

STREAM



Support to Regional Aquatic Resources Management



DFID NRSP Research Project R8100
Investigating Improved Policy on Aquaculture Service Provision to Poor People
March 2002 – May 2003

Policy Review Workshop

Noida, Delhi

24-25 April 2003

In Association With
Gramin Vikas Trust (GVT)

Investigating Improved Policy on Aquaculture Service Provision to Poor People

Policy Review Workshop
Noida, Delhi
24-25 April 2003

In Association with
Gramin Vikas Trust (GVT)

DFID NRSP Research Project R8100
March 2002 – May 2003

Graham Haylor, William Savage and S D Tripathi

Contents

Acknowledgements	ii
The Workshop	1
Inaugural Session	2
The Project	10
Progress of the Case Studies	13
Presentation: Case Studies 1 and 2	14
Statement by Recipients	14
Presentation: Case Studies 3 and 4	15
Statement by GVT	15
Presentation: Case Studies 5 and 6	17
Statement by Departments of Fisheries	17
Performance of Act One of <i>Mahajal – The Big Fishing Net</i>	18
Presentation: Indicators of Progress	19
Presentation: Policy Recommendations	20
Performance of Act Two of <i>Mahajal – The Big Fishing Net</i>	23
Open Discussion	23
Commitments	25
Follow-up Actions and Next Steps	28
Appendices	
1. Participants	29
2. Agenda	31
3. Evolution of Policy Change Recommendations	33

Acknowledgements

We are deeply grateful to the Gramin Vikas Trust (GVT) for organizing the policy Review Workshop in Noida, Delhi. In particular, we would like to thank:

- Dr V S Tomar, CEO of GVT, for his strong continuing support.
- Mr J S Gangwar, formerly Project Manager of GVT East, now Additional CEO in Noida, Delhi, who personally facilitated arrangements for the workshop and enabled members of his staff to work with us.
- Our state Department of Fisheries colleagues who came to Noida to take part in the Policy Review Workshop and to colleagues in the Government of India who committed time and energy to the workshop and the policy change effort.
- Our GVT colleagues, including State Coordinators, Field Specialists, Community Organizers and Jankars, who are working with enthusiasm towards scaling up and policy influence on behalf of farmers and fishers across eastern India.
- Mr Ras Behari Baraik, Mr Md Rushtam Khan and Mr Bhim Nayak, for coming to Noida to contribute their views.
- Dr Ayyappan for his excellent contributions to the workshop.
- Mrs Rebecca Cajilig for handling the workshop logistics and finances so thoroughly.
- Mr Rakesh Rahman and his talented theatre troupe for their dedication and enthusiasm for the project and the lives of fisherfolk.

The Workshop

The Policy Review Workshop was held at the Imperial Palace Hotel in Noida, Delhi, from 24-25 April 2003. Participants (Appendix 1) included representatives of the Government of India; state governments of Jharkhand, Orissa and West Bengal; Gramin Vikas Trust (GVT) and recipients (fishers, farmers and *jankars*) from the three states; DFID-NRSP; Rockefeller Foundation and NACA-STREAM. Fifteen members of a theatre troupe also participated.

The Policy Review Workshop was the final activity in the DFID-NRSP Research Project R8100 entitled “Investigating Improved Policy on Aquaculture Service Provision to Poor People”. The workshop followed:

- A Review of Lessons Learnt in Enabling People’s Participation in Policy-making Processes, published in April 2003
- A Consensus-building Process which ran from February to March 2003
- Six Case Studies carried out from mid-2002 to January 2003 in Jharkhand, Orissa and West Bengal
- A Stakeholders Workshop in January 2003 in Ranchi, Jharkhand
- Three State-level Workshops in Purulia, West Bengal; Ranchi, Jharkhand and Bhubaneswar, Orissa in October 2002
- An August 2002 Planning Visit
- A Rural Aquaculture Service Recipients and Implementers Workshop held in May 2002 in Ranchi, Jharkhand, and
- An Inception Visit in March 2002.

