara, published by VIKSAT, will cover the Yatra and JPAM.
3. The concept of JPAM will be promoted in the upcoming National Environment Awareness Campaign (NEAC), being coordinated by VIKSAT.
4. A State level JPAM Coordination Committee is to be formed.
5. There will be an awareness campaign against the trend of denotifications taking place in Gujarat.
6. Efforts will be made by the CEE to promote internal dialogue within the Forest Department.

Shoolpaneshwar

1. An independent team consisting of NGOs, retired forest officials and journalists will try to look into the bamboo cutting issue.

Hingolghadh

1. The Centre for Environment Education, working at Hingolghadh, will contact The Wildlife Institute of India, Dehradun, to get relevant information on the research being done on Nilgai crop damage, and also assess its local acceptability.

Gir

1. Recently, the Gujarat High Court, acting on a writ filed by a lawyer after the Yatra publicised the issue, ordered status quo with respect to 50 acres of land recently allotted to the Kankeshwari Temple Trust in Gir and restrained the trust from felling trees. CEE will check the details of this stay order and inform others.

RAJASTHAN

State level

There was a State level meeting held at Sawai Madhopur in February, 1995. The major conclusions were:

- Traditional knowledge to be urgently documented and used in PA management
 - Forest Department and people will have to join hands; possibilities of JPAM are evident.
 - Need to study Kankadban, a traditional conservation system in Sariska
 - Creation of a State Coordination Committee
- These are to be followed up.

Sariska

1. Tarun Bharat Sangh (TBS), an NGO working in the villages in and around the Sariska National Park, will try to increase peoples' involvement in protection and spread the message of the successful experiment at Bhaonta (Teh.Thanagazi), where villagers have protected 1200 ha. of forest land and declared it the Bhairondev Dhakao Sonchuri.
2. Traditional knowledge will be documented.
3. Some members of TBS and local villagers will go to Nepal to study the ways in which people are involved in management of a sanctuary (Annapurna).
4. TBS workers will move around in all the PAs covered by the Yatra and spend time, share experiences and invite people to Sariska.

Jamwa Ramgarh

1. Villagers will try to organize themselves against mining in the area with the help of TBS.

Bharatpur

1. A Sampark Yatra is to be organised by the Keoladev Research Foundation (KRF), through all the villages around the park. These will also involve city dwellers and intellectuals.
2. The KRF will also initiate a dialogue with the Forest

Department, especially the lower staff, to discuss JPAM.

3. Experiments on controlled grazing to be urged.

Ranthambhor

1. The Mordungri experiment, where understanding between the villagers and the Field Director of Ranthambhor led to some form of Joint Forest Management, is to be strengthened by CEE.

2. The Kaila devi model, where the villagers, with help of the Forest Department, have formed Forest Protection Committees, effectively stopped mining in some areas and are actively conserving their forests, is to be documented and analysed.

3. CEE will try to apply the results of the research done by the Wildlife Institute of India, in methods to prevent crop damage.

Phulwari Ki Nai

1. Workshop to be held from the 20-22nd of April in Udaipur.

2. Organisational work, surveys among people will be done by ASTHA.

MADHYA PRADESH

Kanha and Shivpuri

1. Ekta Parishad will now take up PA issues including the ones in Kanha and Shivpuri. They will start with gathering information on PAs.

2. Regarding Udanti and Achankmar Sanctuaries (including a proposed Tiger Reserve), Lehar, Ekta Parishad and Unmesh Brahme will together plan a strategy to suggest how tribals, officers, and others could jointly plan and manage the area. A meeting for this will be held on 7th April.

Pench

1. IPT will investigate the fishing issue at Pench, including the recent granting of fishing licences, in consultation with a local activist, Shyam Thakur.

UTTAR PRADESH

Rajaji

1. Justice Poti, at the initiative of the Indian People's Tribunal, had investigated the various issues relating to villagers and commercial forces in and around the Rajaji park. The draft report of the investigation will be brought out by the end of March, 1995, and will be finalised after receiving comments

and after another tour by Justice Poti in April (see elsewhere in this Update for news on this).

NATIONAL LEVEL FOLLOW-UP ACTIONS

1. World Wide Fund for Nature is willing to host a meeting on Yatra related issues.

2. Networking, overall to be done by Nanakram Gujjar of Sariska, and in respective states by the Yatra state coordinators.

3. Networking on denotification to be done by Virender Singh.

4. News related to the Yatra and the follow-up to be put into IIPA's JPAM Update.

5. Compilation of the draft report of the Yatra to be done by Anand Kapoor, Farhad Vania, Virender Singh, Kusum Karnik and Yadhuvir. Report publication is to be handled by Bitu Sahgal.

6. Documentation of struggles, experiences and its distribution to be done by NGOs in various areas.

7. A simple booklet on the Wildlife Protection Act and related legislation, to be prepared: the Centre for Environmental Law (WWF) will be contacted for this. The Hindi version will be brought out by Rakesh Faujdar and Shakti Mohan.

8. Training of volunteers for resource management is to be coordinated by CEE and TBS. Training module is to be prepared by CEE.

9. Analysis of the Wild Life Act from the JPAM point-of-view to be requested from B.J Krishnan (Save Nilgiris Campaign) and Chatrapati Singh (Centre for Environmental Law).

10. Documentation of traditional knowledge systems to be carried out, including by joining the Community Register programme recently launched by a number of groups (production cost of the resulting publication to be born by TBS).

For further details, please contact the state coordinators:

- Rajasthan: Rajendra Singh, Tarun Bharat Sangh, Bhikampur- Kishori, via Thanagazi, District- Alwar-301022

- Maharashtra: Anand Kapoor, Maharashtra Arogya Mandal, Bhimashankar Project, Narodi, Tal. Ambegaon, Dist. Pune 410503, Maharashtra.

- Gujarat: Kiran Desai Centre for Environment Education, Thaltej Tekra, Ahmedabad- 380054.

- Uttar Pradesh: Ashok Choudhry/ Roma, VIKALP, 11 Mangal Nagar, Saharanpur- 247001.

- Madhya Pradesh: Bechain Das, Ekta Parishad Madhya Pradesh, Gandhi Bhavan, Shymla Hills, Bhopal- 462002.

JPAM UPDATE
News on Action Towards Joint Protected Area Management

No. 5

July 1995

1. News from Specific Areas

Rajasthan

1. As suggested by Tarun Bharat Sangh of Sariska, Kalpavriksh has agreed to do the documentation of the innovative work going on in the Bhairodev Dhakao 'Sonchuri', a 1200 ha. patch of forest declared as protected by the inhabitants of five villages in Alwar district. Villagers have promulgated their own set of rules and regulations, and are zealously protecting the area against any outside encroachments. Violations are dealt with by village councils, which have appointed a "Sonchuri" warden. They proudly say that there are two leopards in the forest, and are going to start an annual census of wild animals. Kalpavriksh members will do a flora-fauna listing, and look at the ways in which the villagers are protecting the area. The study is scheduled for August.

2. In 22 villages of Jamva Ramgarh Sanctuary, Tarun Bharat Sangh has started the work of water and soil conservation, along with some mobilisation of villagers against the mining going on inside.

3. An informal meeting on the people-wildlife relationship in Kailadevi Sanctuary of Rajasthan was called by the Joint Protected Area Management team of IIPA, and hosted by WWF-I, on 2nd June, 1995. The minutes of the meeting have been attached to this Update.

Maharashtra

1. A padyatra and meeting were held at Bhimashankar Sanctuary (Maharashtra), on 30 May, to further discuss and highlight issues of people-wildlife relations. Ekjoot Sanghatan organised the event. For details, contact: Kusum Karnik/Anand Kapoor, Ekjoot Sanghatan, P.O. Narodi, Tal. Ambegaon, Dist. Pune 410503, Maharashtra.

2. Regional/ State

News

Maharashtra

1. As reported in Update 4, a meeting on the issue of people and protected areas in Maharashtra was held at Koregaon, in March 1995. A report of the meeting is available in Marathi. Those interested can contact B.J. Avinash, Satya Shodh, Post Koregaon, Dist. Satara-415501. Ph. 02163-20452.

3. National News

1. A report of the deliberations of the Workshop on Joint Protected Area Management, held in IIPA in September 1995,

is now available in a printed form titled, Joint Protected Area Management in India: Report of a Workshop. Its 100 pages contain the deliberations, a summary of major issues and recommendations, a list of papers, and a list of participants. All participants of the workshop will get a complimentary copy. For the rest, it has been priced at Rs. 50 or \$5.

2. The Centre for Environmental Law, World Wide Fund For Nature-India (New Delhi), has organised a Workshop On Conflict Resolution in Biodiversity Conservation, in Bhopal, on 27-30th July, 1995. The workshop hopes to provide a forum where conflict situations can be discussed and analysed by all concerned parties. The three day session will discuss general issues such as resource use, mining, leasing of forest land for industrial purposes, regularisation of land rights in forest areas, and role of local government in forest resource management. The specific case studies of protected areas being discussed are Narayan Sarovar, Bhattarkanika, Melghat, Rajaji, and Pulicat. The proceedings of the workshop will be published by WWF. For further details, please contact: Sanjay Upadhyay, Centre for Environmental Law, World Wide Fund For Nature - India, 172 B Lodhi Estate, New Delhi 110003.

3. A few of the actions decided at the end of the Jungle Jivan Bachao Yatra (a full list of follow-up actions was carried in Update 4), have been carried out, while others remain unfulfilled. Some actions taken:

- i. Documentation of the Bhairodev Dhakao 'Sonchury' (see above).
- ii. Mobilisation against mining inside Jamva Ramgarh Sanctuary (Rajasthan), by villagers with help from Tarun Bharat Sangh (TBS). This is a very difficult fight, and TBS has appealed to all NGOs and individuals to help in whatever way they can (including legal action).
- iii. A visit, by villagers from Sariska, to communities in other protected areas in Rajasthan, including Nahargarh, Jamva Ramgarh, Kailadevi, Jaisamand, Phulwari ki Naal, Kailamata, and Ranthambhor. The aim was to consolidate the network of people/groups working on issues related to protected areas.
- iv. A petition against the dereservation of 50 acres of forest land inside the Gir National Park (Gujarat), to accommodate the growing demands of an existing temple. This was filed by a local lawyer in the Gujarat High Court, after the Yatra had highlighted the issue during its visit to Gir. Details of the case are not yet available.
- v. Official and NGO moves against bauxite mining in and around Radhanagari Sanctuary (Maharashtra). Apparently, the Chief Wildlife Warden of the state, Shri Jagir Singh, has used the judgment of the Supreme Court in the Sariska mining case, and the provisions under the Environment Protection Act, to strengthen his position; it is interesting that these tactics were suggested to him by the Yatra members.
- vi. A padyatra and meeting at Bhimashankar Sanctuary (Maharashtra), on 30 May, to further discuss and highlight issues of people-wildlife relations.
- vii. Some actions and pledges by groups and individuals along the Yatra route, to conserve forests and ensure local community livelihood.

A lot still remains to be done, especially in following up the dialogue between forest officials and local communities, started in some protected areas during the Yatra. Even the full report of the Yatra is not yet ready, though we are told that the persons responsible are working on it.

International News

1. A detailed discussion paper on "People's Involvement in Protected Areas: Experiences from Abroad and Lessons for India " prepared by Saloni Suri at IIPA, is now ready for circulation. The paper summarises several case studies of protected areas from African, South American, Australian, and Asian countries, and draws tentative lessons from these for India. All those who might be interested in it can get a copy from us (on payment of copying and mailing charges of Rs. 20 each).

2. The World Conservation Union (IUCN), in collaboration with several national organisations and governments, is initiating a major international project on joint management (of forests, wetlands, and protected areas). A draft project proposal (Collaborative Management for Conservation) is ready. As part of its ongoing efforts, it is helping the Uganda National Parks authority to organise a week-long workshop on joint management of national parks, in October this year. For more details, contact: Grazia Borriani-Feyerabend, IUCN, 28 Rue Mauverney, 1196 Gland, Switzerland.

3. We continue below our series of case studies of joint/participatory management from other countries, presented with the objective of learning lessons which may be relevant for India:

Gonarezhou National Park (Zimbabwe)

For several decades, a number of far-sighted wildlife biologists and rural development specialists have believed that indigenous wildlife and in particular the large mammals for which Africa is renowned, can and should be used by rural communities to generate income and improve the quality of their lives. These benefits, they maintain, can encourage rural people to change their attitude towards wildlife, help ensure the survival of wildlife habitats and natural ecosystems, and thus reduce the environmental degradation that often accompanies rural poverty. One way of attaining this ambitious plan has emerged in the form of Zimbabwe's Communal Areas Management Programme for Indigenous Resources (Campfire), which enables rural communities to manage and benefit from wildlife and other resources (Environmental Consultants 1990).

Campfire projects are now being implemented in several of Zimbabwe's communal lands. The signs, measured in terms of community benefits and changing attitudes, are encouraging. One such example is of the Mahenye people, in the Gazaland district in S.E. Zimbabwe.

The Mahenye community originally migrated into South East Zimbabwe from the South Africa's northern Transvaal, and are mainly hunters by tradition. In 1966 this area was incorporated into the Gonarezhou National Park, and its inhabitants were forcibly evicted. These people then settled on an island on the border of the national park. The community was extremely isolated, and with Zimbabwe's independence in 1980 the Mahenye people and the Department of National Parks came into direct conflict with each other. The wild animals were destroying crops, and the people in turn continued to hunt in

the national park, and were also assisting ivory poachers.

Role of Other Agencies: One of Campfire's characteristics is the role that individuals with unique talent have often played in its promotion and implementation. In the case of the Mahenye people this role was played by a local rancher, businessman and hunter. He had grown up in this region and had been intimately involved with the Mahenye people for many years. He was therefore an impartial mediator between the community and external agencies.

He was aware that traditionally the people here had a philosophy that was based on the recognition of the value of wildlife. But the eviction of the community from the national park, combined with the prohibition of hunting inside, had destroyed this sense of identification. He now outlined two possible options for the community. The first one was to fence the area surrounding the national park, the other was to allow the community to manage the wildlife, and to take responsibility for its sustainable use. He then approached the Director of the Department of National Parks, who agreed to provide an experimental quota of two elephants for the community.

Sharing Management and Control: Out of the two suggestions given above the Mahenye people preferred to opt for the second, and to apply their traditional knowledge to the management of wildlife on their land. The villagers themselves took the decision to vacate the island that they were occupying, and turn the area into a wildlife management area. In terms of getting formal recognition from the government body, in 1990 the community finally acquired legal status for two councils, the Gazaland District Council, and the Gaza Khomanani council.

Sharing of Benefits: The two elephant permits issued finally reaped profits as a successful hunt was carried through. Revenues from the hunt had still to be given to the Government treasury, as the Mahenye people had no legal representing body. They now formed a District Council, but the division of funds was not yet equitable, and the only benefit that they got was a small portion of the free meat. Nevertheless the community continued to maintain the island as a wildlife management area and refrained from hunting in the Gonarezhou park.

A wildlife co-operative was also set up in conjunction with a private sector company that would undertake the marketing of hunts, and the provision of professional hunting services. The co-operative would be accountable to the district councils, and would disburse funds from wildlife management, according to which 15% of the return of the costs will go to the safari company, 15% to the District Council, 15% to the co-operative, and the rest to the wards in which the hunting was done. The wards would then divide the shares equitably among all the households in the area. Some of the proceeds would also provide compensation for crop damage, while some may be invested in projects related to wildlife management, such as fencing to reduce crop damage.

Further trust was instilled among the Mahenya people, when the Department of National Parks spent \$33,000 on a school and a maize mill.

So far no external financing had been sought, and the co-operative's expenses had been met by the funds generated by the wildlife project. Although some support would be needed for full implementation of the project, the principle

of economic independence in the Campfire project would be adhered to by seeking soft loans rather than grants.

Rural Development In Zimbabwe. Conlon Printers Ltd. (Zimbabwe), Harare.

Source: Environmental Consultants (Pvt.) Ltd. 1990. People, Wildlife and Natural Resources - The CAMPFIRE Approach To

JPAM Update 5 was prepared by Saloni Suri and Ashish Kothari. Ideas and comments may please be addressed to Ashish Kothari, Indian Institute of Public Administration, I.P. Estate, New Delhi 110002. Ph: 3317309; Fax: 3319954; Email: akothari@unv.ernet.in.

Appendix

JPAM Update 5

KAILADEVI WILDLIFE SANCTUARY: REPORT OF AN INFORMAL MEETING

2 June, 1995

An informal meeting on the people-wildlife relationship in Kailadevi Sanctuary of Rajasthan was called by the Joint Protected Area Management team of IIPA, and hosted by WWF-I, on 2nd June, 1995. The meeting was attended by Dr. A.J.T. Johnsingh (WII), Sachin Sachdeva (CEE), Ashish Kothari and Saloni Suri (IIPA), Mahesh Rangarajan (Nehru Memorial Museum & Library), Arun Jindal (Society for Sustainable Development), Vasant Saberwal (Yale School of Forestry & Environment Studies), and Seema Bhatt (WWF-India).

Kailadevi, declared a sanctuary in 1983, spreads over 674 sq.km. in Sawai Madhopur district, and is a part of the Ranthambhor Tiger Reserve. It has some 2000 people (mostly pastoralists) inside and 40,000 around it.

The background of the meeting was given by Kothari. At a recent meeting on the possibility of joint management of Rajasthan's PAs, held at Sawai Madhopur, the DFO of Kailadevi, Shri Bharat Temne, had described how the Department had been supported by local pastoralists in conserving the area. When this was subsequently recounted by Kothari at the Tiger Link meeting at Delhi, as a possible case for joint management of PAs, Johnsingh expressed interest in the status of the tiger and other wildlife at Kailadevi. Kothari then suggested that a multi-disciplinary team study the situation, and sent copies of the correspondence to Sachdeva, Rangarajan, Bhatt, and Tinny Sawhney (formerly of WWF-I). Sachdeva and Sawhney urged that a preliminary meeting discuss the objectives and modus of the study. The 2nd June meeting was thus called. Sawhney, unfortunately, could not attend.

Sachdeva circulated a brief note on Kaila Devi to participants, and described a recent visit that he and Jindal had made to the sanctuary. They noticed considerable vegetative regeneration, and opined that this could be due to protection being given by the Forest Protection Committees (FPCs) set up in various villages. These FPCs had recently been registered by the Forest Department. The Department had recently conducted a wildlife census, so figures would be available soon.

The FPCs, apart from protecting the forests around them, had helped the Forest Department to check the movement of nomads, who come with 3-5 lakh sheep every year and reportedly cause major damage. They had also helped to stop destructive mining here. Nevertheless, the nomads

remained a major pressure, as they held the sheep of several VIPs, and were not always possible to stop. There was in any case the question of their own lifestyles and needs.

All participants gave their opinions on the kind of study needed, and the major questions to be answered: What was the traditional relationship between the nomads and local people, and how had it broken down? What alternatives can be made available to the migratory graziers? What was the ecological impact of both migratory and resident people and livestock? What was the status of wildlife, including large mammals, throughout the sanctuary? What is the dependence of surrounding populations on the sanctuary? How effective are the FPCs, how many people are involved, and are they spreading? Could they be a forerunner to joint management, and if so, what form would such management take?

Sachdeva warned that the study must proceed with caution and full recognition of what the long term involvement of participants was. Already the activity and movement of officials in the area had put fear in villagers' minds, that it may become a national park, whereby they would all be kicked out. A study team may increase that fear. Jindal informed that he had recently set up a group (Society for Sustainable Development or SSD) in Karauli, from where he hoped to work full-time in Kailadevi. Participants agreed that, given the sensitivity of the situation, it may be appropriate to approach villagers through a local organisation like SSD. Sachdeva also mentioned that the most severe problem currently was of water shortage, and there was the added issue of unemployment caused by the closure of mines. These should be tackled urgently.

There was, first, a need to properly define the objectives and methodology of the study. These could be discussed with local community representatives, to gain their trust. The actual field study could start in October 1996. Meanwhile, the following needed to be done :

1. Formulating the framework of the study : on wildlife status, by Johnsingh; on people and their responses, by Sachdeva; and on management parameters, by Bhatt.
2. Conducting preliminary data collection, on human/cattle population, wildlife diversity and numbers, history of the area, climate, etc - by Sachdeva and Jindal.
3. Circulating the frameworks and available data to all participants and to the Forest Department, for comments and refinement - by Kothari and Suri.

4. Inviting the Forest Department to be involved in the study from the beginning.
5. Making preliminary inquiries on who could conduct the study.

The study frameworks are to be prepared within a month (i.e. by 1st week of July) and circulated. Sachdeva and Jindal will report on the local situation. Jindal may put in

funding applications to WWF-I and other agencies for local activities.

Reported by Ashish Kothari
Indian Institute of Public Administration, I.P. Estate, New Delhi
110002

JPAM UPDATE
News on Action Towards Joint Protected Area Management

No. 6

September 1995

News from Specific Areas

Karnataka

1. Proposed Joint Management of Biligiri Rangaswamy Sanctuary (BRT): The Biligiri Rangaswamy Temple (BRT) Sanctuary is an important hilly forested habitat in southern Karnataka, well-known for its elephant population, medicinal plant diversity, the Soliga tribals, and the ancient temple itself. Several tribal hamlets have been in these forests for generations, and continue to stay there, possibly since the Forest Department realises that they do no appreciable damage to wildlife or its habitat. Proof of their sustainable ways is coming from the preliminary results of a study being conducted by the Tata Energy Research Institute (TERI) and other agencies, on the impact of non-timber forest product collection on biodiversity. Another group based inside the sanctuary, the Vivekananda Girijan Kalyan Kendra (VGKK), has been working among the tribals for over 15 years. Apart from health and education-related activities, and some marketing of tribal produce, VGKK is also helping with resettling tribals who want to move the sanctuary's periphery, and in promoting agro-forestry among them. Both TERI and VGKK are now exploring further possibilities of tribal entrepreneurship based on the area's biological resources, including local processing of medicinal plants (the ingredients of the famous Trifala come from these forests), honey, and other non-timber forest produce.

On a recent visit to the area, IIPA had detailed discussions with members of these groups, as also with a senior forest officer at Bangalore. Dr. H.S. Sudarshan of VGKK felt that there should be some move towards involving the tribals in the management of the sanctuary, since they were extremely knowledgeable about the area's biodiversity (much of TERI's field work is based on the plant identification skills of the Soligas), and since they have a right to a sustainable harvest of the resources. We agreed, and gave him a brief note on how we think this could proceed. This note is enclosed at Annex 1. Interestingly, back in Bangalore we dropped in to see Mr. M.L. Ramprakash (whose proposal for joint management at Nagarahole National Park was reported by us in Update 3), who revealed that he had proposed joint management of BRT some years back. While the proposal was not taken up at that time, perhaps with the backing of the local groups, it could move forward.

There are, of course, many issues to be sorted out before any form of joint management of BRT can be started. Some of these are listed in the appended note; others will come up when and if the discussions start between the Forest Department, the NGOs, the tribals, and independent conservationists who have been associated with the area. We would stress the importance of taking all parties into confidence right from the start; on this visit, IIPA was not able to talk with the forest officials in charge of the sanctuary, so we have stressed that VGKK should do this soon.

Contacts: Dr. H.S. Sudarshan, Vivekananda Girijan Kalyan Kendra, P.O. B.R. Hills, Mysore Dist., Karnataka. Ph:

08224-8125/8425.

Dr. K.S. Murali, Tata Energy Research Institute, 50/7 Palace Road, Bangalore 560052. Ph: 080-2268296; Fax: 2255760
Divisional Forest Officer (WL), Forest Department, Chamrajnagar, Karnataka.

Madhya Pradesh

1. Campaign against destruction of Achanakmar Sanctuary: An NGO working in Bilaspur (Madhya Pradesh), Nature Club, has regularly been visiting the Achanakmar Wildlife Sanctuary (AWS). They recently reported that the sanctuary is being affected by serious overgrazing and disturbance caused by 'daihans' (cattle camps), belonging to influential owners from outside the area. These camps hold some 20,000 cattle, who are allowed to graze freely in the forests. Since the owners are people with clout, the Forest Department is unable to fully control the situation, though it has repeatedly tried. Competition between wildlife and cattle is reportedly severe, especially during summer when there is anyway water shortage. In addition, Nature Club members report that a large number of Gaur and deer (Spotted?) have died because of a disease spread by cattle known as 'Khurha'. Other problems, which may be related to the higher incidence of local human intrusion, is the increasing number of attacks on humans by Sloth bears. Nature Club also alleges that 'daihan' owners help poachers in killing wildlife, including tigers and leopards.

Nature Club is now taking up a campaign on the issue, both locally in and around Bilaspur as well as in the state. Recently they have begun to consult the villagers living inside the sanctuary (many of whom, being pastoralists, are also seriously affected by the 'daihans', and are therefore vehemently opposed to them). They hope that with the help of these villagers, and the Forest Department, they can put adequate pressure on the government to curtail the activities of the daihans.

Contact: Anurag Shukla, Nature Club, Mans Associates, Magarpara Road, Bilaspur, Madhya Pradesh. Ph: 07752-22181.

Maharashtra

1. Dialogue at Bhimashankar Sanctuary: Kusum Karnik of Ekjoot Sanghatan recently reported that there was a consultation between forest officials, local tribals, and NGOs, on the various issues faced by the Bhimashankar Sanctuary in the Western Ghats. She also says that they are continuing to push for a joint management system with the Forest Department, local tribals, NGOs, and independent conservationists/activists being involved. She has promised to send a write-up on the latest situation; we will report it in the next issue.

Contact: Kusum Karnik/Anand Kapoor, Solat Building, Manchar, Tahsil Ambegaon, District Pune - 410503, Maharashtra.

Rajasthan

1. Fresh Threat to Sariska Tiger Reserve: Rajendra Singh of Tarun Bharat Sangh reports that a major hotel project of the Birlas has started construction within the boundaries of the Sariska Tiger Reserve last month. The TBS has organised villagers to protest against this, and managed to stall construction by physically blocking it for a few days. However, he has appealed for urgent help from outside, as the forces behind the hotel are very powerful, and have the backing of the state government.

Readers will recall the famous struggle against mining, which was successfully waged by the villagers inside and adjacent to the Tiger Reserve. That struggle involved actions ranging from local blockades to a petition in the Supreme Court, considerable media attention, and support from the Forest Department. Perhaps something akin to that is needed against this new threat. Once again, this shows that in such situations some form of collaboration is needed, for any single party on its own may not be able to fight the vested interests bent on destroying the last of our wildlife habitats and rural livelihood resources.

Contact: Rajendra Singh, Tarun Bharat Sangh, Bhikampur - Kishori, Via Thanagazi, Alwar -301002, Rajasthan. Ph: 014652/4443.

Regional/State

News

Gujarat

1. Bharat Lal, Deputy Conservator of Forests, Junagadh, Gujarat, who has been working on the peripheries of the Gir National Park, has written to us supporting the idea of people's involvement in protected areas. Lal had been honoured by a local NGO, during the Jungle Jivan Bachao Yatra in January 1995, for his pioneering work in regeneration of forests in the Girnar area. Local conservationists report that not only has the grass output for livestock in the area increased significantly, but that some lions and other wildlife which had disappeared earlier have been resighted, possibly having moved back from the adjacent National Park.

Lal has sent in an interesting document on the work done in the area, titled "Moisture Conservation Strategies in Drought Prone Areas: Technological Alternatives To Enlist People's Participation". In a recent note he has also written about the efforts of the Department to regenerate the productivity of the state's grasslands to meet the fodder requirements of livestock, and has reiterated that this sort of effort, along with watershed development, should be the endeavor of the Department in and around PAs.

Contact: Bharat Lal, Deputy Conservator of Forests, Working Plan Division, Sardarbaug, Junagadh, Gujarat 362001. Ph: 0285-23180.

National News

1. Workshop on Conflict Resolution: The Center for Environmental Law, World Wide Fund For Nature-India (New

Delhi), organised a Workshop On Conflict Resolution in Biodiversity Conservation, in Bhopal from 27-29th July 1995. The workshop provided a forum where conflict situations could be discussed by various interest groups. The sessions included specific case studies of protected areas like Narayan Sarovar (Gujarat), Bhitarkanika (Orissa), Melghat (Maharashtra), Rajaji (Uttar Pradesh), and Pulicat (Andhra Pradesh/Tamil Nadu). Though unfortunately no concluding session could be held, WWF-I is hopefully formulating some concrete follow-up. The report of the workshop and the papers presented, are being published by WWF.

Contact: Sanjay Upadhyay, Center for Environmental Law, World Wide Fund For Nature - India, 172 B Lodhi Estate, New Delhi 110003. Ph: 011- 4624197; Fax: 4626837; Email: wwfindel@unv.ernet.in.

2. Committee to Recommend Conservation Measures: Alarmed at the recent spate of poaching and habitat destruction all over the country, and following the directives of the Delhi High Court following a writ petition by conservationists, the Ministry of Environment and Forests has set up a committee to recommend urgent measures to protect wildlife. The committee is chaired by the Inspector General of Forests, S.M. Ahmed. Unfortunately, while the committee has many eminent wildlife experts, it has no representative of groups who are working among people in and around our wildlife habitats, nor of course any community representative. Nevertheless, we feel that the opportunity should be used to lobby the members to bring in the urgent measures which are needed to secure people's livelihoods in wildlife areas, both as a measure of social justice, as also to gain the support of these communities in conservation efforts. Concrete recommendations on wildlife protection, of course, are also critically needed. The committee has only six months to finish its work, so we would urge readers to write in with suggestions as soon as possible.

Contact: Ashok Kumar, Member-Secretary (Wildlife conservation committee), Ministry of Environment and Forests, Paryavaran Bhawan, CGO Complex, Lodi Estate, New Delhi 110003. Ph: 011-4361669; Fax: 4360678; Email: envmis@hub.nic.in.

3. Wild Life Act Amendments?: It is learnt from some officials in the Ministry of Environment and Forests that a committee has been set up to look into possible amendments of the Wild Life (Protection) Act 1972. The composition of the committee, and its terms of reference, are not known at the time of bringing out this Update. Readers may wish to contact the Ministry for further details.

Contact: N.R. Krishnan, Secretary, Ministry of Environment and Forests, Government of India, Paryavaran Bhawan, CGO Complex, Lodi Estate, New Delhi 110003. Ph, Fax, Email, as above.

In a parallel development, some NGOs and individuals who have recently been involved in presenting a people's version of the revised Forest Act, have decided to analyse the Wild Life Act from the twin objectives of securing people's involvement in protected areas, and safeguarding these areas from destructive commercial-industrial forces. A small team has been set up for the purpose, and it plans to meet in Pune in late November.

One fear that a number of conservationists have expressed is that the argument for people's involvement and benefit-sharing in and around protected areas should not become a entry point for destructive forces, which are constantly eyeing the rich wood and mineral resources they contain. To this end, and for other purposes, readers are urged to send their comments and suggestions; especially useful would be concrete recommendations on specific clauses of the Act.

Contacts: Vijay Paranjpye, Econet, Durga 92/2, Erandawane, Pune 411004, Maharashtra. Ph: 0212-332448 (res.); or Ashish Kothari (see address at end).

4. **Debate:** A debate on people and protected areas is being organised by the Centre for Science and Environment, New Delhi, on 10 October, 1995. Issues related to protected areas and the Wild Life Act are on the agenda. Unfortunately, since the IIPA JPAM team has not been invited, we will be able to report on the debate only if and when we get news from the organisers.

Contact: Anil Agarwal, Centre for Science and Environment, 41 Institutional Area, Tughlaqabad, New Delhi 110062. Ph: 011- 6986399/6981124; Fax: 91-11-6985879; Email: cse@unv.ernet.in.

International News

1. **Uganda Moves Further Towards Joint Management:** Readers may recall a brief report, in Update 5, regarding the move of the Uganda government to start collaborative management of forests, wetlands, and protected areas. Grazia Borrini-Feyerabend of the Social Policy Service of the World Conservation Union (IUCN) reports that there is now a new policy in Uganda, stating that a collaborative system is one of the legal ways of managing a national park. The main challenge is now on how to implement this policy. A meeting on the subject is being organised at Mt. Elgon National Park, Uganda, by the Uganda National Parks in association with IUCN, on 23-27 October, 1995. IIPA has been invited to participate; we will report about the meeting in the next Update.

Contact: Grazia Borrini-Feyerabend, Social Policy Service, IUCN-World Conservation Union, Rue Mauverney 28, Ch-1196 Gland, Switzerland. Ph: 0041-22-9990001; Fax: 9990025; Email: gbf@hq.iucn.ch.

2. **Resourcebook on Conservation:** IUCN has also been working on a detailed resource book called "Social Sustainability in Conservation", which is aimed at incorporating social concerns in the appraisal, planning, implementation, and evaluation of habitat/wildlife conservation programmes. The first draft, dated April 1995, is currently being reviewed and revised.

Contact: As above.

3. **Profile:** In the last few Updates, we have been presenting case studies of participatory management of protected areas from other countries. Valmik Thapar of the Ranthambhor Foundation reports that one of these, on Kakadu National Park

in Australia, where we had reported successful collaboration between the aborigines and officials, is actually nowhere near a success story at all. He has promised to send details. Such responses from readers would greatly help, especially since we have stressed that our reporting of these foreign case studies is based on secondary literature (with the source always mentioned).

With that word of caution, we continue the series below.

Michiru Mountain Conservation Area (Malawi)

The Michiru Mountain Area is an experiment in the integration of conservation and multiple land use in Malawi (Hough 1991). The Michiru mountain stands on the eastern edge of the African rift valley and ranges in altitude from 700 to 1470 meters. It covers an area of approximately 46 sq. kms. During the 1960's and 1970's, high demand for firewood and charcoal from the nearby town, Blantyre, led to a progressive denudation of the mountain on the eastern and the southern sections, subsequent grass fires led to major soil erosion and rapid water run-off from the mountain. At this point of time 82% of the mountain area was controlled by the Forest Department while 18% belonged to an European landowner who operated a 840-hectare dairy farm.

As a response to the degradation, an integrated land-use management program was initiated. Management of the conservation area was placed in the hands of the Department of Forestry National Parks and Wildlife (DFNPWL) and the private landowner, with consultative input from the Land Husbandry Department. The coordinator, though assigned to DFNPWL, reported directly to the Ministry of Forests and Natural Resources. Throughout the development and establishment of the conservation area, the role of the coordinator was critical, as he had to balance out the differences between the local people and the Forest Department.

Sharing Management and Control: The development of a local co-ordinating body, which received support from the high Government officials and the local people proved critical in the plan's eventual implementation. Although local political leaders were represented in the planning process, there was little direct consultation with the people. However, before any strict controls were implemented a major educational effort was made to educate the people, and a successful management plan was achieved by combining a variety of demands.

Zoning: For management purposes the mountain was divided into three major natural regions: gentle footslopes, steep escarpment slopes, and a gently sloping plateau. The basic landuse patterns to be established on these regions were, respectively, plantations of fast growing, exotic eucalyptus trees to provide firewood and building poles, complete protection of the existing forests on the escarpment slopes, and afforestation with pines in the plateau areas. Within each of these broad areas detailed management plans were drafted.

Sharing of Resources and Benefits: The program includes provisions for sustained dairy farming and grazing within the area. While local access to firewood was restricted, community forestry plantations were established and portions of the area remained open for firewood gathering on a rotating basis.

Role of Other Agencies: In the early 1970's this dairy farmer decided to take some action against the denuding mountain

side and offered to give half of his grazing land to the government, in return for government action. This offer was accepted by the Malawi government.

This integrated approach to landuse, enabled a degraded mountain to retain its traditional productivity, increase its standing crop, improve the abundance and diversity of its wildlife, and provide an educational and recreational resource. By 1984 the conservation area was receiving favorable comments from members of the local community who had come to see an improvement in the health of the mountain

and the rapidly maturing plantations. A key factor in this acceptance was a high level of awareness amongst the surrounding communities.

Source: Croft, Trevor A. 1991. Lake Malawi National Park: A Case Study in Conservation Planning. in West, P.C. and Brechin, S.R. (eds). 1991. Resident People and National Parks: Social Dilemmas and Strategies in International Conservation, University of Arizona Press, Tuscon.

JPAM Update is produced as a follow-up to the Workshop on Exploring the Possibilities of Joint Protected Area Management (JPAM), organised at Delhi in September 1994. JPAM Update 6 was prepared by Saloni Suri and Ashish Kothari. Ideas, comments, and news/information may please be sent to Ashish Kothari, Indian Institute of Public Administration, I.P. Estate, New Delhi 110002. Ph: 3317309; Fax: 3319954; Email: akothari@unv.ernet.in.

Annexure 1

1. Proposed Joint Management of Biligiri Rangaswamy Sanctuary (BRT):

(note given by Ashish Kothari, IIPA, to Dr. H.S. Sudarshan, Vivekananda Girijan Kalyan Kendra, BRT Hills (see above, News from Specific Areas, for background and contact addresses), August 1995).

Most of India's national parks and sanctuaries have people living inside them and/or dependent on them for various subsistence needs. Any attempt at excluding them from these areas would be unjust, and in any case impossible, given the magnitude of dependence. Moreover, the forest bureaucracy on its own cannot possibly protect these areas and their wildlife, especially if the local population is hostile. Given these factors, it is important that people (especially tribals) be involved in conserving these areas, for which they will need to be given security regarding their livelihood, and respect for their knowledge and skills.

Joint protected area management (JPAM) would, in its fullest form, mean: "The conceptualisation, planning, and management of protected areas and their surrounds, with the objective of conserving natural ecosystems and wildlife, while ensuring the livelihood security of local and adjacent communities, through mechanisms which ensure a partnership between these communities, government agencies, and other concerned parties."

JPAM at BRT will need to assess and determine the following:

1. The conservation priorities of the area (elephant, medicinal plants, etc.).
2. The impact of various human uses in the area (NTFP collection, plantations, tourism, etc.).
3. The range and kind of benefits which local communities should be guaranteed (NTFP, share in tourism revenue, etc.) to give a stake in the area's conservation.
4. Alternative activities to, or modifications in, the existing resource use practices which are detrimental to (1) above.
5. The kind and range of conservation/management measures in which tribals can participate (anti-poaching, fire fighting, monitoring, etc.).
6. Methods of integrating tribal skills and knowledge into management.
7. The institutional structures by which joint planning and

management can take place (from village forest protection committees to an overall sanctuary protection committee), and the relative share of each party (local community, government agency, NGO, etc.) in its membership.

8. The processes of continuous interaction, dispute resolution, monitoring, etc.
9. The intermediary/other role of various NGOs.
10. Major research requirements.
11. Areas that should be left inviolate, if any.
12. Education/training needs.

It seems that BRT is a very good place for a trial JPAM, given all the ecological and socio-political work that has gone into it, the high degree of tribal mobilisation, a sympathetic forest department, and the presence of strong NGOs. Such a combination exists in very few other protected areas.

I would suggest the following steps:

1. Vivekananda Girijan Kalyan Kendra (VGKK) and Tata Energy Research Institute (TERI) should write a brief profile of BRT and its problems, ongoing work etc.
2. VGKK/TERI should do an outline proposal for joint management, and send it for comments to the Forest Department, IIPA and others.
3. Informal discussions with the PCCF and sanctuary officials could be held simultaneously.
4. A formal meeting (exploratory) could then be called, involving all the possible partners/stake holders. It is vital that such a meeting be preceded by homework by the people/groups proposing JPAM at BRT, to put forth a solid case.

What could also be stressed is that such cooperation would strengthen the fight against commercial/industrial pressures, such as quarrying or the coffee plantation activities inside/adjacent to BRT.

JPAM UPDATE

News on Action Towards Joint Protected Area Management

No. 7

November 1995

News from Specific Protected Areas

Madhya Pradesh

1. Proposal to include Bori Sanctuary and Satpura National Park under Project Tiger Opposed: ??? Under this proposal 25 villages from these two protected areas would have to be relocated, with a total of 987 families. For the coming next five years a net sum of 20-25 crores has been asked for in the PA budget.

The people of this area have already been relocated from here on account of the Tava dam, Ordinance factory, and the Sardi electricity house. Several coal mines and other

such commercial pressures have destroyed thousands of acres of forest area.

One of the main problems of this area is of the forest catching fire. The question which comes to mind now is that once the people here are moved out who is going to put out the fire ?

The local NGO which is actively involved with the local people here and is bringing out the critical issues in this area is the Kisan Adivasi Sanghatan and the Samajvadi Jan Parishad. Bori Sanctuary and Satpura National Parks have not yet been included in the Project Tiger, if the pressure is kept on the government body the project can even be shelved at this stage. From 31st May to 2nd June 1995, about 500 people had done a Padyatra to Hoshangabad to protest

against the Project Tiger proposal. The Chief Minister and other Forest Department officials had given confidence that no move would be taken without the concern of the people and nobody would be forcibly evicted from their villages.

Contact: Sunil, Kisan Adivasi Sanghathan / Samajvadi Jan Parishad, Kesela, Dist. Hoshangabad, Madhya Pradesh

Rajasthan

1. Proposal on Kailadevi Wildlife Sanctuary: Readers may recall an item on Kailadevi Sanctuary (part of Ranthambhor Tiger Reserve) in Update 5, in which we had reported on existing collaboration between the Forest Department and local people, and on a possible study towards joint management. Now, Arun Jindal who has recently set up an NGO (Society for Sustainable Development) at Karauli, adjacent to the Sanctuary, has proposed a study and activities on issues which he would like to take up at the field level. He will work under the Conservation Corps Programme of World Wide Fund for Nature (WWF) India. Jindal says that the most severe problem faced by local villagers is of water shortage, and he hopes to first tackle that. He would also be looking at other resource uses in the sanctuary, and focusing on how the already good relations between the Forest Department and the local people can be strengthened, and how they can work together for conservation. The project is for two years. Under a separate project (see below), the Indian Institute of Public Administration may help in some of the work.

Contact: Arun Jindal, Society For Sustainable Development, Shah Inayat Khirkiya, Karauli 322241, Rajasthan.

Uttar Pradesh

1. Proposal on Rajaji by Wildlife Institute of India: The Wildlife Institute of India has proposed a two year project in Rajaji National Park. The project is aimed at creating an enabling environment among key stakeholders (particularly park managers and local communities), to help develop processes for more participatory problem-solving and management in Rajaji National Park. WII will undertake training for, and facilitate interaction between park staff and local communities; it will initiate village ecosystem planning, help develop local enterprise, and undertake documentation and research. The proposed project has been approved for funding by the Ford Foundation.

Contact: B.M.S. Rathore, Wildlife Institute of India, P.O.Box.No.18, Chandrabani, Dehradun 248001, Uttar Pradesh. Ph: ????. Fax: ????. Email: wii.isnet@access.net.in.

Regional/State

News

Madhya Pradesh/Maharashtra

1. Satpura Bachav Abhiyan: The Nature Conservation Society of Amravati, Maharashtra, proposes to undertake a footmarch along the Satpura ranges in central India, to highlight the growing fragmentation of forest and wildlife habitats. They will travel along four protected areas, Melghat (Mah.), Bori, Satpura, and Pachmarhi (M.P.), investigating the threats to them and to the corridors connecting them, and campaigning for declaration of the whole area as a biosphere reserve. Attempts will be made to generate public support in the area.

The march is planned for January (exact dates not yet fixed).

Contact: Kishor Rithe, Nature Conservation Society, c/o Prof. N.W. Kale, "Ambasadan", Rukhmininagar, Amravati 444606. Ph: 086457-673434.

National News

1. Workshop at Bharatpur: The World Wide Fund for Nature (WWF) India and WWF International are currently holding a workshop on "Participatory Planning and Local Institution Building" at Keoladeo (Bharatpur) National Park, Rajasthan, from 20th November to 9th December. The workshop will train participants in participatory rural appraisal (PRA) techniques and will conduct PRA exercises in 14 villages around the PA. The workshop will also prepare an analytical report indicating methodology, key findings, and recommendations for implementation and follow-up by the park management and by WWF-India.

Contact: Rashmi de Roy, WWF India, 172 B, Lodhi Road, New Delhi 110003, India. Tel: 011-4693744. Fax: 4626837. Email: wwfindel@unv.ernet.in.

2. I.I.P.A. Projects: The Society for Promotion of Wastelands Development (SPWD) and the Ford Foundation have recently cleared grants to the Indian Institute of Public Administration (IIPA), for work on participatory management of protected areas. Following the national workshop on JPAM last year, IIPA has been helping to network with various groups and individuals through the Update, as also helping in local activities. The grant will enable a small team to continue fulfilling this networking/servicing role, and to undertake research on the institutional, legal, and policy-related issues necessary for the implementation of joint protected area management. Study areas supported through the SPWD grant are Rajaji National Park (Uttar Pradesh), Ranthambore Tiger Reserve (Rajasthan), and Dalma Sanctuary (Bihar).

Contact: Ashish Kothari/Saloni Suri at IIPA (address at end of Update).

3. Bagh Bachao Andolan: Over one hundred NGOs involved in wildlife conservation across the country have joined hands in a move to save the tiger, which is facing a grave threat from poaching for trade. The "Bagh Bachao Andolan" was launched on 1st October, 1995, in Delhi. The Andolan's nationwide programme aims to muster political support and create public opinion favoring the conservation of wildlife and forests in India. A delegation of senior conservationists met the Minister for Environment and Forests and presented an appeal to the Prime Minister of India. Some highlights from the appeal are as follows:

(add para on local communities, and reduce lines below ???)

* India could be losing 500 tigers every year - more than one a day. Seizures from poachers and traders who supply the gruesome international trade in tiger body parts is dramatically increasing.

* India lost 204,000 hectares of forest land during 1990-1995, much of which was important tiger habitat and corridors.

* Violations of the Forest Conservation Act, the Environment Protection Act, and the Wildlife (Protection) Act, have

mounted. * Endless interventions, recommendations and national strategies to save the tiger have gathered dust on the shelves of the MoEF.

*The Indian Board for Wildlife, of which the P.M. is the chairman, has not met for the past seven years.

*The international initiative of the Global Tiger Forum has not started functioning so far, even though it is nearly two years old.

The PM was urged to take the following actions:

*To address the nation on Doordarshan to encourage public support for tiger conservation.

*To activate the government machinery in the interest of tiger conservation.

*To make sure that adequate investments in protective infrastructure and manpower are immediately initiated.

*To support a crackdown on poaching gangs, wildlife traders, and violators of laws that govern our natural resources.

