

Recognising the Human Environment

What is the issue?

\n\n

\n

- There was widespread protest in Tuticorin, TN against Vedanta's copper smelter recently.

\n

- The incident calls for a broader understanding on the issues related with environment and business projects.

\n

\n\n

What is the problem in Tuticorin?

\n\n

\n

- The Vedanta subsidiary promised world class community engagement, environment management and CSR.

\n

- But the proposed copper smelter was located close to human habitation.

\n

- It generated about 400 MT of chemical gases like sulphur dioxide every day.

\n

- These are gases that can travel for miles as in the case of Bhopal's Union Carbide.

\n

- Resultantly, people are suffering from various ailments.

\n

- They wanted to halt the construction of the new 1200 MT copper smelter and demand a closure of the existing facility.

\n

\n\n

What are the recent developments?

\n\n

\n

- The Labour Party in the UK asked for Vedanta Resources to be delisted from the London Stock Exchange.
\n
- Earlier, the Church of England had withdrawn from Vedanta.
\n
- As Vedanta had failed to respect the human rights of local people in setting up a bauxite mine in Odisha.
\n
- The Dongria Kondh tribals protested against taking away of their hill of worship in Niyamgiri, Odisha.
\n
- In all, investors are becoming wary of companies that are seen to be environmentally irresponsible.
\n
- High standards of social governance are gaining significance in companies.
\n

\n\n

What are the larger concerns?

\n\n

- **Human environment** - There is predominance of a forest department outlook in the environment ministry.
\n
- It leads to a narrow interpretation of the environment for only its physical side - water, air, land/forests.
\n
- Nonetheless, human beings are fundamental to any discourse about the environment.
\n
- Divorced of this, the environment has no social value.
\n
- **EPA** - The Environment (Protection) Act, 1986 came after the UN Conference on the Human Environment.
\n
- Under it, India pledged to take steps for protection and improvement of the human environment.
\n
- Unfortunately, the EPA has only a passing mention of the human being.
\n
- **Clearance** - In most cases, environment clearance is pushed through as an ease of doing business proposal.
\n

- The company's presentation of strong CSR credentials results in overlooking the environmental impact.
- **People** - No significant social impact study is undertaken, nor is people's consensus ensured.
- There is little opportunity for people to put forward the concerns in future implications of the project.

\n\n

What should be done?

\n\n

- **Government** - It must mandate a social impact study prior to the public hearing.
- This should include the likely impact on health of people in the influence zone of the project.
- It should consider the nature of the likely effluents and the already existing health sensitivities.
- Quality of available water and impact of the expected discharges should be accounted.
- The methodology of waste disposal and its impact on water and air should be studied.
- Government should ensure that public hearing takes place only after the general consent of all villages.
- **Company** - Company must define the affected zone of the project.
- It should include villagers whose land is being acquired and who will be under the environmental influence.
- It should reserve 15-24% initial shareholding for villagers who are in the affected zone.
- This portion could be allocated as social/sweat equity.
- The company should announce benchmarks for water, air and soil quality.

\n

- It should also commit to pay compensation for any breach of these.

\n

- Companies must re-examine their entire CSR framework.

\n

- They can recruit village-level representatives to engage better with the villagers.

\n

- In all, there is a need for a bottom-up approach of social and civic engagement, with prime focus on the human environment.

\n

\n\n

\n\n

Source: Business Standard

\n