The aim of the Policy Review Workshop, as with all project activities, was “contributing to ‘giving people a voice’ in policy-making processes that have an impact on their livelihoods”. The workshop objectives were:

- Through six case studies, stakeholder statements and a street-play, understand the experiences of rural aquaculture services provision from the perspectives of representative recipient and provider groups
- Review the process for transacting policy change and lessons learnt
- Review progress towards policy change and lessons learnt, through “indicators of progress”
- Make recommendations for policy change based on the outcomes of the project
- Seek commitment from policy-makers on taking up the recommendations, and
- Consider how the Government of India, NACA-STREAM and GVT may follow up the project.

The Policy Review Workshop agenda can be found in Appendix 2.

Inaugural Session

Welcome – Dr V S Tomar, CEO, GVT

Good morning, everybody ...

It gives me a great pleasure to welcome Dr S Ayyappan, Deputy Director General (Fisheries) of ICAR. I am grateful to him to spare his valuable time to attend this inaugural session. Dr Ayyappan was also associated with GVT as one of the members of the Steering Committee of the Eastern India Rainfed Farming Project. As a Director of CIFA also, he has provided necessary help to EIRFP as most of our staff and *jankars* were trained at CIFA only. It is further a matter of great pleasure that you will be with us to share your experiences with the participants. I would request you to spare your valuable time for the concluding session for tomorrow so that the outcome of the workshop could be shared with you.

It is also a matter of great pleasure to welcome Shri Chandra Pal Singh, Chairman of KRIBHCO and Gramin Vikas Trust. It is only his inspiration as Chairman of GVT that GVT has earned goodwill as an organization for the rural development among the Government of India and different state governments. I welcome him on behalf of myself, on behalf of GVT and on behalf of all participants.

Dr Pedro Bueno, Director General of NACA (Network of Aquaculture Centres in Asia-Pacific) has come here from Bangkok to attend the workshop. I welcome him for being here with us. I welcome Mr John Gaunt from DFID-NRSP London who is here to share his experiences during the workshop.

I am extremely grateful to Dr Graham Haylor, Director of STREAM (Support to Regional Aquatic Resources Management) and his team members, Mr Bill Savage, Ms Reby Cajilig and Dr S D Tripathi, to choose Gramin Vikas Trust as an organization for this project on “Investigating Improved Policy on Aquaculture Service Provision to Poor People”. We have a long association with Dr Graham, as earlier he also has worked on a research project on “Integrated Aquaculture in Eastern India – Constraints and Opportunities”. In this project also a number of constraints were identified and participatory research was conducted. So I welcome Dr Graham and his entire team.

I welcome to this workshop Mr A K Ray, Joint Secretary, Government of West Bengal; Mr Rajiw Kumar, Director of Fisheries, Government of Jharkhand; Dr Chauhan, Deputy Fisheries Commissioner, Government of India; Mr Ashish Kumar, Deputy Director of Fisheries, Government of Jharkhand; and Mr P R Rout, Assistant Director of Fisheries, Government of Orissa.

I welcome all the recipients from Jharkhand, Orissa and West Bengal. I also welcome Project Managers of GVT and all our State Coordinators, Field Specialists and Community Organizers who have come to attend this workshop. The recipients’ problems have also been translated into a drama. Mr Rakesh Raman from Jharkhand along with his team is here. I welcome him and his team members.

I would like to appraise that prior to this workshop, workshops were organized in all the three states where the participants from the respective state governments had also participated. A

fourth workshop was organized at Ranchi where the participants from all three states attended and came out with certain recommendations.

This is the final workshop where we have invited senior GOI officials and participants from all three states, so that the constraints could be appraised to the senior government officials to bring about changes in the pro-poor policies.

At the end, once again, I welcome you all.