The Andolan is an initiative of the Tiger Link, an informal network of conservation organisations throughout India, working to save the tiger. Medha Patkar of the Narmada Bachao Andolan, in a letter to the Prime Minister, has also extended the support of the people of the Narmada valley in demanding the protection of the Tiger.

Contact: Bagh Bachao Andolan, c/o Wildlife Protection Society of India, 124 Janpath, New Delhi 110001. Tel: 011-3320573. Fax: 3327729.

4. Wild Life Act Amendments: In Update 6, we reported the formation of a loose NGO network aiming at analysing the changes needed in the the Wildlife Protection Act (1972), to enable local community involvement and benefits. The group has recently held its first meeting at Pune, hosted by Econet. The meeting aimed at critically analysing both the Wildlife Act as also the proposed Biodiversity Conservation Act of the Government of India. A report from that meeting is awaited.

Meanwhile, the IIPA team circulated a note for facilitating further discussion on the subject. The note is annexed.

Contact: Vijay Paranjpye, Econet Office Premises, 5 Sanket, 2123 Vijaynagar Colony, Sadashiv Peth, Pune 411030, Maharashtra. Ph: and Fax: 0212-331250.

A committee has also been set up by the Ministry of Environment and Forests to look into the possible amendments of the Wildlife Protection Act (1972), as was mentioned in our previous Update. Members of the Committee have agreed, orally, to our suggestion that widespread NGO and local community inputs be taken before finalising the amendments. Readers are urged to write in to the Committee Chairman, Dr. M.K. Ranjitsinh, with specific comments on the Act.

Contact: Dr. M.K. Ranjitsinh, Director-General???, CAPART, Habitat Centre, Lodi Estate, New Delhi 110003.

International News

1. Uganda Moves Further Towards Joint Management: As reported in previous Updates, Uganda has piloted some experimental Joint Management measures in a couple of its national parks. Now, in an effort to consolidate this effort, and to review it in the light of experiences from other countries, a workshop on "Collaborative Management (CM) of Protected Areas - Exploring the Possibilities in Uganda", was held at Mbale, Uganda, from 23 to 27 October, 1995. The Workshop was organised by the Uganda National Parks (UNP), with technical support from IUCN - The World Conservation Union and Makerere University for Environment and Natural Resources, and financial support from the World Wide Fund for Nature (WWF) and USAID/APE. Participants (numbering about 50) included the wardens and other UNP staff from various protected areas, staff of community development projects, NGO members, donor representatives, Forest Department officials, local community representatives and politicians. Resource persons from other countries (Tanzania, India, Canada, Madagascar, Switzerland) also participated; one of us from the IIPA team was called as facilitator and speaker.

The workshop included a range of activities. Formal presentations were made regarding CM in general, CM experiences from some other countries (India, Canada, Tanzania, Madagascar), and CM experiences from four national parks in Uganda (Mt. Elgon, Rwenzori, Bwindi, and Lake Mburo). Field trips were organised for participants to meet communities living adjacent to the Mt. Elgon National Park, and to briefly visit the park itself. Special sessions were held on conflict resolution, and on processes of initiating CM on the ground. Small group discussions, role playing, and informal sessions were held to maximise participation.

A short report containing the major issues raised at the Workshop, and the main recommendations, has been prepared by the team at IIPA, and will be finalised and put out by UNP/IUCN. It can then be had from IUCN by request. A full workshop report, along with the papers presented, is likely to be published sometime early next year.

Contact: Grazia Borrini-Feyerabend, Social Policy Service, IUCN-World Conservation Union, Rue Mauverney 28, CH-1196 Gland, Switzerland. Ph: 0041-22-9990001 ??? (this is general IUCN no., what is hers?); Fax: 9990025; Email: gbf@hq.iucn.ch.

2. Global Biodiversity Forum: IUCN, World Resources Institute, and ??? organised a workshop on Local Initiatives in Conservation???, as part of the Global Biodiversity Forum meeting at Jakarta, Indonesia, on 4-5th November, 1995. This meeting preceded the Second Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity, held during 6-17th November at Jakarta. A number of papers on local community involvement in conservation were presented at the workshop, and a strong plea for putting this aspect squarely at the centre of national and international conservation efforts was made. The papers are likely to be published as a book in the next few months; a report on the workshop should be available sooner.

Contact: ???

JPAM Update is produced as a follow-up to the Workshop on Exploring the Possibilities of Joint Protected Area Management (JPAM), organised at Delhi in September 1994. JPAM Update 7 was prepared by Saloni Suri and Ashish Kothari. Ideas, comments, and

news/information may please be sent to Ashish Kothari, Indian Institute of Public Administration, I.P. Estate, New Delhi 110002. Ph: 3317309; Fax: 3319954; Email: akothari@unv.ernet.in.

Annexure

NOTE ON NEW DIRECTIONS FOR WILDLIFE LEGISLATION

(A discussion note for the NGO group analysing the Wild Life Protection Act of 1972)

Ashish Kothari

Background

Debates within conservation circles are increasingly focusing on the relationship of local communities and wildlife conservation. These are marked especially by the increasing realisation that local community needs, rights, and knowledge systems have often been ignored in the planning and implementation of conservation programmes, and that this has created hostility towards these programmes. Also increasingly realised is that the major forces impinging on our natural habitats are commercial-industrial, as witnessed recently in the spate of denotification proposals from many states.

No-one denies that natural habitats and wildlife need to be conserved: the question is how, and by whom? The current bureaucratic and legal set-up is clearly not adequate for the purpose; nor, however, can it be assumed that local communities on their own can (or often will want to) protect these habitats and wildlife. If, therefore, conservation is an important goal for our society, we will have to consider ways in which the relative strengths of all sections, especially of local communities and government agencies and conservation groups, can be put together. Such collaboration is especially necessary to counter destructive commercial-industrial forces.

The widespread people's response to the proposed new Forest Act appears also to have brought out these thrusts, towards much greater and more meaningful participation of local communities, towards meeting the basic requirements of these communities, and towards greater curbs on industrial exploitation.

New Thrusts Needed

I would therefore urge that we look at the Wild Life (Protection) Act of 1972 (along with its amendments on 1991), from the point of view of four basic parameters:

1. How amenable it is to a central role for communities in the planning, management, and monitoring of wildlife programmes, especially protected areas like national parks and sanctuaries, and what kind of changes would be needed to make it so;
2. How amenable it is to ensuring benefits (in kind and cash) to communities who are traditionally dependent on natural habitats and wildlife, as a recognition of their customary rights and as a means to receiving their support for conservation, and what kind of changes are required to further ensure this; and
3. What kinds of checks and balances it contains to ensure that no party who has rights and powers related to a protected area, abuses these rights and powers, and what kinds of changes are required to ensure such checks;
4. How strong it is in counter-acting destructive activities, especially those emanating from industrial and urban demands, and what kind of changes would be required to ensure the

safety of wildlife habitats and wildlife from these forces.

In the case of protected areas, we may like to consider the recommendation that we move towards forms of joint or collaborative management, in which local communities, government agencies, and independent groups/individuals get together to plan and manage an area, with the objective of meeting conservation goals as also the needs of local people.

A Word of Caution

In the current climate of economic 'liberalisation' (euphemism for free-for-all), natural habitats everywhere in India are being eyed for their wealth of resources (minerals, hydro-electricity potential, timber...). Though activists often do not realise it, the Wild Life Act has been one of the main obstacles between industrialists and these habitats (Sariska, Bhitarkanika, Silent Valley, Valley of Flowers...and many other protected areas have been the reason for the dropping of destructive 'development' projects). There is therefore intense pressure from this industrial lobby to further dilute the provisions of this Act, so that they can more easily gain entry into protected areas.

Our analysis of the Act must be sensitive to this fresh threat, so that our arguments for amendments do not play into the hands of the industrial lobby. Any changes made to ensure the legitimate rights and requirements of local communities, and their role in conserving wildlife, must be adequately balanced by provisions which make the entry of destructive forces doubly difficult.

I would therefore appeal that we do not rush headlong into a populist demand for amending the Act (or dropping it altogether, as some activists seem to suggest), but go about it carefully and with abundant caution.

Some Proposed Changes

Annexed here are some tentative suggestions for changes in the Act, as put forward by legal experts Chhatrapati Singh and B.J. Krishnan. Please note that I do not necessarily endorse all these suggestions, but am only attaching them to stimulate discussion.

Ashish Kothari
Kalpavriksh - Environmental Action Group
C17/A Munirka, New Delhi 110067

and

Indian Institute of Public Administration
I.P. Estate, New Delhi 110002
Ph: 11-3317309; Fax: 11-3319954; Email:
akothari@unv.ernet.in

(Note: for correspondence, please use the latter address)

PROPOSED CHANGES IN WILD LIFE ACT

Suggestions by B.J. Krishnan, Save Nilgiris Campaign

(excerpted from 'Legal Implications of Joint Management of Protected Areas', paper presented at the Workshop on Joint Management of Protected Areas, September 1-3, 1994, Indian Institute of Public Administration, New Delhi).

1. Restoration of Rights To Scheduled Tribes

In a rare exception, the Wild Life Protection Act exempts the Scheduled Tribes of Nicobar Islands in the Union Territory of Andamans and Nicobar Islands, from its purview (Sec.65). But no other tribal community in India was given this right, though there are many compact tribal communities, such as the Chola Nayakans of the Wynad area in the Nilgiris, who still retain their traditional character. Such communities can be identified and listed in a schedule annexed to the Act. The exemptions given to them may exclude hunting of Schedule 1 species. Sec. 65 of the Wild Life Protection Act may be suitably amended, to provide for the new schedule.

2. Restoration of Rights of the Tribal Villages:

Tribal villages should be recognised as a legal unit under the Wildlife Protection Act. They should be defined under Sec. 2 of the Act as human settlements inside the sanctuary/national park consisting of tribal people (listed in the schedule mentioned above). Sec.27 which deals with the restriction on entry in sanctuary/national park, should be suitably amended, exempting tribal villages.

A new schedule, listing out the Tribal Villages may be added to the Act by necessary amendment. The identification of Tribal Villages and consequent amendments may be left to the state governments.

Hunting and cultivation in the Tribal Villages inside the sanctuary/national park may be regulated under Wildlife Protection Rules notified by the concerned States.

3. Restoration of Rights of Forest Villages

Forest Villages are not a recognised legal entity in the existing enactments. The Indian Forest Act 1927 refers to "forests adjoining villages" but not "villages adjoining forests". However the National Forest Policy states that "while safeguarding the customary rights and interest of such people (tribal and forest dwellers) forestry programmes should pay special attention to the development of Forest Villages on par with Revenue Villages." The term "Forest Village" should be defined as a human settlement consisting of tribals and other forest people situated inside the sanctuary/national park/reserved forest and included in the definition clauses of the Wild Life Protection Act as well as the Indian Forest Act.

The State Governments may list out the Forest Villages and add a new schedule in the Wild Life Protection Act. Consequently the Forest Villages should also not come under the purview of Sec.27 (restricting entry) of the Wild Life Protection Act.

Hunting and cultivation inside the Forest Villages can be regulated under Wildlife Protection Rules notified by State Governments.

4. Tribal/Forest Labour Co-operatives

One of the major causes for degradation of forest is illegal cutting and removal by contractors and their labour. The contractors should be replaced by Tribal/Forest Labour Co-operatives. Tribal/Forest Laborers Co-operative Societies should be formed for plantation work, harvesting, marketing and distribution of minor forest produce. The Co-operative Societies can take forest contract work. The minor forest produce should be given to these societies either free or at a nominal cost. Forest labourers and artisans should join the Co-operative Societies and can produce baskets, agriculture implements and other products which can be marketed by the Societies.

These Co-operative Societies can successfully function from inside the protected areas and the reserved forests. The Wildlife Warden can be the ex-officio president of these societies and guide the forest dwellers. Institutional arrangements for the marketing of minor forest produce is very essential. State governments can make necessary rules in this regard in their respective Wildlife Protection Rules.

5. Employment in the Forest Management

The Forest Department should employ at least one male member of every tribal family of the area as a Watcher/Guard in the protected area. The minimum qualification for appointment of Watcher/Guard should be relaxed if necessary. These tribal Watchers/Guards should not be transferred to other sanctuaries/national parks. Appointment of Watchers/Guards from tribal families from the respective area should be made mandatory. This should be incorporated in the Wildlife Protection Rules of the States.

6. Village Forest and Wildlife Protection Committees

Village Forest and Wildlife Protection Committees, consisting of local communities, Forest Department officials and NGOs can be formed for Joint Protected Area Management. The working and management plan for any forest area should be finalised only after consulting these Committees. These Committees should be given appropriate legal status.

7. New Classifications of Forest and Protected Areas

It is now broadly admitted that the present classification of forests into Reserve Forests, Protected Forests, Village Forests, Sanctuaries and National Parks, is inadequate in the emerging perceptions of forest management. The Man and Biosphere programme introduced a set of new classifications like Core Zone, Buffer Zone, Manipulative Zone

and Cultural Zone. These zones though important have no legal sanctity. Core zones are critical for conservation, and if necessary all human interference and activities should be kept outside the zones. Such areas are few. But such zones are not legally demarcated within the protected areas. On the other hand, areas which are prone to social conflict, and where the conflict cannot be resolved within a protected area context, should be denotified as sanctuaries/national

parks and classified as Village Forests. Constituting friendly "Social Zones" within the forests (both protected areas and other forests) should be considered.

Contact: B.J. Krishnan, Save Nilgiris Campaign, Nahar Building, Charing Cross, Ootacamund 643001.

PROPOSED CHANGES IN WILD LIFE ACT

Suggestions by Chhatrapati Singh, Centre for Environmental Law, WWF-I

(excerpted from 'Legal Policy for India's National Parks and Sanctuaries', paper presented at the Workshop on Joint Management of Protected Areas, September 1-3, 1994, Indian Institute of Public Administration, New Delhi).

Background

1. Wildlife and forest are in the Concurrent List of the constitution. This implies that the States have the powers to change their policy/law concerning wild habitats or sanctuaries. The Amendment to the Wild Life Act now provides that the States can change the boundaries by passing a resolution by the State Legislature through a simple sitting majority. This has allowed various governments, such as Gujarat, Orissa and Maharashtra to denotify sanctuaries and alter their boundaries in ways which destroy the habitats of wildlife. This amendment to the Act has led to a Constitutional crisis which needs to be immediately set right if sanctuaries are to be safeguarded.

2. The settlement of rights of the local people, under section 24 (2) (c) of the Wild Life Act, has not been done in most sanctuaries as yet. This creates a major problem in determination of occupancy or resource rights of the indigenous people.

3. The conservation practice and plans are operating with various terms which have no legal definitions, such as 'Protected Areas', 'Tiger Reserves', 'Biospheres', 'Buffer Zones', etc. These create numerous problems.

Legal Alternatives

A paradigm shift in legal thought is required if the interest of the sanctuaries and the local people are to be safeguarded. A number of experiences reveal that recognition of group right, whether that group is an ethnic one of a tribe, or an administrative one of a committee or a statutory one of a panchayat district or a state, does not in itself guarantee sustainability of the resources. Additional legal principles need to be invoked and implemented to attain this. As noted earlier, a balance of interests and powers seems to be the most efficacious way to attain the goals. This can be achieved in the following way:

2. Interests of the State: The basic interest of the State is to retain sovereign rights over the designated sanctuary. In the interest of the conservation of biological diversity it is evidently not interested in the trade, transfer or use of the resources from the area.

In the light of this, the Wild Life Act needs to clearly prohibit all trade and transfer of wildlife species by the State or any of its agencies; the state needs to declare that it is holding the National Park or Sanctuary as a trustee for the people of India. With these clear provisions in the Act, the interests of the state will be safeguarded. The State is also evidently, not interested in "developing" such areas. The Law must also prohibit all development activities in these areas.

3. Interests of the Wildlife: The flora and fauna need to certainly stay in the habitat, that would be their first interest. To establish their right to reside Article 19 (1) of the constitution could be extended to apply to all living beings in the national Parks or Sanctuaries, or alternatively, the Wild Life Act could be amended to make the occupancy right of the wildlife non-alienable. The Act must also guarantee the right to resource to all living beings in such areas.

4. Interests of the people: Local people who have established occupancy/residence rights in law and are interested in staying within the parks and sanctuaries, need to be allowed to do this, with a clear understanding that there will be no development activities in such areas, such as schools, roads, electricity and other facilities or services. The Wild Life Act must clearly prohibit all development activities by the states or others in the Parks and Sanctuaries as well as in the buffer zones around such areas. The limits of the buffer zone must be clearly defined in law.

Where such bona-fide occupancy right of non-tribals or outsiders who have recently migrated into the designated area, cannot be established, or whose rights are genuine and wish to move out, the Wild Life Act must clearly state that they will be rehabilitated and compensated for displacement. The Act must make the planning and implementation of rehabilitation and compensation mandatory and also prior to the full legal recognition of an area as National Park or Sanctuary.

Contact: Chhatrapati Singh, Centre for Environment Law, World Wide Fund for Nature - India, 172-B Lodi Estate, New Delhi 110003.

JPAM UPDATE
News on Action Towards Joint Protected Area Management

No. 8

February 1996

**News from Specific
Protected Areas**

Rajasthan

1. Village Representatives' Meeting on Ranthambhor: On 16th and 17th of December 1995, a meeting of village representatives was held at the Dastkar Kendra, Kutalpura village, Sawai Madhopur, to discuss issues relating to the Ranthambhor National Park. This was the outcome of a suggestion for such a meeting, made by villagers themselves. Ranthambhor Foundation facilitated its organisation, with a view to enable villagers to come forward and express firmly their opinions on the protected area and its management.

Over 200 people from 55 villages participated. Among the participants were one Deputy Pradhan, 16 Sarpanches/Ex-Sarpanches, 4 Directors of Panchayat Samitis, representatives of 44 different local organisations, many local leaders, and concerned representatives of all sections of the community including the landless. Such a gathering had never assembled before. The concerns expressed by the people were that permits must be issued to allow people to extract dry wood from the forest, the ban on the issue of licences for guns should be removed, and subsidised LPG cooking gas should be made available. Alternatives must be found for their day to day needs, like using steel for building their houses. In return, villagers agreed that no one would cut the forest any longer and that the forest would be saved at any cost. Today all the villages living on the fringe of the forest were grazing their cattle without any objection from anybody, in the pasture land inside the forest which was once theirs. The ex-Sarpanch of Dumoda village requested all those present not to do this. A suggestion also came forth that efforts should be increased to encourage women's education and development in the area.

The following is the summary of recommendations and suggestions:

- a. A Forest Protection Society must be formed in each village along the periphery of the national park, with the majority of the members being of the younger generation.
- b. Alternative energy sources like bio-gas, solar energy and LPG should be provided. All wasteland in the area surrounding the park should be fenced, and fodder plantations and trees should be regenerated. Village pasture lands should be developed and fodder plantations done with full involvement of the local people. Checkdams should also be made for water and soil conservation, and employment possibilities must be linked to the park's improvement.
- c. Education should be a vital means to increase the awareness towards the park and its problems.
- d. Environmentally friendly industries for employment opportunities must be stressed upon.
- e. A deep trench should be dug all around the national park, especially to prevent wild animals from raiding the crops.
- f. Livestock from outside the region should be prohibited from

entering the park or the surroundings.

g. All the income generated from tourism in the park should go towards a village fund and representatives of different villages should form a Samiti to manage this.

It was universally accepted that the present situation of the park was the worst it has ever been; therefore along with local people it is important that forest officials become more active in its protection.

Contact: Ranthambhor Foundation, 19 Kautilya Marg, Chanakyapuri, New Delhi 110021. Ph: 11-3016261. Fax: 3019457. Email: tiger.linking@access.net.in.

Gujarat

1. Shoolpaneshwar Sanctuary: In 1989, the Dumkhal Sloth Bear Sanctuary was extended from 15,000 ha. to 60,000 ha., reportedly to offset the loss of forests and wildlife under submergence of the Sardar Sarovar Project. It was renamed Shoolpaneshwar. According to the local social action group ARCH-Vahini, this extension affected 40,000 tribals of 100 villages, and has created severe conflicts. While the economic and social rights of the villagers are restricted by the Wild Life (Protection) Act, the Central Pulp Mill, Sonagadh, Surat has been given permission to cut and remove thousands of tonnes of bamboos from the core zone of the sanctuary. All developmental work has been halted inside the sanctuary, making life very difficult for the villages inside. The Vahini also reports that a gang of wood-cutters descended in the months of November-December 1994, and felled 'thousands' of teak trees, allegedly in collusion with some forest officials.

Tribals and NGOs have been protesting against a policy which allows free reign to industry and commercial interests, while discriminating against poor tribals. The situation is felt to be so bad that the tribals have been demanding denotification of the sanctuary. Whether that would be a wise decision or not is a matter of debate, but there is no denying that unless the legitimate rights and needs of the tribals are ensured, public support for wildlife conservation in the area cannot be gained.

Contact: Trupti Parekh, ARCH-Vahini, P.O. Mangrol, Tal. Rajpipla, Dist. Bharuch, Gujarat. Tel: 40140, 40154. For the Forest Department's view, contact: Deputy Conservator of Forests, Rajpipla (East), Rajpipla, Dist. Bharuch 393145, Gujarat.

Assam/Bhutan

1. Threat to Manas National Park: The Bhutan Government is reportedly constructing a road through the Bhutanese part of the Manas National Park, jeopardizing one of the world's most valuable wildlife heritage sites and biodiversity zones. The road passes through the park covering a distance of 13 kms. from the border demarcating Indian and Bhutan portions of Manas,

to Panbung Dungkha, a small town inside Bhutan. Nature's Beckon, an environmental activist group from Assam, has condemned this project, and has appealed to people to raise their voice against it. It says that there is hardly any need for constructing a wide road through the park. There is no village or market inside the park. On the other hand, the road will only provide greater opportunities for the extraction of rare orchids, agar wood, and timber, as also for tiger bone collectors, rhino horn hunters, and wildlife poachers.

Contact: Soumyadeep Datta, Director, Nature's Beckon, Datta Bari, Ward No.1, Dhubri, Assam. Tel: 03662-21067. Fax: 20076.

Karnataka

1. Biodiversity initiatives in Biligiri Sanctuary: Readers may recall our report on the initiatives taken in the Biligiri Rangaswamy Temple Sanctuary in Karnataka, to enhance the livelihood security of the Soliga tribals resident inside the sanctuary while ensuring the conservation of the area. A number of studies relating to livelihood and biodiversity are underway. The various groups working in the area have now started a newsletter Biodiversity Conservation Committee Newsletter, to report on these efforts.

Contact: Dr. K.S. Murali, TERI, 50/7 Palace Rd., Bangalore 560052. Ph: 080-2268296. Fax: 2255760.

State/Regional

News

1. Satpura Bachao Abhiyan: As announced in Update 7, the Nature Conservation Society, Amravati, in association with other organisations, organised a Satpura Bachao Abhiyan in the last week of January. The aim was to highlight the continuous fragmentation of wildlife habitats in the Satpura ranges, and plead for the conservation of what remains of this rich forest tract. The Abhiyan consisted of a march starting simultaneously from Pachmarhi in Madhya Pradesh and Chikhaldara (Melghat) in Maharashtra, and meeting at Betul (M.P.). A full report of the journey is awaited.

Contact: Kishor Rithi, Nature Conservation Society Amravati, c/o Prof. N.W. Kale, 'Ambasadan', Rukmini Nagar, Amravati 444606, Maharashtra. Ph: 086457-673434.

National News

1. Wildlife Act: Responding to the suggestion made in Update 7, G. Raju of VIKSAT has sent in some suggestions on amendments to the Wild Life (Protection) Act of 1972, to the committee which has recently been set up by the MoEF to look into this. He has pointed out some underlying principles that can be derived from the experiences of joint management of forests and other natural resources:

- creating space and support for emergence of people's institutions and other natural resources;
- creating an empowered management council from the Forest Department, NGOs, people's institutions, for overseeing development and implementation of management plans;
- evolving flexible management plans/systems in consultation with people and their implementation in a transparent way;

- developing multiple zones within a protected area (PA). These may be (a) Habitat Zones (b) Agricultural Zone (c) Forest Use Zone and (d) Undisturbed Zone. Such a zonation can be evolved through a consultation mechanism of the empowered management council;
- formation of people's institutions, similar to those set up under JFM, at the village/hamlet or cluster level, for the protection, development and management of PAs. They should be explicitly recognised in legislation, and their roles, responsibilities, and authority defined;
- assigning other roles to these institutions, including plantation, moisture conservation, tourism, and nature education;
- identifying alternatives for direct benefits to local people;
- strengthening legislation against the threats from commercial activities and large scale development projects that have emerged since the advent of new economic policies.

Contact: G. Raju, Director, VIKSAT, Nehru Foundation for Development, Thaltej Tekra, Ahmedabad 380052. Tel: 079-426220, 442642. Fax: 420242.

2. NGOs recommend peoples' participation in conservation: A national meeting of NGOs was held by the Minister for Environment and Forests, Shri Rajesh Pilot, on 23 January, 1996, in Delhi. Some 300 representatives of NGOs and the entire senior staff of the Ministry were present. At the meeting, the following recommendations were finalised:

- Identify natural forests of this country. Commercial exploitation and non-forestry use should be banned particularly in the tropical rain forests of Andaman and Nicobar Islands, Western Ghats and North-East.
- Management of forest should be made people oriented. While the initiatives on JFM were welcome, orientation of lower level staff is essential. Apart from the issue of usufructs, an important area to be addressed is the sharing of control and management (power) with the communities. JFM resolutions should ensure adequate representation of women in the general and executive bodies.
- In the management of areas notified under the Wild Life (Protection) Act, local communities should be involved through the process of joint protected area management. A Government of India resolution encouraging States to adapt such management after working out relevant guidelines is urgently needed, for which the Wild Life Act may also be appropriately strengthened.
- To strengthen the management of protected areas (PAs), MOEF should reconsider, legislate suitably, and implement vigorously, the Biosphere Reserve concept.
- Degraded forest areas should not be leased to industries. Requirement of raw material for industries should be met from farm forestry sector as also from degraded forests developed by village communities.
- Monocultures should be discouraged in afforestation schemes, and emphasis should be on indigenous species. Greater reliance should be placed on natural regeneration.
- Integrated watershed planning concept should inform the Forest Department's programme for afforestation. The MoEF should address this problem, because presently there are difficulties in coordinating activities of MoEF, Ministry of Rural Development, Ministry of Agriculture, etc.

The Ministry will presumably be preparing a report of the full meeting.

Contact: Secretary, Ministry of Environment and Forests,

Paryavaran Bhawan, CGO Complex, Lodi Estate, New Delhi 110003.

3. Deposition before High Court Committee: At the invitation of the Inspector General of Forests, chairperson of the committee appointed by the Ministry of Environment and Forests, under the directions of the Delhi High Court, to recommend measures to improve wildlife conservation in the country, Ashish Kothari of IIPA made a written and oral submission on the need to proceed towards joint management of protected areas, and on steps towards curbing urban-industrial pressures in such areas. He presented the findings of the Jungle Jivan Bachao Yatra, and of various other initiatives on the subject. Committee members were agreeable in principle to the idea of much greater involvement of local communities in the management of PAs, but some were skeptical of the practicality of the idea, especially given the increasing populations and commercial pressures which these communities are subject to. The report of the Committee is to be ready by the end of February; we will keep readers updated.

For a copy of the written submissions, pl. **Contact** Ashish at the address given at the end of the Update.

4. National debate report: The debate organised by the Centre for Science and Environment, on the issue of people and wildlife, has been reported on in the December 31, 1995, issue of its magazine, Down to Earth. This issue also carries other articles on the topic. A booklet with the full transcript of the debate is to be brought out shortly.

Contact: Neena Singh, Centre for Science and Environment, 41 Institutional Area, Tughlaqabad, New Delhi 110062. Ph. 11-6986399; 6981124; 6981110. Fax: 6985879. Email: cse@unv.ernet.in.

International News

Continuing our series of case studies from outside India:

Khunjerab National Park (Pakistan)

Source: Slavin, Terry. 1993. Survival in a Vertical Desert. In Elizabeth Kemf (ed.). The Law of the Mother: Protecting Indigenous Peoples in Protected Areas. Sierra Club Books, San Francisco.

For Pakistan Khunjerab is a matter of prestige, tourism potential, and the country's first World Heritage listing for a Natural Site. The park is home to one of the world's only remaining populations of Marco Polo sheep. It also contains the rare/threatened Tibetan ass, Brown bear, Blue sheep, Snow leopard, and Ibex.

For years, the government had been determined to have a national park based on a Western model, banning all grazing and other human activity. But by the early 1990s, recognition was dawning that this approach, which has pitted the people of Shimshal and other villages against park officials, and conservation groups against one another, was not the right path to take.

Pakistan established this 2,300 sq. kms. park in 1975. Pamir is a range of pasture land on the roof of the

Himalayas, where the Shimshali people of northern Pakistan have grazed their animals for hundreds of years. Much of this traditional grazing land is now within the boundaries of the national park. The villagers saw no reason as to why they should abide by the rules of the park because they were convinced that whoever was in charge would "pocket the money, cut down the trees and provide hunting for his pals".

Emotions have also run high among the six villages to the south of the park in Gojal, which hold grazing rights. But the villages lie in the Karakoram Valley tourist belt, and can see the potential in tourism benefits. The villagers say that when the park was formed they were promised compensation for lost grazing rights but received nothing. They asked for grazing permission in a 12 sq. kms area and when they were refused they forcibly moved in until the police forced them out. As a show of defiance all the six villages went on strike and the government then realised that a strictly defined park may not be possible.

Sharing of Resources and Benefits: The head of the management plan team from WWF - Pakistan managed to work with the people of Gojal and sign an agreement, whereby grazing would continue in the park but on a controlled basis. In exchange:

1. 80 % of the new employment opportunities would go the local people
2. There would be spin off jobs created by the extra tourism
3. Once wildlife stocks had increased the park authorities would allow hunting in a game reserve outside the boundaries of the park, and 70% of the proceeds would go the local people.

Sharing Management and Control: One of the main problems in involving the people at the decision making stage was, that the local villagers refused to nominate anybody from the village to represent them, for fear that this person would be "bought off" by the government. Such was the level of distrust among the villagers. However, the Gojali villagers now patrol the park and outlying areas to protect wildlife from hunting, and are receiving tourism income. But while the Gojali have already begun to police themselves, they remain incensed about the fact that government officials have been coming on shooting sprees. And the Shimshali graziers remain unconvinced about the park. There is hope that once they have seen how the Gojalis have benefited, they might also want to be part of the agreement.

Role of other agencies: When Dr. Per Wegge, a Norwegian wildlife conservationist, surveyed the park for IUCN in 1988, he found that the Marco Polo sheep population was almost wiped out and that the other species had also significantly declined, mainly due to illegal poaching and grazing pressures from animals. He suggested that the area should be developed into a multiple purpose conservation area similar to Annapurna Conservation Area in Nepal. That plan would allow grazing in some areas and controlled trophy hunting in others, with some of the income from the permits going to the villages that have traditional grazing rights there. Shimshal would be developed as a tourist centre. The involvement of IUCN and WWF was partly instrumental in converting the situation of conflict into one of hope.

JPAM Update is produced as a follow-up to the Workshop on Exploring the Possibilities of Joint Protected Area Management (JPAM), organised at Delhi in September 1994. JPAM Update 8 was prepared by Saloni Suri and Ashish Kothari. Ideas, comments, and news/information may please be sent to Ashish Kothari, Indian Institute of Public Administration, I.P. Estate, New Delhi 110002. Ph: 3317309; Fax: 3319954; Email: akothari@unv.ernet.in.

JPAM UPDATE
News on Action Towards Joint Protected Area Management

No. 9

May 1996

NEWS FROM SPECIFIC PROTECTED AREAS

Meghalaya

Threat from cement industry to Balphakram National Park

Bittu Sahgal of Sanctuary Magazine reports that there is a proposal of the Associated Cement Corporation (ACC) to set up a cement plant near Balphakram National Park, located in the Garo hills of Meghalaya.

Cement plants, and their associated limestone mining activities, in and around protected areas are now no longer an unprecedented phenomenon in India. In 1991 the Ambuja Cement Company of Gujarat lobbied with the government of Himachal Pradesh to denotify Darlaghat Sanctuary, in order to set up a cement plant in the area. More recently, the Sanghi Cement Company of Hyderabad has begun establishing a cement plant in the area of the Narayan Sarovar Sanctuary, Gujarat, following its partial denotification from over 700 sq km to 400 sq km.

The Wildlife Protection Society of India has prepared a report on the Balphakram case. In the event of ACC going ahead with its proposed plans in Balphakram National Park, a national campaign to boycott ACC cement is being considered.

For further details, or if any reader has additional information, please contact : Bittu Sahgal, Sanctuary Magazine, 602 Maker Chambers V, Nariman Point, Bombay 400 021. Ph.: (022) 283 0061, 283 0061; Fax : (022) 287 4380; Email : bittu@ecologist.ilbom.ernet.in; or Ashok Kumar, Wildlife Protection Society of India, Thapar House, 124 Janpath, New Delhi 110 001. Ph: (011) 332 0573; Fax: (011) 332 7729

Uttar Pradesh

Much Ado at Rajaji National Park

The last few months have seen a spate of activities at Rajaji National Park:

(i) On 24-25 February the **Rural Litigation and Environment Kendra**, Dehradun, released its proposed plan for the Gujjars of Rajaji National Park. For now only a summary has been made available for limited circulation, with comments and feedback to be incorporated into the final report. The summary, titled Community Forest Management in Protected Areas : Van Gujjar Proposals for the Rajaji Area, identifies land rights, livelihood insecurity, education, and health as being the major issues facing the Gujjars. The objectives of the plan are as follows :

1. To protect the ecosystem of the Shivaliks, conserve biodiversity, and protect and support endangered and threatened species.
2. To protect and support the rights, needs and lifestyle of the Van-Gujjars such that they can

permanently live in the proposed Park in an sustainable manner.

3. To provide Van-Gujjars with the freedom to make environmentally responsible choices about their lifestyle, either inside or outside the forest.
4. To protect the traditional rights of villagers living in border areas to use forest resources in an environmentally sustainable manner.
5. To encourage villagers to take responsibility for border areas which can produce forest resources to meet their needs and development priorities.
6. To increase the documented knowledge base about the Shivalik ecosystem through partnerships between local people and external scientists and researchers.
7. To ensure and promote ecologically and culturally responsible tourism and education under the supervision of a community forest management structure.

The broad strategies to be adopted for meeting these objectives include, development of a formal Community Forest Management structure and Community Enforcement System, advocacy and support for the nomadic movement of the Gujjars, sustainable resource use by villages especially in the surrounding area, and giving priority to the development needs of the Gujjars.

Contact : Avdash Kaushal, Rural Litigation and Entitlement Kendra, 8 Chandralok, Behind Ajanta Hotel, Rajpur Road, Dehradun, Uttar Pradesh. Ph: (0135) 656 881, 657 630.

(ii) The **Wildlife Institute of India (WII)**, Dehradun, is proposing to undertake a long term project, initially for two years possibly followed by another three, on Building Partnerships for Biodiversity Conservation in Rajaji National Park. The project has a strong training component for all the major stakeholders involved with the various problems affecting Rajaji, with WII playing a facilitator s role in conflict resolution. The objectives of the project are the following :

1. Capacity enhancement of Park management for conservation with people s involvement.
2. Capacity enhancement of local communities so as to minimise Park-people conflict.
3. Facilitate co-ordination amongst major stakeholders to resolve conflicts.

The strategies to be adopted to meet these objectives include Park management staff training, local community level training, local enterprise development, documentation, research and monitoring.

Contact : B.M.S. Rathore, Wildlife Institute of India, PO Box 18, Chandrabani, Dehradun 248 001, Uttar Pradesh. Ph: (0135) 640 112-15; Fax: (0135) 640 117; Email: wii.isnet@access.net.in.

(iii) In May 1995, the Chief Conservator of Forests (Wildlife), Uttar Pradesh, issued a directive regarding removal of grass from protected areas (see **State News**

below). The **Ghad Kshetra Mazdoor Sangharsh Samiti** (GKMSS), a people's organisation working with the *baan* weavers adjacent to Rajaji National Park, wrote to the District Collector, Haridwar, urging him to implement the provisions of the CCFs directive, besides making further suggestions to involve local communities in the management of the Park. The organisation has pointed out the fact that copies of this government order have yet to be made available to local organisations or people, and in spite of it contractors, rather than people from villages, are being allowed to extract *bhabbar* grass (*Eulopsis binata*) from the Park area. The GKMSS proposal recommends the following:

1. The system of *haqdari* (customary rights) to be reinstated in the Park area, with certain responsibilities of local communities, to ensure conservation, added on.
2. Permission to extract *bhabbar* grass to be given exclusively to local communities for whom it is a means of livelihood, rather than contractors of the Forest Development Corporation whose interest is purely commercial.
3. The system of *haqdari rammana* (rightholder's permit) and *aam rammana* (general permit) should be reinstated to ensure removal of left over grass in the summer months when the risk of accidental fire is maximum.
4. Local forest protection committees to be organised with 50% membership reserved exclusively for women. The forest protection committees to function within a structure of decision making at the village, range, and Park level. The multi-agency team, as recommended in Justice P.S. Poti's report on Rajaji, to be set up.
5. The cutting and distribution of *bhabbar* to be done through local people's co-operatives.
6. Identified *haqdari* holders to be given identity cards to facilitate monitoring of the activity.
7. The system of contractors and contract labour in Rajaji to be abolished altogether.
8. A tripartite board to be set up consisting of local organisations, the Park authorities and the District authorities to plan and implement developmental activities for the region.
9. Local communities and organisations must be kept informed of all new proposals, schemes and funds, related to Rajaji National Park.

Contact : Ghad Kshetra Mazdoor Sangharsh Samiti, Village Buggawala, via Bihargarh, District Haridwar, Uttar Pradesh; or Ashok Chaudhuri / Roma, Vikalp Social Organisation, 11 Mangal Nagar, Saharanpur 247 001, Uttar Pradesh. Ph: (0132) 724 507

Karnataka

Critique of Nagarhole eco-development plan

Anita Cheria, involved with tribal organisations in southern Karnataka, has prepared a critique of the eco-development plan for Nagarhole National Park. This plan is part of a larger exercise which is scheduled for funding from the Global Environmental Facility of UNDP/UNEP/World Bank, and which

includes another 6 protected areas in India. The critique alleges that the plan does not respect the rights of local tribals living inside the park, nor takes them along as full-fledged partners in conservation and development. Armed with this critique, Cheria made a deposition at a GEF-NGO consultation held in Washington on April 1, 1996, demanding that the plan be translated and discussed with the local tribal organisation (Buddakattu Krishikara Sangha), tribals be involved at all levels of the plan including the steering committee, and other NGOs active in the area (CORD, DEED, FEDINA-VIKASA) be consulted. She reports that the response from GEF members, and from the World Bank team involved with the project, whom she later met, was "positive". A copy of the critique and more details can be obtained from Anita or Edwin at: c/o BCO, 658, 45th Cross, II 'A' Main, V Block, Jayanagar, Bangalore 560041. Ph: (080) 663 5622; Fax: (080) 663 3538; Email: admin@bco.frlht.ernet.in.

Rajasthan

Field visit to Kailadevi Sanctuary

Between 24-27 February 1996, a team of researchers from IIPA made a field visit to Kailadevi Wildlife Sanctuary, one of three cases that have been taken up in the project on Participatory Management of Protected Areas (as reported in previous *JPAM Updates*). The team interacted with villagers residing in and around the Sanctuary. The villages were selected with the help of Arun Jindal of the Society of Sustainable Development, based at Karauli in Sawai Madhopur district, who has been actively working with local communities in the area for some time.

The objective of this field visit was to familiarise the research team with the study area, and to get some idea of the dependence of local people on the resources within the Sanctuary, and of the reported moves by the villages to protect the forests (please refer to the detailed report on Kailadevi in *JPAM Update 5*).

The research team is currently putting together information on Kailadevi Sanctuary. Readers aware of sources may kindly write in to: Priya Das, c/o Ashish Kothari (see address at end).

Participatory Management Plan For Keoladeo National Park

A Participatory Rural Appraisal (PRA) exercise was organised by WWF-India in several villages around Keoladeo National Park, Bharatpur, between November 20-December 5, 1995. The objectives were to gauge the people's perception of the Park and their use of its resources, and to facilitate a dialogue between people and the Park authorities in its management..

The exercise, in which officials, NGO members, and villagers participated, involved classroom sessions, followed by field exercises in the villages. Information was also gathered from the rickshaw pullers inside the park, tourists, forest guards, grass cutters and hoteliers in Bharatpur.

Grazing and fodder needs, crop damage by wild herbivores, water problems and unemployment were some of the main problems confronting local communities. Suggested solutions included a system of annual permits for fodder collection,

fuelwood permits, strengthening and raising of the boundary wall around the wetland, revenue sharing and schemes for water management. WWF-I is preparing a detailed report, which can help to evolve a participatory management plan.

Contact: Parikshit Gautam, World Wide Fund for Nature - India, 172 B Lodi Estate, New Delhi 110 003. Ph: (011) 461 6532, 469 3744, 462 7586; Fax: (011) 462 6837; Email: wwfindel@unv.ernet.in.

Mining threatens Jamva Ramgarh Sanctuary

Information received from Tarun Bharat Sangh, a local NGO working in the Alwar district of Rajasthan, indicates that at least 40 marble mines are currently operating within the boundaries of the 300 sq.km. Jamva Ramgarh Sanctuary. While the largest mine is 10 sq. km. in size, most other mines cover an area of less than 2.5 ha., and operate on 10-20 year leases. The lease period of most mines is over, and permission for renewal has not been granted by the Forest Department, yet they continue to operate under the orders of either the state government or under a stay from the Rajasthan High Court. What is disturbing is that many of the mine-owners, mostly private, were given leases for mining after declaration of the Sanctuary, making a mockery of the state government's intention to protect the area for its wildlife. This is probably also a violation of the Wildlife Protection Act, 1972, and the Forest Conservation Act, 1980.

In addition to the destruction of forests and land, the associated blasting, dumping of debris, road- construction, movement of vehicles, and employment of large labour- force, all contribute to the disturbance and destruction of the area's wildlife. According to records available with local Forest officials, many of the mine-owners have been fined large sums of money for dumping debris on forest land; yet they continue to operate with impunity.

Furthermore, it has been alleged that violations of the Code of Conduct for the Lok Sabha elections may also be taking place in the area. Significantly, Shri Rajesh Pilot, Minister of State for Environment and Forests, is a Congress-I candidate from Dausa electoral constituency, which covers Jamva Ramgarh Sanctuary. Mine owners are bringing pressure on the state government to deny the Sanctuary, and large sums of money, to the tune of crores of rupees, may have been offered for this. Local people have been threatened by mine owners to cast their votes in the Lok Sabha elections only in favour of Pilot, who will allegedly ensure the mines are kept running following the elections and therefore lead to development of the region. As of March 12, 1996, the Rajasthan. Recent information received from a coalition of NGOs in Rajasthan suggests that there may be a move to deny Jamva Ramgarh Sanctuary by the state government.

The coalition, which has filed a complaint with T.N. Seshan, the Chief Election Commissioner, consists of the following organisations: Adhunik Welfare Society, Jaipur; Rashtriya Yuva Parishad, Jaipur; Tarun Bharat Sangh, Bhikampura-Kishori; and Society for Promotion of Environment and Sustainable Development, Jaipur.

Contact: Rajendra Singh, Tarun Bharat Singh, Village Bhikampura-Kishori, Via Thanagazi, District Alwar, Rajasthan 301 002. Ph: (014652) 4443.

Bihar

Field visit to Dalma Sanctuary

A field visit to Dalma Sanctuary was undertaken as part of IIPA's project on Participatory Management of Protected Areas, from 1-6 March, 1996 (for project details, pl. see previous *JPAM Updates*). Besides Dalma Sanctuary, the team also visited Jamshedpur and Ranchi, and Gobarghusi town. Meetings were held with local farmers, fuelwood head loaders, Forest Department officials and guards, and representatives of local NGOs. The aim of the visit was to obtain a profile of the Sanctuary, its management, and local communities dependent on it. Further visits to the area are planned for the coming months and a workshop involving all stakeholders has also been proposed. A detailed field visit report has been prepared and is being circulated for comments.

Contact: K. Christopher, c/o Ashish Kothari (see address at end).

Gujarat

Bamboo extraction recommences in Shoolpaneshwar Sanctuary

Action Research and Community Health and Development (ARCH), a local NGO based in Mangrol on the banks of the Narmada, has sent in information on bamboo felling in Shoolpaneshwar Sanctuary. The 110 sq. km. Sanctuary is mostly degraded forest land, and was created in compensation for partial submergence of forests north of it, by the Sardar Sarovar Dam. Apparently restrictions have been imposed by the Director of the Forest Development Corporation on employment generation schemes for villages inside the Sanctuary under the Employment Guarantee Scheme (EGS) and Minimum Wage Programme (MWP). This has been done on the pretext that activities under these schemes may be detrimental to the interests of wildlife conservation. However, since February 1996, bamboo is being extracted for the Central Paper and Pulp Mills, owned by the J.K. Industries group, with the argument that the clearings produced by this are good for wild herbivores!

Two local organisations, Adivasi Vikas Vahini and ARCH-Vahini, organised a demonstration outside the Piplod Forest Range Office at Dediapada, on 22 April, to protest against the double standards being adopted by Forest Department.

Contact : Anil Patel, ARCH-Vahini, P.O. Mangrol 393 150, Taluk Rajpipla, District Bharuch, Gujarat. Ph: (02640) 401 40, 401 54 or (0265) 421 246

STATE/REGIONAL NEWS

Uttar Pradesh

In May 1995, the Chief Conservator of Forests (Wildlife), UP, issued a directive (no. 719/12-1 dated 8/5/95) on measures proposed to tackle fire hazards, in parks and sanctuaries and other forest areas, during the summer months. It was addressed to senior UP Forest Department officials and Field Directors of Corbett and Dudhwa Tiger Reserves, Rajaji National Park, and Nandadevi Biosphere Reserve.

The directive enables the Forest Department to undertake the following:

1. Dead and fallen trees may be removed, from sanctuaries only, before February 1996, in as short a time-span as possible.
2. In January–February 1996, grass may be removed from national parks and sanctuaries in the interest of wildlife conservation, by local communities who have had customary rights to do so in the past.
3. These activities will be taken up under supervision of senior Forest Department officials.
4. In Dudhwa National Park, eucalyptus plantations will also be thinned, under the provisions of point 1 above.

