

Gadgil Panel Report and Kerala Floods

What is the issue?

 $n\n$

\n

• The recent floods of catastrophic dimensions have ravaged the state of Kerala.

\n

• This has proved the rejection of Gadgil panel report to be a costly error for people and environment.

\n

 $n\$

What was the Gadgil Panel on?

 $n\n$

۱'n

• About 8 years ago, the Centre constituted the Western Ghats Ecology Expert Panel (WGEEP).

\n

• It is a 14-member panel under the chairmanship of noted ecologist Madhav Gadgil.

۱'n

• It was tasked to look into measures to arrest the ecological devastation from human activities in the Western Ghats.

\n

- The 1600-km-long mountain range of Western Ghats is a fragile ecosystem.
- \bullet It is regarded as one of the eight 'hottest' biodiversity hotspots in the world. $\ensuremath{^{\text{h}}}$
- \bullet Kerala accounts for nearly 18% of the biodiversity-rich Western Ghats. $\ensuremath{^{\text{h}}}$
- The Gadgil panel submitted its report in 2011.

 $n\n$

What are the key recommendations?

 $n\n$

\n

• The Gadgil Committee divided the Western Ghats into three ecologically sensitive zones (ESZ).

\n

• These are the highest (ESZ1), high (ESZ2) and moderate sensitivity (ESZ3) zones.

\n

• This is in addition to the Protected Areas managed under acts such as the Wildlife Protection Act.

\n

- It suggested that ESZ1 and ESZ2 would be largely 'no-gone' zones.
- So mining, polluting industries as well as large-scale development activities, including new railway lines are restricted.
- It also objected to new dams, thermal power stations or massive windmill farms or new townships in ESZ1.
- The panel however gave importance to the local communities and gram sabhas.

\n

• They were given a larger say in deciding on matters relating to the ecology of these regions.

۱n

• It also called for \n

 $n\n$

\n

i. stricter regulation on tourism

 $_{\mbox{\scriptsize ii.}}$ phasing out of plastics and chemical fertilisers

iii. a ban on diversion of forest land into non-forest applications

 $n\n$

What happened next?

 $n\n$

\n

• The Gadgil panel report was rejected by the then Union Environment Minister.

\n

- The report was also unacceptable to any of the six Western Ghats States.
- These included Kerala, Karnataka, Tamil Nadu, Goa, Maharashtra and Gujarat as well as Pondicherry (UT).
- \bullet A year later, the government appointed a new committee under the chairmanship of K Kasturirangan. $\mbox{\sc h}$
- It was tasked to "examine" the WGEEP report.

 $n\n$

What were the changes made?

 $n\n$

\n

• The Kasturirangan committee did away with the graded approach in terms of ecological sensitivity.

\n

- It rather divided the Western Ghats into cultural lands (where there are currently human settlements) and natural lands.
- It recommended declaring cultural lands into ecologically sensitive area (ESA).

\n

- This spanned around 60,000 sq-km or 37% of the total area.
- Recently, the Environment Ministry notified an area of around 56,000 sq km in the Western Ghats as ESA.

۱n

• In Kerala, the Kasturirangan committee had proposed an area of 13,000 sq km as ESA.

\n

 \bullet But under pressure from the Kerala government, the notified area was brought down to less than 10,000 sq km. \n

\n\n

Why was the Gadgil panel report rejected?

 $n\n$

\n

• The Gadgil panel faced stiff resistance from all political parties, particularly

in Kerala.

۱n

• It was primarily because of the involvement of private land.

\n

- A large part of the ecologically sensitive zones belonged to private citizens.
- Attempts to introduce social control over the use of private land have often been challenged.

\n

- The restrictions may not have much of an impact on people.
- But they are often instigated, by groups with vested interests, to oppose such moves.

\n

 \bullet Popular resistance thus increases the political considerations in implementing such regulations. $\ensuremath{\backslash n}$

\n\n

What are its implications?

 $n\$

\n

• Nearly 40% of the granite quarries in Kerala in 2014-15 were located in ecologically sensitive areas.

\n

 \bullet Significantly, a quarter of them were in the Gadgil committee-earmarked extremely sensitive ESZ1.

۱n

• These are notably some of the regions which have been devastated by the recent floods.

\n

• The present disaster caused by heavy rainfall in Kerala could not have been completely avoided.

\n

• But its severity could have significantly been reduced, if not for the rejection of WGEEP's proposed zoning.

\n

• If the measures to protect the fragile environment were in place, man-made factors would not have worsened the impact.

• Development in the State in the last several years had materially compromised its ability to deal with a disaster of this proportion.

\n

What is the way ahead?

 $n\n$

\n

• The Western Ghats States need to reconsider their stand in view of the recent calamity.

\n

• The "environment vs development and livelihoods" debate should not be used to shield vested interests.

\n

- A different governance regime, as suggested by the Gadgil panel, may be required to administer the Western Ghats.
- However, Kasturirangan panel's observation that results are better achieved through incentives than policing is valid.
- \bullet Indeed, the challenge is to set up decentralised, participatory institutions to manage hilly regions and river basins. $\mbox{\sc h}$
- \bullet The Centre should urge the States to accept the best in both the reports. $\ensuremath{\backslash} n$
- It should not entertain any further reduction of ecologically sensitive areas, for nature's and hence people's sake.

 $n\n$

Source: BusinessLine

\n