Address by Guest of Honor – Mr Chandra Pal Singh, Chairman, KRIBHCO/GVT

I am thankful to the organizers for inviting me to the inaugural function of the two-day Policy Review Workshop. India is an agricultural-based country and 80% of its people depend on agriculture for their livelihood, so if 80% of our people remain happy, then only we can expect the country to be happy. Agriculture includes horticulture, livestock and fisheries or fish culture too. Today agriculture alone cannot feed the whole country, so animal husbandry and fisheries need to be developed. In GVT's Eastern India and Western India projects, newer technologies are being developed for the farmers, for the last 7-8 years. In GVT, our approach is participatory which makes things easier. I have seen the work of GVT in fisheries in Jharkhand, where poor people collect rain water in a pond and practice fish culture that has brought about an improvement in the economic condition of these groups. Fish culture is being practiced in 250 ponds and is expected to expand in more ponds. Some more improvement is certainly possible and your deliberations in the next two days would highlight the changes to be brought about in the policies to remove the constraints that are hampering its growth. I expect that the farmers and officers will openly discuss their problems and find out ways to change the policies for their benefit. I thank Dr Tomar, Joint Secretary of West Bengal, Deputy Commissioner of the Government of India, DDG of ICAR and others for giving me an opportunity to speak on this occasion. I am sorry that I am not able to be with you for the whole day, but I wish you a successful workshop.

Brief on GOI-NACA – Dr S Ayyappan, DDG Fisheries, ICAR

India has 16% of the world's population but only 2.5% of land and 4% of fresh water, so to feed the population, aquaculture is a means of diversification in agriculture. There is a tremendous stress on land and diversification is necessary to feed the burgeoning population. Aquaculture is one resource that is most important in this context. It should not be surprising to note that aquaculture has grown at a faster rate (6%) than agriculture that has registered a growth rate of 4% only. Aquaculture is in the forefront and is committed for 6% growth. Even in the 10th Five-Year Plan, 4% growth in agriculture is possible only when aquaculture has 6% growth. In the states of Jharkhand, Orissa and West Bengal, the water resource is rich so aquaculture can be taken up. As in agriculture – where land, labor and capital are the basic requirements – so it is in aquaculture where water, fish seed and feed are the main inputs.

The country's agriculture policy is now about two years old but there is no fisheries or aquaculture policy. Like in other activities, the core issue in aquaculture is policy. It remains on the driving seat always. I am happy that you are working to review the policies in aquaculture. I have heard that various states of India are also formulating their own aquaculture policies. So far, Uttaranchal and Tamil Nadu have done this and West Bengal and Orissa are in the process. I expect that Jharkhand will also go for a state policy on aquaculture. But there is a scope for development and improvement through participation by

STREAM that can focus on the achievements and mistakes of Thailand, Cambodia, Vietnam and all other countries associated with the Initiative. This could develop as a model for the 23 states in the country. Government has to see how fish availability can be ensured in all the states and union territories of the country.

We have a long way to go so planning at this stage is necessary for incorporating in the 10th Five-Year Plan and the Vision Statement document. This is the right time as the Planning Commission has recently asked for a state-wise report on inputs required for aquaculture. The workshop could provide feedback and active participation would make us wiser by tomorrow evening.

Vote of Thanks – Mr J S Gangwar, Additional CEO, GVT

Under the guidance of Mr Chandra Pal Singh, GVT has grown much and we are committed to work in the future. We thank Dr Ayyappan for inaugurating the workshop. He has had a long association with GVT and so many staff and farmers were trained under his guidance at CIFA.

Thanks to Dr Pedro Bueno of NACA, Dr John Gaunt of DFID-NRSP, Dr Graham Haylor and his colleagues, Mr William Savage, Mr Rubu Mukherjee and Ms Rebecca Cajilig for their efforts in organizing this workshop. STREAM has shared the burden of GVT by working in their project area and focusing on the same issues of policy change as the GVT.

We thank Dr Dinesh Joshi from the Rockefeller Foundation, Mr Rajiw Kumar, Mr A K Ray and Mr A K Rout to make it possible to be present in the workshop. Many thanks to Dr Chauhan for coming to the workshop despite his busy schedule. I thank Mr Rakesh Raman and members of his theatre troupe. Last but not least, we thank colleagues who are State Coordinators, Field Specialists, Community Organizers, *jankars* and farmers from the three states.

Brief on GVT – Dr V S Tomar, CEO

Gramin Vikas Trust is a separate entity promoted by KRIBHCO with the support of the GOI and DFID to manage rural development projects. GVT was created to evolve policies and strategies with the consultation of donors, government and other stakeholders. GVT is presently managing two projects known as Eastern India Rainfed Farming Project (EIRFP) and Western India Rainfed Farming Project (WIRFP). Both projects are funded by DFID and KRIBHCO.