NGOs in Rajaji have already taken up the matter (see **News from Specific Areas** above).

Contact: Chief Conservator of Forests (Wildlife), Forest Department, 17 Rana Pratap Marg, Lucknow 226 001, Uttar Pradesh. Ph: (0522) 248 397; Fax: (0522) 232 770.

NATIONAL NEWS

Committee on Wildlife Conservation, Protection and Laws

In July 1995, under directions from the High Court, the Ministry of Environment and Forests (MoEF) had constituted a seven member committee on Wildlife Conservation, Protection and Laws, under the chairpersonship of Shri M.F. Ahmed, Inspector General of Forests, MoEF. The Committee submitted its final report in February 1996. The Committee has made the following major recommendations:

1. Creation of a new ministry at the Centre, exclusively for wildlife conservation.
2. Statutory status for the Indian Board for Wildlife (IBWL).
3. Expanding the coverage of the existing PA network from 4.52% to 7% by 2000 AD, taking suggestions from Wildlife Institute of India for the creation of additional PAs.
4. Expansion of PA categories such as those in IUCN's list.
5. Setting up of advisory councils with village and panchayat representatives, to suggest ways of involving local communities in management of PAs.
6. Setting up of a 'wildlife cell' in each state police headquarters to combat poaching.
7. Establishing an intelligence network for undercover investigations on wildlife related cases.

The report has detailed recommendations pertaining to 'People, Wildlife and Forests':

1. Priority to be given to harmonizing relationship with forest communities, through intensive discussions, and ecological development and sensible land use regulation outside PAs.
2. Creation of an advisory council made up of village representatives/panchayat who can participate and be involved in management and protection of the area.
3. Immediate assessment of the relevance of traditional

knowledge for conservation and its incorporation into the management of wildlife habitats.

4. Mechanisms to assess the adverse impacts of wildlife on crops and livestock; mechanisms for effective compensation and means to check such impacts.
5. Mechanisms to assess as well as spread awareness of the benefits that accrue from forests and wildlife in terms of conservation.
6. Reorientation of all staff (PA and forest), to sensitize them to tribal culture.
7. Rapid surveys to assess damage caused by anti-conservation activities and offer immediate corrective and alternative measures.
8. Well planned voluntary relocation programmes that make provision for : (i) Reduction of human and livestock pressures in critical habitat, (ii) Compensation by the government, and (iii) Utilization of 'Long-Term Compensation Scheme (LTCS)'.
9. New and innovative land use policies outside key habitats for reduction of dependency on critical wildlife habitat.
10. Viability of low impact eco-tourism, for revenue generation, to be assessed.
11. Effective management and land-use of multiple use areas for enhancement of connective corridors between wild populations, ensuring genetic pools.
12. Assessment of eco-development schemes in order to prevent counter-productive results.
13. Generation of tangible benefits to the local people, from PAs, as an incentive for conservation. Some income generated from controlled tourism should be utilized for development and improvement of traditional lifestyles.

Contact: M.F. Ahmed, Inspector-General of Forests, Ministry of Environment and Forests, Paryavaran Bhawan, CGO Complex, Lodi Estate, New Delhi 110 003. Ph: (011) 436 1669.

Committee to review Wild Life (Protection) Act, 1972

The Committee set up by the Ministry of Environment and Forests to examine changes needed in the Wild Life Act (see also earlier reports in *JPAM Updates 7&8*) met with NGOs on March 15 in Delhi. Among the groups which made presentations were: VIKSAT (Ahmedabad, Gujarat); Vikalp (Saharanpur, UP); Karnataka Rajya Moolnvasi Budakattu Janara Vedike and Joint Tribal Action Committee Karnataka (coalitions of several NGOs working with tribals); Indian Social Institute, Kalpavriksh, IIPA, Centre for Environmental Law/WWF-I, and Ranthambhore Foundation (all New Delhi). The discussions were free and frank, with NGOs stressing that the Act as it exists today is too restrictive, allowing neither a central role to local communities in the management of conservation areas, nor adequate opportunities to pursue their livelihood. Other lacunae regarding the weakness of the Act to counter destructive commercial forces, and to curb poaching, were also pointed out. A number of constructive suggestions were made. Though reluctant to accept the full implications of the NGOs viewpoints, the Committee appeared open, and requested that concrete changes be recommended in writing. It was also agreed that it would not rush through with its deliberations, and would consider holding regional meetings to obtain a greater cross-representation than was possible sitting in Delhi.

Summaries of written submissions from some of the NGOs are presented below:

(i) The **National Committee for the Protection of Common Land Resources** (NCPCLR), a coalition of NGOs, has strongly urged the committee to integrate the interests and needs of local communities in the strategies for wildlife conservation. It has reproduced the recommendations for specific changes in the Act which were made by advocate B.J. Krishnan (see *JPAM Update 7*).

Contact: B.J. Krishnan, President, Save Nilgiris Campaign, Nahar Building, Charing Cross, Ootacamund 643 001, Tamil Nadu

(ii) **Wildlife First!**, a Bangalore based NGO has sent a strong note in favour of strengthening the Act in the interests of wildlife conservation, and sees any attempt to dilute it as spelling the “death knell of many of our wildlife reserves”. The organisation would like to see all exploitation of natural resources from PAs, especially to meet commercial demands, terminated forthwith. Any efforts by the state or NGOs to provide basic services and development inputs such as promotion of agriculture, animal husbandry, roads, electricity, education, health care, etc. to local communities within PAs would only serve to disrupt and fragment wildlife populations and habitats. Wildlife First! urges that human populations within PAs should be resettled and absorbed, “intelligently, humanely and fairly” into areas outside. The organisation is also in favour of protective policing of PAs while supporting wildlife protection staff, who are expected to work under difficult conditions without much motivation or support.

Contact: V. Krishna Prasad, Wildlife First!, 248, 4th Main Road, Chamarajpet, Bangalore - 560 018. Ph: (080) 662 1544; Fax: (080) 661 2936.

(iii) On behalf of the **IIPA JPAM team**, four submissions were given in. One pointed out that the thrust of the proposed changes in the Act should be to ensure a role for local communities in managing and receiving benefits from PAs while keeping out destructive commercial and urban-industrial activities. A second, done by Ashish Kothari and Neema Pathak, suggested some concrete changes in specific clauses of the Act. A third laid out a broad strategy of involving local communities in PA management, suggesting concrete additions to the Act such as the creation of local-level management boards. The fourth one suggested ways to keep destructive pressures out of PAs, by various alternative legal methods including compulsory public scrutiny of proposed developmental and commercial projects, and a double clearance process involving the state and central governments. Copies of these submissions are available on request.

Contact: Ashish Kothari (address at end).

(iv) **Karnataka Rajya Moolnivasi Budakattu Janara Vedike** and **Tribal Joint Action Committee Karnataka** organised three meetings through February-March in Karnataka to get representations from local organisations, especially those working with tribals in around PAs. The major thrust of their recommendations is to expand the coverage of the Act from

only wildlife to all biodiversity, overhauling the functioning of the Forest Department, involvement of tribals in the management of national parks and sanctuaries, continuation of tribal ways of living even in national parks and acknowledgement of their customary rights, implementation of the provisions of the 1988 Forest Policy and the Bhuria Committee Report.

For further details regarding the Committee's progress, please contact: Kishore Rao, Additional Director (WL), Ministry of Environment and Forests, Paryavaran Bhawan, CGO Complex, Lodi Estate, New Delhi 110 003. Ph: (011) 436 0957.

Wildlife Working Group on IXth Five Year Plan allocations for wildlife conservation

A Working Group was constituted in February 1996 by the Planning Commission, to review the various schemes initiated in the Wildlife sector of the VIIIth 5-year Plan, and recommend appropriate schemes and budgets for the IXth Plan. The Group consists of officials of the Ministry of Environment and Forests and state wildlife wings, and members of groups like the Bombay Natural History Society, SACON, Wildlife Institute of India, and IIPA.

Wildlife schemes under the earlier Plan included Development of National Parks and Sanctuaries, Eco-development, Project Tiger, Project Elephant, Control of Poaching and Illegal Trade, Strengthening Wildlife Division, Tribal Rehabilitation from protected areas. Unfortunately, no systematic review of the success or otherwise of these schemes is available, so one essential part of the Group's Terms of Reference was not fulfilled. In view of this, and in view of the widespread evidence of many funded projects being mishandled at state and local levels, some members justifiably raised doubts, and stressed that carrying on with these schemes without a review was simply 'business as usual'. In addition, the rush with which these schemes and allocations were being decided (the Group had merely two months!) was not conducive to any form of public consultation.

With regard to protected areas, the following observations and recommendations were made by IIPA JPAM team member Ashish Kothari, as a member of the Working Group: (i) Revision of the scheme on 'Development of National Parks and Sanctuaries' to consider means to integrate much greater scientific, traditional, and socio-economic information into the planning and management of PAs, identify major threatening factors in each PA, and identify ways to integrate traditional human uses and knowledge into management; (ii) Starting a new scheme to expand the categories of PAs (including people-protected and multiple-use areas), and accordingly identify new areas (and review earlier ones) for declaration; (iii) Starting a new scheme on Participatory Management of Protected Areas, including the creation of participatory management boards in each PA; (iv) Reorientation of the Eco-development scheme to include coordination of overall land-use around PAs; (v) Starting a new scheme on Relocation of Urban-industrial and Large Development Projects from PAs. Kothari stressed that existing schemes on relocation of tribals from PAs, and a new proposed thrust to settle rights of people inside PAs, would not be acceptable in the current framework, since they involved forcible eviction and undemocratic processes of settlement. They would be justified only within a framework of genuine participatory management, in which local communities have full powers and rights as equal partners.

The final recommendations of the Working Group are currently under preparation, and will be considered by the Planning Commission. What finally comes out as part of the IXth Plan is anyone's guess, at this stage. We will keep readers updated.

Meanwhile, for further details, please contact: Kishore Rao (see above, Wild Life Act Committee).

INTERNATIONAL NEWS

Uganda Workshop Report

As reported in *JPAM Update 7*, a workshop on Collaborative Management of Protected Areas in Uganda was organised at Mbale, Uganda, in October 1995. IIPA JPAM team member Ashish Kothari, who participated as a facilitator, was also given the responsibility of preparing the short and full reports of the workshop. A draft report of the complete deliberations has been prepared with help from Saloni Suri, and sent to the organisers (Uganda National Parks and IUCN). Readers interested in receiving the final reports can contact IUCN.

Contact: Grazia Borrini-Feyerabend, Social Policy Service, IUCN-The World Conservation Union, 28 Rue Mauverney, CH-1196 Gland, Switzerland. Ph: (41 22) 999 0001; Fax: (41 22) 999 0025; Email: gbf@hq.iucn.ch.

UPCOMING

Starting with this issue, we are starting a column on upcoming events. Readers are invited to send in information on any events related to protected areas which may be of interest, which they would like announced here.

Collaborative Management Workshop : A two day workshop (21-22 May, 1996) is being organised at Murree, Pakistan, hosted by IUCN Pakistan, on Collaborative Management (CM) for Conservation in South Asia. The workshop will comprise informal exchanges of experiences from various countries, as well identification of key lessons, issues, opportunities and potential for initiatives on CM in South Asia.

Contact : Grazia Borrini - Feyerabend (as above).

Workshop on Community-Based Protected Area Management : The Centre for Science and Environment (CSE), New Delhi, is organising a three day workshop on Community Based Protected Area Management, scheduled from 22nd July, 1996 in New Delhi.

Contact: Ravi Sharma, Centre for Science and Environment, 41 Tughlakabad Institutional Area, New Delhi - 110062. Ph: (011) 698 1110, 698 1124, 698 3394, 698 6399; Fax : (011) 698 5879, Email: cse @ unv.ernet. in

Regional Workshop on Community Based Conservation : Principles and Practice : The Indian Institute of Public Administration is organising a workshop for the South and Central Asian region, on the principles and practices relating to community involvement in conservation. The workshop is sponsored by UNESCO. It will

be held in Delhi on 9-11 February, 1997.

Contact: Ashish Kothari (see address at end).

WHAT'S AVAILABLE?

As of this issue, we are starting a new column on material related to JPAM. Readers are invited to send in any relevant material (including the print and electronic media), or references to such material, for inclusion in this column.

Sarkar, S., Singh, N., Suri, S., and Kothari, A. 1995. *Joint Protected Area Management in India: Report of a Workshop*. Indian Institute of Public Administration, New Delhi.

A report of the proceedings of the Workshop on the subject, held in IIPA in September 1994. Its 100 pages contain the deliberations, a summary of major issues and recommendations emerging at the end of the Workshop, a list of papers, and a list of participants.

Available from : Indian Institute of Public Administration (see address at end). Rs. 50 or \$5.

World Wide Fund for Nature - India. 1994. *Seminar on Biodiversity Conservation: Proceedings*. Proceedings of the First National Conservation Congress, 21-23 November 1994.

Includes all papers presented at the Congress, including on Bhitarkanika Sanctuary (Orissa), Dudhwa Tiger Reserve (UP), Manas Tiger Reserve (Assam), Marine National Park (Gujarat), and the Nilgiri Biosphere Reserve (Karnataka, Tamil Nadu and Kerala).

Contact : WWF-India, 172 B, Lodhi Estate, New Delhi 110 003. No price mentioned.

Barber, Charles V. 1996. *Community-Based Biodiversity Conservation : Challenges for Policy makers and Managers in Southeast Asia*. Paper presented at DANCED International Meeting on Biodiversity, Chiang RAI, Thailand, 14-19 January 1996.

Reviews some of the steps taken by governments, donors, NGOs and local communities in the Southeast Asian region, to implement and support community-based biodiversity management (CBBM). Includes examples drawn from Indonesia, the Philippines and Thailand. It also discusses six key issues in actually implementing initiatives on the ground.

Contact: C.V. Barber, 14 Cabbage Street, Valle Verte 5, Pasig Metro Manila, Philippines. Ph: (63-2) 631 0406; Email: cbarber@mnj.sequel.net

Manas News: Quarterly New Magazine of Manas Tiger Reserve.

Started late last year, the inaugural issue contains information on the history, biodiversity, and ongoing projects related to

Manas Tiger Reserve.

Road 781 315, Assam. Ph: (03666) 32253. Price not mentioned.

Available from: Field Director, Manas Tiger Reserve, Barpeta

JPAM Update is produced as a follow up to the workshop on Exploring the Possibilities of Joint Protected Area Management (JPAM), organised at IIPA, New Delhi, in September 1994. *JPAM Update 9* was prepared by Priya Das, K. Christopher, Suniti K. Jha, Ashish Kothari and Farhad Vania. Ideas, comments, news and information may please be sent to Ashish Kothari, Indian Institute of Public Administration, Indraprastha Estate, New Delhi 110 002. Ph: (011) 331 7309; Fax: (011) 331 9954; Email: akothari@unv.ernet.in.

JPAM UPDATE
News on Action Towards Joint Protected Area Management

No. 10

July 1996

NEWS FROM SPECIFIC PROTECTED AREAS

ASSAM

Tiger Crisis Cell team appraises Kaziranga and Manas

A four-person team from the Tiger Crisis Cell comprising of S. Deb Roy, Valmik Thapar, Bittu Sahgal and Dr. Ullas Karanth, visited Manas and Kaziranga Tiger Reserves in April 1996 (*Tiger Link News* June 1996). According to the team poaching and encroachment are two of the major problems in the area. In Manas, rhinos are reported to be nearly extinct, swamp deer and hog deer have decreased while elephant tuskers are being regularly shot. The situation with the Forest Department is also reported to be grim. Morale is extremely low among staff and some Forest Guards have not been paid wages for three months. Kaziranga Tiger Reserve is especially threatened by rampant use of pesticides, including DDT, by the several tea estates in the surrounding area. (See also NEWS FROM STATES).

GUJARAT

Lions moving out of Gir National Park /Maldharis being evicted?

According to recent reports (*Business Standard* 28 May 1996) from Gujarat, an unspecified number of Asiatic lions have been sighted in the Kodnar and Girnar forests of Junagadh district, some 40-60 km away from Gir National Park. While the exact reasons for this movement are not immediately clear, Forest Department officials claim it could be due to the rise in the number of lions in Gir. A census conducted by the Forest Department in 1995 reported 304 lions in Gir. However local conservationists are skeptical about the Department's census technique and claim there are probably no more than 200.

The reports also claimed that indiscriminate promotion of Gir as a tourist destination has taken its toll by way of unregulated numbers of visitors, vehicular pollution and plastic waste. Other pressures include public access roads, a railway line, and two temple complexes that have become major pilgrimage centers attracting over a lakh visitors every year.

Experts are also worried about the implications of the limited number of lions in Gir, which may lead to in-breeding and genetic complications in future. There is a therefore a proposal to relocate some lions from Gir to the Palpur Kuno Sanctuary in Madhya Pradesh.

Meanwhile, Setu-Centre for Social Knowledge and Action, an Ahmedabad based NGO, has alleged that the Forest Department is forcibly relocating Maldharis from Gir, as part of a Global Environment Facility (GEF) funded eco-development project, even though the project's own documents clearly state

that there is to be no 'involuntary displacement'. This has also been corroborated by newspaper reports on the issue (*Times of India* 28 May 1996). The allegation is further supported by another NGO based in the Gir area, the Saurashtra Paryavaran Sanrakshan Samiti (SPSS). The Forest Department, however, claims that only three Maldharis have been served notices for carrying out illegal activities, at least one of them for claiming occupancy rights to Gir despite being from outside.

In March and April this year, demonstrations and fasts were held by a group of Maldharis, supported by SPSS, to protest against the action of the authorities. A petition was also presented to the Gujarat Chief Minister by SPSS.

Currently there are an estimated 7,000 Maldharis spread over 54 *nesses* (settlements) in the roughly 1,400 sq km Gir National Park and Sanctuary. Between 1973 to 1983, 845 Maldhari families were relocated from the protected area and given land for agriculture in the surrounding area. However, they have been unsuccessful in adopting farming as a way of life. It is uncertain whether the remaining Maldharis will be allowed to remain inside Gir. In 1990 the Maldharis were accorded Scheduled Tribe status by the government.

For further information on the recent events, pl. contact: Achyut Yagnik, Setu-Centre for Social Knowledge and Action, 1 Punyashlok, near Liberty bus-stop, University Road, Ahmedabad 380 009. Ph: (0272) 656 0751. For the Forest Department's version, pl. contact: Deputy Conservator of Forests (Wildlife), Sasangir 363 125, District Junagadh, Gujarat.

Gujarat High Court order on Narayan Sarovar Sanctuary

On 23 April, 1996, the Gujarat High Court passed an interim order staying the construction of a jetty by the Sanghi Cements Co. at the site of the Narayan Sarovar Sanctuary in Gujarat. The order was passed on a petition filed by the World Wide Fund for Nature, which has for the last few years been trying to stop the state government from destroying the Sanctuary.

Narayan Sarovar Sanctuary, covering 766 sq.km., was declared in 1981, to protect the unique desert and saline wetland ecosystem of western Kutch, and its inhabitant wildlife like the Chinkara, Houbara bustard, and flamingos. Unfortunately, the same state government which took this step has in the 1990s targeted the area for mining and industrial expansion. To facilitate this, it went to the extent of denotifying a substantial portion of the sanctuary, reducing the area to 444 sq.km. This was done especially to accommodate the cement factory proposed by Sanghi Cements, and the related mining. Unfortunately, this denotification could not be stopped by NGO action.

However, WWF-I has continued to keep its vigil in the area, and has won a temporary battle by getting an injunction against the construction of a jetty and related works, which

are needed for the factory. This was based on its finding that these works were in violation of the Coastal Regulation Zone Notification of 1991.

Contact: Sanjay Upadhyaya, Centre for Environment Law, World Wide Fund for Nature – India, 172 B Lodi Estate, New Delhi 110 003. Ph: (011) 469 3744/461 6532; Fax: (011) 462 6837; Email: wwfindel@unv.ernet.in.

ORISSA

Efforts to protect Olive Ridley turtle nesting sites in Bhitarkanika Sanctuary

A string of islands in the Bay of Bengal, off the coast of Orissa, form a part of the 170 sq km Bhitarkanika Sanctuary. The islands and a part of the coast are reported to be favoured nesting sites for the highly endangered Olive Ridley turtle. Recently, the Defence Research and Development Organisation (DRDO) acquired six major islands of a group called Wheeler Islands to build a missile testing range. According to Banka Behary Das of Orissa Krushak Mahasangh, a Bhubaneswar based NGO, and experts like B.C. Choudhury of the Wildlife Institute of India, this range and its associated activities would pose a major threat to the nesting turtles.

Information on the matter was sent, among others, to the Scientific Adviser to the Defence Minister, who suggested a meeting between NGO representatives and the Director, DRDO, to try and find ways out. Following some patient negotiations, the DRDO has agreed to take the following measures to protect the turtle and its nesting sites:

1. As far as possible, missile test firing will not be carried out between November and April, which is the peak turtle nesting period at Gahirmatha beach.
2. Lighting arrangements on Outer Wheeler Island during construction, and thereafter, will be suitably altered to prevent confusing turtle hatchlings, who have been observed heading away from the sea under the influence of lights.
3. The DRDO will request the Indian Coast Guard, and possibly the Indian Navy, to assist in patrolling and anti-poaching operations during the nesting period.

If successfully carried out, this appears to be a significant example of what some simple collaboration can achieve. But strict monitoring will obviously be necessary in future.

Contact: Banka Behary Das, Orissa Krushak Mahasangh, Parivesh Bhavan, 14 Ashok Nagar, Bhubaneswar 751 009, Orissa. Ph.: (0647) 400 305; Fax: (0647) 404 222, 409 1125.

SIKKIM

Teesta Hydro-electric Project threatens Khangchendzonga National Park

A public meeting was held at Magan Bazaar, on 20 August 1995, to discuss the Sikkim Government's proposal to implement Stage III of the Teesta Hydro-electric Project, in the North District of Sikkim. The Project site lies in the buffer zone of Khangchendzonga National Park, an area of considerable biodiversity value. A resolution passed at the meeting made the following demands:

1. The Government of Sikkim consider cancelling the Teesta Hydro-electric project.
2. The memorandum submitted to the President of India on 21 October 1991 should be duly considered by the Government.
3. The impact of the Project on the local Lepcha community, and on the Khangchendzonga National Park are likely to be severe enough to warrant cancellation of the Project.
4. Small scale power project should be actively considered for power generation and meeting the power requirements of Sikkim.

The resolution, signed by local village leaders, Panchayat representatives, current and former MLAs, was submitted to the Union Minister of Environment and Forests in November 1995.

Contact: Nandu Thapa, MP, Thapa House, Paljar, Stadium Road, Gangtok 737 101, Sikkim. Ph: (03592) 22348.

UTTAR PRADESH

NGO initiates award for Forest Department staff in Corbett Tiger Reserve

The Corbett Foundation, an NGO working in and around Corbett Tiger Reserve, has initiated an annual award of Rs.10,000 to be given to a member of the Forest Department staff for 'contributing the most to tiger conservation'. The first award was conferred to Shri Sati, Forest Guard, Corbett Tiger Reserve, for anti-poaching operations.

Additional activities of the Foundation include: provision of elementary health facilities in villages around the Reserve; awareness generation about conservation and environment including field visits to the Reserve for interaction with Forest Department staff; and advice to villagers on receiving compensation for injury/death caused by wildlife.

Contact: Corbett Foundation, N-37 1st Fl., Panchshila Park, Ne Delhi 110 017. Ph: (011) 644 4016; 646 2011; Fax: (011) 644 7564.

STATE/REGIONAL NEWS

ASSAM

State government takes steps towards forest and wildlife conservation

According to reports (*The Pioneer* 1 June 1996), the newly appointed State Forest Minister for Assam, Nagen Sharma, has proposed a series of bold measures to conserve the state's forest resources and wildlife. These include:

1. A total ban on tree felling in Reserved Forests in Assam forthwith; requirements of existing permit holders to be met from stocks in Forest Department (FD) timber depots.
2. FD to provide a detailed report on causes of destruction of forests in the state.
3. A vigilance cell headed by a Chief Conservator of

- Forests established, to check illegal activities in forest areas.
4. An enquiry into reinstatement by the previous government, of suspended FD officers.
 5. In Kaziranga National Park :
 - i. Income from tourism to be used for emergency work in the Park.
 - ii. Foreign tourists visiting the Park to be charged entry fees in foreign currency.
 - iii. A proposal to increase the area of Kaziranga NP by 400 sq. km., in an attempt to bring under the control of the Park authorities, areas where poaching is reported. Financial resources to facilitate the expansion of area have already been deposited with the Revenue department.
 6. For Manas Tiger Reserve, a committee to recommend improvements in management.
 7. A Wildlife Trust established to help field staff posted in remote parts of PAs and RFs. A part of regular salaries will be donated at the following rates: Minister of State - 1 months salary; all Forest Department officers upto DFO - 7 days; Rangers - 3 days; all other staff - 1 day. The Trust has set itself a target of raising Rs.10 lakhs annually.

Unfortunately, though welcome in themselves, these measures once again seem to miss out the critical element of involving local communities in and around Assam's protected areas.

MADHYA PRADESH

Tribal organisations oppose M.P. Forestry Project

The World Bank aided Forestry Project in Madhya Pradesh, which has substantial components related to protected areas, has come in for strong criticism from several tribal organisations. At a meeting on May 17-18, 1996, at Bhopal, the organisations pointed out that the participatory nature of the project was dubious, and that the project could end up further curtailing the essential links of the tribals with forests, including in and around protected areas. The signatories to a statement which resulted from the workshop include Ekta Parishad; Kisan Adivasi Sangathan, Kesla; Chhatisgarh Mukti Morcha; Adivasi Mukti Sangathan, Khandwa; Narmada Bachao Andolan; and Bhopal Gas Peedit Mahila Udyog Sangathan.

These organisations plan to produce a booklet on the Forestry Project, covering various aspects. They have requested help from environmentalists and scientists in analysing the implications of the Project, both for the campaign which is to be launched against it, and for the booklet.

Contact: Gautam Bandyopadhyay / Devjit Nandi, Ekta Parishad, House 1192, Sector 1, Shanker Nagar, Raipur 492 007. Ph: (0771) 423 775 (Raipur); (07721) 4498 (Tilda).

For another critique of the M.P. Forestry Project, also contact: Bittu Sahgal, Sanctuary Magazine, 602 Maker Chambers V, Nariman Point, Bombay 400 021. Ph: (022) 283 0061; Fax : (022) 287 4380; Email: bittu@ecologist.ilbom.ernet.in.

UTTAR PRADESH

Workshop on Protected Areas of Uttar Pradesh

The Forest Department, Uttar Pradesh, held a 3-day workshop on Biodiversity Conservation and Planning for Protected Areas of UP, at Dehradun, on 27-29th May, 1996. The objectives included the identification of biodiversity values for which protected areas are to be managed, examination of ways of integrating regional and ecodevelopment concerns into management planning, and of ways to include participation of stakeholders including local communities. The discussions covered the whole range of issues facing PAs, though unfortunately, the linkages with the U.P. Forestry Project, of which the workshop turned out to be a part, were not clearly drawn out. Draft recommendations include the creation of special area boards for each PA and its surrounds, in which various government agencies, local community representatives, NGOs, and others can work with the Forest Department in planning for conservation and people's livelihood.

For further details, contact: Ashok Singh, Chief Conservator of Forests (Wildlife), 17 Rana Pratap Marg, Lucknow 226 001, Uttar Pradesh. Ph: (0522) 283 902; Fax: (0522) 283 871.

NATIONAL NEWS

Government agrees to 'no development' zones around protected areas

The Ministry of Environment and Forests (MoEF) has reportedly fully endorsed the idea of a 'no development' zone of 5 km. around all PA boundaries, one of the recommendations of the Delhi High Court Committee on Wildlife Conservation, Protection and Laws (See *JPAM Update 9*). However, the concept of 'no development', and how it is to be enforced, remains to be clarified. It is also unclear whether this will apply only to new proposals for development, or extend to existing industries and development projects around national parks and sanctuaries.

The MoEF has also not made any formal announcement yet, about the recommendations of the Committee (reported in *JPAM Update 9*).

Contact: M.F. Ahmed, Inspector-General of Forests, Ministry of Environment and Forests, Paryavaran Bhawan, CGO Complex, Lodi Estate, New Delhi 110 003. Ph: (011) 436 1669.

Additional NGO inputs for amendments to Wild Life (Protection) Act, 1972

More submissions for changes in the Wild Life (Protection) Act (WLPA) have been made by NGOs, to the Committee set up for the purpose at the Ministry of Environment and Forests. So far the following NGOs/institutions have responded :

1. **National Committee for Protection of Common Land Resources**, Ootacamund, Tamil Nadu (See *JPAM Update 7*).

2. **VIKSAT**, Ahmedabad, Gujarat (See *JPAM Update 9*).
3. **Karnataka Rajya Moolnivasi Budakattu Janara Vedike and Tribal Joint Action Committee Karnataka** (See *JPAM Update 9*).
4. **Wildlife First!**, Bangalore, Karnataka (See *JPAM Update 9*).
5. **Econet**, Pune, Maharashtra.
6. **Indian Institute of Public Administration**, New Delhi (see *JPAM Update 9*).
7. **Rhino Foundation**, Guwahati, Assam.
8. **Centre for Ecological Sciences**, Indian Institute of Science, Bangalore, Karnataka.
9. **Nature Lovers Movement**, Thiruvankulam, Kerala.
10. **Ranthambhor Foundation**, New Delhi.

Summaries of some of the latest submissions for changes in the WLPA :

R. Sukumar of the **Centre for Ecological Sciences**, Indian Institute of Science, Bangalore, has recommended that there should be specific legislation for acquisition of land which could be important corridors for wildlife movement. Regarding research in PAs, there is need for appropriate guidelines to clarify rights and obligations of independent researchers, and a focus on PA management oriented research.

Contact: R. Sukumar, Centre for Ecological Sciences, Indian Institute of Science, Bangalore 560 012, Karnataka. Ph: (080) 334 0985 or 334 4411 extn. 2506; Fax: (080) 334 1683.

Sethumadhavan of the **Nature Lovers Movement**, Kerala, has suggested the following:

- a. Time-bound implementation of the decisions taken by the Wildlife Advisory Boards, and requirement of prior approval from the Boards for non-forest use of forest lands;
- b. Take-over of the Collector's functions under the Act by the Boards;
- c. Ban on not just hunting but also human interference for specified periods, in Closed Areas;
- d. Penalty for serious violations to be increased;
- e. Courts to take cognizance of complaints made by any person who can show evidence of violation (eliminating need to give 60 days notice to government).

Contact: Sethumadhavan, Nature Lovers Movement, Thiruvankulam 682 305, Kerala.

Anwaruddin Choudhury of the **Rhino Foundation**, Guwahati, has urged that revenue earned from wildlife tourism should be channelised back to the protected areas, one-third to be used by the area's management, one-third by village communities, and one-third to be deposited with the state government. A Committee under the CCF or state government should manage this. Secondly, a time limit of not more than two years should be imposed for the settlement of rights. The addition of several species found in north-east India, to the Act's schedules, has also been suggested.

Contact: Anwaruddin Choudhury, Rhino Foundation, Guwahati (address not available). Fax: (0361) 550 902.

Valmik Thapar of the **Ranthambhor Foundation** has suggested the following:

- a. To check misuse of the Act, a system of checks and balances should be incorporated, with decisions on habitat manipulation, water development, NTFP collection, and other resource uses being taken by a panel of experts rather than only the CWLW.
- b. When a protected area is notified in the first instance, all rules relating to protection should immediately come into force.
- c. No industrial/developmental activity should be allowed within 25 km. of a protected area, and no private purchase/sale of land within a 5 km. radius.
- d. No denotification should be allowed without reference to a body of experts.
- e. A new category of "national forest" should be started, with people and forests co-existing.
- f. Mini-cores or inviolate zones should be considered within PAs, especially in the Himalayas.

Contact: Valmik Thapar, Ranthambhor Foundation, 19 Kautilya Marg, Chanakyapuri, New Delhi 110 021. Ph: (011) 301 6261; Fax: (011) 391 6261; Email: tiger.linking@access.net.in.

Chandrakant Wakankar of **Econet** has recommended that:

- a. State wildlife advisory boards should include tribals/forest dwellers, especially women.
- b. The collector should make special provisions for illiterate people to make their claims, and tribal welfare officers or NGOs should be allowed to represent the interests of tribals.
- c. Instead of monetary compensation, alternatives should be provided to activities which are stopped.
- d. Roads going through protected areas should be off-limits to private and public transport.
- e. Grazing should be permitted in a controlled manner within protected areas.

Contact: Chandrakant Wakankar, Econet, 5 Sanket, Vijayanagar Colony, 2123 Sadashiv Peth, Pune 411 030. Fax: (0212) 331250.

Readers are urged to send in their recommendations, as soon as possible to the Committee at the address below. We would appreciate receiving a copy (at the address at the end of the newsletter).

For submissions, and further details regarding the Committee's progress, please contact: Kishore Rao, Additional Director (WL), Ministry of Environment and Forests, Paryavaran Bhawan, CGO Complex, Lodi Estate, New Delhi 110 003. Ph: (011) 436 0957. Fax:

INTERNATIONAL NEWS

Report on Collaborative Management Workshop, Murree, Pakistan

A South Asia regional workshop on Collaborative Management (CM) for Conservation was held in Murree, Pakistan, on May 21-22, 1996. Sponsored by the Social Policy Group of the World Conservation Union (IUCN), and hosted by IUCN-Pakistan, the workshop was attended by NGO and government

representatives from Pakistan, India, Bangladesh, Sri Lanka, Nepal, and Afghanistan, along with members of international agencies from Thailand and Switzerland. Most of the participants had first-hand experience of collaborative management efforts, or related policy-making.

The sessions were informal, oriented towards experience-sharing and throwing up ideas on possible joint programmes in the South Asia region. Experiences recounted by participants included CM in forest areas, wetlands, and protected areas. The workshop ended in a decision to form a network for CM in the South Asia region, with a possible nodal agency in Nepal or Sri Lanka (India and Pakistan were ruled out, due to the serious difficulty in traveling/communicating between the two; half the Indian invitees to the workshop did not even get a visa, and the other two got it only hours before their flights!). The network will facilitate information and personnel exchange, training, workshops on specific issues, and research on CM. Funding possibilities for the network are being looked into.

For further details, contact: Grazia Borrini-Feyerabend, Social Policy Group, IUCN-The World Conservation Union, 28 Rue Mauverney, CH-1196 Gland, Switzerland. Ph: (41 22) 999 0001; Fax: (41 22) 999 0025; Email: gbf@hq.iucn.ch.

Proposed IUCN Resolution on Collaborative Management

The Social Policy Group of the World Conservation Union (IUCN) proposes to sponsor a major resolution on Collaborative Management for Conservation, at the forthcoming World Conservation Congress, to be held in conjunction with the IUCN General Assembly in Montreal, Canada. The related sessions will be held on October 17-20, 1996. The proposed text of the resolution urges all IUCN members, and other governments/agencies, to adapt CM approaches, encouraging the central role of local communities, in conservation programmes.

For details, pl. contact: Grazia Borrini-Feyerabend (address above).

WWF's proposed global tiger strategy urges people's involvement

A draft of a Global Tiger Strategy to be issued by the World Wide Fund for Nature - International, takes a welcome step towards recommending the central participation of people in conservation efforts (more than can be said about a parallel document put out by the U.S.-based World Conservation Society). The major focus in the strategy is on critical tiger habitats. A total of 159 Tiger Conservation Units (TCUs) have been identified based on habitat integrity, poaching pressure, and tiger population status, and classified into those which offer the greatest potential for conservation, those with medium possibility, and those with low potential.

Of the several interesting analytical points and recommendations offered by the strategy, the following is worth quoting in full: "Experience has shown that in the face of growing anthropogenic pressures on the remaining wildlife habitats including protected areas...the most successful conservation projects have been those that have been able to empower local communities for management of the natural resource base. The 'joint forest management' model and the growing model towards 'joint protected area management' is the

direction in which WWF must develop its guiding philosophy for conservation. With the planning and management of landscape level tiger conservation units being recommended in this strategy, people based management approaches, with direct, tangible benefits flowing to responsible communities, must be promoted by WWF in place of the traditional reliance on centralized control by multiple bureaucracies".

The report was coordinated by Thomas Mathew, Director-East and South Asia, WWF-US, who can be contacted at: 1250, 24th St. NW, Washington, DC 20037-1175, USA. Ph: (1-202) 293 4800; Fax: (1-202) 293 9211/9345; Email: mathew+awwfus%wwfus@mcimail.com.

UPCOMING

Workshop on Community-Based Protected Area Management

The proposed workshop (See *JPAM Update 9*) to be organised by the Centre for Science and Environment (CSE), New Delhi, scheduled for 22nd July, 1996 stands indefinitely **postponed!**

For further details contact: Ravi Sharma, Centre for Science and Environment, 41 Tughlakabad Institutional Area, New Delhi - 110062. Ph: (011) 698 1110, 698 1124, 698 3394, 698 6399; Fax : (011) 698 5879, Email: cse@unv.ernet.in.

Workshop on Dalma Sanctuary, Bihar

As part of its project on Participatory Management of Protected Areas (pl. see write-ups in *JPAM Update 9*), the Indian Institute of Public Administration (IIPA) is planning to organise a workshop on Dalma Sanctuary, Bihar. This sanctuary, an important habitat for the elephant and a major source of water for Jamshedpur town and surrounding villages, faces several issues hampering its adequate conservation and management: illegal timber and fuelwood cutting (especially to meet the demand of Jamshedpur), inadequate livelihood options for tribals living in and around, crop damage due to elephants, the tribal mass-hunt (*sendra*) once a year, the conventional non-participatory management approach of the authorities, and so on.

Over the last couple of months, IIPA has been in touch with the whole range of actors in and around Dalma: Forest Department, NGOs, tribals, Tata agencies, and others. Each of these has welcomed the idea of a joint dialogue in which viewpoints and information could be frankly shared. IIPA therefore proposes to organise, in collaboration with local organisations, a two or three day workshop in the first week of August. This is aimed at being the first of at least two, and possibly more, such dialogues. It will therefore have the very limited aim of sharing experiences and viewpoints, and if possible, reaching a minimum common understanding on how to proceed towards conserving Dalma, meeting the livelihood and other requirements of its human inhabitants, and curbing undesirable commercial/industrial pressures.

The workshop will be held in Jamshedpur, on 12-13 August. For precise venue, and other details, pl. contact: K. Christopher, c/o Ashish Kothari (see address at end).

WHAT'S AVAILABLE?

- **Corbett.** Project Tiger, Corbett.

A quarterly newsletter of Corbett Tiger Reserve, brought out by the Reserve authorities as part of its ecodevelopment awareness programme. Carries information on the state of the Reserve, new management initiatives, news from settlements in the adjacent area, etc. For internal circulation only. However, those interested may write to Rajeev Bhartari, Dy Director, Corbett Tiger Reserve, Ramnagar 244 715, District Nainital, Uttar Pradesh.

- **Corbett Tiger Reserve : A Guide.** Corbett Foundation. 1996.

A slim booklet with information on Corbett Tiger Reserve, Jim Corbett, eco-tourism, activities of the Corbett Foundation in villages of the surrounding area, and useful checklists of flora and fauna of the Reserve. Includes an approach map and an outline map of Corbett Tiger Reserve.

Contact: Corbett Foundation, N-37 1st Fl., Panchshila Park, Ne Delhi 110 017. Ph: (011) 644 4016; 646 2011; Fax: (011) 644 7564.

- **Tiger Link News**

Tiger Link is a loose coalition of persons working on tiger conservation and includes NGOs, Forest Department officers, wildlife biologists, lawyers and other interested individuals.

Tiger Link News is their newsletter, available only to Tiger Link participants, and carries information from India and abroad on tiger conservation and related issues.

Contact: Ranthambhor Foundation, 19 Kautilya Marg, Chanakyapuri, New Delhi 110 021. Ph: (011) 301 6261; Fax: (011) 301 9457.

- **Mining : Threat to Ecological Balance in Jamva Ramgarh Wildlife Sanctuary, Rajasthan.** Amarjeet Kaur. 1996.

As reported in *JPAM Update 9*, illegal mining severely threatens the Jamva Ramgarh Sanctuary in Rajasthan. This unpublished report gives the precise extent of the threat. The author is a researcher of the School of Social Sciences, Jawaharlal Nehru University, New Delhi.

Contact: Rajendra Singh, Tarun Bharat Sangh, Bhikampura-Kishori, via Thanagazi 301 022, Dist. Alwar, Rajasthan. Ph: (014652) 4443.

- **Protection of Nature Parks : Whose Business?** Centre for Science and Environment. 1996.

Proceedings of a debate held in Delhi on who should protect India's national parks and sanctuaries: the bureaucracy or the people? The debate included wildlife scientists, activists, community representatives, and researchers.

Contact: Centre for Science and Environment, 41 Tughlakabad Institutional Area, New Delhi 110 062. Ph: (011) 698 1110; Fax: (011) 698 5879; Email: csedel@cse.unv.ernet.in.

- **In Danger.** Paola Manfredi (ed). Ranthambhor Foundation. In press.

The book discusses the relationship between people, endangered habitats and wildlife. The book forms part of an attempt by Ranthambhor Foundation to try and bridge the widening gap between nature, protected areas and people.

Contact: Ranthambhor Foundation, 19 Kautilya Marg, Chanakyapuri, New Delhi 110 021. Ph: (011) 301 6261; Fax: (011) 301 9457.

- **Protected Areas, Forest Dwellers and Ecodevelopment.** Dr. Vikram Soni. Undated.

This paper looks at the ongoing World Bank-GEF ecodevelopment initiatives in protected areas. The author questions the viability of such an initiative and suggests the need for a comprehensive change in outlook towards conservation.

Contact: Dr. Vikram Soni, UGC Professor, Theory Group, National Physical Laboratory, Dr. K.S. Krishnan Road, New Delhi 110 012.

- **Dossier on Coimbatore Zoological Park and Conservation Centre.** FIAN International. Undated.

A 24 page document highlighting issues surrounding the controversial Coimbatore Zoological Park and Conservation Centre. The Zoo is proposed to be located 30 km from Coimbatore city, in the Western Ghats close to the Tamil Nadu-Kerala border. Its aim is to recreate a mosaic of ecosystems with representative flora and fauna of the Western Ghats. The document alleges forcible eviction of tribals, illegal land acquisition and other human rights violations by the Coimbatore Zoological Society. Food First Information and Action Network (FIAN), is an international human rights organisation, founded in 1986 to promote the right to food.

Contact: FIAN International Secretariat, PO Box 102243, D-69012 Heidelberg, Germany.

JPAM Update is produced every two months as a follow up to the workshop on Exploring the Possibilities of Joint Protected Area Management (JPAM), organised at IIPA, New Delhi, in September 1994.

JPAM Update 10 was prepared by Suniti K. Jha, Ashish Kothari and Farhad Vania. Ideas, comments, news and information may please be sent to Ashish Kothari, Indian Institute of Public Administration, Indraprastha Estate, New Delhi 110 002. Ph: (011) 331

JPAM UPDATE
News on Action Towards Joint Protected Area Management

No. 11

September 1996

EDITORIAL

Regular readers will notice that *JPAM Update* has been going through changes in format, and has also started providing information on protected areas in general, not just strictly restricted to what can narrowly be defined as joint management issues. Shri Kishore Rao of the Ministry of Environment and Forests (MoEF) has rightly asked: why this dilution in focus? We have increasingly been feeling that it is difficult to define a clear boundary between people-wildlife issues and other issues facing protected areas, including commercial threats, management problems, and research activities. Hence the expansion of scope, though we are continuing to keep out certain items like purely biological research. Other readers may like to react to this: should we restrict ourselves to people-wildlife issues or also cover other matters related to protected areas?

Our senior-most bureaucrat on wildlife, Shri S.C. Dey, Addl. Inspector General of Forests (Wildlife) in the MoEF, has recently come down heavily on NGOs who are critical of the government's track record vis-a-vis wildlife (see National News, in this issue). Since the precise text of his oral statement, made to senior forest officials, is not available, one cannot respond in detail. But one comment may be in place: rather than policing the activities of NGOs in and around protected areas, our government may be much better off ensuring the accountability of its own officers, offering to work with local communities and NGOs, and ensuring open public access to all information and programmes relating to wildlife. In this way, much greater support from the non-governmental sector can be obtained, and criticism of government may then be more informed and constructive.

Last, a comment on the major controversy of the month: criticism of India's (and in particular WWF's) efforts to save the tiger, by Tiger Trust, a UK-based group. A substantial part of what the Trust has said (faults within the governmental and NGO set-up; wastage of funds in pomp and show, etc.) is true. However, the Trust sounds amazingly fascist when it contends that funds used in meeting the needs of people near PAs, and in issues like "equity and sustainability", are a "drain". Certainly field conditions of the wildlife staff need tremendous improvement, but no amount of guns and guards will save the tiger if local communities are hostile because their needs and rights continue to be disrespected by conservation agencies. Tiger Trust would have done the tiger a greater favour by focusing on such structural problems relating to conservation, rather than training its guns on one NGO.

NEWS FROM SPECIFIC PROTECTED AREAS

BIHAR

Workshop on Dalma Sanctuary

A two day workshop on Dalma Sanctuary: Prospects for Conservation, was held in Jamshedpur on 12-13 August, 1996, jointly organised by Indian Institute of Public Administration (IIPA), New Delhi, and the Rural and Community Services Division, TISCO, Jamshedpur. Around sixty persons attended, including local villagers, NGO representatives and Forest Department staff. Several critical issues facing Dalma Sanctuary were discussed: perspectives of the importance of Dalma Sanctuary among those associated with the area; the relationship of local communities with the Forest Department; livelihood issues of the local villagers; impact of the *Sendra* (traditional annual hunt of the local tribes) on wildlife; elephant-human conflict; local self-initiated forest protection groups; and external pressures on the Sanctuary. An attempt was made to analyse existing problems and possibilities of an alternative strategy of management.

