

NBSAP: the Indian Experience

R J Ranjit Daniels

Care Earth

No 5, 21st Street, Thillaiganganagar

Chennai 600 061

E-mail: ranjit.daniels@gmail.com

Process

Organization

Executing Agency

Government of India: Ministry of
Environment and Forests

Funding Agency

GEF/UNDP

Implementing Agency

Technical and Policy Core Group
(TPCG)

Administrative Agency

Biotech Consortium India Ltd

Contributors

Lead Agency/Individuals

Working Groups

Peer Reviewers

Message from TPCG

“In conclusion, it would hopefully not be an exaggeration to say that this has indeed been a unique process, one that in its scale and coverage has never before been tried in India in the context of natural resources and development. Both in its successes and failures, therefore, it has critical lessons for future planning processes in all sectors”

A Critical Analysis of the Project

Source: NBSAP

Was the scope of coverage achieved?

- All components of biodiversity covered
- Some (eg domesticated) not uniformly covered
- Paucity of information on microorganisms

Were all aspects of biodiversity covered?

- Conservation – yes
- Sustainable use – weak; lack of models
- Equitable sharing/access – weak; lack of models

Was guidance, coordination and communication adequate?

- Guidelines and concept notes circulated
- Radio programs and letters
- Website
- E-mails
- Bimonthly newsletter
- Festivals/carnivals

Was the process participatory enough?

- Call for participation – brochures in 16 languages – literally tens of thousands from various walks of life
- Scientists and academics c. 32%
- NGOs c. 24%
- Forest department c. 15%
- Defense, industry and religious institutions under-represented

Were the stated outputs achieved?

- 29 State and Union Territories plans
- 10 eco-regional plans
- 14 sub-state/local plans
- 12 thematic (cross-cutting) plans
- 32 sub-thematic reviews

Were cross-cutting issues adequately integrated?

- Gender sensitivity – weak (only 9% of the people involved were women)
- Others such as globalization, conservation and livelihoods, bio-piracy, equity and people's empowerment patchy and weak

Was there adequate buy-in from the government?

- Partial – a few States the lead agency was a government department (Forest Department)
- Integration with the Government of India's 10th Plan was not possible (although seriously attempted) due to time lag

Were the linkages with past/ongoing processes adequate, was existing information accessed adequately?

- Strong linkages achieved between NBSAP &
- Macro-Action Plan on Biodiversity (used as base document)
- NWAP, NFAP, NEAP, NCS
- Agenda 21
- BCPP

What were the unanticipated impacts in terms of awareness, capacity enhancement, action & networking?

- Strongest point – wider awareness
- A lot of fresh information generated
- Enhanced networking and partnerships
- Enhanced capacity amongst rural folks

Were the resources adequate?

Was the time frame followed?

- Resources (financial) inadequate
- Mainly because the original time schedule of 2 years was stretched to 3 years
- Time lost in establishing nodal agencies, coordinators and outlining and kick-starting the entire process

End Note: Personal Assessment

- Over-ambitious
- Over-emphasis on Process
- The product did not match the process
- Coordinator's/lead agency's strengths/prejudices rendered sections lopsided
- Recommended strategies and actions lacked focus
- The overall attitude of the National and State Governments to the process and outcomes was 'step-motherly'