The goal of GVT is to develop more effective policies and programs for reducing poverty in rainfed areas of India. Its mission is to act as a catalyst to help socially and economically disadvantaged rural people to improve their livelihoods on a sustainable basis. The objectives of GVT are to:

- Improve the livelihoods of poor tribal farming communities.
- Develop and implement gender and poverty-focused participatory approaches.
- Establish village-based institutions.
- Set up training centers for capacity-building of communities.
- Provide consultancy on rural development to different organizations, institutions, agencies and persons.

The strategies of GVT are:

- Development of participatory planning systems.
- Development of people's institutions.
- Identification of women and men *jankars*.
- Support to rural communities and others for capacity-building for development.
- Influencing government and other agencies to promote policies and programs in favor of rural poor people.

GVT's approaches include:

- Bottom-up planning processes.
- Process approach – blueprints and fixed targets avoided.
- Flexible management system.
- Develop rapport and trust with communities.
- Promote Self-Help Groups (SHG).
- Formation and strengthening of community-based organizations (CBO).

Gramin Vikas Trust is now managing two projects:

- Western India Rainfed Farming Project (WIRFP) in seven districts of Madhya Pradesh (Jhabua, Ratlam and Dhar), Rajasthan (Banswara and Dungarpur) and Gujarat (Dahod and Panchmahal) for the improvement of the livelihoods of 6.75 *lakhs* people. WIRFP Phase II started in April 1999 and will continue until March 2006. WIRFP is working in 202 core villages with 394 dissemination villages.
- Eastern India Rainfed Farming Project (EIRFP) in nine districts of Jharkhand (Ranchi, Latehar, Hazaribagh and Sarainkela), Orissa (Dhenkanal, Keonjhar and Mayurbhanj) and West Bengal (Midnapur and Purulia) for the improvement of the livelihoods of 3.5 *lakhs* people. EIRFP ran from 1995-2000 and has been extended to March 2005. EIRFP is working in 250 core villages and 550 dissemination villages.

Project components are:

- Development of farming systems and sustainable livelihoods in 470 core villages.
- Dissemination of project technologies and approaches in 1,100 dissemination villages (550 in each project) through partnerships via government, NGOs and other organizations.
- Participatory technology development through collaborative research with national and overseas research institutions.

This is done through a team of 324 professionally-qualified women and men of different backgrounds such as rural development, agriculture, agricultural engineering, forestry, social science, livestock and aquaculture.

Programs Undertaken

- Participatory Planning
- Formation of Self-Help Groups (SHG)
- Savings and Credit System
- Functional Literacy
- Crop and Vegetable
- Integrated Crop Management
- Ergonomics
- Tree and Agro-forestry
- Soil and Water Conservation
- Water Resources Development
- Livestock Development
- Aquaculture
- Health and Sanitation
- Income Generating Programs
- Micro-enterprises
- Training and Exposures
- Monitoring and Evaluation
- Impact Assessment
- Participatory Technology Generation
- Working with Others

Major Achievements

- 3,436 SHGs with total savings of Rs 187 *lakhs* and recycling amount of Rs104 *lakhs*.
- GVT has developed new crop varieties (two in rice and three in maize) in collaboration with state agricultural universities.
- Aquaculture program taken up in 206 seasonal and perennial ponds.
- 55% of cropped area covered under HYV (high-yielding varieties) in EIRFP.
- Mortality of livestock has been reduced by 30%.
- 256 grain banks have been established in WIRFP to meet the needs of communities during crisis.

Salient Features

- Poverty-focused participatory approach for development at community level.
- Promoting SHG, capacity-building, diversification and empowerment.
- Working for gender equity and empowerment of rural women.
- Enhancing productivity of renewable natural resources through new and appropriate technology.
- Development of *jankar* system (para-professional force) from the community for dissemination of project approach and technology for development.
- New crop varieties developed through collaborative research under Participatory Technology Development (PTD).
- Involving all stakeholders in project programs.
- Development of partnerships with governments, Panchayat Raj Institutions (PRI)¹, NGOs and CBOs.