A joint resolution was adopted, with participants agreeing to work together to conserve Dalma Sanctuary, and recommending the following:

- i. Equal protection needs to be provided to Dalma Sanctuary as well as the rights of local villagers to forest resources.
- ii. The forest protection groups established by local villagers must be recognised and, to the extent possible, supported by the Forest Department.
- iii. Local people must be assured a decisive role in planning and management of the Sanctuary.
- iv. The practice of *Sendra* needs to be suitably reformed to mitigate its impact on wildlife, without unduly affecting the cultural and religious importance of the activity for local tribes.
- v. Crop damage compensation needs to be increased and procedures simplified.
- vi. Where necessary, relevant government orders and notifications should be passed, or existing ones suitably amended, to facilitate the above steps.

As part of follow-up to this workshop, a second, village level, workshop is being organised on 14-15 October at Gobarghusi village in the adjacent area of Dalma Sanctuary. This workshop will be organised by a local NGO, Shramjivi Unnayan.

Contact: Pramod Kumar, Shramjivi Unnayan, PO Gobarghusi 832 105, via Patamda, East Singhbhum, Bihar.

For the full report on the workshop (in Hindi), pl. contact **K. Christopher**, c/o Ashish Kothari, at the editorial address.

MEGHALAYA

Statement against mining near Balphakram National Park

Balphakram National Park, one of north-east India's critical

wildlife habitats, is threatened with the proposal to start mining and set up of a cement factory near it (pl. see, for details, *Update 9*). A statement has been issued by several prominent conservationists against this proposal. They have argued that it would disrupt the important corridor between Balphakram and other elephant habitats, and increase elephant-human conflicts. They have urged the government to drop the proposal, and instead acquire the corridor area for declaration into a protected area. Signatories include scientists from the Indian Institute of Science, Wildlife Institute of India, AMU Centre for Wildlife, Indian Statistical Institute, Zoological Survey of India, Bombay Natural History Society, Salim Ali Centre for Ornithology and Natural History, and Ranthambhor Foundation.

For a copy, pl. contact Ranthambhor Foundation, 19 Kautilya Marg, Chanakyapuri, New Delhi 110 021. Tel: (011) 301 6261; Fax: (011) 391 6261; Email: tiger.linking@access.net.in.

HIMACHAL PRADESH

Eco-development project in Great Himalayan National Park (GHNP)

In 1993 the Ministry of Environment and Forests initiated proceedings to undertake an ambitious eco-development project in two PAs, Kalakad Mundanthurai Tiger Reserve, Tamil Nadu and Great Himalayan National Park, Himachal Pradesh. Preliminary work towards detailed eco-development planning for GHNP began in 1994. In 1995 the Wildlife Institute of India began a long-term research project in the Park, on resource use activities and the potential for eco-development activities in the villages adjacent to GHNP.

While World Bank project documents state that NGOs and local communities are to be involved right from the conceptual stage of the project, reports from the area seem to indicate that this has not happened. Representatives of two local NGOs working in the area, Kisan Mazdoor Hak Sangathan and Society for the Advancement of Village Economy (SAVE), held meetings in Delhi on 29 & 31 July 1996, to discuss problems of local communities in and around GHNP and the likely inability of the proposed eco-development project to deal with them. The groups have reported a limited understanding of the project among major stakeholders in the Park, primarily due the lack of availability of accurate information. There is also absence of data on the extent and ecological impact of human use of the Park, especially herb collection and seasonal grazing. They have also claimed that the Forest Department, which could be a source of reasonably accurate information on the proposed project, has not made much effort to communicate the same among local communities or NGOs.

The meetings explored the possibility of establishing a GHNP support group in Delhi, and facilitating informal research and analysis of local issues that could be undertaken by the organisations based there. It was also decided to make a list of questions on eco-development drawn up by the local groups for wider circulation; initiate a study focusing on local conservation methods; and later organise a meeting on various issues facing GHNP.

Contact: Hukam Ram, Kisan Mazdoor Hak Sangathan, vill. Upper Railah, via Sainj, Dist. Kullu, Himachal Pradesh. Iqbal, SAVE, Sainj 175 134, District Kullu, Himachal

Pradesh. **Savyasachi**, Delhi Support Group, C-24 Press Enclave, New Delhi 110 117. Tel: (011) 6967674.

UTTAR PRADESH

Rajaji National Park in the news again!

In May 1995 the Chief Wildlife Warden, UP had issued a government order (GO) (no. 719/12-1) regarding the controlled removal of grass and fallen trees from selected PAs and other forest areas of the State (see *JPAM Update 9*). The GO states: "In Jan.-Feb.1996, grass may be removed from national parks and sanctuaries in the interest of wildlife conservation, by local communities who have had customary rights to do so in the past."

This step could have played a major role in reducing the conflicts between Park officials and local villagers. However, according to reports received from the Ghad Kshetra Mazdoor Sangharsh Samiti (GKMSS), a people's organisation working in the area for the last six years, there has been a distorted interpretation of the GO by the Park authorities. Instead of giving the responsibility of the extraction to local communities, the authorities allegedly gave it to contractors, who then sold the grass to villagers! There has been considerable public resentment due to this.

On 1 Sept., 1996, GKMSS organised a public meeting at village Buggawalla, in which about 50 people from seven villages adjacent to the Park participated. Apart from discussing the above issue, there was also a detailed discussion on the establishment of forest protection committees at the village level, which could legitimately avail of the opportunity offered by the provisions of the GO. This is also in keeping with the recommendations of the interim report on Rajaji National Park prepared by Justice P.S. Poti for the Indian People's Tribunal on Human Rights and the Environment (See *JPAM Update 4*).

The forest protection committees will be set up at the village level with 20-50 people as members, depending on the size of the village. 50% of committee members will be women. GKMSS has subsequently written to the U.P. Forest Department to ensure that *bhabbar* grass extraction is given to the local communities in the coming season (winter 1996-97).

Contact: Jaiprakash/Roma, GKMSS, vill. Buggawalla, via Biharigarh, Dist. Haridwar, Uttar Pradesh. **Ashok Choudhary**, Vikalp, 11 Mangal Nagar, Saharanpur 247 001, Uttar Pradesh. Tel: (0132) 724 507.

NATIONAL NEWS

Addl. Inspector General (Wildlife) reacts to adverse publicity

The Addl. IG (WL), Ministry of Environment and Forests, Shri S.C. Dey, has reacted strongly to recent accusations by NGOs over the deteriorating state of wildlife conservation in the country. According to newspaper reports (*The Pioneer* 16/08/96) the Addl. IG has accused un-named, foreign funded organisations of carrying out research in PAs "without obtaining proper permission of the concerned State or the Union Government."

The Chief Wildlife Wardens of all states have been asked to

keep a check on wildlife research activities currently in progress, besides highlighting the achievements of the state Forest Departments themselves. They have also been asked to provide accurate and up-to-date information on various aspects including current levels of human use of PAs. On the issue of availability of resources, the Addl. IG pointed out that there was little return investment by state governments in forests and wildlife when compared to the revenue generated by the sector, which is about Rs.40,000 crores.

More eco-development news

On 5 Sept. 1996, the India eco-development project, covering seven PAs across India (Periyar, Gir, Ranthambhor, Rajiv Gandhi/Nagarahole, Pench, Buxa, Palamau) received formal approval for funding from the World Bank.

This project has been at the centre of controversy for the last couple of years; *JPAM Update* has been carrying occasional news (see, for instance, No. 9, on Nagarahole). The latest salvo was fired by a group of eminent people on 12 July 1996, who issued a statement drafted by the Centre for Science and Environment (CSE), New Delhi. They stated that eco-development, in its present framework, could not relieve pressures on PAs, which was in fact the main objective of the project. The fundamental premise of the project, that poverty forces people to depend on PAs and other forests, is wrong. It is in fact the disempowerment, brought about by the implementation of wildlife laws that do not consider the needs of local people, that is the major problem facing local communities, and not poverty. The project does not address this issue in any significant way. In addition, the project does not consider reducing the commercial pressures on PAs, as part of its strategy.

The statement was also critical of the substantial loan component of the project, and the absence of space to provide any meaningful role in management to communities. It demanded an immediate withdrawal of the project and urged that alternate community based conservation initiatives be encouraged and supported.

Signatories included: Medha Patkar (Narmada Bachao Andolan activist), Rajni Kothari (political analyst), Madhav Gadgil (Indian Institute of Science, Bangalore), Anil Agarwal (CSE, New Delhi), Walter Fernandes (Indian Social Institute, New Delhi), George Fernandes (Samata Party leader), Avdhash Kaushal (Rural Litigation and Entitlement Kendra, Dehradun).

There appears to have been no public response from the Ministry of Environment and Forests so far.

Contact: Ravi Sharma/Neena Singh, Center for Science and Environment, 41 Tughlakabad Institutional Area, New Delhi 110 062. Tel: (011) 698 3394; Fax: (011) 698 5879; Email: cse@unv.emet.in.

Further contributions by NGOs to the Wildlife Act amendments committee

The Committee set up by the Ministry of Environment and Forests, Government of India, to recommend amendments to the Wild Life (Protection) Act, continued its deliberations and started actual redrafting of the Act (see the last three *JPAM Updates* for information). Some more NGO submissions that have come in:

Sharad Kulkarni and Ajay Dolke of the **Van Vidheyak**

Samiksha Samanvay, Maharashtra, put together the comments and ideas of several NGOs and individuals and completely redrafted the Act itself. Their (draft) version has several thrusts:

1. Constitution of new bodies at the central and state level, including a Central Wildlife Act Monitoring and Implementing Commission (to replace the existing Indian Board for Wildlife), a State Wildlife Act Monitoring and Implementing Board (to replace the existing Wildlife Advisory Boards), a Sanctuary Settlement Board (to replace the Collector in the inquiry regarding people's rights), a Commissioner of Wildlife Conservation, and local management committees.
2. All major decisions regarding protected areas and wildlife to be taken by governments only in consultation with, or by permission of, the above bodies.
3. In addition to National Parks, Sanctuaries, and Closed Areas (already in the Act), two other categories to be established: Conservation Areas and Biosphere Reserves.
4. National and State Biodiversity Conservation Funds to be constituted, with tourism revenues, national and international donations, etc.

The authors are still looking for comments on this draft.

Contact: Sharad Kulkarni/Ajay Dolke, Van Vidheyak Samiksha Samanvay, c/o Anubhav Shiksha Kendra, 1B Kaul Building, Gurunanak Nagar, Shankarshet Road, Pune 411 042, Maharashtra. Tel: (0212) 416 283.

Ashish Kothari, on behalf of the **Indian Institute of Public Administration JPAM team**, submitted a completely revised version of the Act's chapter on protected areas, with the following thrusts:

- i. Expansion of the categories of protected (renamed "conservation") areas to include four new ones: Strict Nature Reserves (with no human use, managed by government), Resource Reserves (for sustainable extraction of resources, managed jointly by communities and government), Community Reserves (sacred groves, etc., managed entirely by communities), and Biosphere Reserves (conservation and traditional resource uses over a large landscape, managed by regional boards consisting of all stakeholders). Criteria and management strategies for each category have been briefly laid out.
- ii. Detailed procedures for establishing the rights and activities of local communities, and determining the termination/continuation of these with full involvement of the communities.
- iii. Constitution of Conservation Area Management Committees for each conservation area of the following categories: National Parks, Sanctuaries, Resource Reserves, and Biosphere Reserves.
- iv. Stringent procedures for screening new activities proposed within and around conservation areas, especially to safeguard against destructive developmental/industrial projects.
- v. A one-time national review of existing protected areas, to recategorise them, and to constitute appropriate Committees for their management.
- vi. Periodic reviews of the state and national wildlife plans.
- vii. Creation of a Conservation Fund for each area, to be fed by tourism and other revenues, and to be used for conservation work, staff welfare, and livelihood generation for communities.

A copy of the revised chapter can be requested from us at the editorial address.

Suggestions for changes in the Wildlife Protection Act have also been sent in by individuals. **Sanjay Upadhyay**, a Delhi-based lawyer has suggested the following:

- i. The term "right" or "rights" must be clearly and unambiguously defined by the Act itself, and should include traditional usufruct and easement rights.
- ii. Provision must be made to ensure public consultation before any area is declared a sanctuary or national park. Central government approval, or that of a committee

appointed by it, prior to the declaration of an area as sanctuary or national park, or to boundary alteration, must also be mandatory.

- iii. The Wildlife Advisory Board must be a statutory body, with rules governing its functioning incorporated in the Act.
- iv. Penal provisions should be made more stringent and all wildlife related offences made non-bailable. In addition, the maximum sum payable for compounding an offence (currently Rs.2000), should be raised.
- v. The Schedules in the Act listing endangered flora and fauna should be simplified, and in the case of plants substantially expanded.

List of NGOs who have made submissions to the Wildlife Act amendments Committee

<i>Organisation</i>	<i>Summary in JPAM Update No.</i>
1. <i>National Committee for Protection of Common Land Resources</i> , Ootacamund, Tamil Nadu	7
2. <i>VIKSAT</i> , Ahmedabad, Gujarat	8 & 9
3. <i>Karnataka Rajya Moolnivasi Budakattu Janara Vedike and Tribal Joint Action Committee Karnataka</i> , Karnataka	9
4. <i>Wildlife First!</i> , Bangalore, Karnataka	9
5. <i>Indian Institute of Public Administration</i> , New Delhi	9 & 11
6. <i>Econet</i> , Pune, Maharashtra	10
7. <i>Rhino Foundation</i> , Guwahati, Assam	10
8. <i>Centre for Ecological Sciences</i> , Indian Institute of Science, Bangalore, Karnataka	10
9. <i>Nature Lovers Movement</i> , Thiruvankulam, Kerala.	10
10. <i>Ranthambhor Foundation</i> , New Delhi.	10
.	
11. <i>Van Vidheyak Samiksha Samanvay</i> , Pune, Maharashtra	11
.	

For more information on the progress of the Committee's work, pl. contact: **Kishore Rao**, Addl. Inspector General of Forests (Wildlife), Ministry of Environment and Forests, Paryavaran Bhawan, CGO Complex, Lodi Estate, New Delhi 110 003. Ph: (011) 436 0957; Fax: (011) 436 0678.

Mining projects threaten Indian PAs

The MoEF has recently granted clearance to several large-scale mining projects across the country, according to a press report (*Hindustan Times* 21/08/96). While the Environment Impact Division of the MoEF has been rapidly clearing projects on the assurance that their environmental impact will be adequately managed, the wildlife section of the Ministry has filed an affidavit in the Supreme Court endorsing the claim that PAs be treated as 'no development zones.' Conservationists have strongly objected to the spate of ongoing and proposed mining

projects in and around PAs. The table on the next page gives information, from various sources, on mining in/around PAs across the country.

Palamau Tiger Reserve, Bihar and Tadoba Tiger Reserve, Maharashtra are also threatened by mining but details are not known. Readers who have more information are urged to send it to us, to include in future issues of *JPAM Update*. In addition, information on this issue is being put together by Bikram Grewal, who can be contacted at: 101/4 Kaushalya Park, Hauz Khas, New Delhi 110 016. Tel: (011) 696 1520. Fax: (011) 686 4614; Email: bikram.gmpltld@access.net.in.

Mining in and around some protected areas (information from various sources)

Company	State	Mineral	Lease area	PA likely to be affected
Ambujas	Gujarat	Limestone	905 ha	5 km from Gir National Park
SAIL, Kemangundi	Karnataka	Iron ore	not known	6 km from Bhadra Sanctuary
Kudremukh Iron Ore Corp. Ltd.	Karnataka	Iron ore	Over 4000 ha	Kudremukh National Park
Not known	West Bengal	Dolomite	not known	Buxa Tiger Reserve
Private operators	MP	Limestone	930 ha	Proposed extension of Madhav National Park
Private operators	MP	White sandstone	not known	Panna Tiger Reserve
Private operators	Rajasthan	Red sandstone & limestone	630 ha	Kailadevi Sanctuary (part of Ranthambhor Tiger Reserve)
ACC	Meghalaya	Limestone	not known	Near Balphakram National Park
INDAL	Maharashtra	Bauxite	not known	In and near Radhanagri Sanctuary

INTERNATIONAL NEWS

Session on 'People and Parks' at World Rainforest Movement (WRM) meeting

The WRM is a loose coalition of NGOs, both from the North and South, working on a wide range of issues related to forests. A major concern of WRM is the impact of international treaties, multilateral and bilateral aid, and other processes, especially on indigenous people and other poor and marginalised communities. The group is also involved in tracking private investment in logging, plantations, paper mills, etc.

At its meeting in Oxford, UK, on 29 August-2 September, 1996, one session was devoted to the issue of protected areas and their impact on local communities. Concern was expressed at the subtle move in some countries to turn common lands to protected areas, and then protected areas to private property, usually under the control of large trans-national corporations. An interesting example of involving local communities in protected area management was reported from northern Thailand. The Indian experience with protected areas was also presented by a member of the IIPA JPAM team, including details of the JPAM initiative being considered for some areas.

The Forest People's Programme (FPP), a WRM project, will act as a focal point for networking on this issue. It will also organise a meeting in South America in February next year on the issue of people and protected areas.

Contact: Marcus Colchester/Saskia Onzinga, Forest People's Programme, World Rainforest Movement, 8 Chapel Row, Chadlington, Oxfordshire OX7 3NA, England, UK. Tel: (44 1608) 676 691; Fax: (44 1608) 676 743; Email: wrm@gn.apc.org.

UPCOMING

Diamond Jubilee celebrations at Corbett Tiger Reserve

Wildlife Week events: Various events have been proposed for Wildlife Week (1-7 October, 1996) at Corbett Tiger Reserve particularly for educational institutions. These include: essay

writing; painting and quiz competitions; debate; marathon run; and bird watching camp.

Fifth bird-watching camp at Gairal: The Corbett Foundation is sponsoring a bird watching camp for raptor identification and behaviour at Gairal. A total of 20 participants can be accommodated of which 10 places are reserved for Corbett Tiger Reserve staff. The camp is expected to cost Rs.300/per participant. **Dates: 11-15 December 1996**

Contact: Rajiv Bhartari, Dy Director, Corbett Tiger Reserve, Ramnagar 244 715, District Nainital, Uttar Pradesh. Tel: (05945) 85 489, 85 332; Fax: (05945) 85 376.

Orissa State level seminar on Wildlife Protection Act

The Council of Professional Social Workers (CPSW) and Media Analysis & Service System (MASS) are collaborating to organise a two-day seminar/workshop of Orissa based NGOs on 2-3 October 1996. The twin themes will be: a) proposed amendments to the Wildlife Protection Act (on 2nd), and b) conservation strategies for the Satkosia Gorge Sanctuary and Baisipalli area (on 3rd). The meeting on 2nd will be for groups working with local communities in and around PAs of Orissa, while on the 3rd a larger audience comprising Forest Department officials, other government functionaries, scientists, academics, etc. are also expected to participate.

The organisers have offered to bear all expenses except travel costs, for selected participants. Accommodation has been arranged at Angul, while the venue for the meeting is Tikarapara. Local transport to Tikarapara will be made available.

Contact: M. Pradhan, Secretary, CPSW, N 1/188 IRC Village, Nayapalli, Bhubaneswar 751015, Orissa. Tel: (0674) 417 715; Fax: (0674) 409 156. **B. Mishra,** MASS, Sikhyapada, Angul 759 112, Orissa. Tel: (06764) 302 33.

Meeting on PAs and People in Maharashtra

The third state-level meeting on protected areas and people is being organised in October (dates not fixed), at Malvan, Sindhudurg District, Maharashtra. The meeting will attempt to bring together conservationists, local community representatives,

NGOs and activists, forest and other government officials, and journalists, to discuss the various conflicts facing PAs, in particular related to local communities.

Contact: Kusum Kamik, At & P.O. Manchar, Dist. Pune 410 503, Maharashtra.

World Conservation Congress, Canada

The 20th General Assembly of the IUCN-World Conservation Union (13-23 October, 1996), is the occasion for the World Conservation Congress, to be held in Montreal, Canada. October 17 to 21st will be reserved for a series of exhibits, workshops, and panel discussions on major themes, including Conserving Diversity, Protecting and Managing Land for Conservation, Strategies for Sustainability, Involving People, Economics as a Tool for Conservation, and Acting on Global Issues.

A three-day workshop on Collaborative Management for Conservation will be held on 17-20 October. Participation is from several countries, with experience sharing of joint management programmes, and discussion on a resolution to be adapted by the General Assembly.

Contact: Grazia Borrini-Feyerabend, Social Policy Unit, IUCN - The World Conservation Union, 28 Rue Mauverney, CH-1196 Gland, Switzerland. Tel: (41-22) 999 0001; Fax: (41-22) 999 0025; Email: gbf@hq.iucn.org.

JPAM workshop in Kailadevi Sanctuary

The IIPA JPAM team is proposing to hold a workshop in Kailadevi Sanctuary, tentatively towards the end of October. The objective of the workshop is to initiate interaction between the local communities and the Forest Department. Specific agenda points will include: rights of local communities; traditional knowledge and practices; impact of the local communities on the Sanctuary and vice versa; community-initiated Forest Protection Committees; and potential for joint management.

Contact: Priya Das, c/o Ashish Kothari, at the editorial address.

16th Maharashtra State Friends of Birds Meet, January 1997

The Vihang Mandal, a Solapur-based NGO in Maharashtra is organising its 16th Friends of Birds Meet on 11-12 January 1997. Solapur is an arid drought prone district, forming ideal habitat for the endangered Great Indian Bustard (GIB). There is a GIB Sanctuary at Nanaj comprising mostly of cultivation. There is an urgent need to evolve innovative management strategies for the region which will ensure the continued survival of the GIB as well give local farmers a stake in its conservation. Participants at the meet will include ornithologists, administrators, Forest Department officials, NGO representatives and other individuals interested in birds.

Contact: Pravinsinh Pardeshi/Dr. Ninad V. Shah, 94 Siddeshwar Peth, Umbarje Building, Solapur 413 001, Maharashtra. Tel. (N. Shah): (0217) 651 863 (Office).

WHAT'S AVAILABLE?

- Kothari, A., N. Singh and S. Suri. 1996. *People & Protected Areas : Towards Participatory Conservation in India*. Sage Publications India Pvt. Ltd., New Delhi. Pp.276. Rs. 200 (PB); Rs. 350 (HB).

A compilation of papers first presented at a workshop in 1994, this is the first book-length review of the subject in India. Contains 17 papers by social activists, conservationists, foresters and scientists. Also contains several case studies of specific PAs and a detailed bibliography.

Contact: Sage Publications India Pvt. Ltd., PO Box 4215, New Delhi 110 048. Tel: (011) 648 58854, 644 4958; Fax: (011) 647 2426.

- Ghorpade, K.D. 1996. *Hunting and conservation in Zimbabwe : the lessons for Indian conservationists*. Unpubl. Mimeo. Pp.8.

This paper compares the experiences of state-sponsored wildlife conservation in India and Zimbabwe. It highlights the successful (though somewhat controversial) CAMPFIRE initiative in Zimbabwe and outlines lessons from it for India. The author advocates re-introduction of species in former habitats; meaningful involvement of local communities in PA management; sport hunting; and flexibility in the Wildlife Protection Act.

Contact: K.D. Ghorpade, Dattawad House, 334E Shahupuri, Kolhapur 416 001, Maharashtra. Tel/fax: (0231) 654 443.

- WWF - India. 1996. *Tiger Conservation Strategy and Action Plan..* World Wide Fund for Nature - India, New Delhi. Pp.35.

The document gives brief information on the status of the tiger including numbers, distribution, threats, and conservation efforts both by government and non-government agencies. The main activities proposed to be undertaken by WWF-I, over an initial period of two years, include: influence policy and decision making; mobilize grassroots support in tiger range areas; assist and strengthen enforcement measures; generate greater awareness and mobilize public support; and facilitate international cooperation.

Contact: WWF - India, 172B Lodhi Estate, New Delhi 110 003. Tel: (011) 461 6532, 469 3744. Fax: (011) 462 6837. Email: wwfindel@emet.unv.in.

- Rhino Foundation & WPSI. 1996. *Impact assessment of proposed ACC cement plant near Balphakram National Park*. The Rhino Foundation for Nature in North East India, and Wildlife Protection Society of India, New Delhi. Pp.16.

Dealing with the proposed ACC operations near Balphakram, the report is a description of the area and the problems it faces. Though not a full impact assessment, the report does

identify some of the potential impacts the ACC cement plant will have on habitat and wildlife, and provides some baseline information.

Contact: Wildlife Protection Society of India, Thapar House, 124 Janpath, New Delhi 110 001. Tel: (011) 332 0573; Fax: (011) 332 7729.

- Anon. 1996. *The World Bank in Nagarahole (with assistance from the state): A story of human rights violations, lies and deceit*. Pp.58.

A compilation of letters, statements, portions of official documents, newsclippings, etc. on the GEF funded eco-development project in Nagarahole (now Rajiv Gandhi) National Park, Karnataka. Includes a critique of the official eco-development plan that was presented at the last GEF consultations in Washington and a useful list of names and addresses of GEF, World Bank and UNDP officials associated with GEF projects around the world.

Contact: Anita & Edwin, 658, 45 Cross, 11 A Main, Jayanagar Block 5, Bangalore 560 041. Tel: (080) 663 5622; Fax: (080) 6633538; Email: admin@bco.frlht.ernet.in.

LETTERS / MISCELLANEOUS

Clarification on *JPAM Update 10* news items on Gir and Narayan Sarovar

Shri Kishore Rao, Deputy Inspector General (Wildlife) at the MoEF has sent in clarifications on the news items on Gir National Park and Narayan Sarovar Sanctuary that were carried in *JPAM Update 10*. Relevant parts of his letter are reproduced here in full:

“I would also like to point out that the news item relating to the lions of **Gir N.P.** has been very casually written and has

factual inaccuracies. We have had a detailed report on the census operations carried out by the State Forest Dept. in Gir in May, 1995 and this document is freely available from them. Involvement of local and national NGOs and other experts in the census operation has been clearly mentioned therein. Moreover, the exact number of lions inhabiting the coastal forests, Girnar Hills and Mityala area has been recorded and the reasons clearly identified. In fact, the reasons for the lions straying out of Gir is extensively studied and documented by the WII as well. I may add that straying of lions outside Gir is a historical fact as mentioned in the book on the Asiatic Lions written by Mr. Rashid and Dr. R. David. Besides, there is no question of any forcible relocation of Maldharis from Gir, particularly because of the fact that Gir is now a project site under the India Eco-development Project, and the World Bank's Operational Directive No. 420 clearly guards against this eventuality. No relocation can take place without a detailed study and their prior approval. You will recall that Simlipal in Orissa was dropped as one of the project sites from the India Eco-development Project because the assurances on voluntary relocation were not found to be satisfactory by the World Bank.

As regards the news item on **Narayan Sarovar Sanctuary**, I may add that four NGOs of Gujarat, namely Lok Adhikar Sangh, Ahmedabad, Centre for Social Knowledge and Action, Ahmedabad, Gujarat Jan Jagaran Sangh, Banaskantha and Kutch Lok Samiti, Kutch have filed a Special Civil Application (No. 8799 of 1995) in the High Court of Gujarat seeking a stay on the resolution passed by the Gujarat Legislative Assembly denotifying a part of the Sanctuary, and stopping the grant of any permission or licence for setting up industries, and for establishing a high powered committee to go into all aspects of the matter.”

Change of email number

JPAM Update 10 had carried an item on WWF-International's proposals for tiger conservation world-wide. The contact person, Tom Mathews, now has a new email number.

Contact: Tom Mathews, Director (East and South Asia), WWF-US, 1250, 24th St. NW, Washington, DC 20037-1175, USA. Tel: (1-202) 293 4800; Fax: (1-202) 293 9211/9345; Email: mathew@wwfus.org.

JPAM Update is produced bimonthly as a follow up to the workshop on Exploring the Possibilities of Joint Protected Area Management (JPAM), organised at IIPA, New Delhi, in September 1994. *JPAM Update 11* was prepared by Priya Das, K. Christopher, Suniti K. Jha, Ashish Kothari & Farhad Vania. Secretarial support: Vishal Thakre & Sangeeta Kaintura.

Ideas, comments, news and information may please be sent to: Ashish Kothari, Indian Institute of Public Administration, Indraprastha Estate, New Delhi 110 002. Tel: (011) 331 7309; Fax: (011) 331 9954; Email: akothari@unv.ernet.in.

JPAM UPDATE
News on Action Towards Joint Protected Area Management

No. 12

December 1996

EDITORIAL

Our natural environment is important for its ecological and wildlife value, as also for being the survival base of hundreds of millions of rural people. While it is morally imperative that nature and wildlife be protected in their own right, the survival rights of these people cannot be swept aside in the process. And vice versa.

The Supreme Court orders to throw out all encroachments from the Delhi Ridge Reserved Forest (See NEWS FROM SPECIFIC PROTECTED AREAS), which includes the area of the Asola Wildlife Sanctuary, has threatened several thousand slum-dwellers and villagers with eviction. Predictably, government and private agencies (including the armed forces and luxury farmhouses), the biggest destroyers of the Ridge, remain relatively untouched.

In Pench National Park (See NEWS FROM SPECIFIC PROTECTED AREAS), a recent petition has stopped fishing by local people in the reservoir, and a counter-petition by fisherfolk has challenged this. Conservationists point out that outside vested interests, such as fish traders, often benefit in the name of the poor. But in the process of targeting these unscrupulous elements, it is the poor who are worst affected, including the handful of families in Pench for whom fishing is the main livelihood. Unfortunately, conservationists have done little to help such people gain a respectable livelihood which can take them away from the clutches of commercial interests. Unfortunately too, human rights activists have ignored the fact that legally protected areas have often been the best defence against destructive industrial expansion, and that the poor are often a facade for vested interests.

Urban conservationists have to rid themselves of the blind spots which often lead them to have a touching faith in bureaucracy, to avoid confronting their own consumerist lifestyles which cause far more damage than local communities, and to continue with an attitude (rather unscientific) that assumes any resource use (except tourism!) as detrimental to biodiversity. On their part, social activists would do well to be sensitive to the intricacies of wildlife habitats, and the dangers of populist versions of local community control. Such reorientation of both sides of the debate will be crucial, given the increasing level of conflicts in and around protected areas, and the fact that there is a petition before the Supreme Court asking all state governments to move ahead with the procedures concerning rights in protected areas.

Unfortunately, the commercial-industrial economy has pitched environmentalist against environmentalist, activist vs. activist, as can be seen in the Asola, Pench, Rajaji, and other protected areas. Those who have realised that the only beneficiaries of this fight are industrialists/contractors/politicians, are trying to join hands in a common cause: saving the natural habitats

which are the homes of wildlife and the resource base of forest-dwellers and fisherfolk and pastoralists. On an understanding that environmental sustainability and social justice are non-separable, conservationists and human rights advocates need agreement on some basic elements of a common platform, e.g. *no forcible displacement of local communities from either environmental or developmental projects; no exploitation of threatened wildlife species; rejection of commercial-industrial projects in natural habitats; and equitable partnerships for conservation and livelihood generation.*

We invite your comments and suggestions on this vital issue.

NEWS FROM SPECIFIC PROTECTED AREAS

ASSAM

Local communities assist in protection of Chakrashila Sanctuary

Nature's Beckon, an NGO which was instrumental in the declaration of the Chakrashila Wildlife Sanctuary, has reported that villagers are contributing significantly in the protection of the area. The Sanctuary harbours a population of the endangered Golden langur. In 1994 the NGO had facilitated a meeting between the Forest Department and local communities to work out the principles of Community Forest Management (CFM). Initial efforts at CFM have been undertaken in the forests of Salkocha Range. In January 1995 the villagers are reported to have apprehended four tiger poachers in the Sanctuary, and later that year in June, timber smugglers were also caught by them.

The organisation has organised awareness and education programmes in and around several other protected areas in Assam including Manas Tiger Reserve, Kaziranga National Park, and Dibru Saikhowa, Pabitora, and Rajiv Gandhi Wildlife Sanctuaries. Education material like booklets, folders and posters have also been developed in local languages. The group brings out a newsletter highlighting its various activities (see WHAT'S AVAILABLE?).

Contact: Soumyadeep Datta, Director, Nature's Beckon, "Datta Bari" Ward No. 1, Dhubri 783 301, Assam. Tel : 03662-20 167; Fax : 03662-20 076.

BIHAR

Follow-up workshop in Dalma Sanctuary

Following the Workshop on Dalma Sanctuary: Prospects for Conservation, organised in Jamshedpur by the Indian Institute of Public Administration (as part of the project on Participatory Management of Protected Areas), and Tata Steel Rural Development Society in August 1996 (See *JPAM Update 11*), a series of village-level meetings have been planned. The first of these was organised by Shramjivi Unnayan, a local NGO at Gobarghusi, in end-November 1996. The aim was to discuss in greater detail the recommendations of the Jamshedpur workshop, and develop specific plans for some aspects of Dalma Sanctuary's conservation and local community livelihood. A report on the meeting is awaited.

Contact: (For information on Dalma and the earlier workshop) **K. Christopher**, at the editorial address. (For information on the Gobarghusi workshop) **Pramod Kumar**, Shramjivi Unnayan, PO Gobarghusi 832 105, via Patamda, East Singhbhum District, Bihar.

DELHI

Forced eviction from Asola Sanctuary

The 7,777 ha. Delhi Ridge forest has been under constant threat for several decades, from the development pressures of the capital of India, including construction of roads, armed forces activities, conversion to parks, etc. Pressure from environmental organisations over several years has resulted in some level of protection, including its declaration as a Reserve Forest.

In the most recent incident the State Government has been forced to implement a Supreme Court order to free the Ridge from all encroachments. However, in the several months since the judgment, most major occupations by government/private agencies have continued, while the authorities have moved quickly to evict poor slum-dwellers and villagers. In the latest incident, eviction notices were issued to residents of Sanjay, Balbir and Indira Colonies from the Asola Sanctuary area of the Delhi Ridge. The several thousand strong affected population primarily comprises construction worker families who have been living in these colonies for over twenty years. While some alternate area has been identified, this also appears to be a part of the Ridge, though not in its legally notified part. Mostly ravinous, the site is in any case unfit for habitation.

The people have now organised themselves, with help from members of the National Alliance of People's Movements, under the banner of Gram Bachao Sangharsh Samiti, to oppose their forced eviction. Environmental groups like Kalpavriksh, Srishti, Vatavaran, WWF-I (Delhi-Haryana State Unit) and Development Research and Action Group (DRAG) have supported their struggle; they have asked for the removal of the bigger destroyers (including the Indian Army) first, a negotiated settlement with the villagers, and an investigation on why luxury farmhouses adjacent to the villages have not been targeted for eviction.

Contact: **Gram Bachao Sangharsh Samiti**, Sanjay Colony, Bhatti Mines, New Delhi 110 030. **Vimal**, National Alliance of People's Movements, c/o Delhi Forum, F 10/12 Malviya Nagar, New Delhi 110 017. Tel: 011-642 6783.

GUJARAT

Threat to denotify Dhrangadhra Wild Ass Sanctuary

The Dhrangadhra Wild Ass Sanctuary, falling in five coastal districts of Gujarat, was established in 1973 to protect the Indian wild ass (*Equus hemionus khur*) and its last remaining habitat in the Little Rann of Kutch. The adjacent area of the Sanctuary is reported to have 107 villages. These, and additional villages from further away, are dependent on the Sanctuary for salt manufacture, grazing and fishing. Roughly 20% of the salt produced in India is reported to come from this region. An estimated 40,000 people and large numbers of vehicles associated with the salt manufacturing industry are reported to operate inside the Sanctuary.

A local NGO, Dhrangadhra Prakruti Mandal (DPM), has expressed concern over threats facing the Sanctuary. Indiscriminate expansion of salt manufacturing and a possible move to denotify the Sanctuary under pressure from the salt industry, needs to be urgently countered. The organisation has made the following suggestions to mitigate some of the problems presently affecting the Sanctuary:

- Regulation of the salt manufacturing industry.
- Completion of the rights and leases settlement procedure for the Sanctuary.
- Management and enforcement; improvement of degraded habitat.
- Studies on various aspects of flora, fauna and pressures affecting the area.
- Pollution control and halting desert expansion.
- Shifting of military activities out of the area.
- Vigilance among NGOs/conservationists against attempts to denotify the Sanctuary.

A petition to this effect has been filed in the Gujarat High Court by DPM on 2/11/96, with Jhalama Unnati Astha (Dhrangadhra) and Gujarat Nature Conservation Society (Baroda) as co-litigants. Notices have been served by the court to the central and state governments. In addition, the Delhi-based organisation Kalpavriksh has written to the Governor, Chief Minister and Chief Wildlife Warden, Gujarat and Secretary, Ministry of Environment and Forests, seeking clarification on some of the issues concerning the Sanctuary, and suggesting a participatory planning and management process for defining an appropriate land use plan for the area.

This is the third instance of a wildlife sanctuary in Gujarat being threatened with denotification. The first was the infamous case of a large area of Narayan Sarovar Sanctuary being denotified to make way for a Sanghi industries cement plant; the second was to aid the establishment of the proposed Reliance Oil Refinery adjacent to Marine National Park, which has fortunately not yet materialised.

Contact : **Dr. Harin Vadodaria**, Dhrangadhra Prakruti Mandal, opp. State Bank of India, Dhrangadhra 363 310, Gujarat. Tel : 02754-22 023, 22 291.

MADHYA PRADESH

Petition on Pench Tiger Reserve

A petition filed by Animal and Environment Legal Defence Fund in the Supreme Court has resulted in a stay on fishing in the Pench reservoir inside Pench National Park and Tiger Reserve which straddles both MP and Maharashtra. While the government of Maharashtra has banned fishing, MP had recently issued fishing licenses to 305 families who had been displaced when the reservoir came up. Conservationists allege that the actual beneficiaries of the licenses are contractors, and that the fishing activity causes considerable disturbance in the Park.

A counter-petition has been filed by some of the fisherfolk, arguing that their survival is threatened by the stay order. Already displaced by the Pench Dam, benefits from which do not reach them anyway, they are bitter that now conservationists are cutting off their livelihood source.

Once again, a classic case of environment vs. livelihoods (see EDITORIAL), created by an ill-conceived development project, threatens to snowball into a major controversy, unless some mutually acceptable compromise can be worked out, which ensures a secure livelihood to the villagers while maintaining the conservation value of Pench National Park. An independent investigation is urgently required. *JPAM Update* will keep you posted on further developments; meanwhile, readers with information and ideas on this issue are urged to write in.

RAJASTHAN

'Kailadevi Sanctuary : Prospects for Conservation' workshop

A workshop was conducted at Kailadevi on 6-7 December 1996, by the Indian Institute of Public Administration (as part of the project on Participatory Management of Protected Areas), and the Society for Sustainable Development, Karauli. The workshop was aimed at initiating constructive dialogue between villagers living inside the Sanctuary, wildlife officials and NGOs, on issues affecting conservation of the area as well as the resource requirements of local communities. Kailadevi Sanctuary is a part of the buffer zone of the Ranthambhor Tiger Reserve.

The two-day Workshop was attended by about 60 villagers from 20 villages, three NGOs (Society for Sustainable Development, Karauli, WWF-India, Ranthambhor and IIPA, New Delhi), and several other concerned individuals.

Regretably, the Forest Department was absent from the Workshop, other than a solitary Forest Guard, despite repeated assurances (including a personal one from the Field Director Shri S.S. Chaudhry) that they would come. The Workshop had already been rescheduled once, from November to December, at the request of the Forest Department. However, a few retired Forest Department officials made significant contributions to the discussions.

The major issues discussed at the Workshop were the following:

- The rights of villagers to natural resources for sustenance and to sources of livelihood, keeping in consideration the

conservation value of the Sanctuary.

- Measures to stop the various external pressures on the Sanctuary including: illegal felling, entry of livestock such as the migratory sheep of the Rabari community, and mining.
- Empowering the village forest protection committees/panchayats, to conserve the area more effectively.

Workshop participants issued a joint resolution on these issues, containing recommendations for specific measures. On the issue of **livelihood and employment** it was recommended that water availability be urgently enhanced, the productivity of their limited land and livestock be improved, and suitable sources of employment be provided. In addition, adequate and quick compensation for the damage done to crops and livestock by wild animals should be paid. The villagers rejected any attempts at forcible displacement, and stressed that they would ensure conservation of the forests while meeting their livelihood requirements in their existing locations. On the issue of **external pressures** it was recommended that cattle camps set up by villagers from outside the sanctuary not be permitted once adequate water/fodder arrangements for the resident villagers were available inside; that migratory Rabaris with their sheep herds not be permitted into the entire area; and that illegal felling from outside be tackled by giving more powers to the village level committees. Related to this was the third issue, that of **people's participation** in the management of the Sanctuary. For this, it was recommended that the village-level Forest Protection Committees (FPCs), elected by the whole village, should be legally recognised and registered, and should consist of all caste/ethnic communities of the village. At least two out of five members should be women. The FPCs should have the powers of a Forest Ranger, in order to check illegal activities; they should be involved in arbitration in cases of forest offenses committed, and should get 50% of all fines levied in such cases.

The participating villagers also sent a letter to the Rajasthan Chief Minister, protesting the absence of the Forest Department at the workshop, and demanding that it be present for future such meetings.

A full workshop report is currently under preparation and will be available shortly. Participants have decided to meet again on January 30, 1997, at Kailadevi, to review steps taken as follow-up to this workshop.

Contact: Priya Das, at the *JPAM Update* editorial address. Arun Jindal, Society for Sustainable Development, Karauli, District Sawai Madhopur, Rajasthan. Tel: 07464-20 065; 21 065.

UTTAR PRADESH

Steps towards community involvement in Rajaji National Park

Following two meetings between local community and NGO representatives, the Field Director, Rajaji National Park, and representatives from research institutions including the Wildlife Institute of India, Dehradun and the Indian Institute of Public Administration, New Delhi, a proposal to facilitate the implementation of the UP Chief Wildlife Warden's order of May

1995 (see *JPAM Update 9*) has been drafted. The Field Director is currently in the process of seeking formal approval for this proposal.

The major issues discussed and alternatives suggested were the following:

- Controlled removal of *bhabbar* grass should be allowed for a period of four months annually, from November to February. The activity will be regulated by village-level committees.
- *Haqdari* (right-holding) villages will need to identify legitimate resource users in their respective villages, each of whom will be given an identity card.
- The actual removal of *bhabbar* will be monitored by both the village-level committee and representatives of the Forest Department.
- All the *bhabbar* extracted from Rajaji National Park must be for local use only.

In an incident related to *bhabbar* grass extraction, a clash took place on 2 December 1996, in Chilawali Range of Rajaji National Park. Local villagers from Banjarewala, a village situated outside the boundary of the Park, and some Gujjars of Chilawali Range apparently clashed over *bhabbar* stocks that had already been cut by the Gujjars. Normally the Gujjars do not have any use for this grass. The Ghad Kshetra Mazdoor Sangarsh Samiti, a local organisation, has deplored the role of the Forest Department in this incident for aiding the villagers, rather than controlling the situation before it turned violent between the two groups. On 9 December 1996, at a meeting in Mohand between village and Gujjar representatives, it was resolved to prevent such incidents from taking place in future.

Contact: Diwakar Kumar, Field Director, Rajaji National Park, 5/1 Ansari Road, Dehradun 248 001, Uttar Pradesh. Tel: 0135-621 669; Fax: 0135-621 669.

Jaiprakash/Roma, Ghad Kshetra Mazdoor Sangharsh Samiti, Village & Post Buggawala, District Haridwar, Uttar Pradesh. **B.M.S. Rathore**, Wildlife Institute of India, PO Box 18, Chandrabani, Dehradun 248 001, Uttar Pradesh. Tel: 0135-640 112-5; Fax: 0135-640 117; Email: wii.isnet@access.net.in.

STATE NEWS

MAHARASHTRA

New sanctuaries in the State

According to newspaper reports (*The Hitvada* 10/08/96), the Maharashtra State Wildlife Board, at its meeting in Mumbai in July this year, is reported to have recommended that nine new protected areas be established (see full list below). It is estimated that these sanctuaries will together cover an area of 854.02 sq km. Seven of the new sanctuaries are in the Vidarbha region of Maharashtra. There are currently 29 protected areas (5 national parks and 24 sanctuaries) in the State, covering an area of approximately 14,775 sq km.

	<i>Proposed Sanctuary</i>	<i>Area (in sq km)</i>	<i>District</i>
1.	Bhamragarh	104.38	Gadchiroli
2.	Tipeshwar	148.63	Yavatmal
3.	Karanja-sohol	17.81	Akola
4.	Namala	12.35	Akola
5.	Dnyanganga	205.23	Buldana
6.	Ambabarwa	127.11	Buldana
7.	Wan	211.00	Amravati
8.	Yedshi-ramlingaghat	22.37	Osmanabad
9.	Mayureshwar	5.14	Pune

WEST BENGAL

Eco-development Committees for Protected Areas

West Bengal has become the first state in India to pass a resolution regarding the involvement of local communities in the management of protected areas. Resolution No. 3841-For/FR/0/11M-7/95, dated 26 June, 1996, provides that "Eco-development Committees (EDCs) shall be constituted for the purpose of protection and development of wildlife protected areas and members of such committees shall be allowed benefits of usufruct sharing and eco-development activities, subject to observance of the conditions provided in this Resolution". These conditions include the fulfillment of a series of duties related to the protection of forests and wildlife and prevention of illegal acts. In return for this, the villagers participating in the programme will be entitled to "the collection and removal of certain items of forest products from identified zones of a protected area" provided that such collection/removal is determined by the Chief Wildlife Warden as being "necessary for the improvement and management of wildlife therein".

The Resolution specifies the composition of the EDCs, and their functions. It also specifies that micro-planning for eco-development in the villages will be done in consultation with these EDCs.

While the Resolution is a step forward in the involvement of people in protected areas, it retains a strong bias in favour of control by the Forest Department, and does not really empower the EDCs to take their own action (see report on Kailadevi Workshop, under NEWS FROM SPECIFIC AREAS, for villagers' views on the need for such empowerment). There are several aspects which need clarification: for instance, eco-development benefits are supposed to be subject to the quality of protection work done by the EDC, as evaluated by the Divisional Forest Officer or PA in-charge, yet no criteria have been established for such evaluation. In the absence of this, considerable arbitrariness could result. Nor do the EDCs have a role in the planning of the PA, though they are supposed to assist in its management and protection. One hopes that these aspects will be looked into in further revisions of this important move.

Contact: Chief Conservator of Forests (Wildlife), Forest Department, Vikas Bhavan, North Block, Salt Lake, Calcutta 700 001. Tel: 033-284 069.

NATIONAL NEWS

'Insignificant from the wildlife point of view?'

A candid survey of the willingness of officials of the Forest and Environment Departments to oppose pressures to make available forest land, particularly wildlife habitats, for industry and other development needs, has led to some depressing findings. The following is a selection of examples from Bittu Sahgal's report in the *Deccan Herald* (3/11/96):

Nagarjuna-Srisailam Tiger Reserve, Andhra Pradesh: The construction of a tail pond for the Nagarjunsagar Dam is expected to submerge 81 ha of forest land. The Forest Department has justified the move by stating it will create a wetland area suitable for crocodile, fish and aquatic birds.

Palamau Tiger Reserve, Bihar: The Horilong Mine Project has sought to divert 11.92 ha from Palamau Tiger Reserve. The Deputy Conservator of Forests (Core) has apparently directed that the boundary of the Reserve be redrawn to exclude this area. Information from the Ministry of Environment & Forests has confirmed that there are dry sal forests on this land. An additional 794.91 ha of forest land will be brought under mining in the adjacent area.

Sitanadi Sanctuary, MP: The Sondur Irrigation Project requires 1,080.22 ha of which 529.70 ha fall within Sitanadi Sanctuary, one of the few remaining areas in the country for Wild Buffalo.

Jhirayiya Tank Project, MP: 128.47 ha of forest land, with more than 86,000 standing trees, has been cleared for utilisation by this project. The Chief Wildlife Warden reportedly did not consider the area significant for wildlife as it did not form part of any existing protected area.

Kudremukh National Park, Karnataka: The Ministry of Environment & Forests granted clearance to the Kudremukh Iron Ore Corporation, for a new 'prospecting lease' in the Park. Iron ore mining operations over the last several years have already damaged substantial portions of the Park. An estimated 75,000 tonnes of mining debris now pollutes the Bhadra River which flows into the Bhadra Sanctuary.

Tuirial Hydro-electric Project, Mizoram: The Project is expected to submerge an area of 5,330 ha including an estimated two lakh trees and several crore bamboos. 11 species of endangered animals have also been reported from the area. The Principal Chief Conservator of Forests did not believe the area was significant from the wildlife point of view.

Contact: Bittu Sahgal, Sanctuary Magazine, 602 Maker Chambers V, Nariman Point, Bombay 400 021. Tel: 022-283 0061; Fax: 287 4380; Email: bittu@ecologist.ilbom.ernet.in.

Additional protected areas proposed across the country

According to the Press Trust of India (11/11/96) the Minister of State for Environment and Forests has stated that the government intends to declare 73 new national parks and 75 new wildlife sanctuaries across the country. This is in addition to the existing 521 protected areas in the country today. There is also a proposal to increase the number of biosphere reserves from the current eight. This announcement was made at the inauguration of the Pan-Asian Ornithological Congress in Coimbatore, Tamil Nadu. One hopes that the declaration of new protected areas is done in full consultation with local communities in these areas and respects their livelihood rights, unlike what has happened in the past.

INTERNATIONAL NEWS

World Conservation Congress, Canada

IUCN-The World Conservation Union, organised a session on Collaborative Management for Conservation from 17-20 October, 1996, as part of its General Assembly and World Conservation Congress at Montreal, Canada. Apart from presentation of co-management experiences from several countries, the highlight of the session was the formulation of a resolution on collaborative management. Later adopted by the General Assembly, the resolution urges all countries/members of IUCN to consider co-management approaches to conservation.

Contact: Grazia Borrini-Feyerabend, Social Policy Unit, IUCN-The World Conservation Union, 28 Rue Mauverney, Ch-1196 Gland, Switzerland. Tel: 41-22-999 0001; Fax: 41-22-999 0025; Email: gbf@hq.iucn.org.

UPCOMING

Training Course in Participatory Management of Protected Areas. 17 February - 7 March, 1997, Bangkok, Thailand

Organised by the Regional Community Forestry Training Center (RECOFTC), Kasetsart University, in collaboration with the World Wide Fund for Nature, the course is designed to provide forestry and natural resource professionals with the necessary skills to effectively plan, implement and monitor projects which focus on local participation in protected area management. Applicants are expected to have direct responsibility in a protected area programme besides a university degree or equivalent experience in forestry, social sciences or related fields. Proficiency in spoken and written English is essential. The course fee is US\$3,975 and includes course material, accommodation, daily allowance, field study and health insurance. Sources for financial support suggested by the organisers include: FAO, World Bank, Asian Development Bank, Ford Foundation, AusAID, USAID, ODA, DANCED, The Asia Foundation and ITTO.

Contact: Dr. Somsak Sukwong, Director,

RECOFTC, Kasetsart University, PO Box 1111, Bangkok 10903, Thailand. Tel: 66-2-940 5700; Fax: 66-2-561 4480; Email: ftcss@nontri.ku.ac.th.

Seminar on People's Rights Over Sanctuaries. 18-19 January, 1997, Raipur, Madhya Pradesh

The Raipur-based Chattisgarh Institute of Law is organising a Seminar on People's Rights Over Sanctuaries. The objectives of the Seminar include: preservation and promotion of the relationship between people, forests and wildlife; to address certain prevailing myths surrounding wildlife conservation; and to build positive public opinion on these issues. Participants will include academics, lawyers, journalists, environmental activists and government officials. Activists working among the inhabitants of Sitanadi, Udanti and Barnawapara Sanctuaries are also expected to attend.

Contact: Bose Thomas/Gautam K. Bandyopadhyay, Chattisgarh Institute of Law, Raipur, Madhya Pradesh. Tel: 0771-421 926 (R); Fax: 0771-425 163 (Attn. Gautam).

Regional Workshop on Community-based Conservation : Policy and Practice. 9-11 February 1997, New Delhi

This Workshop has been sponsored by UNESCO, and organised by the Indian Institute of Public Administration, New Delhi. Participants are expected from Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Bhutan, India, Iran, Mongolia, the Maldives, Nepal, Pakistan and Sri Lanka. It will provide an opportunity for participants to share experiences and discuss some of the major issues facing community-based conservation in the South Asian region. Workshop themes will include: policy and law; institutional structures; role of traditional knowledge systems; the challenges of social inequities including caste, class and gender; and issues relating to benefit-sharing.

Contact: Ashish Kothari, at the editorial address.

WHAT'S AVAILABLE?

- CEE. 1996. *Seminar on Protected Areas of Gujarat : Recommendations and Abstract of Proceedings*. Centre for Environment Education (CEE), Ahmedabad. Pp 41.

The report of a seminar on 'Protected Areas of Gujarat', held on 19-20 December 1995, jointly organised by CEE, Gujarat Ecology Commission, Gujarat Forest Department, Gujarat Nature Conservation Society and World Wide Fund for Nature-India, Gujarat. The Seminar was attended by over 130 representatives of the state Forest Department, other government agencies, NGOs, academics, and conservationists. The primary objective of the seminar was to develop strategies for effective management of protected areas in the state.

Working group themes at the seminar included: threats to protected areas from industry and commerce; role of people in and around protected areas; pilgrimage, tourism and interpretation in protected areas; management of protected

areas; research methodology for monitoring the health of protected areas; and communications strategy for generating public support.

Contact: Centre for Environment Education, Thaltej Tekra, Ahmedabad 380 054, Gujarat. Tel: 0272-442 642, 442 651; Fax: 0272-420 242.

- EIA. 1996. *The Political Wilderness: India's Tiger Crisis*. Environmental Investigation Agency (EIA), London. Pp 37.

The second report on the Indian Tiger to be produced by an international agency in recent months. (The first was produced by the UK-based Tiger Trust). The EIA report consolidates a lot of the available information on tiger conservation in India without being sensational, unlike the other report. However, it too gives inadequate coverage to the critical issue of local community involvement in conservation.

The major recommendations the report makes include the following: the Indian Board for Wildlife must be reconvened; additional financial resources should be allocated for wildlife conservation in the next Five Year Plan; the findings of various expert committees must be heeded by the government; and the international community must make available all necessary assistance to enable India to overcome its tiger crisis.

Contact: Environmental Investigation Agency, 15 Bowling Green, London EC1R 0BD, United Kingdom. Tel: 44-171-4907040; Fax: 44-171-490 0436; Email: eiauk@gn.apc.org.

- ECONET. 1996. *The National Conference on Biodiversity and Legislation in India*. 12-14 April, 1996. ECONET, Pune. Pp 25.

Brief proceedings of a three-day National Conference on Biodiversity Legislation in India, organised by the Pune-based organisation ECONET, and attended by over 50 academics, lawyers, NGOs and activists concerned with biodiversity conservation issues in India. The report includes: list of papers presented, detailed recommendations and conclusions of the Conference (including those related to protected areas), a list of references related to biodiversity conservation, and a list of participants.

Contact: Vijay Paranjapye, ECONET, 5 Sanket, Vijaynagar Colony, 2123 Sadashiv Peth, Pune 411 030. Fax: (0212) 331 250, 476 451.

- Gokhle, Yogesh V. and Raghunandan A. Velankar. 1996. *Documenting People's Knowledge About Biodiversity at Supegaon Village, District Raigad, Maharashtra State, India*. RANWA Technical Report No. 6. Research and Action in Natural Wealth Administration (RANWA), Pune. Pp 34.

The report carries detailed socio-economic and ecological information on Supegaon village adjacent to Phansad Wildlife Sanctuary, Maharashtra, and includes recommendations for a

village-level biodiversity conservation strategy. The study is an example of the practical application of the concept of "community register" currently being developed by several groups and co-ordinated by the Foundation for Revitalisation of Local Health Traditions (FRLHT), Bangalore. The text is well supported by several tables, diagrams, local resource use maps and lists of useful plants.

Contact: Research and Action in Natural Wealth Administration, 16 Swatishree Society, Ganeshnagar, Pune 411 052. Tel: 0212-364 218 (attn. Bhushan), 450 036 (attn. Shonil); Fax: 0212-475 942; Email: pune.lascom@access.net.in.

- **IUCN/WCPA South Asia Newsletter**

Newsletter of the South Asia region of IUCN's World Commission on Protected Areas (formerly CNPPA), covering Bangladesh, Bhutan, India, Nepal, Pakistan and Sri Lanka. Carries protected area related information from these countries as well as other IUCN news. First issue was released in October 1996, copies of which are available on request.

Contact: Kishore Rao, WCPA South Asia Regional Vice-Chair, Ministry of Environment and Forests, Paryavaran Bhavan, CGO Complex, Lodhi Estate, New Delhi 110 003. Tel: 011-436 0957; Fax: 011-436 3918; Email: krao@envfor.delhi.nic.in.

- **Nature's Beckon News**

Newsletter of the Dhubri-based NGO of the same name. Carries news on the activities of the organisation, as well as from other parts of Assam, in the field of environmental education, wildlife conservation, workshops/meetings announcements and reports, publications, etc. See also above, NEWS FROM SPECIFIC AREAS (Assam).

Contact: Soumyadeep Datta, Director, Nature's Beckon, "Datta Bari" Ward No. 1, Dhubri 783 301, Assam. Tel : 03662-20 167; Fax : 03662-20 076.

- WWF-India. 1996. **Participatory Management Planning for Keoladeo National Park**. World Wide Fund for Nature-India Pp 187.

Detailed proceedings of a WWF-India initiated Participatory Rural Appraisal training workshop held at Keoladeo National Park, Rajasthan, from 20 November-5 December, 1995. Participants included local villagers, Forest Department personnel, NGOs and conservationists. The report documents the process of analysing resource use, issues and problems confronted and suggested alternatives for each, for six villages around the Park.

The report is available both in Hindi and English. A 15 minute film **Conservation with a Human Face** has also been made on this effort.

Contact: Parikshit Gautam, Wetlands Division,

WWF-India, 172 B, Lodhi Estate, New Delhi 110 003. Tel: 011-461 6532, 469 3744; Fax: 011-462 6837; Email: wwfindel@unv.ernet.in.

LETTERS

Besides sending out copies to a mailing list, the **JPAM Update** is also put out on a global natural history email conference focusing on India. Responses to the **JPAM Update** are regularly from subscribers to this conference.

JPAM Update 11, in its section on NATIONAL NEWS, had carried details of a statement on ecodevelopment, issued by the Delhi-based Centre for Science and Environment and signed by several leading activists, academics and conservationists. Reproduced below is a summary of some of the email responses to this news item:

Rauf Ali, ecologist based at Auroville, Pondicherry (email dated 14/10/96), questioned the position taken in the statement, that it is not poverty but oppressive forest laws which are the crux of the problem. He said that this statement is only an assertion without the backing of "good statistically validated data". Rauf has been involved with Kalakad-Mundanthurai Tiger Reserve for a long time and has seen the ecodevelopment project evolve there. Notwithstanding slow release of funds, the project is reported to have been executed with "genuine participation", by the Forest Department and the Vivekananda Kendra.

Jagdish Krishnaswamy, a PhD student at Duke University, USA (email dated 14/10/96), agreed with the above position and added that "many of the (forest) dependent people were already marginalised long before reserves (and protected areas) came up."

Vinay Sinha, of the College of Environmental Science and Forestry, State University of New York, USA (email dated 14/10/96), was of the opinion that various levels of demands will continue to be made on forests, often with unpredictable ecological consequences. "The challenge is to search for a really innovative management, which could address both local as well as global demands from the forest. It is useful to look in the past for an idea but one cannot live there."

Nina Sengupta, also an ecologist (email dated 16/10/96), felt that while the issue of poverty and forest dependence was a complex one, some effort was being made to amend existing laws to enable participation of local communities in forest management. However, there still exist problems of implementation and monitoring. "Wildlife laws are not perfect, but they are going in the right direction."

Email contacts: Rauf Ali rauf@auroville.org.in.
Jagdish Krishnaswamy jug@acpub.duke.edu. **Vinay Sinha** vksinha@mailbox.syr.edu. **Nina Sengupta** sengupta@vtvm1.cc.vt.edu.

Readers are urged to carry on this debate. Interested people can subscribe to the conference at:

nathistory-india@lists.princeton.edu.

JPAM Update is produced every two months as a follow-up to the workshop on Exploring the Possibilities of Joint Protected Area Management (JPAM), organised at IIPA, New Delhi, in September 1994.

JPAM Update 12 was prepared by Farhad Vania, Priya Das, Suniti K. Jha, and Ashish Kothari. Secretarial support was provided by Vishal Thakre, Sangeeta Kaintura and Virender Anand.

Ideas, comments, news and information may please be sent to: Ashish Kothari, Indian Institute of Public Administration, Indraprastha Estate, New Delhi 110 002. Tel: 011-331 7309; Fax: 011-331 9954; Email: akothari@kv.unv.ernet.in.

JPAM UPDATE
News on Action Towards Joint Protected Area Management

No. 13

April 1997

EDITORIAL

Even in the midst of depressing news regarding continued tiger poaching and habitat destruction, there are signs of hope. The legal victory of a tribal group over a powerful corporate adversary in Nagarahole National Park (see Local News), and the reasonably balanced (if somewhat unwieldy) Supreme Court judgement on Pench Tiger Reserve (see Local News), indicate that citizens' action can actually work. A process of reconciling conservation and livelihood requirements is also underway at Rajaji and other protected areas, and important policy pronouncements have been made in other countries (notably Uganda and Nepal, see International News), which India can learn from.

People's mobilisation on these issues is critical. An active campaign amongst tribals affected by protected areas in Madhya Pradesh could well snowball into a major movement (see State News). Unfortunately, in *some* of its more strident pronouncements, the campaign has voiced opposition to national parks and sanctuaries, rather than to *the way* in which these protected areas are planned and managed. Protest regarding the alienation of local communities is fully justified, but social activists need to be careful not to throw the baby out with the bathwater. Remove the legal protection given to these areas by the Wild Life (Protection) Act, and both the habitats and local communities will be gobbled up by urban-industrial forces. The Act *must be changed* to empower communities to be centrally involved in conservation, and enable people's own concepts and traditions of protection and sustainable utilisation to flourish...but neither the Act nor protected areas *can be done away with*. We believe that Ekta Parishad and other groups involved in the campaign are sensitive enough to realise the dangers of undue populism.

A national -level meeting of major social activists and conservationists will take place in April to discuss the above issues (see Upcoming). We feel that the meeting will be critical in bringing the two potential allies together to fight against their common enemy: the urban-industrial consumer economy. More on this in the next issue.

LOCAL NEWS

ASSAM : Adjutant stork nesting sites threatened

The city of Nagaon, on the NH 37 between Guwahati and Jorhat, possesses an active nesting colony of Greater adjutant storks. The nesting site, covering an area of about 5

bighas, is located in a residential part of the city with houses, some still under construction, all around. There are several large trees (80-100) on the site, of which five trees with about 24 nests, are being occupied by the storks. It is not yet known why the storks prefer to nest only in the trees on this plot when there are several others of the same species around town and in a nearby Reserve Forest.

The site is under threat as its present owners are considering giving it up for development as a housing colony. The storks on this site have been under investigation since September 1994, under a joint project between the Centre for Wildlife and Ornithology, Aligarh Muslim University, the US Fish and Wildlife Service, and the Green Guard Nature Organisation. There is a proposal under consideration to buy up the plot and convert the area into a sanctuary. It is estimated the plot would cost around 15-20 lakhs at current prices.

The Greater Adjutant Stork is globally endangered, with only a few hundred remaining individuals. Assam has the majority of this population. Lesser adjutant storks, also reported to be nesting in the same trees, are considered Vulnerable as per IUCN standards.

In another incident in early March '97, a senior Nagaland police official was involved in killing a Lesser adjutant stork in Uriagaon, near Nagaon. The local villagers apprehended the official and his party and handed them over to the local police. A local NGO, Aaranyak Nature Club, has protested against the incident.

Contact: Dr. Asad Rahmani, Centre for Wildlife and Ornithology, Aligarh Muslim University, Aligarh 202 002, Uttar Pradesh; **Hillaljyoti Singha/R.K. Goswami**, Green Guard Nature Organisation, Lakhinagar, Haiborgaon, Nagaon 782 002, Assam; **Bibhab Kumar Talukdar**, Aaranyak Nature Club, Samanwoy Path, PO Beltola, Guwahati, Assam 781 028. Email: bibhab@gu.ernet.in

Source: Email from Dave Ferguson 2/12/96; email from Christine Sheppard/Anna Marie Lyles 4/12/96; email from Bibhab Kumar Talukdar 4/3/97.

KARNATAKA : Monumental victory for tribals against Taj hotel in Nagarahole

In 1996, several tribal activist groups in Karnataka (see Source below) had jointly filed a public interest litigation in the Karnataka High Court against the leasing of land in Nagarahole National Park (now called Rajiv Gandhi NP) for the establishment of a holiday resort. The Karnataka Forest Department had entered into an 18 year lease agreement with the Taj Group of Hotels, to set up and run the Gateway Tusker Lodge which would be located at Murkal. The project, estimated to cost Rs.4.80 crores, would have involved the

construction of tourist facilities, including the installation of powerful diesel generators for electricity, at the site of an abandoned saw mill. No prior clearance from the Central Government had been sought for the project, even though it is mandatory under the Forest (Conservation) Act.

The Karnataka High Court interpreted tourism to be a 'non-forest activity', and in issuing its final order on the case, ruled that the Taj group must stop all its activities on the forest land in question and hand over its possessions to the State Government. The Supreme Court order of 12 December 1996 (See National News) was also partially instrumental in deciding the case in favour of the petitioners.

Contact: **Nagarahole Budakattu Hakku**,
Nagarahole Haadi and Post, Virajpet Taluk,
Kodagu District, Karnataka.

Source: Email from Equations 3/1/97; High Court of Karnataka, Bangalore, order dated 20 January 1997 on Writ Petition No. 31222 of 1996, Nagarahole Budakattu Hakku and others (petitioners) vs. State of Karnataka and others (respondents); *The Pioneer* 23/1/97.

MADHYA PRADESH : Supreme Court passes final judgement on Pench

On 5 March 1997 the Supreme Court passed its final judgement on the Pench National Park case (See *JPAM Update* 12). In May 1996 the Chief Wildlife Warden, Madhya Pradesh had granted permits for fishing in Totladoh reservoir to 305 persons who had been displaced in the 1970s, following submergence due to the construction of the Pench Hydro-electric Project Dam. The granting of these permits had been challenged by the Delhi-based Animal and Environment Legal Defence Fund as being a violation of the Wild Life (Protection) Act, 1972. A counter-petition was filed by the Jan Van Andolan Samiti, representing the affected fisherfolk.

The judgement is a mix of elements favouring both parties: "While every attempt must be made to preserve the fragile ecology of the forest area, and protect the Tiger Reserve, the right of the tribals formerly living in the area to keep body and soul together must also receive proper consideration." It upholds fishing, by the dam-affected people, as an activity to meet their livelihood requirement. However, recognising the potential problems this may create for conservation, it also lays down several conditions to be met prior to the actual commencement of fishing. Finally it asks the MP government to expedite the final notification of Pench National Park. The Court has also asked the Jan Van Andolan Samiti, based in Totladoh, to enable the fisherfolk to understand the conditions of the judgement.

The terms and conditions to be met are:

1. Photo identity cards will be issued to all legitimate permit holders, in the form of a non-transferable "personal right."
2. The MP government will appoint a person of appropriate authority to demarcate the parts of the reservoir where fishing will be allowed. Movement inside the Park will be regulated through a series of check-posts to be set up

by the Park authorities.

3. Access to the reservoir will only be allowed on the Totladoh-Thuepani road. Fishing will be banned from July to October.
4. No night halts inside the Park will be permitted nor will fishermen be allowed to light fires for cooking or any other purpose on the banks of the reservoir.
5. The MP government will sanction an adequate number of personnel and obtain necessary equipment to monitor the activities of the 305 fisherfolk.

Contact: **Raj Panjwani**, Animal and Environment Legal Defence Fund, Chamber 339, Delhi High Court, New Delhi 110 001. Tel: 011-225 4012.
Rajiv Dhawan, PILSARC, C 569 New Friends Colony, New Delhi 110 065. Tel: 011-682 2525; Fax: 011-682 7887.

Source: Supreme Court of India judgement dated 5 March 1997 on Writ Petition (Civil) No. 785 of 1996, Animal and Environment Legal Defence Fund (petitioner) vs. Union of India and others (respondents).

ORISSA : Olive Ridley Turtles in Bhitarkanika

In *JPAM Update* 10 we had reported on the efforts of the Defence Research and Development Organisation (DRDO) to collaborate with Orissa Krushak Mahasangha, an NGO based in Bhubaneswar, and the Wildlife Institute of India, Dehradun, on minimising the adverse impacts of a missile test range currently under construction on Outer Wheeler Island in Bhitarkanika Sanctuary. At the time the DRDO had agreed to undertake the following measures:

- i. As far as possible, missile test firing will not be carried out between November and April, which is the peak turtle nesting period at Gahirmatha beach.
- ii. Lighting arrangements on Outer Wheeler Island during construction, and thereafter, will be suitably altered to prevent confusing turtle hatchlings, who have been observed heading away from the sea under the influence of lights.
- iii. The DRDO will request the Indian Coast Guard, and possibly the Indian Navy, to assist in patrolling and anti-poaching operations during the nesting period.

By January this year the DRDO, on the advice of the Scientific Adviser to the Defence Ministry, is reported to have made the following arrangements:

- Lights being used at the construction site have been masked.
- The activities at the site have been rescheduled so as not to cause undue disturbance during the peak nesting period.
- Indian Navy and Indian Coast Guards have been requested to provide protection around Gahirmatha Beach, one of the largest turtle nesting rookeries in the area.

While these are sound initial measures in themselves, they will only be put to test when the mass nesting of the Olive Ridley turtle begins. According to reports from the area the nesting had not commenced till end-March, an unprecedented delay compared to previous years. A few thousand turtles

have nested at Rishikulya in Ganjam district, but Gahirmatha beach remains bare. The reasons for this delay are as yet unclear, however there is speculation that the large numbers of turtles killed by fishing trawlers in recent months may have had an effect. The Orissa government is reported to have indiscriminately issued licences for trawlers, which are reported to have flouted regulations by fishing within 20 km of the coastline.

Contact: Orissa Krushak Mahasangha, Contact: Banka Behary Das, Orissa Krushak Mahasangh, Parivesh Bhavan, 14 Ashok Nagar, Bhubaneswar 751 009, Orissa. Tel: 0647-400 305; Fax: 0647-404 222, 409 1125.

Source: *Times of India* 11/1/97; *Hindustan Times* 12/1/97; *Telegraph* 12/1/97; *JPAM Update* 10.

RAJASTHAN : Follow up meeting to December '96 workshop on Kailadevi Sanctuary

We have been regularly reporting the progress of IIPA's Participatory Management of Protected Areas (PMPA) project in Kailadevi Sanctuary (see *JPAM Update* 9 & 12). On 6-7 December 1996 a workshop had been organised on 'Kailadevi Sanctuary: Prospects for Conservation', which was followed up by a meeting on 30 January 1997. Apart from residents of the Sanctuary villages, the meeting was also attended by representatives from Gopalpur and Faria villages. (These villages had been relocated from the Ranthambor National Park in the 1980s and settled in the Khandhar region of Sawai Madhopur. WWF-India has an ongoing field project in these villages.) Some Forest Department officials also attended the meeting. The following points came up for discussion:

Forest Department/district administration response: There has been virtually no constructive response from either the Forest Department or the district administration on any of the resolutions of the December '96 meeting (See *JPAM Update* 12). The Forest Department has claimed that the issue of amendments to the livestock/crop damage compensation procedure, is beyond the jurisdiction of the Sanctuary-level authorities. However, no commitments have been made to take it up at a higher level.

Follow up action: The villagers have decided to take their own initiative on some the resolutions adopted at earlier meetings. As a first step, one village has agreed to identify land suitable for agriculture that legally belongs to the Forest Department but is devoid of any forest cover. They will also identify equivalent revenue land, some with existing forest, which can then be exchanged for the land they wish to cultivate.

A group of villagers also decided to visit Tarun Bharat Sangh, an NGO based on the outskirts of Sariska Tiger, to hold discussions with people there on their initiatives in water conservation. (This visit took place on 8-10 March '97, but no additional details are currently available.)

In another meeting, held on 20 February 1997, an informal evaluation of the PMPA project initiative in Kailadevi was done, with most people of the opinion that it had been an extremely positive experience for them to have been able to interact with

the Forest Department as equals.

Future meetings will be the responsibility of each Forest Protection Committee (FPC) *adhyaksh*, including arranging for representation from villages under their FPCs. Participants have decided to issue pamphlets in their villages with information on their progress so far and announcements for upcoming meetings.

India Ecodevelopment Project: The Sanctuary will be taken up in the second phase of the India Ecodevelopment Project proposed for Ranthambhor Tiger Reserve. There is virtually no reliable information available on this project at the village level. In November 1996 the Forest Department held a four-day workshop to orient their front-line staff (and some Forest Protection Committee members from the Kailadevi villages) with different aspects of the project. However, the participants did not report any significant change in their understanding. This has not prevented the Forest Department from claiming that many of the problems currently being experienced by the villagers will be taken care of under the India Ecodevelopment Project.

As part of the project, two micro-plans are reported to have been drawn up by the Forest Department for Lakhruki and Maramda villages in the Kailadevi area. However, the people of these villages are unaware when this exercise was carried out nor have they actually seen a copy of any micro-plan for their village.

The World Bank Project Appraisal Mission visited Ranthambhor Tiger Reserve in February, and reportedly asked for all micro-plans to be redone in the next 6 months, this time with more meaningful involvement and participation of the local people.

Contact: Arun Jindal, Society for Sustainable Development, Karauli 322 241, District Sawai Madhopur, Rajasthan. Tel: 07464-20 065; 21 065. Ashish Kothari, at the editorial address.

STATE NEWS

ANDHRA PRADESH : AP State Highways Project (APSHP) to affect protected areas

The Roads and Buildings Department of Andhra Pradesh is in a process of upgrading its state highways and major district roads. The World Bank is supporting a part of the APSHP with a loan of Rs.1,100 crores. An environmental impact assessment of the project undertaken in 1996 indicates that a section of the Pericherala-Guntoor road passes through Nagarjunsagar-Srisailem Tiger Reserve for a distance of over 12 km, while the Warangal-Pollacolu road passes close to the western boundary of Sri Venkateswara Sanctuary.

Environmentalists have expressed concern at the potential impact the road building activities and the increased traffic on the roads once completed, will have on the habitat and wildlife of these areas. The Infrastructure and Miscellaneous Projects Environment Appraisal Committee of the Ministry of

Environment and Forests (MoEF) in its last meeting has asked for the following:

1. All sections of the APSHP affecting protected areas will be realigned, heading away from these areas.
2. The MoEF will hold back clearance for the project pending site visit reports by its Environment Appraisal Committee to the affected areas.

Contact: **Bittu Sahgal**, Sanctuary Magazine, 602 Maker Chambers V, Nariman Point, Bombay 400 021. Tel: (022) 283 0061; Fax: (022) 287 4380; Email: bittu@ecologist.ilbom.ernet.in.

Source: **Environmental Impact Assessment Report**, Roads and Buildings Department, Government of Andhra Pradesh, July 1996; email from Bittu Sahgal 10/12/96 & 3/1/97.

MADHYA PRADESH : Campaign on people's rights vis-a-vis protected areas

A number of people's organisations have grouped together under the banner of Campaign on People's Rights Over Sanctuaries and National Parks in Madhya Pradesh. These include Ekta Parishad, Chhatisgarh Mukti Morcha, Bhopal Gas Peedith Mahila Sangathan, Narmada Bachao Andolan, Adivasi Mukti Sangathan, Khedut Mazdoor Chetna Sangathan, and several other groups from the state working on forest/people issues. Over the last few months, the Campaign has been organising a series of actions aimed at pressurising the Madhya Pradesh Government to review its policies and programmes related to forests and wildlife in the state.

On 19 January, 1997, the Campaign along with the Chhatisgarh Institute of Law organised a one-day Seminar on People's Rights Over Sanctuaries and National Parks, at Raipur. The meeting was attended by affected tribals from several of MP's protected areas (Sitanadi, Udanti, Barnawapara, Bandhavagarh, Kanker Ghati, and Kanha), and academics and activists from Raipur, the Chhatisgarh region, and Delhi. The meeting highlighted the suffering that was being caused to tribals in the state's protected areas, due to top-down insensitive policies, and recommended that local people be involved in managing these areas, as also be ensured adequate means of livelihood.

On January 30, a public meeting and one-day fast was held at Bhopal, to protest against the World Bank funded MP Forestry Project, and to highlight the case of people living in and around protected areas. Local people from several protected areas attended the meeting including: Kanha, Bandhavagarh, Sanjay, and Panna National Parks and Kanker Ghati, Sitanadi, Bori, and Semarsot Sanctuaries. A recent problem in some of these protected areas has been the zealous implementation of the central government directives to district collectors to complete pending procedures regarding people's rights under the Wild Life (Protection) Act, 1972 (see National News, below). There is little reliable information available at the village level and rumours of displacement are widespread.

A statement issued on the day stated that:

1. The destruction of forests is more due to industrial and urban demand rather than that of tribals and other forest-dependent communities.

2. Forest-related policies, projects and legislation that have been formulated without prior consultation of forest dwellers are totally unacceptable.
3. The government has failed to protect forests. It is the local people who can protect forests and forest-dependent livelihoods.
4. Displacement of people in the name of national parks, sanctuaries or plantations is unacceptable.
5. The World Bank MP Forestry Project will be opposed at all costs.

On April 2, the Campaign held simultaneous rallies, dharnas, and public meetings in district and tehsil headquarters across the state. People participating in the activities included affected villagers from Bandhavagarh, Sanjay, and Panna National Parks, and Sitanadi, Udanti and Kanker Ghati Sanctuaries, and from the forests of Dhar, Chhattarpur, Tikamgadh, Bilaspur, Satna, and Shivpuri. The main demands were similar to the above.

A public meeting is now planned to be held in the Madhav National Park and Palpur Kuno Sanctuary area, on April 12.

Contact: **Gautam Bandopadhyay**, Campaign on People's Rights Over National Parks and Sanctuaries in M.P., House No. 1192, Sector 1, Post Shankarnagar, Raipur 492 007. Tel: 077-421 926.

NATIONAL NEWS

Indian Board for Wildlife (IBWL) meets again after eight years!

On 13 March 1997, the IBWL convened after a gap of eight years. The meeting was chaired by the Prime Minister and attended by the Minister for Environment and Forests, other officials, and NGO representatives.

Some of the IBWL members issued an appeal to the Prime Minister urging the implementation of the following:

1. An address to the nation by the Prime Minister on the threats to wildlife and the need for urgent action.
2. Support from the Prime Minister's Office for reforming the country's mechanisms for conservation.
3. Ensuring that the budgetary allocation of Rs.2,500 crores, for the Ministry of Environment and Forests, is obtained without any cuts.
4. Establishment of new co-ordination mechanisms between the Centre and states to ensure effective implementation of policies and timely availability of funds.
5. Reforms in the Indian Forest Service to enable it to meet emerging challenges, and improvement in the service conditions of field officers.

The outcome of the meeting will be reported in the next *Update*.

Source: *Deccan Herald* 21/3/97.

Completion of procedures regarding rights in protected areas

District authorities in several states have issued notices to villages within and around protected areas, to register claims regarding their rights to resources inside the protected areas. This follows a Supreme Court observation asking the Central Government to specify what steps it is taking to ensure that the Wild Life (Protection) Act provisions are being complied with.

Reports of the process having been initiated have been received from Madhya Pradesh and Maharashtra. The experience does not seem to have been very positive.

In Melghat Tiger Reserve, Maharashtra, the Revenue Department published a full page notification (No. 1/1996 dated 21/12/96) in a local newspaper (*Loksatta* 29/12/96) identifying the boundaries of the Reserve and the names of 22 villages to be covered in the settlement process. Included in the notification was a sample application form, for individuals to make out their claims of existing rights and expected compensation. The last date for filing claims was 21 February 1997. According to a local NGO, Van Vidhayak Sameeksha Samanvaya, besides publication in the newspaper, the notification was also sent to sarpanches of panchayat samitis, but no copies were reported to have been received in the villages themselves.

Similar notices have been issued in villages in protected areas in Madhya Pradesh. In Semarsot Sanctuary, for example, villages (predominantly tribal) have received such notices along with copies of 'Form 8' (the format to file claims). 95% of the local population is reported to be illiterate. After some initial uncertainty over trying to understand what the process was all about (no official explanation was given), they have organised themselves under the Semarsot Abhyaranya Sangharsh Samiti. Several demonstrations were held in Sarguja, the district headquarters, with petitions being sent to the Collector and state government demanding greater clarity about the situation. The last date for filing claims was 28 December 1996. The current situation in the area is not known.

Readers are urged to write in to the Editorial address, about any other instances of notices being issued to villages in order to complete the settlement process for any protected area, and related problems.

Contact: **Ajay Dholke**, 18/7 Ujwal Nagar, Wardha Road, Nagpur 440 025, Maharashtra. Tel: 0712-224 709. **Semarsot Abhyaranya Sangharsh Samiti**, Village & Post Padhi 497 118, District Sarguja, Madhya Pradesh.

Source: *Loksatta* 29/12/96; letter from Ajay Dholke 20/1/97; discussions with members of several NGOs.

Conference on Management of Tourism in National Parks and Sanctuaries

With the opening up of India's economy, tourism has also received a major boost, raising fears of adverse impacts on India's environment and cultural diversity. A 2-day Conference on Management of Tourism in National Parks and Sanctuaries: The Human Experience, was organised to discuss these and related issues, in New Delhi, on 26-27th March, 1997. The

conference was organised by the Jawaharlal Nehru University and the Ministry of Tourism, Government of India. More details of the outcome are awaited.

Contact: **Prof. R.C. Sharma**, 212 School of Environmental Studies, Jawaharlal Nehru University, New Delhi 110 067, India. Tel: 011-610 7676 ext. 287; Fax: 011-616 5886.

Meet on 'People and Protected Areas'

A two-day workshop on 'People and Protected Areas', organised by the National Committee for Protection of Land Resources, was held at Nagpur on 7-8 December 1996. Participating organisations included: Sahbhagi Vikas Kendra (Orissa), Joint Council for Tribal Action Tamil Nadu), Abhiyan (Bihar), Ekta Parishad (Madhya Pradesh), Nagarahole Budakattu Haku, Samaj Parivartan Samudaya (Karnataka), and Setu (Gujarat). The participants resolved to:

- Lobby with the government to adopt and implement the Bhuria Committee Report on tribal autonomy;
- Oppose the policy of leasing of forest lands to industry;
- Oppose the India Ecodevelopment Project, currently being implemented in seven protected areas across the country (See past few issues of *JPAM Update*).

Participants demanded that the government first acknowledge the traditional approaches to conservation of tribal communities, before going in for large externally funded projects. The meeting also sent a jointly signed letter to Digvijay Singh, Chief Minister, Madhya Pradesh, protesting the handing over of forest land to commercial interests in Betul, Chhindwara, Seoni and Rajnandgaon districts of the state.

Contact: **S.R. Hiremath**, National Committee for Protection of Land Resources, Samaj Parivartan Samudaya, 'Ashadeep', Jayanagar Cross, Saptapur Dharwad 580 001, Karnataka.

Source: *Hitvad* 7/12/96; *Indian Express* 9/12/96.

Update on Wild Life (Protection) Act change committee

The Committee set up by the Ministry of Environment and Forests to amend the Wild Life (Protection) Act 1972, is still in the process of drafting its final recommendations.

Meanwhile, the **Friends of Doon**, a Dehradun-based NGO, made a submission to the Inspector General (IG) of Forests on wildlife conservation in the country with some suggestions regarding the Wild Life (Protection) Act. These are summarised below:

1. Expanded management categories and criteria to determine management category status for each area, besides giving legal recognition to biosphere reserves and tiger reserves.
2. JFM in limited number of existing protected areas and possibly under some of the expanded management categories. However, total protection for natural rainforests, productive wetlands, coastal protected areas,

areas containing endangered species, high biodiversity areas include core zones of national parks.

3. Compensation to people adversely affected by protected areas especially injury/death to humans, and property/crop damage, by wildlife.
4. Settlement of rights and leases in a time bound period, resettlement of inside populations outside, with land rights, monetary compensation and social benefits.
5. Magisterial powers for field directors of protected areas.
6. Terms of employment of Forest Department (Wildlife Wing) staff to be equivalent to that of state police forces.
7. Environmental impact assessment of certain activities adjacent to protected areas to be made mandatory.
8. Field directors to be enabled to take decisions on controlled extraction of forest produce, translocation of wildlife, culling when numbers exceed carrying capacity, etc.
9. Appointment of Honorary Wildlife Wardens for protected areas.

Contact: Samir Ghosh, The Friends of Doon Society, c/o EBD Business Centre, 49 Rajpur Road, Dehradun 248 001, Uttar Pradesh. Tel: 0135-657 748, 654 487; Fax: 658 730. **Kishore Rao**, DIG (WL), Ministry of Environment & Forests, Paryavaran Bhavan, CGO Complex, Lodhi Estate, New Delhi 110 003. Tel: 011-436 0957; Fax: 011-436 3918; Email: krao@envfor.delhi.nic.in

Source: Memorandum from Samir Ghosh on behalf of the Friends of Doon Society dated 26/2/97 to A.F. Ahmed, IG Forests, Ministry of Environment and Forests, Government of India.

Supreme Court order on forests

On 12 December 1996 the Supreme Court passed an order on the felling of trees in forest areas in India in the T.N. Godavaram Thirumulkpad vs. Union of India and others case (see Source below). The order has implications for all forest areas, including those within protected areas. Key excerpts from the order:

1. "In accordance with Section 2 of the Forest (Conservation) Act, all ongoing activity within any forest in any state throughout the country, without the prior approval of the Central Government, must cease forthwith. It is, therefore, clear that the running of saw mills of any kind and mining of any mineral are non-forest purposes and are, therefore, not permissible without prior approval of the Central Government."
2. "In the tropical wet evergreen forests of Tirap and Changlang in Arunachal Pradesh, there would be a complete ban on felling of any kind of trees therein because of their particular significance to maintain ecological balance."
3. "The felling of trees in all forests is to remain suspended except in accordance with the Working Plans of the State Governments, as approved by the Central Government."
4. "There shall be a complete ban on the movement of cut trees and timber from any of the seven North-Eastern states to any other state of the country."
5. "Each State Government should constitute within one

month an Expert Committee to: identify areas which are (presently) forests; areas which were earlier forests but stand degraded, denuded or cleared; areas covered by plantations."

6. "Each State Government should within two months file a report regarding: number of saw/veneer/plywood mills operating in the state with particulars of ownership; the licensed and actual capacity of these mills for stocking and sawing; proximity to nearest forest; and source of timber."
7. "Each State Government should constitute within one month an Expert Committee to assess: the sustainable capacity of the forests of the state *qua* saw mills and timber-based industry; the number of saw mills that can be 'safely' sustained in the state; the optimum location of saw mills."
8. "Each State Government would constitute a Committee comprising of the Principal Chief Conservator of Forests and other senior officers to oversee the compliance of this order and file status reports."

The order also contains additional directives for specific states including Jammu & Kashmir, Himachal Pradesh, Tamil Nadu, and the hill regions of Uttar Pradesh and West Bengal.

Source: Supreme Court order dated 12 December 1996 on Writ Petition (Civil) No. 202 of 1995, T.N. Thirumulkpad (petitioner) vs. Union of India and others (respondents).

INTERNATIONAL NEWS

SOUTH ASIA : Regional Survey of Community Involvement in Conservation

A group of individuals associated with the Indian Institute of Public Administration, New Delhi, has initiated a South Asian regional survey of community participation in conservation of wildlife and natural habitats, including protected areas. Facilitated by the International Institute of Environment and Development (IIED), which is sponsoring similar assessments in various regions of the world, the study aims to bring out the key issues arising from participatory and community-based conservation efforts, and feed these into further policy-building in each of the involved countries. The study is in three phases: in the first, a broad overview of the situation in each of the South Asian countries (Nepal, Bhutan, Sri Lanka, India, Pakistan, Maldives, and Bangladesh) will be obtained; in the second, detailed field research will be carried out at selected sites in some of these countries; and in the third, the results from this region will be compared with the results from other regions of the world.

Apart from the regional and global reports, the other outputs of the project will be: a detailed inventory of sites where community involvement is taking place, a database of related persons/organisations, and a listing of relevant materials. It is also hoped that the process of networking between these people and organisations will be facilitated during the project.

Readers who are familiar with literature, people/organisations, and ongoing efforts/experiences on the subject, are requested to contact the research team. A questionnaire has been prepared for the purposes of the study; anyone who can help

to fill it up will be most gratefully sent a copy, and will also receive the project outputs.

Contact: Ashish Kothari, Farhad Vania, and Neema Pathak, at the editorial address.

SOUTH AND CENTRAL ASIA : Regional Workshop on Community-Based Conservation

Conservationists, social activists, government officers, and academics from Pakistan, Nepal, India, Afghanistan, Sri Lanka, Maldives, Bhutan, United Kingdom, Switzerland, and Mongolia participated in a Regional Workshop on Community-Based Conservation: Policy and Practice, held in New Delhi on February 9–11, 1997. The Workshop was organised by the Indian Institute of Public Administration, and sponsored by UNESCO's Regional Office for South and Central Asia. Discussions covered a range of issues, including legal and policy measures, institutional structures, benefit-sharing measures, and the role of local community knowledge. The major recommendations can be summarised as follows:

- Full respect, protection, and support must be given to local community knowledge relevant to conservation, and complementarity sought between this and formal knowledge systems.
- Innovative mechanisms of sharing the benefits of conservation with local communities must be evolved and employed, keeping in mind the need to equitably distribute these benefits, to ensure benefits to the disadvantaged, and to ensure that resource exploitation is sustainable.
- Revival of traditional institutional structures, where relevant, or creation of new ones as needed, should be encouraged; these structures should ensure the full participation of local people (including women), and in particular those that are disadvantaged within society.
- Laws and policies related to conservation should ensure the inclusion of local community rights and participation in conservation areas and programmes, while strictly regulating activities which could cause irreversible damage to biodiversity. Such laws should also be flexible to allow for site-specific modifications.

A full report of the Workshop has been prepared by the co-ordinating team of R.V. Anuradha, Neema Pathak, and Ashish Kothari (see below, What's Available). In addition, the full set of papers presented (about 25) are being edited by the same team, for publication as a book.

Contact: Ashish Kothari, at the editorial address.

NEPAL : New Buffer Zone Regulations

In a significant move to diffuse tensions between government authorities and local people living adjacent to protected areas, the Nepalese government has notified the Buffer Zone Management Regulation 2052 (1996) under the National Parks and Wildlife Conservation Act 2029 (1973).

The Act permits 30 to 50% of the revenue generated by a protected area to be channelled back to local communities; this provision is to be used to provide developmental and other inputs to communities living adjacent to the four protected areas (Chitwan, Bardia, Parsa, and Suklaphanta), in Nepal's terai area. It also brings in a substantially larger area under the control of the PA staff, and provides for the participation of people in management of the buffer areas (though not as yet of the protected area itself). Currently, some work in the above direction has started under a UNDP sponsored People and Parks Project.

Nepal is already well-known for its innovative approach in the Annapurna Conservation Area, where a vast area (over 7000 sq.km.) is under the management of an NGO and a large number of village-level committees.

Contact: Prabhu Budhathoki, Project Manager, Parks and People Project, Department of National Parks and Wildlife Conservation, PO Box 860, Kathmandu, Nepal. Tel: 977-1-220 850, 220 912; Fax: 977-1-227 675.

INDIA/NEPAL : First Trans-boundary Consultative Meeting on Conservation

Following up on a joint statement issued at the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species (CITES) meeting in 1994, the Governments of India and Nepal have adopted a resolution at a consultative meeting on biodiversity conservation, held on 3–5 January 1997 in Kathmandu. The resolution seeks to:

1. Improve national legislation to address the requirements of CITES.
2. Encourage establishment of trans-boundary protected areas.
3. Maintain and share information from appropriate databases.
4. Set up anti-poaching units to tackle illegal trade and encroachment.
5. Investigate the illegal trade routes between the two countries.
6. Monitor the trans-boundary movement of wild animals.
7. Promote mutual co-operation in research, training and visit programs.
8. Initiate measures at the national, regional and local levels to involve people in conservation.
9. Establish a process to involve all relevant government agencies in control of illegal trade.