¹ The 73rd amendment to the Constitution made Panchayat Raj Institutions at all levels, the institutions of self-governance. This included the establishment of a three-tier set-up of Panchayat Raj with territorial constituencies; Reservation of seats and offices of Chairpersons to Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes in proportion to their population and for Backward Classes as decided by the State Legislature; Reservation of not less than one-third of seats and offices of Chairpersons for women; Regular election to Panchayat Raj bodies every five years; Constitution of independent Finance Commission and Election Commission; Devolution of powers to Panchayat Raj Institutions; Audit of accounts of the Panchayats to be done; Legal status to Gram Sabha at village level; Constitution of District Planning Committee (as part of 74th Constitution Amendment).

Brief on NACA – Mr Pedro Bueno, Director General***The Relevance of NACA and STREAM in Indian Aquaculture and Aquatic Resources Development: A Brief Overview****Regional Context*

Asian aquaculture is now more organized, with increasing state support and greater private sector participation. Productivity has increased faster (average of 10% or more over the past decade) than any other agricultural commodity, largely from the better application of technology, and technical and management skills. Increasing levels of production have improved the general availability of food to the population and increased the export earnings of national economies. Aquaculture has contributed to better health and nutritional well-being of people, and improved incomes. There is a growing sensitivity to the fact that practicing socially and environmentally-responsible aquaculture makes good business sense.

As with the rest of the region, India has made similar progress in its aquaculture development and it would be fair to apply the same characterization as above. It would also be a fair expectation that, as with the rest of the region, the aquaculture sector of India can be described as:

Intensified production has begun to stress the land, water and biological resource bases, impairing their capacity to continue to support production. There is a need for a clear understanding and strong unified action to better address the difficult issues faced by the production and marketing of products in highly competitive markets, where it is essential to assume responsibility not only for the quality of the product but for the actions taken, or not taken, in producing it. Information capability has not kept up with the demands of effective policy-making. Conflicts over resource use simmer, occasionally flaring up to strain the management and regulatory capacities to deal with them. Promoting cohesiveness and harmony in the face of diverse interests, with the poor and weak often getting ignored, has begun to expose weaknesses in policy-making and governance. And higher production has not been shown to significantly reduce rural poverty.

The regional program of NACA, which, along with other members of the organization, India has helped to shape, is addressing these regional issues. On the other hand, there are specific country activities in collaboration with NACA and/or STREAM, addressing such concerns as the participation of poor rural people in remote communities in research and policy formulation, disease control and health management of coastal shrimp aquaculture, formulation of an appropriate national fish health management strategy, intensification of food production through aquaculture, and sustainable management of coldwater fishery resources.

National Context

India registered a good 6.1% growth in GDP in the 1990s; its 1999 GDP was US\$ 442 billion. This economic gain, however, had been negated by a high population growth. The Human Development Index is low in all South Asian countries. One of five people in South Asia is described as chronically malnourished, and one of three is living below the poverty

line (US\$ 1/day). In India, it is 44%, and three-fourths of these are in rural areas. Landless people make up 45% of rural poor people (Mruthunjaya and Pal, 2002)².

A regional exercise held in Hyderabad in July 2001 – sponsored by the Asia-Pacific Association of Agricultural Research Institutes to identify research priorities (in which the author along with the current DDG (Fisheries) of ICAR took part) – described common issues facing agricultural development in South and West Asia as:

- High incidence and concentration of poverty
- Prevalence of natural disasters including drought, floods and cyclones
- Fragmented and small landholdings (arable land availability in India stood at less than 0.30 hectare per person in 1999 and is expected to decrease to around 0.25 ha by 2010)
- Gender inequities
- Low urbanization and poor infrastructure
- Poor transfer of technology, and
- High risks associated with production and marketing of agricultural commodities.

The opportunities for harnessing the vast potential of aquatic resources in addressing these social and economic problems have been identified in recent forums held in India. One such was the “Roundtable on Fisheries and Aquaculture” held in New Delhi on 27 September 2000, which pointed out that the concern should be how to exploit the vast aquatic resources in a sustainable way and, more importantly, with poor people actively participating and mainly benefiting from their utilization (Kutty, 2002)³.