Source: Resolution of the First Trans-boundary Consultative Meeting on Biodiversity Conservation Between Nepal and India, Kathmandu, Nepal, 3–5 January 1997.

Contact: Kishore Rao, Regional Vice Chair, WCPA South Asia, Ministry of Environment & Forests, Paryavaran Bhavan, CGO Complex, Lodhi Estate, New Delhi 110 003. Tel: 011-436 0957; Fax: 011-436 3918; Email: k rao@envfor.delhi.nic.in.
Dr. T.M. Maskey, Department of National Parks and Wildlife Conservation, PO Box 860, Kathmandu, Nepal. Fax: 977-1-227 657.

programme on conservation and people's livelihoods.

UGANDA : Taskforce on Collaborative Management of Protected Areas

In earlier issues of *JPAM Update* (No.'s 5, 6, 7), we reported on new policy and legislation in Uganda, mandating the collaborative management (CM) of its protected areas. A taskforce was set up by the Uganda Wildlife Authority to look into the implementation of CM. This exercise was commissioned by the country's Ministry of Tourism, Wildlife and Antiquities, given financial support by NORAD, and technical support by IUCN.

The taskforce has come out with its report, which provides a conceptual framework for CM, operational guidelines for implementing it, specific institutional responsibilities, and a 5-year workplan. The detailed document has significant innovative steps to move the country towards CM, integrating aspects of livelihood requirements and conservation.

Contact: Uganda Wildlife Authority, PO Box 3530, Plot 31 Kanjokya Street (Kamwokya), Kampala, Uganda. Tel: 00256-41-530 574, 530 158; Fax: 00256-41-530 158.

UPCOMING

Consultation on Conservation and People's Livelihood Rights: Building Bridges.

Tarun Bharat Sangh (TBS), vill. Bhikampura-Kishori, via Thanagazi, District Alwar, Rajasthan. 10-12 April 1997

A small group of wildlife conservationists, human rights activists and community representatives will meet in early April at the Tarun Bharat Sangh ashram, adjacent to Sariska Tiger Reserve. The meeting, called by the Indian Institute of Public Administration and Kalpavriksh, will try to address certain critical issues that are emerging out of the increase in conflicts between local communities and the conservation policies of the state.

An attempt will be made to keep the discussions informal, but within the framework of the following agenda points:

- i. The current state of wildlife conservation and local people's livelihoods: major points of conflict, and threats to both;
- ii. What are the respective positions of various conservationists, local community representatives, social activists, and others?
- iii. What could be the common ground between these various positions?
- iv. What are the constraints and opportunities in the current situation, towards achieving progress on this common ground?
- v. Ways to move forward on a common minimum/maximum

We will report on the outcome of the meeting in the next *Update*.

Contact: Ashish Kothari/Farhad Vania, at the editorial address, or Rajendra Singh, at the TBS address above.

World Commission on Protected Areas (WCPA) Regional Workshop, Uswetakeyawa, Sri Lanka. 5-7 May 1997

WCPA South Asia, one of the IUCN's several commissions operational in the region, is holding a meeting in Sri Lanka to:

- i. Update and finalise the WCPA South Asia Regional Action Plan (RAP)
- ii. Seek consensus on its adoption by member countries.
- iii. Establish a framework for action on specific recommendations of the RAP.
- iv. Develop a work plan of future activities for WCPA South Asia.

Participants at the workshop will include selected members of the WCPA South Asia network including government and non-government representatives working on protected area-related issues; other IUCN members from the region; and representatives of donor agencies.

Contact: Kishore Rao, Regional Vice Chair, WCPA South Asia, Ministry of Environment & Forests, Paryavaran Bhavan, CGO Complex, Lodhi Estate, New Delhi 110 003. Tel: 011-436 0957; Fax: 011-436 3918; Email: krao@envfor.delhi.nic.in

Global Biodiversity Forum (GBF), Harare, Zimbabwe, 6-8 June, 1997

The 7th session of the Global Biodiversity Forum (a forum for debate established in 1993 to assist in the implementation of the Convention on Biological Diversity), is being organised on 6-8 June, 1997, at Harare, Zimbabwe. This is immediately prior to the 10th meeting of the Conference of Parties to the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES) (9-20 June, 1997). The GBF will focus on four themes: identifying and monitoring the causes of species loss, non-detrimental export and sustainable use of wildlife; access to floral resources, and community-based resource management. All of these themes have implications for people and protected areas.

Contact: Caroline Martinet, Biodiversity Policy Co-ordination Division, IUCN - The World Conservation Union, 28 Rue Mauverney, 1196 Gland, Switzerland. Tel: 41-22-999 0001; Fax: 41-22-999 0025; Email: ccm@hq.iucn.org.

WHAT'S AVAILABLE?

- GEF/World Bank. 1996. *India Ecodevelopment Project*. Global Environment Facility (GEF) and World Bank, Washington. Pp 299.

A useful document for those involved in any way with the India Ecodevelopment Project. Provides detailed information upto September 1996 on the status of the project including background information, description of the areas covered under the project, cost estimates, implementation schedule, potential impacts and justification for the project.

Contact: The World Bank, Lodhi Estate, New Delhi 110 003. Tel: 011-461 7241/4, 461 9497/8; Fax: 011-461 9393.

- Tiwari, S.K. 1997. *Wildlife Sanctuaries of Madhya Pradesh: State of Biodiversity and Human Infringement*. APH Publishing Corporation, New Delhi. Pp 139. Price Rs.300.

Brief profiles of protected areas in MP including physical features, climate, flora/fauna and constraints to effective management in each area.

Contact: Natraj Publishers, Rajpur Road, Dehradun 248 001, Uttar Pradesh.

- WII. 1995. *A Manual for Planning Wildlife Management in Protected Areas and Managed Forests*. Wildlife Institute of India (WII), Dehradun. Mimeo., pp 260.

Produced by WII for its courses in wildlife conservation and management of protected areas for senior and middle level managers. The document covers most aspects of planning and management that are likely to be encountered, and is now being used to develop plans for selected protected areas (e.g. Dalma Sanctuary, Bihar).

Contact: Wildlife Institute of India, PO Box 18, Chandrabani, Dehradun 248 001, Uttar Pradesh. Tel: 0135-620 912/915; Fax: 0135-620 217; Email: wii@giasdl01.vsnl.net.in

- Regional Workshop on Community-Based Conservation: Policy and Practice - Full Report. Indian Institute of Public Administration, New Delhi.

The full report of discussions at the workshop by the above name, held in New Delhi in February 1997 (see above, International News).

Contact: Ashish Kothari, at the editorial address.

- RGICS. 1995. *Protecting Endangered National Parks*. Rajiv Gandhi Institute for Contemporary Studies (RGICS), New Delhi. Pp 206.

This is a compilation of brief studies on several protected areas (not just national parks, as the title suggests): Manas World Heritage Site (Assam), Bhitarkanika Wildlife Sanctuary (Orissa), Dudhwa National Park (Uttar Pradesh), Gulf of Kutch Marine National Park (Gujarat), Gulf of Mannar Marine Biosphere Reserve (Tamil Nadu), and Nilgiri Biosphere Reserve (Tamil Nadu). These studies were prepared as part of the National Biodiversity Alliance, chaired by M.S. Swaminathan. The generic issues emerging from the studies include the need to centrally involve local communities in meeting livelihood requirements and in management, greater co-ordination between different government departments, more inter-disciplinary and participatory environmental impact assessments, and specialist training to the wildlife staff.

Contact: Rajiv Gandhi Foundation, Jawahar Bhawan, Dr. Rajendra Prasad Road, New Delhi 110 001. Tel: 011-375 5117; Fax: 011-375 5119.

MISCELLANEOUS

Bibliography on the wildlife of North-East India

Nature's Beckon, a local NGO in Assam, has undertaken a project to compile a bibliography on the wildlife of North-East India. The organisation is looking for feedback on all available sources of information pertaining to the region and its wildlife, including protected areas.

Contact: K. Lahakar, Nature's Beckon, "Datta Bari" Ward No. 1, Dhubri 783 301, Assam. Tel : 03662-20 167; Fax : 03662-20 076.

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

APSH

Andhra Pradesh State Highways Project

CITES	Convention on Trade in Endangered Species
CM	Collaborative Management
DRDO	Defence Research and Development Organisation
GBF	Global Biodiversity Forum
GEF	Global Environment Facility
IBWL	Indian Board for Wildlife
IIED	International Institute for Environment and Development
IIPA	Indian Institute of Public Administration
IUCN	World Conservation Union
JPAM	Joint Protected Area Management
MoEF	Ministry of Environment and Forests
MP	Madhya Pradesh
NGO	Non-government organisation
PILSARC	Public Interest, Legal Support and Research Center
PMPA	Participatory Management of Protected Areas
TBS	Tarun Bharat Sangh
WCPA	World Commission on Protected Areas
WII	Wildlife Institute of India
WWF-I	World Wide Fund for Nature-India

JPAM Update is produced every two months as a follow-up to the workshop on Exploring the Possibilities of Joint Protected Area Management (JPAM), organised at IIPA, New Delhi, in September 1994.

JPAM Update 13 was prepared by Farhad Vania, Priya Das and Ashish Kothari. Secretarial support was provided by Vishal Thakre.

Ideas, comments, news and information may please be sent to: **Ashish Kothari**, Indian Institute of Public Administration, Indraprastha Estate, New Delhi 110 002. Tel: 011-331 7309; Fax: 011-331 9954; Email: akothari@kv.unv.ernet.in (or) ashish@giasd101.vsnl.net.in

JPAM UPDATE
News on Action Towards Joint Protected Area Management

No. 14

August 1997

EDITORIAL

This issue is full of news about the attack of commercial-industrial forces on India's protected areas. It seems that after laying bare a substantial part of the rest of India, timber contractors, mine-owners, industrialists, urban elite consumers (like many of us!), dam-builders, and other agents of the country's so-called "progress", are targeting the 4.5% of the country's territory contained in its protected areas (PAs). Not that the attack is entirely new; every once in a while it has taken place on one PA or the other over the last few decades. But the scale and audacity of the assault is now unprecedented, and at least in part due to the new economic policies which in the 1990s have propelled India's economy onto the supposed "fast-track" to the 21st century. With scant regard for the fresh air, fresh water, productive soil, and myriad other things which we all depend on. Our protected areas not only harbour wildlife, but provide these essential "goods", a fact that must be inculcated in the minds of our planners and decision-makers before it is too late...if it is not already. We would urge readers to respond in any way they feel appropriate, to the many depressing bits of news carried in this issue.

What this also means is that those of us arguing for greater involvement of local communities in PA management, need to be very careful not to let this become an excuse for destructive forces to enter the PAs. Fish contractors in Pench (Madhya Pradesh), real estate agents in Borivali (Maharashtra), industrialists in Narayan Sarovar (Gujarat), timber merchants in North-east India, and others have shown that they are quite capable of using the poor as a front for their vested interests. The challenge is to be able to sift out these interests from the ones which genuinely depend for survival on the natural resources of the PAs, and empower the latter not only to be able to live with dignity but also be instrumental in alienating destructive forces within and outside them.

The Committee to amend the Wild Life (Protection) Act (news on which has been carried in several past issues of *JPAM Update*, has finished its work and handed in a revised Act to the Ministry of Environment and Forests. Unfortunately, the revised draft has not been made public; it has not even been sent to those who sent detailed submissions. This secrecy is rather unfortunate; we can only hope that the Committee has done full justice to the call for greater people's involvement, as also for greater shields against destructive forces of the kind reported about in this issue of the *JPAM Update*.

LOCAL NEWS

ANDHRA PRADESH

Nagarjunsagar-Srisailem: Naxalites against Project Tiger?

The last tiger census in the Nagarjuna-Srisailem Tiger Reserve has indicated that while there are some tigers on the south-east bank of the Krishna river, there are virtually none left in the Nallamalla Range, north-west of the river. Two possible causes are being speculated upon: the first is poisoning of tigers by local people at the behest of Naxalite groups who are opposed to Project Tiger; the second is that poachers may have intensified their activities in this area, while putting the blame of loss of tigers on the Naxalites and villagers. It has also been alleged that the local Forest Department failed to inform the State headquarters of the sudden decline of tiger numbers, due to which no action has been taken so far.

Source: nathistory-india electronic mail discussion site (see below, What's Available?).

GUJARAT

Girnar: Proposed ropeway project threatens Junagadh forests

A ropeway has been proposed from Girnar Taleti to Ambaji Temple near Junagadh town in Gujarat. The primary objective is to facilitate pilgrim traffic to the several temples located around the Girnar peak, inside the Girnar Reserved Forest (RF). The temples already attract lakhs of visitors each year, many of whom stay on for several days. The Girnar hills play a vital role in regulating the water table of Junagadh town and surrounding areas. A forest corridor connects Gir Sanctuary & National Park with the Girnar RF and a small population of Asiatic Lions has also been reported from here.

The Girnar RF is a 7,827.29 ha. teak forest with some dry deciduous scrub, of which 7.28 ha has been identified for the ropeway project. Though the area to be cleared seems to be small, activists allege that "several thousand" trees will be cut, and the increase in pilgrim numbers and associated pressures will have an adverse impact on the forests and local ecology of the area. The proposal has already been cleared by the Union Ministry of Environment and Forests. A subsidiary of the Usha group of companies, which manufactures ropeways, is reported to be pushing for the project. A public interest litigation has been filed against the State Government by the Ahmedabad-based Nature Club of Sabar. which has also appealed for help in doing an independent environmental impact assessment of the project.

Contact: Manish Vaidya, Nature Club of Sabar, B 60 Harsh Nagar, D'Cabin, Sabarmati, Ahmedabad 380 019, Gujarat. Tel: 079-746 7073; Fax: 079-333 243.

Sources: Vaidya, M. 1997. *Threatening the Biodiversity of Girnar Forest Reserve*. Mimeo. Emails from Ravi Chellam, Wildlife Institute of India (WII) dated 28/4/97 and Bittu Sahgal, dated 1/7/97.

KARNATAKA

Dandeli: Reserved Forest land handed over to paper company

127 acres of prime Reserved Forest land in the adjacent area of Dandeli Sanctuary have reportedly been handed over to the privately-owned West Coast Paper Mill by the State government. Due to existing uncertainty over the exact boundary of the protected area and the Reserved Forest, it is feared that some part of the Sanctuary may have been handed over as well.

This follows a sanction by the State government to release nearly 500 acres of forest land, also in the adjacent area of Dandeli Sanctuary, to the Kalyani industrial group to set up a steel plant.

World Wide Fund for Nature (WWF)-India is considering legal action against the move of the State government on the grounds of allowing forest land to be taken over for a "non-forest purpose."

Source: *Indian Express* 30/7/97.

Kokrebellur: Crows threaten Painted Storks!

Kokrebellur in Karnataka, one of the better known examples of a people-initiated conservation effort, is a village protecting a large resident population of Painted storks, Spotbilled pelicans and other wetland birds. A few members of Mysore Amateur Naturalists (MAN), a local NGO, have been living in Kokrebellur for over a year now and have reported that nesting areas in the village are being threatened by several factors. Attempts have been made by MAN to establish a nursery for the chicks that fall out of nests due to various disturbances. A relatively recent pressure is the increase in the number of crows in the village that are constantly getting at the eggs and chicks. The storks are easily disturbed by the presence of outsiders as they move about the nesting sites (though not apparently by the movement of local villagers), which gives the crows an opportunity to attack the nests.

Mysore Amateur Naturalists has appealed for help in tackling the crow problem and the management of the area in general.

Contact: Manu Ravi, Mysore Amateur Naturalists, 571, 9th Cross, Anikethana Road, Kuvempunagar, Mysore 570 023. Tel: 0821-541 744, 542 648.

Source: Email from Shyamal, dated 5/4/97.

Kudremukh: Mining may restart

The Kudremukh Iron Ore Co. Ltd. (KIOCL) plans to resume mining operations in an area covering 310 ha at Nellibedu. The KIOCL and much of its lease area are an enclave within the Kudremukh National Park. The 1996-97 Supreme Court order on forests and erratic power supply by the Karnataka Electricity Board had forced KIOCL to cease preliminary mining operations in the area. Following the Supreme Court order a joint committee had surveyed the area and submitted a report to the government. In all the KIOCL has acquired 4,605 ha of land of which mining is currently taking place on 900 ha. However, mining at Nellibedu will only commence after the Forest Department, State Pollution Control Board, and the Mines and Geology Department have provided the necessary clearances for the project.

Contact: Bittu Sahgal, Sanctuary Magazine, 602 Maker Chambers V, Nariman Point, Mumbai 400 021. Tel: 022-283 0061; Fax: 022-287 4380; Email: bittu@giabm01.vsnl.net.in or bittu@ecologist.ilbom.ernet.in.

Source: Email from Bittu Sahgal dated 22/5/97.

Nagarahole: Villagers declare self-rule

An estimated 125 villages with a population of 40,000 people within the Rajiv Gandhi National Park (better known as Nagarhole National Park) have declared self-rule. Among other reasons, this move was apparently made following the passage of the 73rd Constitutional Amendment (Extension to Scheduled Areas) Act, 1996, which gives much greater control to tribal communities over local resources. Though this move cannot be legally recognised as Karnataka has yet to pass appropriate, enabling legislation, its popularity is increasing, especially among the educated youth in these villages. A task force has been set up in every village to work out the modalities of self-rule. In some villages barriers have been erected with boards directing outsiders to seek the permission of the *yajaman* (traditional chief) prior to conducting their business in the village. The *gram sabhas* (village councils) have taken to hearing and settling cases relating to the village.

It is also reported that the people have once again started collecting non-wood forest produce from the Nagarahole forests. In some cases land has also been taken over for cultivation by tribals. Timber smuggling, reported to be a rampant problem in the Nagarahole area, has declined after the self-rule initiative. Non-tribal shopkeepers in villages have been thrown out as they also used to indulge in exploitative money-lending. Local tribal activists have asked for a redrawing of the boundaries of the Park which will include a core zone closed to villagers and the Forest Department alike; a middle-level zone for tourism and use by local communities; and a fringe zone where the tribal settlements must be allowed to exist in peace. A local NGO, Budakkatu Krishikara Samaja (BKS) (which early this year successfully fought a legal battle against an upcoming hotel on the edge of the National Park, see *JPAM Update 13*), has supported the tribals in their move towards self-rule.

Source: Tribal hamlets in Karnataka declare self rule, *Hindustan Times* 1/6/97.

KERALA

Periyar: Plans to develop Sabrimalai temple complex

The Kerala State Government is reported to be backing a proposal to develop the Sabrimalai temple complex adjacent to the Periyar Tiger Reserve, which will include additional construction along the pilgrim access road to the temple. Currently one of the access routes to Sabrimalai is through Periyar Tiger Reserve. The proposal includes diversion of some land from the Tiger Reserve. The State Government also proposes to actively promote tourism in the hills adjacent to Eravikulam National Park, Parambikulam Sanctuary and in the Anamalai range.

Contact: Jagdish Krishnaswamy, 22K, 1315 Morreene Road, Durham, NC 27705, USA
Email: jug@acpub.duke.edu.

Source: Email from Jagdish Krishnaswamy dated 18/7/97.

MADHYA PRADESH

Karera: Bustard gone, Blackbuck being wiped out

Dr. Asad Rahmani of the Bombay Natural History Society, who spent several years working on the endangered Great Indian bustard of Karera Sanctuary, has reported that the birds are locally extinct and the Blackbuck population on the verge of being wiped out. He also claims that the management of the Sanctuary has been reduced to a minimum with Forest Department staff seldom visiting the area.

The trouble is reported to have started with the Forest Department issuing notices to evict villages inside the Sanctuary. (Similar instances were reported in *JPAM Update 13*).

The relations between the Department and local communities are now strained to the extent that the villagers are reported to have killed nearly 60% of the blackbuck in the Sanctuary and even deny the very existence of the Great Indian bustard. Dr. Rahmani has also reported that in the past the villagers never considered the bustard as being inimical to their interests, indicated by the local name for the bird *sonchidiya*, or golden bird.

To make matters worse, a proposal to manage Dihaila Jheel inside the Sanctuary, in a way that it benefits the villagers while maintaining its integrity as a wetland ecosystem, has reportedly been shelved by the MP Forest Department.

Contact: Dr. Asad Rahmani, Bombay Natural History Society (see address, under Local News, Borivali)

Source: Letter dated 29/3/97 from Dr. Asad Rahmani.

MAHARASHTRA

Borivali: Mumbai residents campaign to "Save the Lakes"

A meeting was held at the Bombay Natural History Society (BNHS) of about a 100 people representing NGOs, citizens'

groups, Forest Department, and others on 22 April 1997, to discuss the problems of the Borivali (now known as Sanjay Gandhi) National Park. A position paper is currently being prepared on the various threats to the protected area including: encroachments, forest fires, bootlegging, expansion of temple complexes, quarries, builders, and the thousands of picnickers who visit the Park every week. In addition, a coalition of NGOs, activists, journalists and wildlifers has been formed for a "Save the Lakes" campaign to highlight the threats to the six reservoirs inside the Park supplying 50% of Mumbai's drinking water.

Contact: Bittu Sahgal (see address, under Local News, Kudremukh). **Bombay Natural History Society**, Hornbill House, Salim Ali Chowk, Dadabhai Naoraji Road, Mumbai 400 023. Tel: 022-284 3869, 284 3421, 282 1811; Fax: 022-283 7615.

Source: Email from Bittu Sahgal, *Sanctuary Magazine*, dated 22/5/97.

ORISSA

Bhitarkanika: Olive Ridleys give Gahirmatha the miss

The annual nesting of Olive Ridley turtles at Gahirmatha beach, was particularly poor this year with only a few thousand turtles showing up (See *JPAM Update 13*). However, other areas, especially in Andhra Pradesh reported greater numbers of Olive Ridleys than has been the case in the past. There is speculation among scientists that changes in global weather phenomenon may have had something to do with the disruption of nesting cycles. Twice in the 1980s there have been similar instances of low nesting numbers. Other possible factors could have been related to the recent spate of development projects in the region including fishing jetties in Bhitarkanika and the upcoming TISCO Steel Plant at Gopalpur, as also increased metal contamination of water courses.

As if the non-arrival of turtles in expected numbers was not bad enough, the carcasses of about 4,000 turtles and some dolphins were also found washed up on the shore of the beach during the nesting season. The cause of these deaths is not known but may have been the result of fishing trawlers using improper nets. The Ministry of Environment and Forests is reportedly considering declaring Gahirmatha and the area around it (not so far included in the Bhitarkanika Sanctuary) a marine sanctuary.

Source: Email from Vivek Tiwari dated 13/6/97.

RAJASTHAN

Desert National Park: Denotification and mining

The Rajasthan state government is reported to be considering allowing mining in Desert National Park. The area is a fine example of a desert ecosystem and has one of India's largest populations of the endangered Great Indian bustard (about 70). The 3,162 sq km National Park has already been affected by the passage of the Indira Gandhi Canal for a

distance of 70 km through the Park. Now there is a move to denotify most of the Park leaving only 300 sq km as a protected area, in order to enable limestone mining by private operators. Local Forest Department officials have claimed that the Park has been grossly neglected by the State government and are bitter about the recent moves to allow mining which they see as a contradictory policy of conservation and exploitation.

Contact: Asad Rahmani, Bombay Natural History Society (see address, under Local News, Borivali)

Source: *Indian Express* 3/8/97.

Kailadevi: People's protection of forests spreads beyond Sanctuary

Forest Protection Committees (see *JPAM Update 12*), locally known as *kulhadi bandh panchayat*, are now being established in villages outside Kailadevi Sanctuary as well. In Chaurdhan village at a meeting held on June 7 the members of the *kulhadi bandh panchayat* were appointed in the presence of Forest Department officials. There has also been some follow up on the resolutions of the workshop on "Kailadevi Sanctuary: Prospects for Conservation", organised by the Indian Institute of Public Administration (IIPA), New Delhi and the Society for Sustainable Development (SSD), Karauli, held on 6-7 December 1996 (see *JPAM Update 12*).

The district administration helped to monitor the state of water availability in villages inside the Sanctuary through the summer months by conducting periodic inspections. The Forest Department has also made plans to construct anicuts in some villages. According to the ACF (Wildlife), the procedures for receiving compensation for injury/loss of livestock to wild animals have been simplified by doing away with the need for a veterinary report prior to processing claims from villagers. This has yet to be officially confirmed by the Forest Department.

Contact: Arun Jindal, Society for Sustainable Development, Shah Inayat Khirkiya, Karauli 322 241, Dist. Karauli, Rajasthan. Tel: 07464-20 065.

Sources: Arun Jindal, pers comm. 30/7/97.

Several news items in *Rajasthan Patrika*.

TAMIL NADU

Kalakkad-Mundanthurai: Road project proposal revived

The Tamil Nadu state government has asked for the release of forest land to enable the laying of a 11.3 km road along the border with Kerala. This section of the road will be located inside the Kalakkad-Mundanthurai Tiger Reserve, while the complete road will connect Papanasam in Tamil Nadu with Thiruvananthapuram in Kerala. The Tamil Nadu government has apparently cleared the proposal and is awaiting clearance from the Ministry of Environment and Forests to begin construction.

Currently parts of the road are only accessible by jeep or motorcycle. The road will pass through some of the most dense forest areas of the Sanctuary and once regular traffic begins, it will be difficult to save this wildlife habitat.

Contact: Ravi Chellam, Wildlife Institute of India, PO Box 18, Chandrabani, Dehradun 248 001. Tel: 0135-620 912-5; Fax: 0135-620 217; Email: wii@giasdl01.vsnl.net.in.

Source: Email from Ravi Chellam dated 23/4/97.

UTTAR PRADESH

Dudhwa: Changing land use and attitudes affect barasingha

Barasingha (Swamp deer *Cervus duvauceli*) are declining in Dudhwa Tiger Reserve because their fawning grounds in the swamps outside the Park are being reclaimed for agriculture. Moreover, recent floods in the Suheli river have taken a heavy toll of new born calves, especially in the southern portion of the Park. Now attempts are on to keep the female barasinghas inside the Park by making alternate fawning sites available for them. The open grassland in the Sathiana area of the Park is being ploughed up to encourage new growth of palatable shoots. Local farmers have provided their tractors free of charge to help the Park authorities with the ploughing.

Contact: Rupak De, Field Director, Dudhwa Tiger Reserve, Lakhimpur, District Lakhimpur Kheri, Uttar Pradesh.

Source: Email from Yogesh Wadadekar dated 18/7/97.

Corbett: Pesticide use threatens raptors

A study undertaken by the Bombay Natural History Society in Corbett Tiger Reserve between 1991-96 has established that breeding among the Lesser fishing eagle is being threatened due to increased use of pesticides by farmers in the surrounding area. DDT is reported to have severely contaminated the birds hunting grounds leading to a thinning of eggshells and high mortality among new born chicks.

Contact: Rishad Naroji, Bombay Natural History Society (see address, under Local News, Borivali).

Source: Email from P. Kalra dated 6/7/97.

WEST BENGAL

Sundarbans: Steamer route proposed through the Tiger Reserve

A new international steamer route has been proposed by the Inland Waterways Authority of India, that will pass through the Sunderbans Tiger Reserve for a distance of 191 km before heading out into the Bay of Bengal. Although work on the

project has yet to commence, it is expected that the project will involve an enormous amount of dredging every year. An environment impact assessment of the project has concluded that "due to the dredging activity, a complete change in ecosystem is anticipated." Six to seven permanent concrete structures will also be built along the route to enable movement of goods and passengers.

Contact: **Bittu Sahgal** (see address, under Local News, Kudremukh).

Source: Email from Bittu Sahgal dated 23/4/97.

HELP REQUIRED TO MAP PROTECTED AREA HOTSPOTS

Bittu Sahgal, Editor Sanctuary Magazine is in the process of compiling information on, and making a map of, the instances of commercial pressures on protected areas and other wildlife habitats. Bittu is currently looking for assistance with the map preparation process. The map will need to be done on a computer using appropriate software and should be capable of depicting the following:

- Forest cover of India
- Location of national parks and sanctuaries
- Location of upto 60 industrial and development projects
- Location of forest dwelling communities

It is hoped that the map can be reproduced in a size of 15" x 20" or 18" x 23", with each entry annotated by way of a reference note. Ideas and suggestions on how such a map can be made and for further details contact Bittu Sahgal.

Contact: Bittu Sahgal (see address, under Local News, Kudremukh).

STATE NEWS

ANDHRA PRADESH

State government invests in villages around protected areas

According to the *Deccan Chronicle*, the Andhra Pradesh government has invested in nearly 200 villages around nine protected areas in the state. *Vana Samrakshana Samithis* (Forest Protection Committees) have been established and roughly Rs. 6 lakhs spent on every village. Details of activities taken up under this investment are not known.

Source: *Deccan Chronicle* 18/6/97.

MAHARASHTRA

Third Conference on Sanctuaries

The Third Conference on Sanctuaries in Maharashtra, held at Malwan, Sindhudurg District, from 25-27 October 1996, was attended by local people representing several protected areas in the state (Radhanagri, Koyna, Bhimashankar, Borivali, Melghat, Pench, Nagzira, etc.), environmentalists, scientists and Forest Department officials.

A paper on People-oriented Sanctuaries: Principles and Practices, drafted by Vasant Palshikar, was presented and discussed at the start of the meeting. Several experiences from various protected areas were reported, which highlighted the following issues:

1. Local communities continue to remain unaware of the process of declaration and management of protected areas.
2. People living in and around protected areas have to endure a confusing system of rights and concessions which make certain activities legal and others illegal.
3. Management of protected areas is becoming an increasingly difficult task in the absence of a dialogue between the Forest Department and local people.

Specific cases that came up for discussion included bauxite mining in Radhanagari Sanctuary, fishing in Pench National Park and Malwan Sanctuary.

The meeting concluded with a call for greater involvement of local people in the management of protected areas, greater transparency in government processes regarding protected areas and a lift on the ban on fishing in protected areas.

Contact: **Kusum Karnik**, 'SHASHWAT', Manchar 410 503, District Pune, Maharashtra.

Source: Summary report on the Third Conference on Sanctuaries.

NATIONAL NEWS

Building Bridges: Consultation On Wildlife Conservation And People's Livelihood Rights

A group of about 20 social activists, wildlife conservationists, researchers, lawyers, and media-persons met from 10 to 12 April, 1997, at Bhikampura- Kishori in Alwar District, adjacent to the Sariska Tiger Reserve in Rajasthan. The meeting, called by the Indian Institute of Public Administration (IIPA) and Kalpavriksh, and hosted by Tarun Bharat Sangh, was an attempt to initiate a dialogue between those advocating the cause of wildlife protection and those struggling to uphold the human rights of rural communities living in and around wildlife habitats.

The participants agreed that there were certain essential **principles** concerning both local people's livelihoods as well as wildlife conservation that could not be compromised upon. These include: the right to existence of wildlife, the right to access natural resources by local communities, the full and informed participation of local communities in the management of protected areas, opposition to dependence on foreign agencies for funds, opposition to forced displacement, and protection of threatened species.

Based on these principles a **strategy** was worked out to include: joint programmes between conservationists and social activists, public hearings, consistent defence of local community rights and protected area values, strengthening of wildlife legislation against destructive forces, challenging elite lifestyles and consumerism, declaring all protected areas off-limits to destructive projects, and combining formal/modern with local/traditional knowledge.

Amongst the **joint actions** proposed as follow-up were: lobbying for changes in the Wildlife Act, producing a simple booklet on the Act, helping the Indian People's Tribunal on Environment and Human Rights to investigate ongoing conflicts in and around Madhya Pradesh's PAs, providing support to villagers' move to declare the entire Arvari River catchment (in Rajasthan) a people's protected area, and taking legal action against some tourism projects affecting PAs.

The full text of the joint statement, and news on follow-up, is available from the Editorial address.

Committee to amend Wild Life (Protection) Act

The Committee to suggest amendments to India's Wild Life (Protection) Act, 1972, has finished its work and submitted a new draft Act to the Ministry of Environment and Forests. Committee members who were contacted were cagey about parting with a copy of the amended Act. It is not known how many of the suggestions made by NGOs and experts (see *JPAM Updates 6 to 13*) have been incorporated. On behalf of the group of social activists and conservationists which met at Bhikampura in April this year (see item above), Kalpavriksh and the IIPA JPAM team sent a letter to the Committee asking for widespread consultation before the new Act is finalised. In response, the Committee Chairman, Dr. M.K. Ranjitsinh claimed that they had already undertaken

the most consultative process possible.

Contact: Kishore Rao, DIG (WL), Ministry of Environment & Forests, Paryavaran Bhavan, CGO Complex, Lodhi Estate, New Delhi 110 003. Tel: 011-436 0957; Fax: 011-436 3918; Email: krao@envfor.delhi.nic.in.

Indian Board for Wildlife meeting

The Indian Board for Wildlife, having been resurrected from the dead a few months ago (see *JPAM Update 13*), had another meeting on July 11, 1997, under the chair of Prime Minister I.K. Gujral. A full report of the proceedings is not yet available, but some of the issues that came up for discussion were: possible employment alternatives for those engaged in the bird trade; people-wolf encounters, particularly in UP; suggestions for overhauling the Forest Department; the World Bank-Global Environment Facility projects; establishment of a Fuelwood Mission; and the establishment of a cell in the Home Ministry to monitor illegal trade in wildlife. Members present at the meeting report that among the several decisions taken, some notable ones include: the PM will address the nation on the issue of wildlife conservation on Doordarshan; the impact of World Bank funded projects on tiger habitats will be studied; a Standing Committee with the Minister for Environment and Forests as convenor, will be established to go into the details of actions required to follow up on decisions taken.

Contact: Kishore Rao (see address, under National News, Wild Life Act Committee).

IIPA's JPAM project ends

Over the last year and a half, the Indian Institute of Public Administration has been conducting field work in three PAs (Kailadevi Sanctuary, Rajasthan; Dalma Sanctuary, Bihar; Rajaji National Park, Uttar Pradesh), as also doing conceptual work, on the possibilities of joint management. The project has involved, apart from research, initiating dialogues between PA authorities and local villagers, servicing the requests of movements and NGOs and officials across the country, and networking (e.g. through this *Update*). News on the progress of the project has been regularly carried in the *Update*.

The research part of the project is now over, and a final document containing three detailed reports on these sites, along with 5 other reports on legal, institutional, and other aspects of JPAM, has been produced. The key issues in JPAM have been summarised in a short document, which can be requested from us at the Editorial address.

The report has been sent to the authorities of the three PAs, concerned NGOs and individuals, and major conservation organisations in the country. Already, there has been some response; the Ranthambhor Tiger Reserve authorities plan to use it in a meeting they are organising to discuss the management problems of the area (which includes Kailadevi Sanctuary). Project Elephant director, Shri Vinod Rishi, has offered to use the recommendations of the reports on Dalma

and Rajaji.

This report will be brought out as a book by IIPA after getting comments and revising it. The project team will continue to be involved with initiatives in these 3 PAs, and will also continue to facilitate national networking on JPAM related issues, from a new base in Pune (see box on pg. 2).

Project Tiger takes policy decision on displacement from Tiger Reserves

At a recent meeting of the Project Tiger Steering Committee, chaired by the Union Minister for Environment and Forests and attended by the Secretary (Environment & Forests), a categorical decision was taken that "forced displacement from existing or proposed Project Tiger Reserves must not take place." Further it was decided that those villages seeking voluntary relocation will be extended all facilities, including financial, to enable them to resettle elsewhere.

Contact: P.K. Sen, Director, Project Tiger, Ministry of Environment and Forests, Annexe No. 5, Bikaner House, New Delhi 110 011. Tel/Fax: 011-338 4428.

Source: Fax from P.K. Sen, Director, Project Tiger to Bittu Sahgal, Member Project Tiger Steering Committee, dated 7/2/97.

INTERNATIONAL NEWS

NEPAL/INDIA

Shuklaphanta/Pilibhit: Mahakali Pancheswar project threatens wildlife

An agreement has been reached between India and Nepal over the construction of the multi-purpose Mahakali Pancheswar hydel-irrigation project. However there exist several ecologically important areas downstream of the project including: Shuklaphanta Wildlife Reserve (Nepal), several Reserved Forests in Pilibhit District (India) and the Sarda river in India where over 200 Gharial have been released besides possessing a confirmed population of Gangetic dolphins. It is not known whether an impact assessment of the project on these species and habitats will be made.

Contact: Jagdish Krishnaswamy (see address, under Local News, Periyar)

Source: Email from Jagdish Krishnaswamy dated 18/7/97.

NEPAL/INDIA

At the first Trans-boundary Consultative Meeting on Biodiversity Conservation between Nepal and India, a resolution was adopted which advocates, among other actions, the following: establishment of trans-boundary protected areas, sharing of PA related information, joint anti-poaching and surveillance measures on the border, monitoring of trans-boundary

movement of animals, and measures to involve local people in conservation. These decisions will hopefully help to resolve some of the outstanding problems of illegal trade in wildlife, poaching in border areas (e.g. at Dudhwa National Park in Uttar Pradesh), and others.

Contact: Kishore Rao (see address, under National News, Wild Life Act Committee).

MYANMAR

Conservation extracts heavy price from indigenous people of Myanmar

In an impressive case of investigative journalism, reporters of the *Observer* have unearthed a bizarre conservation policy of the military junta in Myanmar. The proposed Myinmolekat Nature Reserve will be roughly 100,000 ha in size and located in the semi-independent region of the Karen people. In addition, a large-scale eco-tourism venture is being proposed along the southern coast of the country in the Mergui archipelago with the establishment of the Labini Island National Park. Both proposals are being supported by the Wildlife Conservation Society (WCS) and the Smithsonian Institution in the US. WWF-International is also reported to have shown keen interest in these conservation projects.

However, there is apparently an uglier side to these initiatives. An estimated 2,000 Karen people have either been killed or have disappeared in just two months, as part of the purge to make the Myinmolekat Nature Reserve totally free of any human presence. There are reports of hundreds of people being engaged in forced labour and several thousands having fled into the deep forest or across to neighbouring Thailand. The officials in the Forestry Ministry have denied any attempts to forcibly evict people from the Reserve. Interestingly, it has also been reported that in the Tenasserim Division, where the Karen Liberation Army is fairly active, indigenous people have already declared their own wildlife sanctuaries.

Source: Burma's junta goes green, *The Observer* (London) 23/3/97.

IUCN INITIATIVES IN ASIA

IUCN - The World Conservation Union is planning a series of initiatives focusing on people's involvement in protected areas and conservation, in the South and South-East Asia region. The focus, as determined by its country offices, partners and members in the region, will be on action research and process documentation of selected community participation efforts, capacity-building of stakeholders and policy analysis. Exchange of personnel between various sites, and field training will be encouraged. Different units within the IUCN headquarters (Biodiversity, Social Policy, and Protected Areas), will facilitate the process, which will be carried out by several local groups including IUCN country offices/partners in Asia, Asian members of the World Commission on Protected Areas and of the Collaborative Management Working Group, and NGOs from each country.

Contact, at IUCN HQ (IUCN The World Conservation Union, 28 Rue de Mauverney, Gland CH 1196,

Switzerland): **Grazia Borrini-Feyerabend**, Head IUCN Social Policy Group, Tel: 41-22-999 0274; Fax: 41-22-999 025; Email: gbf@hq.iucn.org. **Jeff McNeely**, Chief Biodiversity Officer, Email: jam@hq.iucn.org. **Caroline Martinet**, Biodiversity Unit, Email: ccm@hq.iucn.org. **David Sheppard**, Protected Areas Programme. Tel: 41-22-999 0162; Fax: 41-22-999 0015; Email: das@hq.iucn.org.

Other contacts: **Leslie Wijesinghe**, IUCN Sri Lanka, 7 Vajira Lane, Colombo 5. Tel: 94-1-584 402; Fax: 94-1-580-202; Email: twcusi@sri.lanka.net. **Krishna Oli**, IUCN Nepal, PO Box 3923, Kathmandu, Nepal. Tel: 977-1-523 348; Fax: 977-1-521 506; Email: iucn@mos.com.np. **Sejal Worah**, World Wide Fund for Nature, ICDP Training Programme (Asia/Pacific), Asian Institute of Technology, P.O. Box 4, Khlong Luang 12120, Thailand. Tel: 66-2-524 6128; Fax: 66-2-524 6134; Email: wwficdp@ait.ac.th. **Ashish Kothari** (at the Editorial address).

UPCOMING

Forum '97: New Linkages in Conservation and Development

The Conservation Development Forum, a partnership between the University of Florida, Ford Foundation and a global network of scholars and practitioners established in 1996, is organising Forum '97: New Linkages in Conservation and Development, in Istanbul, Turkey. The meeting from 16-21 November 1997, will cover the following themes: culturally conflicting views of conservation; engaging communities in conservation and development; ethics and responsibility in environmental action; conservation and development in war and peace; business as a partner in environmental action; and institutional pathways to sustainability.

The agenda also includes a specific workshop on "Community-based Wildlife Management."

Contact: Conservation Development Forum, University of Florida, 304 Grinter Hall, P.O. Box 115531, Gainesville, FL, USA 32611-5531. Tel: 1-352-392 6548; Fax: 1-352-392 0085. Email: cdf@tcd.ufl.edu; Url: <http://www.cdf.ufl.edu>.

Symposium: Protected Areas in the 21st Century

The World Commission on Protected Areas of the IUCN - The World Conservation Union, is organising a symposium "Protected Areas in the 21st Century: From Islands to Networks", in Albany, Western Australia, on 23-29th November, 1997. This is meant to be a mid-term review the progress of the 10-year action plan which was formulated at the IVth World Congress on National Parks and Protected Areas, Caracas, 1992. Participation is by invitation only.

Contact: David Sheppard, Head, Programme on Protected Areas/WCPA, IUCN (see address above, under International News.).

Sixth World Wilderness Congress

The 6th World Wilderness Congress is coming up at Bangalore, 18-24 October 1997. The theme of the meeting is "The Call for a Sustainable Future", and intends to focus attention on the Asian region. The meeting is a project of the International Wilderness Leadership Foundation (WILD) and provides an international forum to discuss and act upon critical matters of environmental security, specially related to the conservation of wilderness and wildland areas.

Contact: Dr. M.A. Parthasarthy, No.1 12th Cross, Rajmahal Vila Extension, Bangalore 560 080, Karnataka, India. Tel: 91-80-345 595. Fax: 91-80-341 647.

WHAT'S AVAILABLE?

- Ghimire, K.P and Pimbert, M.P (eds). 1997. *Social Change and Conservation*. Earthscan Publications Ltd., London.

A useful compilation of papers on the social aspects of conservation, particularly protected areas. Besides some concept papers it also includes case studies from Costa Rica, Germany, India, France, China, South Africa, Zimbabwe and Canada. The book covers issues such as indigenous peoples and conservation, role of NTFP collection in local economies, the interface between development and conservation and the role of tourism.

Contact: Earthscan Publications Ltd., 120 Pentonville Road, London N1 9JN. Tel: 44-171-278 0433; Fax: 44-171-278 1142; Email: earthinfo@earthscan.co.uk

- Electronic mail discussion site on natural history

An interesting and useful email discussion site, devoted largely to natural history/conservation issues in South Asia, is run by volunteers from Princeton University, USA. Informal discussions range from the biology of singing ants to population dynamics affecting conservation! Subscribing is free; send an email to: nathistory-india@lists.princeton.edu.

- DeCosse, P.J. and Jayawickrama, S.S. 1997. *Co-management of Resources in Sri Lanka: Status, Issues and Opportunities*. USAID and Sri Lanka Natural Resources & Environment Policy Project/ International Resources Group, Ltd. (NAREPP/IRG), Colombo.

An overview of the co-management opportunities in Sri Lanka, the study makes suggestions for policy changes to enable greater use of the approach for resource management in the

country. The study concentrates on state-owned resources and five groups of people, i.e. the local community, local support institutions, external beneficiaries, central resource institutions and other external stakeholders.

Contact: NAREPP/IRG, USAID, 1 Gower Street, Colombo 5, Sri Lanka. Tel: 94-1-586 099; Fax: 94-1-583 175.

- **CM News**

The newsletter of the Collaborative Management Working Group of the IUCN Social Policy Group, provides information from around the world on collaborative natural resource management initiatives including those for protected areas.

Contact: Grazia Borrini-Feyerabend or Gabriella Richardson, Social Policy Group, IUCN (see address above, under International News).

- **Bird Link Newsletter**

Newsletter of the recently established Bird Link network, a collective of individuals interested in ornithology. Bird Link invites contributions of news, information and views on birds and related issues.

Contact: Bird Link, 101/4 Kaushalya Park, Hauz Khas, New Delhi 110 016. Tel: 011-696 1520, 660 607; Fax: 011-686 4614; Email: biks@giadsl01.vsnl.net.in.

- Desai, Ajay. 1997. *The Indian Elephant*. BNHS,

Mumbai.

- Daniel, J.C. 1997. *Extinction is Forever*. BNHS, Mumbai.
- Karanth, U.K. 1997. *Predators and Prey*. BNHS, Mumbai.
- Borges, R.M. 1997. *Evolution, the Story of Life*. BNHS, Mumbai.
- Gadgil, Madhav. 1997. *Diversity, the Cornerstone of Life*. BNHS, Mumbai.
- Khemikar, Issac. 1997. *Moths of India, an Introduction*. BNHS, Mumbai.

Published by the BNHS, these six new titles are for the 12 to 18 age-group, with several more to follow in the series. Available at Rs. 125 for the set.

Contact: Bombay Natural History Society (see address under Local News, Borivali)

CORRIGENDUM

In *JPAM Update 13* (April 1997), we had carried a news item about a two-day workshop on 'People and Protected Areas', organised by the National Committee for Protection of Land Resources, held at Nagpur on 7-8 December 1996. In the list of participating organisations we had failed to mention the Bombay Natural History Society (BNHS) as one of those taking part. The error is regretted.

WE'RE MOVING! The team producing JPAM Update is shifting base. The Update will now be produced from Pune (pl. see mailing address at the end, which is being used temporarily till an institutional base is found). PLEASE MAKE A NOTE OF THIS. **ALL READERS ARE REQUESTED TO CONTINUE SENDING NEWS AND OPINIONS ON PROTECTED AREA ISSUES AT THE NEW ADDRESS.**

JPAM Update is produced every two months as a follow-up to the workshop on Exploring the Possibilities of Joint Protected Area Management (JPAM), organised at the Indian Institute of Public Administration (IIPA), New Delhi, in September 1994. *JPAM Update 14* was prepared by Farhad Vania and Ashish Kothari. Secretarial support was provided by Vishal Thakre, Sangeeta Kaintura, Virender Anand and Kheema Rawat.

Ideas, comments, news and information may please be sent to the new editorial address. Please note this is a mailing address only:

Ashish Kothari
c/o Anchal Sondhi, B1 Siddheshwar Heights
Sanewadi, Aundh, Pune 411 007
Maharashtra, India

Email: akothari@kv.unv.ernet.in.

JPAM UPDATE
News on Action Towards Joint Protected Area Management

No. 16

April 1998

LOCAL NEWS

BIHAR

Palamau Tiger Reserve: Daily wage workers lose their lives

Tragic news recently came from Palamau Tiger Reserve, Bihar. Two daily wage employees of the Reserve, Shri Aziz Quraishi and Shri Sukhdeo Parahiya, lost their lives in a land mine explosion at Terhwa Nala of Chungroo village while patrolling the forest. Their vehicle was blown into pieces. Divisional Forest Officer S.E.H. Kazmi, who was accompanying them and had just got off the vehicle, survived.

Kazmi reports that Quraishi was one of Project Tiger's best drivers and information gatherers, and had been responsible for many seizures of smuggled timber. Parahiya was an excellent tracker, with extraordinary knowledge of tigers.

The perils of protecting wildlife in areas with 'terrorist' activities are at their extreme in Palamau Tiger Reserve. WPSI reports that the mine was specifically detonated to kill Mr. Kazmi. After the explosion he radioed for help but the enforcement authorities were unwilling to come to his assistance for fear of the Naxalites. He had to walk 10 km. for help, and then return the next day (again on foot, because of landmines) to collect the scattered remains of the two bodies. Timber and *Katha* (*Acacia catechu*) smugglers are reportedly protected by a section of the Naxalites, and Palamau now contains the last stands of *Katha* trees in the area. Understandably, without protection support, no member of the forest staff now dares to go into the field.

Pl. see the appeal in the box below.

Contact: S.E.H. Kazmi, Divisional Forest Officer, Daltonganj South Division, Project Tiger Circle, Palamau, Daltonganj 822101, Bihar. **Belinda Wright**, Executive Director, Wildlife Protection Society of India, Thapar House, 124 Janpath, New Delhi 110001, India. Tel: 91-11-6213864; Fax: 3368729; Email: blue@nda.vsnl.net.in (or) wpsi.wildlife@gems.vsnl.net.in.

Source: Appeal issued by S.E.H. Kazmi, and emails from WPSI.

APPEAL

Quraishi and Parahiya were not regular government servants,

and have left behind families (including 6 children) now facing a future of economic hardships. Due to lack of funds, the Forest Department had apparently been unable to pay them wages for the past ten months! Hence any financial assistance or compensation from the government is unlikely. The Wildlife Protection Society of India (WPSI) is arranging to have funds sent to the bank account that has been set up to help the families of the deceased.

You are requested to provide financial help to the families of the deceased. Kindly send your contributions, by cheque, demand draft or money order, in the name of Account No. 1021, Palamau Kshetriya Gramin Bank, Hamidganj, Daltonganj. The contributions should be sent to **Shri Vishwanth Shah**, IFS, Attached Officer, Project Tiger Circle, Palamau, Daltonganj, Bihar, or to **WPSI** (address above).

GUJARAT

Bamboo cutting stopped in Shoolpaneshwar Sanctuary

Readers may recall earlier reportage in *JPAM Update* No. 9 regarding the rampant cutting of bamboo inside the Shoolpaneshwar Sanctuary by the SPM Paper Mills. SPM had for the last few years received a permit from the Forest Department to do this cutting, apparently only of dead bamboo. Local NGOs had reported that under this pretext, a lot of green bamboo was also being taken away; they alleged that in the year 1994-95 alone, about 0.12 million tonnes of bamboo was cut. At one point, Sanctuary officials had justified the cutting, saying that the resulting openings favoured wild herbivores!

The NGO ARCH-Vahini, which has been actively fighting for the rights of tribals who inhabit the Sanctuary, and who reportedly have a tough time meeting basic needs because of the Sanctuary's restrictive rules, has repeatedly highlighted the bamboo cutting issue. Finally, the Gujarat High Court took notice of the media coverage, and directed a CBI enquiry into the matter. The CBI report, accompanied by revealing video footage, showed that there were a series of irregularities in the way that SPM was doing the cutting, including violations of the Forest Working Plan for the area. Finally, on a writ filed by ARCH-Vahini, the court has directed that all cutting be stopped, and that the state government take firm steps to conserve the resources of the sanctuary. It has also authorised NGOs to monitor the situation, and report any irregularities.

Meanwhile, in an interesting development, the tribal villages situated inside the Sanctuary chose a "people's candidate" to fight the Lok Sabha elections. This was supported by ARCH-Vahini. The fate of the candidate (Manga Vasava) is not known at the time of going to press.

Contact: Rajesh Mishra, ARCH-Vahini, Mangrol, Tal. Rajpipla, Dist. Rajpipla 393150, Gujarat.

Sources: 'Soorpaneshwar Abhyaranya: C.P.M. Bahar'. In **Lokrah**, Rajpipla, 3/2/1998 (in Gujarati); Note on Manga Vasava issued by ARCH-Vahini.

Habitat destruction affects Wild Ass population in Rann of Kutch

The Wild ass (*Equus hemionus khur*), found only in India, is restricted to the salt desert ecosystem in the Rann of Kutch, Gujarat. With drastical deterioration in its habitat, its future is severely threatened. It has found its food base in the vegetated islands of the desert (which are the only dry patches during the area's periodic inundation by salt and freshwater) shrinking, and has to increasingly compete for this food base with huge numbers of livestock. Its major stronghold is the Dhrangadhra Sanctuary, covering virtually the whole of the Little Rann (an area of about 4,850 sq.km.), with an estimated population of about 2,400.

In the last two decades, salt traders and extractors have enveloped and encroached the sanctuary area with salt-pans. Fishermen exploit the area during the monsoon, in violation of the Wild Life Act. Thousands of domestic cattle enter the Rann daily to graze illegally, depriving the local wildlife of fodder and spreading diseases. Nearly 900 sq.km. of the sanctuary is forest land but is being used as a transit route for commercial products, in alleged violation of the Forest Conservation Act. The army occupies 1,000 sq.km. of the sanctuary for a field firing range, again causing wildlife disturbance. A branch of the Narmada canal has been planned on the fringe of the sanctuary, which, according to a Wildlife Institute of India report, could cause further havoc. The sanctuary is short of manpower and equipment to patrol its vast area, according to the Wild Ass Sanctuary superintendent. Fodder bed plantations for the asses and guarding of the areas fringing the sanctuary have been undertaken as a measure to protect the animal. Although no legal action can be taken against the rampant salt-panning, the Revenue Department has stopped issuing new licenses.

Wildlife experts insist that the Union Ministry of Environment and Forests set up a fact-finding mission to visit the sanctuary and ensure that the laws are enforced.

Source : Balaram, G. Wild Habitat Deteriorating, Wild Ass of the Rann Find Going Tough. *Times of India*. 2/2/98.

Gir: villages will not be part of extended area

Revenue villages and agricultural land in Gir forest area will not be included or be a part of the proposed extension to the existing national park, the Deputy Conservator of Forests said in a statement. The people in these villages will hence remain unaffected by the extension.

It may be noted here that following earlier notifications which included one lakh hectares of land of Gir forest in the national park, apprehension was created among dwellers in this area that their villages would also be included in the park, and they had made a representation against it. The clarification was issued to dispel this apprehension.

Contact: Deputy Conservator of Forests (WL), Sasan Gir 363 125, Dist. Junagadh, Gujarat.

Source : Anon. 'Villages Will Not be a Part of the National Park'. *Times of India* 25/3/98.

JAMMU AND KASHMIR

Militant activities threaten existence of the Kashmir stag

The Hangul or Kashmir stag (*Cervus elaphus hanglu*) is reported to be slipping towards extinction in its last bastion, the Dachigam National Park. Unofficial estimates point to an alarming decline of this majestic deer over the decade of militancy, from 818 to its lowest-ever population of between 100 to 170 individuals.

Set up as a royal hunting reserve in 1910, and declared a sanctuary in 1951, Dachigam was voted the best National Park in the country in the 1980s. It then turned into a sanctuary for militants and renegades, who shot and injured an estimated 200-250 Hangul.

Dachigam is a prime example of the devastation wrought upon the Valley by the years of turmoil. There are no more than 15-16 functionaries of the Wildlife Department to watch over the 141 sq. km. Park, whose altitudinal range (1700-4000 m) make patrolling doubly difficult. Dachigam is home to 20 mammal species, 150 bird species and 50 species of trees. For fear of the lurking threat of the militants, the park is not guarded/patrolled by the wildlife functionaries during the night. Besides poaching of the Hangul and birds like the Monal and the Koklas pheasants, the last few years were an open season for timber felling, extraction of gravel, stones and boulders, and grazing with the connivance of either the wildlife functionaries or the militants. The deforestation accruing from these illegal activities has contributed to the siltation of the Dal Lake and a falling capacity of the woodlands to absorb the pollution from the urban areas. The Park forms half the catchment area of the Lake and provides a substantial part of the freshwater supply of Srinagar, the state capital.

The Park's infrastructural facilities were nearly wrecked over the militancy years. The interpretation centre suffered a bomb blast, while the library lies in neglect and is used to billet security forces. Wildlife functionaries are not spared by militants, a few having fallen to their rifles over the years. It is now known if the relative decline in militancy in the state has now improved matters.

Source : *Indian Express* 7/2/98

MADHYA PRADESH

Fishy goings on in Pench Tiger Reserve

With a reported annual income of about Rs. 2 crores, the commercial fish mafia of Nagpur has for the last three years lobbied successfully to exploit the fishing potential of the Pench reservoir spread across Madhya Pradesh and Maharashtra, inside the National Park boundaries. The fishing activities are being prevented and discouraged within the Maharashtra shore by strict surveillance from a patrol boat donated to the forest department with the initiative of Tiger Link.

However, the conflict continues in Madhya Pradesh, with news suggesting that the Congress Party in Chhindwara (former Environment Minister Kamal Nath's constituency) had promised the fishing mafia of Nagpur unbridled access to the Pench reservoir. The matter has actually reached the Supreme Court which issued very strict orders allowing only 300 or so fishing licences to be issued to local villagers, for fixed routes and for fixed times.

However, it is reported that no less than 1000 people are being pushed into the National Park from all sides to fish, and they camp there for days on end. This appears to be a clear contempt of court, and NGOs have demanded that the concerned M.P. government officials should go to jail for this.

The issue is complicated by the fact that a number of villagers are dependent on fishing for their economic livelihood, and the above mentioned case in the Supreme Court had considered their needs. However, clearly vested commercial interests are exploiting the situation, and have thwarted NGO attempts at reconciling the genuine livelihood interests of villagers with the conservation values of Pench.

Contact : Bittu Sahgal, Sanctuary Magazine, 602 Maker Chambers V, Nariman Point, Mumbai 400 021. Tel: 91-22-283 0061; Fax : 287 4380. Email: bittu@giasbm01.vsnl.net.in

MAHARASHTRA

Mining at Radhanagari Sanctuary

A Division Bench of the Bombay High Court has restrained the Indian Aluminium Co. Ltd (INDAL) from carrying out any mining activity within the Radhanagari Bison Sanctuary in District Kolhapur, in a writ petition filed by the Bombay Environmental Action Group.

Armed with a lower court order, INDAL has earlier stripped the protective cover from a key plateau in the Sanctuary, using bulldozers. It is reported that, thus far, not one truck of bauxite has actually been smelted by the company.

Radhanagari Sanctuary contains many endemic and rare plants, insects, birds, and mega-fauna including leopard, gaur (*Bos gaurus*) and tiger. A proposal is being readied by a special investigative team to propose this vital Western Ghats forest as a Project Tiger Reserve.

Meanwhile, INDAL and researcher Sharad Subramanyan have stated that the mined area is outside the current sanctuary limits, and even if the sanctuary is extended as proposed to include this area, the mine will be 8 km. from the core area. They also state that the mining technology used will cause minimal disturbance to the area. Activists from Kolhapur and

Bombay maintain, however, that the mining poses a serious hazard, not just because of the actual mining activity but also because of the access roads and other associated activities. The High Court will hear the matter further before final judgement is passed.

Contact: Bittu Sahgal, see MP above. Debi Goenka, Bombay Environmental Action Group, c/o Shyam Chainani, 9 St. James Court, Marine Drive, Mumbai 400 020. Tel: 91-22-514 7574; Fax: 511 5810; Email: beag@access.net.in.

Sources: Postings by Bittu Sahgal and others, and subsequent discussion between them and Sharad Subramanyan, on nathistory-india@lists.princeton.edu, Feb-March 1998.

Meeting on Communities in Melghat Tiger Reserve

Melghat Tiger Reserve is once again in the centre of controversy, following the state government's zealous drive to build or tar roads throughout the Reserve, ostensibly as a response to NGO demands for amenities to villages affected by malnutrition deaths last year. Conservationists have opposed this move, fearing that it will only open the area to further commercial exploitation, and arguing that tribals outside the Reserve are more affected by malnutrition than those within, who have adequate forest resources to survive on.

The NGO Co-ordination Committee (the NGO CC), of NGOs working with communities living in and around the Reserve, held a meeting on 28th January, 1998, at Chikhaldara inside the Reserve. While this was one of their regular meetings to assess the state of their work on issues such as malnutrition, they had also invited conservationists to discuss the above controversies. NGOs present at the meeting included YUVA Nagpur, Oxfam Nagpur, Koro Kora, ADIM, Utkarsh, Upekshit, Apeksha Home Society, Kal ke Liye, Prem, Sarita, Human Rights Law Network, Kalpavriksh, and Amravati Nature Conservation Society. The discussions brought out the following main points:

- (i) The serious communication gap between wildlifers and human rights activists on the status of communities inside the Reserve must be bridged with regular correspondence and meetings.
- (ii) Community-based NGOs clarified that they did not want major tarred roads through the Reserve, but rather 'traditional' approach paths, to ensure access for villagers especially in the difficult monsoon months.
- (iii) Other developmental amenities being demanded included medical and educational facilities; however, NGOs agreed that they should try to build on local health and learning traditions and only supplement these with allopathic and formal educational systems where necessary.
- (iv) On the proposed hydro-electricity dam proposed on the edge of the Reserve, the NGOs were eager to fight against it.
- (v) There was general agreement that forced relocation was unacceptable, nor was a situation where villagers are so cut

off from basic amenities that they are forced to ask for relocation.

(vi) Community-based NGOs agreed to work out, with the 22 villages inside the Reserve, joint management plans which would help to protect the forests and wildlife as also meet livelihood requirements.

(vii) To this end, a joint statement between conservationists and human rights organisations would be worked on; the Melghat NGOs would discuss this in their next meeting.

(viii) The government would be jointly pressurised to release all information relevant to Melghat; urban NGOs would help local groups to obtain such information.

(ix) The Amravati Nature Conservation Society member requested NGO members to report poaching cases to him, especially where forest staff were involved; he also promised immediate payment of compensation for cattle kills, using his position as Honorary Wildlife Warden for Amravati district.

Contact: Datta Patil, YUVA Nagpur, 295 Abhyankar Nagar, Nagpur 440 010, Maharashtra. Tel/Fax: 91-712-54 3561; Ashish Kothari, at editorial address; Bittu Sahgal, see MP above.

Rehekuri Blackbuck Sanctuary

The Maharashtra government has declared 217.30 hectares of reserve forest at Rehekuri in District Ahmednagar as a sanctuary for the endangered Blackbuck, locally known as 'Kalvit'.

The wildlife authorities had initiated a project with a small Blackbuck population (15) in the 1980s; the population has shot up to about 400. The Blackbuck, found only in India, has suffered a serious decline in numbers all over the country in the past few decades. According to a forest range officer of the sanctuary, a population of 40 lakhs in the 19th century has recently receded to 4 lakhs (*Editorial note: the basis for these figures, which seem grossly exaggerated, is unclear*). He attributes illegal poaching by tribals as one of the reasons for this considerable reduction in the Blackbuck population.

Another threat to the animal was from wolves and dogs which hunt it, taking a heavy toll of fawns.

These factors led the government to take the decision to declare Rehekuri as a sanctuary. Simultaneously Ramling-Ghat in Beed district and an area in Akola district have also been declared as sanctuaries. Protection, food, water and prevention of diseases, research and counting process are some of the major responsibilities of the officials. More than 15 forest guards patrol the sanctuary. The state government has also made accommodation facilities to promote eco-tourism.

Source : Press Trust of India. Rehekuri - A Sanctuary for Black Bucks. *Indian Express* 25/3/98.

ORISSA

Rare migratory birds sighted at Chilka

Ornithologists have sighted some rare migratory birds this winter in the Chilka lake, a bird sanctuary and one of the country's largest waterfowl habitats. Baikal teal (*Anas formosa*), the resident bird of lake Baikal in northern Asia, was found in the 'Nalaban' for the first time this year.

About two million birds had arrived at the lake since October 18, 1997. The influx which continued till the second week of January, was expected to end now, and the winged visitors have started leaving at the first hint of summer towards the end of February or early March.

Source : *Deccan Herald*, Jan.22, 1998 (PTI), reported in nathistory-india@lists.princeton.edu.

TAMIL NADU

Expansion of Mudumalai and Mukurthi Sanctuaries

Mudumalai and Mukurthi Sanctuaries, two of Tamil Nadu's most important wildlife reserves, have reportedly been expanded. Mudumalai has been expanded by 240 sq km. to a total of 561 sq km., possibly to include dry thorn forests and scrub in the Sigur area. Mukurthi, home of the threatened Nilgiri tahr (*Hermitragus hylocrius*), has been increased by 33 sq km. to 111 sq km, possibly to include adjacent grasslands. No further details are as yet available.

Source: <http://www.coimbatore.com/news.htm>, as reported by Jagdish Krishnaswamy on nathistory-india@lists.princeton.edu, 13 March, 1998.

UTTAR PRADESH

Proposed dolphin sanctuary in Uttar Pradesh

The 160 km. stretch in the upper part of the Ganga between Bijnor and Narora barrage in Uttar Pradesh will soon be declared a Dolphin sanctuary, according to sources of the World Wildlife Fund for Nature. Though it has been listed under Schedule I of the Wild Life (Protection) Act, 1972, the Gangetic dolphin (*Platanista gangetica*) is fast vanishing. Conservationists put its present population at around 2,500, down from 4,000-5,000 in 1982. Of the 130-160 dolphins killed annually on an average, as many as 100 are in the Ganges between Buxer and Farakka.

The proposed sanctuary would be the second in the country after Vikramshila in Bihar. A detailed plan to save the dolphin also includes: to ascertain the current status of the dolphin; to set up trans-boundary aquatic biodiversity protected areas between India, Nepal, Bangladesh and Bhutan on rivers like Narayani, Ghaghara-Karnali, Ganga, Brahmaputra and Padma; to find an ecologically sustainable substitute for dolphin oil used in the riverine fishery; and to develop an awareness programme on the conservation of dolphins.

The Ganga river dolphin, commonly known as Susu, is one of the four freshwater dolphins of the world. It is killed for its meat and oil. The oil is used by the fishermen to catch fish, and in folk medicine, for curing joint pains, burns, rickets, pneumonia and cold and cough. It is also used in soap making and tanning. Though hunting of dolphins has been going on for centuries, conservationists say, of late, habitat degradation is mainly responsible for its depletion.

Contact: Chief Wildlife Warden, 17 Rana Pratap Marg, Lucknow 226 001, Uttar Pradesh. Tel: 91-522-283 902; Fax: 91-522-283 871.

Source: Vivek Tiwari (vivek@ee.princeton.edu), on nathistory-india@lists.princeton.edu.

STATE NEWS

ANDHRA PRADESH

Wildlife and environmental problems: Response from the state

In response to a letter to the Chief Minister of Andhra Pradesh, sent by Ashish Kothari of IIPA, expressing concern about the increasing tiger killings in the state, we got the following letter from the Special Chief Secretary, Dr.C.S. Rangachari (paraphrased):

Reports of serious deforestation and the poaching of tigers in the Nallamali forests have been incorrect. However, there have been some stray incidents of poisoning/tiger kills by the local cowherds in an attempt to protect their cattle. The growing militancy in the forest areas of Mehaboobnagar, Warangal, Nizamabad and some other Telangana regions in A.P. has been interfering with the normal protection duties of the Forest Department staff, besides posing a threat to the wildlife. The FD is taking necessary action to counter these problems.

An Environmental Surveillance Cell, comprising the heads of all enforcement directives/departments (Customs, Police, Railways, and Posts) along with NGOs like World Wide Fund for Nature, has been constituted under the Chairmanship of the Chief Secretary to the Governor of A.P. This Cell reviewed the causes for the decline of the tiger population in this state and made recommendations offering maximum protection to wildlife.

Procedures for compensation to be paid to the victims of cattle loss have been simplified, permitting immediate payment. Incentives in the form of rewards have been announced for information on cattle kills, poaching activities and even accidental kills. The Police Personnel have been involved in collecting intelligence on the poaching activities and also to control the trade in fake skins of wild animals. Special Training Programmes are organised to sensitise non-forest officials in conservation activities. The forest personnel are similarly trained in detection and systematic prosecution of offence cases. Grazing within the Sanctuary areas is regulated by levying a heavy grazing fee. Discouragement of migratory grazing in the Sanctuary, in turn helps improve the habitat for the tiger.

Support from the local villagers in this conservation movement has been sought by forming Eco-Developmental Committees and Vana Samrakshan Samitis (Forest Protection Committees). Efforts to improve the economic and social status of the native tribals are being made by addressing their fuel and fodder requirements and by providing income generating programmes, livestock and agricultural improvement programmes.

Readers may wish to respond to these claims by the State Government.

Contact: Dr.C.S. Rangachari, IAS., Special Chief Secretary to Government, E.F.S.&T. Department, A.P. Secretariat, Hyderabad, Andhra Pradesh.

Source : Letter no. 12939/FOR III.97-3, dated 28 February, 1998, from Dr.C.S.Rangachari to Ashish Kothari.

JAMMU AND KASHMIR

Birds in Trouble

The Wildlife Department of Jammu and Kashmir is being pressured to certify that there are too many birds in the wetlands such as Hokarsar, according to a report from Srinagar. The idea is to alter the Wildlife Act to allow culling.

The only way to prevent this tragedy (of legalizing bird hunts), would be to provide hard data on the decline of migratory species, and make a case for the protection of wetlands not only from shooting, but also from reclamation, toxic dumping, and pesticide contamination.

Any details and opinions, quoting numbers or surveys of the annual waterfowl census, are invited along with official letters from conservation organizations, stating a decline in waterfowl numbers migrating between the Trans Himalaya and India.

These should be sent to **Vikram Singh**, Journalist, Indian Express, Srinagar, J&K, India, Tel: 91-194-451672; Fax: 452661.

Source: Bittu Sahgal (bittu@giabm01.vsnl.net.in) on nathistory-india@lists.princeton.edu.

MADHYA PRADESH

NGOs protest against World Bank aided forestry project

Several community-based organisations have continued protesting against the World Bank aided Forestry Project in the state, arguing that it will further alienate tribal and other forest-dependent people from their resource base, and benefit mostly industrial interests. These organisations, through forums like the Campaign on People's Rights over National Parks and Sanctuaries, have also questioned the effect of this Project on the state's protected areas, and the people who live in them.

In a new twist to the controversy, a Delhi-based NGO, the Society for Participatory Research in Asia (PRIA), has taken up a study commissioned by the World Bank, to assess the

state wildlife authorities' claims that local communities are being involved in the management of forests. The Raipur Wildlife Division has been chosen for this study, and in particular the Udanti and Sitanadi Sanctuaries.

However, several mass-based NGOs (Kisan Adivasi Sangathan, Kesla; Narmada Bachao Andolan; Ekta Parishad; Bargi Bangh Visthapit Evam Prabhavit Sangh, Jabalpur; Shramik Adivasi Sangathan, Betul; and Bhimgadh Bandh Visthapit Prabhavit Sangh) have protested the involvement of PRIA in this study, and have appealed to NGOs to reject the World Bank's attempts to rope them into rubber-stamping its Forestry Project. PRIA's response to this is not known.

Contact: Gautam Bandyopadhyaya, Ekta Parishad, House No. 1192, Sector 1, P.O. Shankar Nagar, Raipur, Madhya Pradesh 492 007. Tel: 91-771-421 926; Fax: 91-771-510 465.

Rajesh Tandon, Society for Participatory Research in Asia, 42 Tughlakabad Institutional Area, New Mehrauli Road, New Delhi 110 062. Tel: 91-11-698 9559, 698 8508.

Sal borer attack: an excuse for clear-felling?

Madhya Pradesh has India's second largest area under Sal (*Shorea robusta*) tree cover. The sal heart-wood borer infestation has been endemic to the districts of Mandla and Balaghat. Several studies in the past have suggested measures to control and prevent the epidemic caused by the beetles. Unfortunately, the dominant opinion amongst forest officials has been to clear-fell sal forests in a vast area; reportedly several hundred thousand trees have already been cut, despite environmentalists and some experts suggesting that this is not necessary.

The then Union Minister for Environment and Forests, Saifuddin Soz halted all felling operations and constituted a task force in January 1998 to go into the matter. According to some of the non-governmental members, the task force worked in a rather hasty and non-participatory manner, and was not amenable to the views of these members, who had to send a dissenting note to the Minister. In a report specific to two protected areas in the area, Kanha National Park and Phen Sanctuary, a subgroup of the task force reported that a very small percentage of trees here were affected, that they were mostly the ones already defective and weak, and that a number of trees already felled did not show any signs of borer attack. They also suggested that beetle catching by trap-tree operations has been neglected in the past, perhaps causing the present epidemic in some areas.

There was, instead of large-scale felling, a need for restoration of damage in earlier clearfelled areas, a multi-disciplinary study to assess the problem, strengthening corridors between protected areas (in particular Kanha National Park and Phen Sanctuary), and allowing natural controls to take effect as they have in the past when such epidemics have hit sal forests.

Contact: P.K. Sen, Director, Project Tiger, Ministry of Environment and Forests, Annexe No. 5, Bikaner House, Shahjahan Road, New Delhi 110 003. For a dissenting note to the official task force report, contact: **Utkarsh Ghate**, Centre for Ecological

Sciences, Indian Institute of Science, Bangalore 560 012. Tel: 91-80-334 0985; Fax: 331 5428; Email: utkarsh@ces.iisc.ernet.in.

Source: See *What's Available?*, below.

MAHARASHTRA

Several state-wide meetings and activities

Activity relating to protected areas in Maharashtra has considerably stepped up:

1. A group of about 25 wildlife conservationists, Government officials and media persons met in November 1997, at Kolkhas, Melghat Tiger Reserve, Dist. Amravati, Maharashtra. This meeting was called by the Mobile Tiger Conservation Action Force of the Nature Conservation Society of Amravati (NCSA), in an attempt to explore new working policies for the protection and conservation of wildlife and forests in Central India. A summary of the discussions:

(i) **Pench National Park** (Maharashtra and Madhya Pradesh): The residents of the Todladoh colony (M.P.) continue fishing in the reservoir, rejecting alternate suggestions being provided to them by the Forest Department. Commercial fishing too is carried on in violation to the directives of the Supreme Court. This should be contested in the Supreme Court and evidence in the form of video recordings and photographs should be provided. Media persons have offered to provide support against illegal fishing in Totaladoh reservoir.

(ii) **New PAs in Vidarbha** : The seven new sanctuaries created in the Vidarbha region require special protection from grazing. Sanctuaries such as the Ambabarawa and Pal are facing a tremendous problem due to the influx of thousands of migratory sheep. There appears to be a nexus among some politicians, forest officials and the sheep owners. An Ordinance to deal with this needs to be developed.

(iii) **Proposed PAs**: A decision regarding the conversion of five more areas into protected areas is suggested. The areas include Pohara Malkhed, Mahendri (Dist. Amravati), Mansinghdeo (Nagpur), Lonar and Budhaneshwar Girda (Buldhana).

(iv) The **Bhingara forest** near Dist. Buldhana which links Ambabarawa and Yawal (Pal) Sanctuaries is also facing the problem of land encroachment by influx of tribals from M.P. The Maharashtra government should take steps to curb this influx.

(v) **Melghat Tiger Project**: Participants strongly opposed the Maharashtra government's decision of deleting certain areas from the Melghat Sanctuary. This deletion, they feared, is for the purpose of the Rs. 1,400 crore Upper Tapi Irrigation Project.

(vi) A newly created Aurangabad Wildlife Division was suggested to control the biotic pressure and divert traffic from the road passing through the **Gautala Sanctuary** and to specify the boundaries of the **Jayakwadi Bird Sanctuary**.

Additional recommendations that came forth in the meeting include :

- (i) NCSA would immediately conduct a village study in Melghat for collecting information and the peoples' opinions.
- (ii) Traffic should be banned on the Paratwada Dharani road at/during the night.
- (iii) The water contribution data (by rivers and forest in Melghat) should be used by the Tiger Project Office to focus on the Tiger Reserve as a water conservation/recharging unit.
- (iv) Joint patrolling of the M.P.- Maharashtra border area is essential.
- (v) A monthly inspection should be made in core areas of PAs, by a committee appointed by the Forest Department, comprising journalists, lawyers, NGOs and nature lovers.
- (vi) The next meeting of the State Wildlife Advisory Board should be held in the Vidarbha region to give the PAs here more attention.

Contact: Kishore Rithe, Nature Conservation Society
- Amravati, Pratihtha, Bharat Nagar, Akoli Road,
Nr. Sainagar, Amravati 444 605, Maharashtra. Tel:
91-721-672 359.

2. A meeting on people and protected areas of Maharashtra, earlier scheduled for 16-18 January, has been postponed. The meeting, being organised by the Sahbhagi Vanjivan Sanwardhan Samanvay, Maharashtra, is being held at Sevagram, Wardha. Issues for discussion include official and people's perceptions of PAs, and possibilities of participatory management. NGOs and forest officials are expected to participate.

Contact: Organising Committee, 4th Maharashtra
Protected Areas Meeting, 509 Juni Ramdaspath,
Nagpur 440 010, Maharashtra.

3. With the completion of the draft *Directory of National Parks and Sanctuaries in Maharashtra*, prepared by a team at the Indian Institute of Public Administration, a state-level meeting on the management of protected areas is to be called towards the middle of this year. The draft, which runs into several hundred pages of data, maps, and analysis, has been reviewed by several experienced conservationists and forest officials of the state, and is soon to go to press.

Contact (regarding draft directory): **Pratibha Pande**,
c/o Indian Institute of Public Administration,
Indraprastha Estate, New Delhi 110 002 or
Neema Pathak at the editorial address.

Contact (regarding proposed meeting): **M.G. Gogate**,
Chief Wildlife Warden, Government of Maharashtra,
Jaika Motors Building, 4th Floor, Civil Lines, Nagpur
440 001, Maharashtra. Tel: 91-712-526 758.

ORISSA

A serious situation has emerged along the Orissa coast as wanton killing of the endangered Olive Ridley turtles by fishing trawlers continues unabated. The Orissa government's professed measures for protection of the Olive Ridley turtles off the Gahirmatha coast in Kendrapara district appears to have yielded little result.

The Dehradun based Wildlife Institute of India (WII), estimated over 10,000 turtles to have been killed between December and February alone. The WII, which is undertaking a research programme on this rare species, maintained that the actual casualty figure could be much more as it had only listed those washed ashore on a 282 km. coastline stretching from Gahirmatha in the north to Dankur village bordering Andhra Pradesh in the south. There is also an alarming increase in the number of dead turtles along the Paradeep, Jatadhara and Devi coasts. 7,300 turtles out of about 20,000 seen close to Devi river edge had already been killed.

This points to a complete lack of enforcement of the Orissa Marine Fishing Regulation Act, 1982, prohibiting trawling within five km. from the shoreline. Neither are steps being taken for the mandatory use of the turtle excluder device (TED) in the trawler nets operating in the area. On the contrary, according to environmentalist Banke Behary Das, the trawlers and gill netters have stepped up their activities even in the marine sanctuary area during the current nesting season.

Fisheries secretary Abhayananda Rath, however, insisted that trawling was the last cause for the deaths. He suggested excessive 'fatigue' due to long migration, apart from the ageing process and swallowing of toxic substances released in the sea as the probable reasons. He did not deny the role of trawlers in the killing of turtles, but suggested that a post-mortem should be undertaken to arrive at a definite conclusion.

Forest officials and environmentalists are worried over the absence of Olive Ridleys at Gahirmatha marine sanctuary, their traditional nesting site. Meanwhile, three to four thousand female Olive Ridley turtles have been reported to have gone ashore to nest on the night of March 23rd, 1998, at Orissa's second major nesting site, a 2 km. long beach north of the mouth of the Rushikulya river.

Readers are requested to send notes of concern and requests for urgent action against the trawlers to :

1. **The Chief Secretary**, Government of Orissa (fax:
91-674-400244)

2. **The Honourable Minister of Environment and Forests**, Government of India, Paryavaran Bhavan,
CGO Complex, New Delhi 110 003. Fax : 91-11-436 2222;
Email: mosef@envfor.delhi.nic.in

Contact: Banke Behary Das, Orissa Krushak
Mahasangh, 'Parivesh Bhawan', 14-Ashok Nagar,
Bhubaneswar 751 009, Orissa, India. Tel: 91-674-
400 305; Fax: 404 222, 409 125. **Belinda
Wright**, Executive Director, Wildlife Protection
Society of India, Thapar House, 124 Janpath, New
Delhi 110 001, India. Tel: 91-11-621 3864; Fax:
91-11-336 8729; Email: blue@nda.vsnl.net.in
(or) wpsi@nde.vsnl.net.in. **B.C. Choudhry**,
Wildlife Institute of India, Post Box 18,

Chandrabani, Dehradun. Tel: 91-135-620 912-5;
Fax: 91-135-620 217.

Sources : Satpathy, R. Endangered turtles dying off Orissa coast. *Times of India* 19/1/98. Satpathy, R. Trawlers' slaughter of Olive Ridley turtles causes concern. *Times of India*. 23/3/98. Information posted by WPSI at nathistory-india@lists.princeton.edu.

RAJASTHAN

Circular on eco-development committees for protected areas

In an interesting move which implicitly acknowledges the need to integrate people's livelihood concerns in the objectives of protected areas, Rajasthan has issued a circular authorising the creation of eco-development committees (EDCs) both inside and adjacent to protected areas. Circular No. F11/4/Van/96, dated 2 December, 1997, states in its preamble that the extensive wildlife conservation programme launched by the state government cannot succeed without people's active participation. In addition, it notes that the "World Bank funded" Eco-development Project also requires such participation.

The circular deals with the formation, composition, functioning, and rules of procedure of EDCs, which will be set up in every village or cluster of villages. Two members from every family, one woman and one man, will be members. The head will be chosen by the members, but the Secretary will be the area's Forester. A 6-member Executive Committee (EC) will be elected by the EDC, and the Sarpanch of the area, the Forester, and two NGO representatives, will be non-voting members of this EC. The EDC will be given requisite authorisation by the area's Deputy Conservator of Forests.

The EDC will be responsible for drawing up and monitoring micro-plans for eco-development, handling funds, maintaining relations with senior forest officers, jointly protecting wildlife and forests with forest staff, catching offenders and handing them over to the staff. The EDC will ensure that villagers contribute 25% of the micro-plan expenditure, in the form of monetary or labour or material inputs. Inputs in the form of reporting illegal activities will also be considered.

Villagers will be entitled to benefit-sharing from the PAs. EDCs which perform well according to the approved micro-plans, will be allowed to collect, distribute, and sell non-timber forest produce, fallen timber, grass, etc., from within the PAs. This will be in accordance with the conservation values of the area. These usufruct arrangements will not be considered rights of people.

Contact: Secretary (Forests), Government of Rajasthan, Jaipur, Rajasthan.

Source: Rajasthan State Government Circular No. F11/4/Van/96, dated 2/12/1997.

NATIONAL NEWS

Latest forest survey shows alarming decline

The country has lost nearly 5,500 sq km. of forest cover since the 1995 assessment, according to the 1997 assessment by the Forest Survey of India (FSI).

While Madhya Pradesh has lost nearly 4,000 sq km. of forest cover, Andhra Pradesh is not far behind at 3,822 sq km. Surprisingly, Maharashtra has shown a significant increase of around 2,300 sq km., with even Gujarat recording an addition of 258 sq km. to its green cover.

Though the open forests (crown density between 10-40%) increased by 12,001 sq km. and mangroves by 294 sq km., dense forest depleted by 17,777 sq km. This may indicate that the efforts at regeneration of many degraded forest areas are bearing fruit, but that good standing forests are continuing to be depleted at an alarming rate.

The situation in the North East has improved slightly, losing 316 sq km. of forests as compared to 783 sq km. in the previous assessment, the report says.

Further analysis of the dynamics of the green cover reveals that, from the total dense forest area, about 19,456 sq km. had degraded to open forest, 392 sq km. to scrub and 3,129 sq km. to non-forest. On the other hand, from the total scrub and non-forest area, 1474 sq km. improved to dense and 7972 sq km. to open forest.

Source: *Indian Express* 7/2/98.

INTERNATIONAL NEWS

BANGLADESH

Natural calamities and pilferage threaten ecosystem of Sunderbans

The ecosystem of the world's largest mangrove forest, the Sunderbans in Bangladesh, is being ravaged both by natural calamities and pilferage of forest resources. Ecologists and local people point to rampant tree-felling, hunting, fishing, and unplanned construction of roads and embankments, increased salinity in rivers, canals and marshes, and natural calamities like cyclones.

Covering approximately 2,300 sq miles, the Sunderbans is almost half (44%) of the total reserve forests in the country. But protecting and managing this area is being hampered by shortage of manpower and infrastructure, as well as reported irregularities on part of some foresters. According to some forest officials, the existence of the famous Sundari tree has been endangered due to widespread pest attacks on the tree tops. No measures have so far been taken by the concerned authorities to prevent the disease.

In addition, some species of fish and fish fry are being destroyed every year during the period of shrimp fry collection, in violation of fisheries rules. Unbridled fishing with unauthorised gearnet is causing depletion of many species. Forest officials say that faunal species have dwindled to 123 from 334. Despite the ban on felling of all kinds of trees, since 1989, tree felling continues. Shrimp cultivation, too, is

taking a major toll on the forest. Experts have suggested the introduction of eco-tourism for saving the Sunderbans.

Source: *The Independent*, Dhaka, 26/12/1997. As reported in nathistory-india@lists.princeton.edu by nalinm@aol.com.

PAKISTAN

Exploration activities in Kirthar National Park

Premier Oil, Pakistan, has stated that it will not carry out any exploration activity in the Kirthar National Park unless the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) report is approved by the relevant Government authority. It pledged this in response to the apprehensions expressed by various environmental groups to the effect that exploration in the Dumbar Concession, north of Karachi, which includes protected areas such as Kirthar National Park and areas outside it, would endanger wildlife there. The licence to explore the area had been given in July 1997.

Source : *Dawn* newspapers, Pakistan, as reported in nathistory-india@lists.princeton.edu, 15/3/1998.

CORRESPONDENCE

Jagdish Krishnaswamy of the Duke University, USA, reports that:

“Two articles published in the latest issue of Environmental Conservation relate to issues that constantly come up in *JPAM Update* and in discussions about use and abuse of protected areas.

One is on the PAs in the Eastern Ghats in Andhra Pradesh (by Dr. Rawat, Wildlife Institute of India, Dehradun), and another on livestock and predator conflicts in Kibbar wildlife sanctuary in Himachal Pradesh (by Charudatt Mishra, Centre for Ecological Research and Conservation, Karnataka). Both are based on real field data and free of the biased selective use of examples and data and speculative preconceived conclusions that characterises much of the published work on these issues so far. Another recommended paper is the grassland use study in Bardia in Nepal (by Katrina Brandon, U.K.) which is also interesting.

All three studies directly address the ecological impacts and implications of local use such as grazing, shifting (Podu) cultivation, NTFP collection and in the case of the Andhra Pradesh study, large-scale bamboo extraction for industry as well.

The recent escalation of killing tigers and leopards all over (and wolves in Trans-himalayan areas) unrelated to the bone trade but by livestock owners, is not recognised as a very severe threat, while so much attention is being given to the bone trade in the press and by some conservationists. The increase in numbers of cattle vis-a-vis wild prey within and around PAs and hostility of livestock owners towards predators is emerging as the single largest threat to large predators in

many areas ranging from Nagarjunasagar-Srisailem in Andhra Pradesh to parts of Himachal Pradesh. No amount of guns, jeeps, motorboats set will solve this problem and unfortunately most of the attention seems to be given to the bone trade which is important but only in some areas.”

Contact : Jagdish Krishnaswamy, Duke University. Email: jug@acpub.duke.edu.

UPCOMING

Sixth World Wilderness Congress

The Sixth World Wilderness Congress (WWC) will convene in Bangalore, India on October 24-29, 1998. The 6WWC programme has three major components. Plenary sessions address broad objectives of sustainable living as they relate to wilderness, wildland and biodiversity topics, including perspectives of policy, science, education, politics, business and economics, recreation, management, the arts and humanities. In the afternoon, working sessions will convene to present papers, posters and discuss specific aspects of wilderness research, education, policy and management. In addition, an extensive cultural programme will provide opportunities to experience the ancient and contemporary cultures and natural areas of India and the rest of Asia.

Unfortunately, though the organisers have stressed that the issue of local community and citizens' participation in conservation will be one of the major focal themes, the Congress venue (Taj West End Hotel) and registration fees (Rs. 2000) are likely to keep all local communities away! Partly for this reason, Madhav Gadgil and Ashish Kothari, who were asked to convene sessions on this topic, have declined to participate.

Contact: World Wilderness Trust, # 1, 12th Cross, Rajmahal, Bangalore - 560 080, India. Tel : 91-80-334 0400; Fax : 91-80-334 1674; Email: 6www@sparrl.com. Web site: www.worldwilderness.org.

National Seminar on Wildlife Conservation

A National Seminar on Wildlife Conservation, Research and Management and the XII Annual Research Seminar (ARS) is being organised at the Wildlife Institute of India (WII), Dehradun, India, on 10-13 August, 1998, as part of the commemoration of India's Golden Jubilee year of Independence.

Papers on the broad themes of wildlife conservation, research and management in India have been invited. The TITLE and ABSTRACT of the papers should reach Mr. S.K. Mukherjee, Director, WII, no later than 15th May 1998 and the selection of the paper for inclusion in the seminar will be intimated to the authors no later than 10th June, 1998. Full papers, at least working drafts should be submitted by authors no later than 10th July, 1998. The proceedings of this seminar will be peer reviewed prior to the publication and the volume is planned to be published in early 1999.

Contact: S.K. Mukherjee, Director, Wildlife Institute

of India, Post Box 18, Chandrabani, Dehradun. Tel: 91-135-620 912-5; Fax: 91-135-620 217; Email: wii@giasdl01.vsnl.net.in.

2nd Consultation on Wildlife Conservation and People's Livelihood Rights

The Second Consultation on Wildlife Conservation and People's Livelihood Rights will be held at the Tarun Bharat Sangh Ashram in Bhikampur-Kishori village, Rajasthan on 17-19th April 1998.

The agenda includes topics such as the Supreme Court Order on settlement of rights in PAs and its impact on local communities; proposed amendments to the Wild Life (Protection) Act, 1997, and its implications for local communities in and around PAs; Extension of the Panchayati Raj Act, 1997, to Scheduled Areas and its implications for PAs.

Contact: Editorial address below, or **Farhad**

Vania, Kalpavriksh, C-17 A, Munirka, New Delhi 110067. Tel : 91-11-3317309 ext. 385; Email: fvania@del2.vsnl.net.in. **Rajendra Singh**, Tarun Bharat Sangh, Village Bhikampur-Kishori, Via Thanagazi 301 022, District Alwar, Rajasthan. Tel/fax: 01465-25043.

Dr. Kusuma, an activist and humanist who was working against all odds to prevent the desecration of the exquisite Sheravati Valley and the rest of Karnataka's natural heritage, including the protected areas of the Western Ghats, was killed in a hit and run accident on Saturday,

March 14, 1998. The circumstances of the accident are not clear, but environmentalists have sought an inquiry. This is a major loss for the ecological movement. The editorial team would like to express its deep sorrow at this tragic incident.

WHAT'S AVAILABLE?

Sen, P.K., Gopal, Rajesh, and Thapar, Valmik. 1998. Report of the Sub-group on Wildlife of the Task Force Constituted to look into Sal-borer problems in Eastern Madhya Pradesh. Pp. 25+annexures.

The report of a team which was asked to look specifically at the issue of sal borer attack in the forests of some protected areas of M.P. (including Kanha and Pench). See news item in *STATE NEWS*, above.

Contact: P.K. Sen (address in *STATE NEWS* above).

JPAM Update is produced every two months as a follow-up to the workshop on Exploring the Possibilities of Joint Protected Area Management (JPAM), organised at the Indian Institute of Public Administration (IIPA), New Delhi, in September 1994. *JPAM Update 16* was prepared by Ashish Kothari, Farhad Vania and Anuprita Patel with assistance from Aanchal Kapur.

Ideas, comments, news and information may please be sent to the editorial address. Please note this is a mailing address only:

Ashish Kothari
Apartment 5, Shri Dutta Krupa
908 Deccan Gymkhana
Pune 411 004
Maharashtra, India

Tel/Fax: 0212-354 329

Email: ashish@giasdl01.vsnl.net.in

JPAM UPDATE
News on Action Towards Joint Protected Area Management

No. 17

July 1998

LOCAL NEWS FROM INDIA

ANDHRA PRADESH

Project Tiger and Srisailem Tiger Reserve

In 1983, prior to the commencement of Project Tiger in Andhra Pradesh, the number of tigers was put at 65. However by 1995 there were only 34 tigers left. In February 1997 the Comptroller & Auditor General of India (CAG) conducted a review of Project Tiger in Andhra Pradesh, the report of which was recently tabled in the State Assembly. The main findings of the report are given below:

- ☞ Despite availability of Central government funds, the State government failed to create necessary infrastructure for proper implementation of Project Tiger. Funds to the tune of Rs. 12.8 lakhs were left unutilised.
- ☞ Human settlements in Project Tiger reserves of the State, covering 3,568 sq km spread over 5 districts, had not been relocated posing difficulties in the management of these areas.
- ☞ No effort was made to analyse the possible reasons (e.g. poaching, migration, etc.) for a steady decline in tiger population in the State to enable the Forest Department to take remedial measures.
- ☞ The Department, on the other hand, had failed to evolve any alternative census techniques, resulting in unreliable estimates of tiger numbers. The CAG report rejected the Forest Department argument that there are difficulties in conducting tiger census due to non-traceability of pug marks.
- ☞ Another serious lapse was the insufficient and inadequate wireless network within the Nagarjunsagar-Srisailem Tiger Reserve. Although 14 wireless stations were proposed for the Reserve, only 10 were eventually set up, of which three have been taken away by extremists operating in the area.
- ☞ According to Central Government guidelines issued in 1983, management plans were required to be formulated for every 10 year period in two phases of 5 years each and submitted to the Centre for approval. It was found that no management plan was prepared for the period 1985-1990.

(See also *JPAM Update 15*, January 1998:2 'Tiger Poaching in Nagarjunsagar-Srisailem Tiger Reserve' and *JPAM Update 14*, August 1997:2 'Nagarjunsagar-Srisailem: Naxalites against Project Tiger')

Source: 'Project Tiger Kills Species' *Deccan Chronicle*, 2 May 1998.

ASSAM

Assam's Shrinking Grasslands

The floodplains of the main rivers in Barak Valley, North Cachar Hills, Southern Nagaon and Hamren Valley were once the home of rich elephant grassland. The main grasslands at Bagori, Burhapahar-Deochur (part of Kaziranga), Laokhowa, Burhachapori and Kochmora harbour at least 50 species of mammals and 150 species of birds over the year. Globally endangered species found in the area include the Indian rhinoceros, water buffalo, tiger, Bengal florican, Asian elephant, swamp partridge, and lesser adjutant stork.

A report completed for the Biodiversity Conservation Prioritization Project (BCPP) of WWF-India, notes that today grasslands cover less than 2% of the area. Dr. Anwaruddin Choudhary, principal investigator, cites population explosion and consumerism as the main causes for the dwindling grasslands. He suggests that NGOs could motivate villagers by educating them in population control, improved methods of agriculture for higher productivity and understanding the importance of conservation.

Dr. Choudhary also suggests that Laokhowa and Burhachapori Sanctuaries be amalgamated and some remaining grasslands be added to form a single protected area. He stressed the need for strong and effective management of the area along the lines of Kaziranga National Park besides recommending a rhino reintroduction programme from the densely populated Pobitara area.

Source: 'Shrinking Grasslands Hit Assam's Biodiversity' *Times of India*, 20 April 1998.

Contact: Dr. A. Choudhary, Advisor, WWF-India, NE Regional Office, 202 Meghmallar House, FC Road, Uzan Bazar, Guwahati 781 001, Assam.
Tel: 91-361-550 257, 543 339, 560 926.

Shekhar Singh, C 17/A Munirka, New Delhi 110 067. Tel/fax: 91-11-617 8048; Email: bcpp_wwf@unv.ernet.in

BIHAR / UTTAR PRADESH

Terai grasslands provide refuge for criminals

A study conducted by the Centre of Wildlife and Ornithology, Aligarh Muslim University reveals that the biggest surviving tracts of Terai grasslands on the Indo Nepal border are threatened by criminal gangs. The Valmiki Tiger Reserve in Bihar and the Sohagi Barwa Wildlife Sanctuary in UP have become safe havens for the local timber mafia and other criminal gangs. In fact the study itself had to be undertaken with the help of armed guards. The police in both states appeared to be totally indifferent to the plight of Forest Guards who often risk their lives in order to carry out their duties.

The Terai area provides refuge to several endangered species like swamp francolin, Hispid hare, bison and Indian wild dog.

Salim Javed who heads the project suggests that the Terai grasslands could still be saved through a joint patrolling effort

by the police and the Forest Departments of Bihar and UP to flush out the criminals.

Source: 'Terai Grasslands Threatened by Gangs: Study' *Times of India*, 16 May 1998.

Contact: Salim Javed, Centre for Wildlife and Ornithology, Aligarh Muslim University, Aligarh 202 002, UP.

DELHI

Notorious wildlife trader arrested in Delhi

Raj Kumar, alias Pappu, brother of the notorious wildlife trader Sansar Chand, was arrested in Delhi on 19 June 1998, in an operation by the wildlife enforcement agencies assisted by the Wildlife Protection Society of India (WPSI). Pappu has been a trader of tiger and leopard skins and bones for many years, and active in and around a number of protected areas in north India.

His first recorded case was in the Sariska Tiger Reserve in December 1988, when a tiger was found dead with bullet wounds. He however evaded arrest and was declared a proclaimed offender in 1989. In 1993 he and his brother-in-law Kishan Lal were arrested with six leopard skins. That case is still pending in the courts.

He is also believed to be connected to past poaching cases near Corbett Tiger Reserve and the Dudhwa National Park in UP and other areas in Madhya Pradesh. These are currently under investigation by WPSI.

Source: Belinda Wright, WPSI, on nathistory-india@lists.princeton.edu, 20 June 1998.

Contact: Belinda Wright, Wildlife Protection Society of India (WPSI), Thapar House, 124 Janpath, New Delhi 110 001.
Tel: 91-11-621 3864; Fax: 336 8729;
Email: blue@nda.vsnl.net.in.

GUJARAT

Oil Spill and Cyclone in Marine National Park and Sanctuary

An oil spill of nearly 20,000 litres at the Indian Oil Corporation terminal at Vadinar, 3 km from the Marine National Park and Kutch Marine Sanctuary in Gujarat, has threatened the area which is home to around 800 different species of marine life.

There are also reports of widespread damage due to the recent cyclonic storm which ravaged Gujarat's coast earlier this year; while press reports have justifiably focused on human loss and economic damage, equally serious may be the destruction of coastal and marine ecosystems. The extent of ecological damage due to the cyclone remains uncertain.

Source: Various postings by Bittu Sahgal and others on nathistory-india@lists.princeton.edu.

Contact : Bittu Sahgal, Sanctuary Magazine 602 Maker Chambers V, Nariman Point, Mumbai 400 021, Maharashtra
Tel: 91-22-283 0061; Fax: 287 4380; Email: bittu@giasbm01.vsnl.net.in.

Legal action against Girnar ropeway

Various NGOs, including Mahajanam, Viniyog Parivar Trust and the Bombay Natural History Society (BNHS), have opposed the plan to construct a ropeway through the Gir forests close to the Gir National Park (see *JPAM Update 14*). The National Park is famous for being the only remaining wilderness home to the Asiatic lion.

The Gujarat Tourism Department has given a green signal to Usha Breco Company to build the ropeway to the temples in the Girnar hills, which are visited by 12 lakh visitors every year. NGOs are opposing the project on the ground that the increased and easy access provided by the ropeway would endanger the sacred groves around the temples which is also home to a diversity of wildlife.

In addition, an increase in urbanisation, forest fires and possibly poaching, resulting from the enhanced tourism may also occur. NGOs feel that the ropeway will take away the means of livelihood of the local communities like the Doliwallah and the Tadagars, for whom transporting the pilgrims to and from the temples is a major source of income. They also estimate that 40,000 trees will be cut down to make way for the project, though the government denies that there will be any large scale felling of trees.

The NGOs plan to take legal action if the government does not drop the ropeway project. It is not clear if this will be in addition to the case already filed by the Nature Club of Sabar (see *JPAM Update 14*).

Source: Lina Choudhary, 'Legal Action Planned Against Move to Construct Ropeway Through Gir' *The Times of India*, 3 July 1998.

Contact: Asad Akhtar, Conservation Officer, Bombay Natural History Society, Hornbill House, Dr. Salim Ali Chowk, Shaheed Bhagat Singh Road, Mumbai 400 023.
Tel: 91-22-282 1811; Fax: 283 7615.

For more campaign details, contact:

Manish Vaidya, Nature Club of Sabar, B60 Harsh Nagar, D'Cabin, Sabarmati, Ahmedabad 380 019, Gujarat.
Tel: 91-79-746 7073; Fax: 333 243.

JAMMU AND KASHMIR

Indiscriminate duck shooting at Hokarsar

Hokarsar wetland, a renowned migratory bird reserve in Badgam district of the Kashmir valley, saw more than 20 poachers go on a killing spree in March this year. The barrage of shotgun fire aimed at migratory ducks and geese commenced everyday at 5:30 am, and continued unchecked for nearly 15 days. No action has been taken against these poachers, identified as affluent businessmen from the Dal and Nageen Lakes area, due to their alleged connivance with the local police. False charges were brought against the four wildlife guards who resisted this illegal shooting and they were told to allow the shooting to continue.

Under the J&K Wildlife Protection Act, the penalties for poaching includes steep fines and possible imprisonment. Even licensed weapons cannot be carried into the Kashmir valley without sanction for the exact purpose for which the weapon

will be used.

Source: Vikram Jit Singh, 'Police Wink at 15 day Duck Poaching Spree', *Indian Express* 17 March 1998.

KARNATAKA

Tribals submit alternative plan for Nagarhole National Park

Tribal activists have submitted an alternative plan for the management of the Nagarhole National Park in Karnataka. Whereas a World Bank funded official ecodevelopment plan would cost Rs. 56 crore, the tribal plan would cost a much smaller amount of Rs. 3 crore. Additionally, hundreds of tribal families who have lived in the forests for centuries need not be displaced if the alternative plan is implemented. Though the official ecodevelopment plan does not insist on displacement it encourages a 'voluntary' relocation plan where the tribals would be encouraged to resettle outside the Park and take up income generating activities like dairy, poultry farming and fishing.

This plan however is perceived as a cultural and livelihood threat by the nearly 7,000 tribals who inhabit the forests of Nagarhole. The fate of the 18 tribal hamlets which had been ousted to make way for the Kabini river project in the 1970s is still fresh in many memories. None of the ousted people reportedly received just compensation. They could neither return to their homes in the forests nor could they find a decent means of livelihood outside. Most of them turned into coolies or beggars and some even took to stealing to survive.

Activists argue that the official plan does not make provisions for the tribals to live within the forest with full rights, in the absence of which the tribals will be squeezed out of the Park. Nor does it take into account the tribals' own conservation-related practices and knowledge. The alternative plan would build on these, and would also use the help of the Forest Department to counter external threats.

Source: K.S. Dakshina Murthy, 'Tribals Submit Alternative Plan for Nagarhole', *The Hindustan Times* 26 June 1998.

Contact: (see WHAT'S AVAILABLE?)

Nagarhole National Park Land Reclaimed

In a letter dated 28 May 1998, the Principal Forest Secretary directed the Chief Conservator of Forests, Karnataka, to take over in 45 days the forest area leased to the Taj group of hotels at Nagarhole National Park in Kodagu district. The Centre has also asked for a report, to be submitted within 60 days, fixing responsibility for the violation of the Forest Conservation Act and the action taken on the officers involved.

About 63 sq km of land in the dense forests of Nagarhole were leased out to Gateway Hotels and Gateway Resorts Limited under an 18 year contract. The leasing out of land had violated the guidelines of the Ministry of Environment and Forests on eco-tourism. A separate tourism zone is required to be delineated for a protected area which was not followed in this case. Some of the claims made by the Karnataka government to the high court *vis a vis* a public interest litigation on the deal, filed by the Nagarhole Budakattu Janara Hakkustapana Samithi, have been found incorrect.

Though the State had contended that the leased forest land was in the tourism zone according to a notification, in fact it

was in the core zone of the Park. Circumstances had proved that facts had been deliberately distorted to make out a case that forest area was put to non-forest use before the enactment of the Forest Conservation Act of 1980.

The Conservator of Forests, Mysore, and the Deputy Conservator of Forests (Wildlife), Hunsur, had certified that no violation of law had taken place while leasing out the forest land. The PCCF had contended that the construction of a hotel complex would in no way affect wildlife and habitat. However, the close proximity of the complex to the core area boundary and the subsequent increase in vehicular traffic would definitely have an adverse impact on wildlife and habitat.

(See also *JPAM Update 13* April 1997:2, 'Monumental Victory for Tribals Against Taj Hotel in Nagarhole')

Source: Vinay Madhav, 'Nagarhole land leased to Taj group to be Reclaimed', *Indian Express* 7 June 1998.

KARNATAKA / GOA

Tiger habitat at Bhimgad threatened by dam

A dam across the Mahadayi river, on the border of Goa and Karnataka threatens a vital tiger habitat from where at least 15 tigers have been reported. Pre-empting proposals to declare the entire area a wildlife sanctuary, both State governments insist on going ahead with their plans to build the dam. The National Environmental Engineering Research Institute (NEERI), Nagpur, has been asked to produce an environmental impact assessment report on the project.

Apart from tigers, the many limestone caves in the region are home to a variety of bats, including the Wroughton's Freetailed Bat, said to be found nowhere else in the world, according to the Bombay Natural History Society (BNHS).

Meanwhile, a group of wildlife enthusiasts from Mumbai along with the Belgaum Nature Lovers Club, Belgaum, have been campaigning to get the area declared a sanctuary. In a letter to the Karnataka authorities, they have pointed out the enormous ecological significance of the area, and the various threats it faces. Apart from the dam, they have highlighted the threat of privately owned land in the area being bought over by the mining industry.

(For a related report, pl. also see 'Bhimgad: A forest worth saving' by Durgesh Kasbekar et al, and 'Bhimgad: A spot-visit report' by Anand Pendharkar in *Sanctuary Asia*, Vol. XVIII No. 2, April 1998.

Source: Bittu Sahgal, Editor, *Sanctuary Asia*, on nathistory-india@lists.princeton.edu.

Contact: Vrushal Dongre, Major Mhaskar, Vishweshwar Madhav & Durgesh Kasbekar, 402 "Bhagyalakshmi", Kennedy Bridge, Opera House, Mumbai 400 004, Maharashtra
Email: vrushald@hotmail.com.

Belgaum Nature Lovers, c/o G.S. Science College, Tilakwadi, Belgaum 590 006, Karnataka.
Tel: 91-831-480 353; Fax: 625 3969; Email: natureclub@hotmail.com.

MAHARASHTRA

Protest against proposed Nandurmadmeshwar Sanctuary

Jaywant Bhimrao Bhosale, Vice President, Swatantraya Bharat Party, has threatened to undertake an indefinite fast to demand cancellation of the proposed 100.13 sq km Nandurmadmeshwar bird sanctuary to be set up at in Niphad taluka of Nashik district. According to Bhosale, the proposed bird sanctuary would render 50,000 farmers landless. This includes adivasis and harijans who solely depend on agriculture for sustenance. Farmers from 10 villages who were practising cooperative farming would not be allowed to draw water from the Nandurmadmeshwar canal. Use of diesel pump sets, tractors etc. would also be prohibited as it might affect the birds once the Sanctuary was set up.

However, a recently concluded study on the protected areas of Maharashtra has indicated that the area is already a Sanctuary with the settlement of rights and leases procedure in progress. A substantial portion of the Sanctuary, besides the reservoir in the middle, is in fact agricultural and common land of 11 villages with a population of 19,000. The reservoir forms a primary source of water for irrigation with several farmers also cultivating the draw down area as well. It is possible that the unrest among farmers may be linked to the implementation of the Supreme Court order asking for completion of settlement procedures in protected areas where they are still pending.

Sources: 1. 'Stir Against Bird Sanctuary', *Indian Express* 20 April 1998.

2. Pathak, et al. *Directory of National Parks in Maharashtra*. In Press.

Fires in Melghat Tiger Reserve

Melghat Tiger Reserve, one of Maharashtra's finest tiger habitat, has suffered a series of disasters in the recent past including the ill-advised widening and tarring of roads that has caused major disturbance and siltation of water courses. Recent reports from Melghat also confirm a severe forest fire having affected a large part of the core area. It is possible some Gaur deaths that have been reported may also be related to the fire.

Bittu Sahgal, who has consistently been involved with conservation issues in Melghat besides the rest of the country, has raised several questions on the fires. According to him though fires have always presented a high risk in summer, the Park management still need to answer questions such as: Were firelines cleared in time before the dry season? Were fire watchers at their posts? Why did the fire go out of control? What other animals were killed ?

Source: Bittu Sahgal, Editor, *Sanctuary Asia*, on nathistory-india@lists.princeton.edu.

Contact: Conservator and Field Director,
Melghat Project Tiger, Amravati, Maharashtra. Tel: 91-721-662 792.

Kishore Rithe, Honorary Wildlife Warden,
'Prathishtha', Bharat Nagar, Akoli Road, Near
Sainagar, Amravati 444 605, Maharashtra. Tel: 91-
721-672 359;
Email: ncsa@bom3.vsnl.net.in.

Tansa Sanctuary & Borivali National Park

covered by Mumbai's water conservation campaign

For decades the environment movement has carried the (often deserved) burden of being labelled "negative" and distanced from the common person. An initiative that seeks to alter this perception is the Save the Lakes Campaign in Mumbai, to focus the citizen's attention on the source of their water supply and thus win their support to protect the catchment forests of the critical lakes on which an estimated 12 million people are dependent. Protected areas like Tansa and Borivali are part of this catchment. Equitable distribution of water among users in Mumbai, and its conservation and purity, feature high on the agenda.

A group of citizens have agreed to meet regularly (every Thursday, 5 pm at Hornbill House) to work out a strategy, evolve a consensus and share responsibility for tasks to further the campaign. Work on the campaign already underway, though on a somewhat low key, includes: meetings of credible NGOs with officers of the Maharashtra Forest Department discussions with the BMC and BMRDA and several corporate offices who have agreed to support the campaign slide shows and lectures organised in more than 30 schools.

(See also *JPAM Update 14* August 1997:5 'Borivali: Mumbai Residents Campaign to Save the Lakes')

Contact: Bittu Sahgal (see GUJARAT above)

Slow movement on alternatives in Pench National Park

Adding another chapter to the ongoing debate in Pench (see *JPAM Update 12* December 1996:4 'Petition on Pench Tiger Reserve'), the Minister of State for Forests, Vinod Gudadhe Patil, addressed a meeting at Totladoh on 27 October 1997, in the presence of officials from various government departments including Forests, Irrigation and Fisheries, the Additional District Magistrate and representatives of local NGOs. After considering the positions of all present, the following decisions were taken:

- a detailed report on the situation would be prepared by a committee headed by the minister and comprising of representatives of all concerned departments, NGOs and local people
- genuinely interested / affected people would be accommodated by the Fisheries Department for fishing in alternative sites
- employment would be provided by the Revenue Department outside the National Park to the affected people under the Employment Guarantee Scheme
- affected people would be given priority over others inside the National Park for any departmental works.

However local NGOs claim that the concerned authorities were apathetic and indifferent when they tried to follow-up on the above decisions. They issued a request to all interested to intervene in this matter. Subsequently in April 1998, Bittu Sahgal, Editor, *Sanctuary Asia*, met Forest Department officials and the State Planning Secretary in this regard and was assured by them that the commitments made will be honoured. However he felt that there should be timely and concerted effort by all parties involved to prevent the situation in Pench from becoming volatile.

Source: Minutes of the meeting held on 27.10.98, prepared by

Shree Bhagwan, Conservator of Forests (Wildlife).

Contact: Dinesh Ghose, General Secretary,
Environment Global, Narasimha Bhavan, 7 Mount
Road Extension, Sadar, Nagpur 440 001,
Maharashtra. Tel: 91-712-551 758, 548 276.

Bittu Sahgal, (see GUJARAT above)

Radhanagari : BEAG vs INDAL

The Bombay Environment Action Group (BEAG) had filed a writ petition (No. 959 dated 13.2.98) in the Bombay High Court against the Indian Aluminium Co. Ltd. (INDAL), challenging the mining activities sought to be undertaken by them at Radhanagari Wildlife Sanctuary. (See also *JPAM Update 16* April 1998:5 'Mining at Radhanagari Sanctuary')

When the matter came up for hearing in April this year, INDAL produced a letter enclosing a copy of the order signed by the Section Officer, Trade & Commerce Department, purporting to renew their lease for a period of 20 years, i.e. upto March 2018. However, the court in its judgement asked INDAL to restrain its proposed activities in the area. Subsequently BEAG filed two more writ petitions in the Bombay High Court on the following grounds:

1. that the entire area falls within the notified forest area and therefore no non-forest activity can be allowed without Central government permission. (In this case, not even the Maharashtra Forest Department had been consulted).
2. that the Section Officer has no powers under law to pass an order to grant / renew the mining lease, hence the order is bad in law and liable to be set aside.
3. despite the authorities being fully aware that a petition concerning mining activities was pending in court an order for renewal of lease was granted, which therefore is illegal.
4. that under the provisions of the Mines & Minerals Act of 1957, unless the area has been prospected earlier and the existence of mineral deposits been established, and until a mining plan duly approved by the Central government is submitted, no mining lease can be granted (the petitioners found there was no such mining plan for the area).

These two petitions come up for final hearing on June 19 1998. Further developments will be reported in subsequent issues of the *Update*.

(Also see 'The Fading Future of Radhanagari' by Neeraj Vagholikar, *Sanctuary Asia* Vol. XVIII No. 2 April 1998)

Source: Press release by Debi Goenka, Bombay Environmental Action Group

Contact: Debi Goenka, c/o Shyam Chainani, 9 St
James Court, Marine Drive, Mumbai 400 020,
Maharashtra
Tel: 91-22-514 7574; Fax: 511 5810;
Email: ADMIN@debi.ilbom.ernet.in (or)
beag@access.net.in

Drive to rid Bhimashankar of plastic refuse

Nisargavedh, a Pune-based NGO, has launched a drive to rid the Bhimashankar Wildlife Sanctuary of its problem of plastic waste. The problem has reached serious proportions with many animals (both domestic and wild) reported to have died as

result of consumption of plastic. The plastic comes largely from the pilgrim and tourist traffic to the temple complex in the Sanctuary at the sacred spot of Gupt Bhima, believed to be the origin of the River Bhima. The source of the river is itself reported to be clogged with plastic.

In the first part of the campaign, volunteers of Nisargavedh spent three days in the forest collecting. 25 sacks of plastic garbage, weighing nearly 100 kg. Following an awareness drive, shopkeepers in Bhimashankar have agreed to place rubbish bins in front of their shops and to request customers to discard plastic and other waste only in the bins provided. A Pune based industrialist has also supported the campaign and is producing publicity material to help Nisargavedh in sustaining its efforts.

Source: 'Nisargavedh Launches Drive to Rid Bhimashankar of Plastic Refuse', *Times of India* 30 June 1998.

Contact: Kiran Purandare, Tel: 91-212-337 344.

ORISSA

Mass Hunt in Simlipal Hills

Every year in *Baisakh* (April-May) groups of 50-500 Santhal tribals enter the Simlipal Tiger Reserve (Mayurbhanj district) and participate in an *Akhand Shikar* (a mass hunting ritual) The Reserve has an estimated 1,076 plant species of which 87 are orchids, 29 species of reptiles and 281 species of birds.

While this event is an important part of Santhal tribal culture and of interest to anthropologists, several environmentalists have expressed concern about the damage they cause to the forests and wildlife. The tribals enter the forest in large numbers, set up *shikar* camps, start fires to trap animals and indiscriminately kill all animals except the tiger and the elephant.

Various opinions have been expressed on the implications of this annual event. The Field Director of the Tiger Reserve, S.S. Srivastava, believes that this annual ritual causes irreparable damage to the biodiversity and many species may be pushed to the brink of extinction if the practice continued year after year. He suggests that the core area be made inviolate and free from human presence.

Swagat Bose, a member of the Society for Advancement of Forestry and Environment brings out the human dimension of this problem by pointing out that the special needs of the tribals must first be addressed if you want to solve the problem of rampant poaching.

G. Hebrom, Headman of the Birhor tribal community observes that tribals are so poor that they are compelled to fell trees and kill animals. At the rehabilitation colonies built by the government even basic facilities such as drinking water, health and schools are not provided. Since the people do not have any employment opportunities, they have no option but to carry on with the ways of their forefathers. At the Sabarnaghati Mankadia colony tribals were deprived of their only means of livelihood, i.e. making ropes from the Siali creeper. Today they have to trek more than 100 km to collect the creeper.

Gurva Soren, Secretary of the Society for Research & Development of Tribal Culture, while sympathising with the tribal cause feels the need to educate the tribals on the need to conserve wildlife while Sonali Murmu, a social activist believes

that "conservation cannot be tackled without first dealing with the human dimension of the problem."

Source: Amarendra Bose, 'Who is the Hunter and Who the Hunted', *Indian Express* 4 May 1998.

Landmark Judgement on Bhitarkanika

In a landmark judgement, the Orissa High Court disposing a public interest litigation case filed by WWF-India in July 1994, has asked the State government to evict all encroachers from the Bhitarkanika Wildlife Sanctuary. The court has also directed the State to declare an additional area of 672 km, including rivers and creeks, a Reserved Forest. No more land within the Sanctuary is to be leased out and all renewal of past leases is to be stopped forthwith.

A division bench expressed serious concern over environmental degradation of the Bhitarkanika Sanctuary and has suggested the creation of a permanent body comprising of senior Central and State Forest Department officials, Secretary of the Ministry of Environment & Forests, Coast Guard and police representatives not below the rank of DIG, for protection of the area.

The case highlighted widespread devastation of the Bhitarkanika mangrove forest both inside and outside the Sanctuary due to rampant conversion of the area into prawn farms by several business houses and illegal settlers.

Source: Nageshwar Patnaik, 'Orissa HC Guards Wildlife Park', *Economic Times* 19 May 1998.

UTTAR PRADESH

Road through Corbett Tiger Reserve

A new 2.7 km metalled road is coming up in Corbett Tiger Reserve connecting Ramnagar with Patkot. It will cut through prime forests which include good tiger habitat and migratory corridors for elephants.

The UP government has authorised this construction reportedly without seeking Central government approval, in violation of the Forest Conservation Act, 1980. Rs. 5 lakh of the total 15 lakh sanctioned, has already been released for the road. Nearly two dozen labourers have been working on the 20 m wide road, and by last account, had completed a 750 m stretch. Over 150 teak trees have been felled and part of a hill has also been cut through.

According to The UP Forest Department, the go ahead for the road was given in mid-1996 on the insistence of the then Congress MP from Nainital, Narain Dutt Tiwari. During his election campaign he had promised local villagers a "proper" road to bypass the Bangla Jhala, a small stream less than 200 m wide which swells up during the monsoons. The road has been a long-standing demand of local villagers who boycotted the previous two elections in pursuit of this demand.

The DFO Ramnagar Forest Division G.S. Pandey, also confirmed that the road will serve the villagers needs. When asked why permission from the MoEF was not sought he replied that permission was necessary only for conducting non-forestry activities. He felt that road building activity fell into the category of forest purposes as it would help the FD patrol the area better.

However, according to the Corbett Foundation, an NGO working

in the area, the road is completely dispensable. A proper road already exists, though it is 25 km longer, and buses ply on it from Ramnagar barrage to Patkot. There is also considerable doubt whether the new road would remain operational during the monsoons.

Source: Bhavna Vij, 'Unauthorised Road Comes up in Corbett Park', *Indian Express* 1 April 1998.

Contact: Rajiv Bhartari, Deputy Director, Corbett Tiger Reserve, Ramnagar 244 715, District Nainital, UP.
Tel: 91-5945-85 489 / 85 332; Fax: 91-5945-85 376; Email: rajiv.bhartari@lead.sprintprg.ems.vsnl.net.in

Corbett Foundation, N 37, 1st floor, Panchsheel Park, New Delhi 110 017.
Tel: 91-11-644 4016; Fax: 644 7564.

Local communities agitate against Nandadevi Biosphere Reserve

In a letter dated 2 June 1998, the Gram Pradhan of Laata village of Chamoli District, UP, has declared that the local people of the area will forcibly enter the core zone of Nandadevi Biosphere Reserve if their grievances related to restrictions on access and use of resources are not looked into by the Forest Department.

The letter highlights the state of conservation in the area since the establishment of the Nandadevi National Park and the subsequent declaration of the Nandadevi Biosphere Reserve. The letter alleges that while the people had to adapt their major occupations of agriculture and pastoralism to continue under a regime of restrictions, very little happened by way of conservation of wildlife in the area. Poaching and illegal medicinal plant collection are reported to be rampant; wildlife numbers have dropped especially bharal, monal and musk deer.

The letter also appeals to the authorities to assist in safeguarding the natural assets of the area that the villagers also want to see conserved and not destroyed at the hands of outsiders. It asks for the management of the area to be handed over to local communities and that adequate compensation be paid for losses suffered over the last 16 years. The State government has been given an ultimatum that if the problems of local communities are not addressed and a plan formulated to involve them in management of the area, they will forcibly take over the administration of the area by July 15.

Further developments will be reported in subsequent issues of *JPAM Update*.

Source: Letter (dated 2 June 1998) from Dharamsinh Rana, Gram Pradhan, Laata village to MoEF and several departments of the UP government.

NATIONAL NEWS FROM INDIA

International Award for Indian Wildlifers

Three Karnataka based wildlifers were recognised by the New York-based Wildlife Conservation Society, for their outstanding

contribution to conservation of wildlife and its habitat in India.

The award winners are Thamoo Poovaiah of Madkeri, D.V. Girish of Chikmagalur and Praveen Bhargav of Bangalore. Thamoo Poovaiah and his associates are reported to have put up a dogged fight against timber exploitation in Kodagu district and promoted a humane and voluntary resettlement scheme for adivasis in Nagarhole National Park.

Mr Girish and his group in Chikmagalur have been honoured for their fight to protect the Bhadra Wildlife Sanctuary from the ravages of irrigation projects and for their efforts in stalling timber and bamboo extraction in the Sanctuary.

Mr Bhargav has been championing the cause of wildlife conservation in Karnataka through dedicated and persevering lobbying by his organisation Wildlife First.

Source: J.N. Prasad, on nathistory-india@lists.princeton.edu.

Contact: Merlin Nature Club, 13, 8th Cross, 30th Main, Sarakki ITI Layout, JP Nagar, I Phase, Bangalore 560 078
Email: avian@jasbg.vsnl.net.in. (Pl. mark all messages 'Attn. Prasad')

Simple Guide to the Wildlife Act

Responding to a recommendation emerging from the Consultation on Wildlife Conservation and People's Livelihood Rights held last year at Alwar (see *JPAM Update 14*, August 1997), Sanjay Upadhyay, a Delhi-based freelance advocate, has prepared a draft "Guide to Legal Provisions Relating to National Parks and Sanctuaries", which will eventually be published by Kalpavriksh.

Sanjay would be happy to provide the working draft on request, and would like your comments in order to make it a more user-friendly document. Specifically he would like comments on: your experiences in protected areas and understanding of legal provisions pertaining to notifications, wildlife rules, specific state laws that have been amended which impact protected areas, etc.

Contact: Sanjay Upadhyay, B 39 Dainik Janyug Apartments, Vasundhara Enclave, Delhi 110 096.
Tel: 91-11-247 7375; Fax: 247 4915; Email: upadhyays@hotmail.com

Second Consultation on Wildlife Conservation and People's Livelihood Rights

Following up from the first Consultation on Wildlife Conservation and People's Livelihood Rights, held in April 1997, the second Consultation was organised at the *ashram* of the Tarun Bharat Sangh, Alwar district, Rajasthan. Over 50 people representing various conservation organisations, human rights activists, community-based organisations, government departments, scientific and academic institutions, participated in the three-day meeting.

Amongst the major topics for discussion and action were: commercial threats to protected areas; the proposed amendments to the Wild Life (Protection) Act; the relationship between the Panchayati Raj legislation (including its extension to scheduled areas) and wildlife conservation; poaching problems; the WWF-India case in the Supreme Court regarding settlement of rights in protected areas.

One significant difference between the First and Second Consultations was the presence, even though briefly, of the Director of Project Tiger, the Chief Wildlife Warden of Rajasthan, and other government officers, all of whom expressed their support for a process of building bridges between those fighting for livelihood rights and those arguing the case of wildlife conservation.

The Consultation resulted in the following:

1. A statement of common concern and decisions (a draft is in circulation to the participants, and will soon be finalised).
2. A decision to form a loose network of groups and individuals who will jointly respond to threats to protected areas and resident communities. (The network will be serviced from the editorial address of *JPAM Update* in Pune and will be handled by Pankaj Sekhsaria)
3. Identification of some 'test' cases for a start, to be taken up for joint action, including Melghat Tiger Reserve (roads, tribal development), Pench National Park (fishing), Kanha National Park (displacement); investigation of the settlement procedure initiated pursuant to WWF-India's case in the Supreme Court.
4. A joint letter to WWF-India expressing concern about the implications of its case regarding settlement of rights of people in protected areas all over India (see *JPAM Update 15* January 1998:1), and seeking its co-operation in making the process of settlement more just and participatory.
5. A letter to the Ministry of Environment and Forests, seeking some clarifications regarding the proposed amendments to the Wild Life (Protection) Act, and proposing some additional revisions.
6. A query to concerned authorities in government and to anthropologists and tribal rights activists, seeking clarification on the precise relationship between the Panchayati Raj laws, especially as extended to Scheduled Areas.) These areas in the country also happen to have considerable government forests and protected areas.

For copies of the statement / letters, contact:

Ajay Dolke/Dinesh Ghose, 18/7 Ujwal Nagar, Wardha Road, Nagpur 440 025, Maharashtra
Tel: 91-712-260 709;
Email: aaasn@bom4.vsnl.net.in.

Rehabilitation Policy For Protected Areas

As part of a draft national resettlement and rehabilitation policy which is currently under circulation, proposals have been mooted for special measures to rehabilitate people displaced from national parks and sanctuaries. These include the provision of control over or access to alternative forest resources, and measures to employ or involve affected people in the protected areas themselves, as far as possible.

However, there is no mention of the conditions under which displacement would be seen to be necessary and desirable in the first place, nor of the need to ensure that forcible displacement would not take place. A policy decision to this effect has already been taken by Project Tiger (see *JPAM Update 14* August 1997).

For a copy of the drafts, contact: Ms. Savita,
Under-secretary, Ministry of Social Justice &

Empowerment, Government of India, Shastri Bhavan,
New Delhi 110 001.

For comments and other details, contact:

Walter Fernandes, Indian Social Institute,
Lodi Estate, New Delhi 110 003
Tel: 91-11-462 2379; Fax: 469 0660; Email:
walter@isid.unv.ernet.in.

David, Project Officer, Oxfam (India) Trust, 19
Gazetted Officers Colony, West High Court Road,
Post Box 71, Nagpur 440 001, Maharashtra. Tel:
91-715-533 737, 529 527; Fax: 533 737.

How many displaced by PAs?

There appears to be no comprehensive estimate of the number of people physically displaced by protected areas in India. Walter Fernandes, of Indian Social Institute (ISI), and his colleagues estimated in 1989 that upto 600,000 persons may have been displaced from protected areas (Fernandes, W. & Thukral, E.G. 1989. eds. *Development, Displacement and Rehabilitation*, ISI, New Delhi). This figure is based on an extrapolation of some initial estimates available only for Project Tiger Reserves. It also appears to be based on the assumption that most people living inside protected areas would almost certainly have been evicted, but this has not necessarily happened in many cases.

More recent figures released by the Director, Project Tiger, for Tiger Reserves alone, are between 13,000 and 23,000 persons. Jagdish Krishnaswamy of Duke University, who also made an estimate for Project Tiger areas, says that this concurs with figures he had estimated last year.

Based on a nation-wide survey carried out at the Indian Institute of Public Administration a decade back (Kothari et al. 1989. *Management of National Parks and Sanctuaries in India*, IIPA, New Delhi), it was estimated that over 100,000 persons had probably been displaced from protected areas across the country. Given that Tiger Reserves and national parks are the primary sites for displacement (due to either greater administrative or legal attention), and taking the Project Tiger Director's figures as being representative, this figure may not be too far off the mark.

Compared to the total displacement in India over the last few decades (some estimates put this at over 20 million people), protected areas represent a tiny fraction. This does not of course make the suffering of those displaced any less, nor does it in any way justify forced or induced displacement in future. And it does not include people who are "livelihood-displaced", i.e. those whose livelihood opportunities are reduced due to restricted access to resources within protected areas.

Other readers may be able to shed more light on the estimates made above, and we would welcome a discussion on the subject.

INTERNATIONAL NEWS

NEPAL

Workshop on Collaborative Management of Protected Areas in Asia

11 Asian countries participated in a Workshop on Collaborative Management of Protected Areas, held at Chitwan National Park, Nepal, on May 25-28, 1998. The Workshop assessed the state of protected area management in relation to involving local communities and other stakeholders. The national and regional level requirements to strengthen this process were also discussed. Both government and non-government delegates from each country participated.

Participants also discussed and finalised a proposal for a 5-year process to carry out the following:

- ✓ participatory action research at specified sites to understand the dynamics of co-management
- ✓ capacity building of various stakeholders through training and learning sessions
- ✓ sharing of information and experiences through personnel exchange
- ✓ influencing policy changes.

A co-ordinating group will be taking this process forward. The workshop was organised by IUCN-Nepal, in association with the King Mahendra Trust for Nature Conservation, Nepal, the Department of National Parks and Wildlife Conservation, Nepal, IUCN-Sri Lanka, the World Commission on Protected Areas, and the Collaborative Management Working Group of the IUCN.

Contact: Krishna Oli, IUCN-Nepal, PO Box
3923, Kathmandu, Nepal
Tel: 977-1-528 782; 528 761; Fax: 536786;
Email: iucn@mos.com.np

BOTSWANA

Last Bushmen in Kalahari Resist Eviction

The Khwe, one of the San or Bushmen peoples are the original inhabitants of the Kalahari desert. In the 1960s the 52,000 sq km Central Kalahari Game Reserve (CKGR) was set up as haven for the indigenous community as well as for the animals they hunted. Another minority people, the Bakalagadi, lived in the south of the Reserve. Until 1997 about 1,000 people were resident in the area permanently, while another 2,500-3,000 used the Reserve intermittently.

Since 1986 the Botswana government has had plans to move the Khwe and the Bakalagadi out of the CKGR. Two reasons were given:

1. to preserve wildlife and enhance the tourism potential of the Reserve, and
2. to rescue the indigenous people from their allegedly miserable life among animals and integrate them with the rest of Botswana society.

Neither of these reasons adequately explains the efforts put into moving the people out. Many suspect other reasons altogether: the wish to exploit the large diamond deposits suspected to be in the Reserve and plans being made to lease out extensive parts of the Reserve for luxury tourism.

In 1997, in the face of several world-wide protests, the government finally resettled the people to a new Xade settlement just outside the Reserve. Notwithstanding the government's denials, the residents claim that they were forcibly removed, even hoodwinked to leave, with possessions and

livestock loaded onto trucks against their will. The new site has no water supply or permanent buildings, and life there is bleak. Since it is part of a "wildlife management area" the Khwe cannot hold title to the land and development is restricted.

In June 1997 Khwe's own organisation, First People of the Kalahari, sent a letter to the Minister of Lands asking for a meeting to discuss their claim to the Reserve as indigenous inhabitants and to stop all removals until the claim had been resolved. The letter was ignored and removals went on. Recently however the negotiating team obtained a meeting with the outgoing President and have pressed for the following:

- the Botswana government should set up serious land claim talks with representatives of CKGR
- it should recognise and uphold the peoples right to the ownership of their land and resources
- the government should refrain from trying to move the remaining people out of the Reserve
- Those who have moved out should have the right to return.

Source: Survival International, Urgent Action Bulletin

Contact: Survival International, 11-15
Emerald Street, London WC1N 3QL, UK
Tel: 44-171-242 1441; Fax: 242 1771;
Email: survival@gn.apc.org.

RUSSIA

Siberian Cranes Back Home!

The lone pair of Siberian cranes that winter in Keoladeo National Park have safely returned to their nesting grounds near the Kurnovat river in western Russia.

Sasha Sorokin, in-charge of the Co-ordination Program for Siberian Cranes in Russia has been monitoring these two birds in India and Russia since the early 1990's. In the winter of 1995-96, he was able to confirm that this was indeed the Keoladeo-Kurnovat pair after colour banding their chick on the nesting grounds in Russia and following the birds to India.

This is now the only pair of Siberian cranes that are known to visit India. Last winter, they arrived in Keoladeo on the 17th of November, accompanied by one other adult Siberian crane. Three and a half months later, on 4th March they took off for their long and hazardous journey to their nesting ground in western Russia and are reported to have reached safely.

Source: George Archibald of the International Crane Foundation in a message to Belinda Wright, WPSI.

Contact: Belinda Wright, WPSI, Thapar House, 124 Janpath, New Delhi 110 001
Tel: 91-11-332 0573; Fax: 332 7729;
Email: blue@nda.vsnl.net.in (or)
wpsi@nde.vsnl.net.in.

SLOVAKIA

Fourth Conference of Parties of the Biodiversity Convention

The Fourth Conference of Parties (COP) of the Convention on Biological Diversity was held on 4-15 May, 1998, at Bratislava, Slovakia. Several hundred government delegates, observed by several hundred NGO and indigenous people's representatives,

discussed issues ranging from *in-situ* conservation to biotechnological safety and patenting. Important decisions were taken on activities relating to forest, marine, agricultural and inland water biodiversity, access to genetic resources, sharing of benefits arising from the use of these resources, and other matters.

One of the most significant outcomes was an agreement on the need for a working group on indigenous and local community knowledge / practices relating to biodiversity. If seriously carried out, the work programme of this group could have important bearing on the future relationship between protected areas and local communities.

Contact: Biodiversity Convention Secretariat,

World Trade Centre, 393, St. Jacques Street, Suite 300, Montreal H2Y 1N9, Quebec, Canada
Tel: 1 514-287 7034; Fax: 288 6588;
Website: www.biodiv.org/cop4/cop4docs.html (COP4 decisions can be downloaded from here).

WHAT'S AVAILABLE?

 Anon. 1998. *From Principles to Practice: Indigenous Peoples and Biodiversity Conservation in Latin America*. Proceedings of the Pucallpa Conference, Pucallpa, Peru, 17-20 March 1997. IWGIA Document No. 87, International Work Group for Indigenous Affairs, Copenhagen, pp 304. Price not stated.

A compilation of interesting papers on the conservation and management of habitats and wildlife, including protected areas, by Latin America's indigenous communities.

Contact: Forest Peoples Programme, 1C Fosseway Business Centre, Stratford Road, Moreton-in-Marsh, GL56 9NQ, United Kingdom. Tel: 44-1608-652 983; Fax: 652 878; Email: wrm@gn.apc.org

 Kirpekar, C.S. et al. 1994. *Assessment Report, Project Tiger Melghat 1974-1994*. Vidarbha Natural History Study Centre, Nagpur, 88 pp. Price not stated.

Though now somewhat dated, this little-known document continues to be of relevance, as it is one of India's few detailed assessments of a protected area covering a period of 20 years.

Contact: Vidarbha Natural History Study Centre, Nisargh Sewa Sangh, 509 Old Ramdaspath, Nagpur 440 010, Maharashtra.

 Srivastav, Aseem et al. Undated. *Biodiversity Conservation: The Gir Way*. Conservator of Forests, Wildlife Circle, Junagadh. Price not stated.

 Srivastav, Aseem and Patel, V.S. Undated. *Resolving Conflicts Through Negotiation: A Case Study of Natalia Village around Gir*

Protected Area. Conservator of Forests, Wildlife Circle, Junagadh, pp 20. Price not stated.

☞ Srivastav, Aseem. Undated. **Managing Conflicts: Options for Gir Protected Area.** Conservator of Forests, Wildlife Circle, Junagadh, pp 15. Price not stated.

These three documents provide details of the experience of the Gujarat Forest Department in implementing the ecodevelopment project in and around Gir National Park.

Contact: Aseem Srivastav, Conservator of Forests, Wildlife Circle, Junagadh 362 001, Gujarat
Tel: 91-285-31 678, 30 051; Fax: 32 900.

☞ Shramjeevi Unnayan. 1997. **Bharatiya Lok Prashasan Sansthan dwara Dalma Abhayaranya sanyukt prabandhan ki sambhavanayen: Vishay tatha mahatvapoon sujhav.** Shramjeevi Unnayan, Bihar, pp 32. Price not stated.

A Hindi version of the major results of the study on the possibilities of joint management of Dalma Sanctuary, Bihar, carried out by the Indian Institute of Public Administration, New Delhi. This study was carried out in association with local groups like Shramjeevi Unnayan, which has also produced this booklet.

(See also: Dalma: Hope for a Beleaguered Forest, by K. Christopher and Ashish Kothari, **Sanctuary Asia**, Vol. XVIII No. 2, April 1998).

Contact: Peoples Forester, Shramjeevi Unnayan, Gobarghusi, Patmada, District West Singhbhum, Bihar.

☞ **People's Plan for Preservation of Adivasi and Nagarhole Forests in Karnataka.** Undated. Nagarhole Budakattu Janara Hakkustapana Samithi, pp 21. Price not stated.

The challenge of preparing a 'peoples plan' for a protected area has not been taken up by many groups in India, though there has been much talk about the concept. The Samithi, a network of tribal groups in Karnataka, which successfully fought a legal battle against the proposed holiday resort, backed by the Taj group, at Nagarhole has done just this. Though thin in detail about their proposed alternatives, there are interesting suggestions on an institutional structure which would, in association with the Forest Department, manage the various zones of the Nagarhole National Park for wildlife conservation and livelihood security.

Contact: Nagarhole Budakattu Janara Hakkustapana Samithi, Nagarhole, Virajpet Taluk, Kodagu District, Karnataka
Tel: 91-8276-74 487; Fax: 74 091.

JPAM Update is produced every two months as a follow-up to the workshop on Exploring the Possibilities of Joint Protected Area Management (JPAM), organised at the Indian Institute of Public Administration (IIPA), New Delhi, in September 1994. **JPAM Update 17** was prepared by Ashish Kothari, Farhad Vania, Pankaj Sekhsaria and Yashodhara with assistance from Aanchal Kapur and Vidya .

Ideas, comments, news and information may please be sent to the editorial address. Please note this is a mailing address only:

Ashish Kothari
Apartment 5, Shri Dutta Krupa
908 Deccan Gymkhana
Pune 411 004
Maharashtra, India

Tel/Fax: 0212-354 329

Email: ashish@giasdl01.vsnl.net.in