This broad concern of utilizing aquatic resources (including for aquaculture) to address social issues is the core element of the regional policy on “Aquaculture for Rural Development” which the member governments of NACA have formulated and made the thrust of the Work Program for 2001-06. This has five major elements:

1. Capacity-building through education and training
2. Effective research and development (R&D) by collaborative networking among centers and institutions
3. Information and communication
4. Policy guidelines and support to policies and institutional capacities, and
5. Aquatic animal health management.

The flagship of the rural development thrust is the STREAM Initiative.

Statement of Project History and Workshop Objectives – Dr Graham Haylor, STREAM Director

In 1996, the DFID-funded KRIBHCO Eastern India Rainfed Farming Project (EIRFP) included aquaculture as a component of its support to poor communities in Bihar (now

² Mruthunjaya and Pal, S 2002 *Agricultural Research Priorities for South and West Asia – The Asia-Pacific Association of Agricultural Research Institutions*. New Delhi: National Centre for Agricultural Economics and Policy Research, ICAR.

³ Kutty, M N 2000 *Priorities in Aquaculture Development in India*. Working paper for the Roundtable on Fisheries and Aquaculture, New Delhi, 27 September.

Jharkhand), Orissa and West Bengal. Between 1996-2000, DFID-NRSP supported a research project “Integration of Aquaculture into the Farming Systems of the Eastern Plateau of India” (R6759) involving groups of tribal farmers in eastern India, Stirling University, KRIBHCO, ICAR (CIFA) and the local DOF. The coordinated efforts of these research and development projects, working with groups of farmers, evolved an appropriate low-input approach to aquaculture utilizing seasonal ponds.

Livelihoods were markedly improved:

- Local labor opportunities reduced migration rates from 40-50% to 15-20%.
- Productive use of seasonal ponds increased local availability of fresh fish with nutritional benefits.
- Group savings evolved into sources of micro-credit at 2.5% per month instead of 10% per month from moneylenders.
- *Jankars* developed new (transferable) skills.
- Food-insecure people previously earning Rs 30-50 per day had more hope.

KRIBHCO EIRFP evolved into GVT. It became clear that NRSP, GVT, the NACA STREAM Initiative and ICAR shared a desire to understand how more poor men and women could benefit from their research and development work, collaboration and lessons learnt. When this was put to the Fisheries Commissioner in Delhi (during the Inception Phase) he:

- Invited a draft Component Concept Note
- Created a slot in the 10th Five-Year Plan
- Requested consultations leading to new recommendations, and
- Supported a Consensus-building Process at state and national levels.

The aim of the Policy Review Workshop, as with all project activities is “contributing to ‘giving people a voice’ in policy-making processes that have an impact on their livelihoods”.

The workshop objectives are:

- Through six case studies, stakeholder statements and a street-play, understand the experiences of rural aquaculture services provision from the perspectives of representative recipient and provider groups
- Review the process for transacting policy change and lessons learnt
- Review progress towards policy change and lessons learnt, through “indicators of progress”
- Make recommendations for policy change based on the outcomes of the project
- Seek commitment from policy-makers on taking up the recommendations, and
- Consider how the Government of India, NACA-STREAM and GVT may follow up the project.

The Project

The Inception Visit in March 2002 involved meetings in Mumbai, Delhi and Ranchi and field visits in Jharkhand and West Bengal. It defined the geographic scope, key stakeholders, potential policy change mechanism, and a workplan.

The eastern plateau of India is characterized by poverty and inequality, land alienation and seasonal migration. It is home to scheduled castes and tribes, many of whom lack the means to produce sufficient food throughout the year. Laboring and seasonal migration are common. Along with rice, fish is a popular, essential but rare food. Small seasonal water bodies are an important resource.

Following on from the previous work with clusters of villages, GVT, ICAR and the DOF, the geographic scope of the project would be Jharkhand, Orissa and West Bengal. The key stakeholders include:

- Recipients – poor men and women including tribal as well as other marginalized and disadvantaged groups
- National policy actors – Fisheries Commission, Fisheries Division of ICAR, technical and learning centers (CIFE and CIFA)
- State policy actors – Chief Ministers, Fisheries Secretaries, Directors, their assistants and officers, FFDA
- Non-government actors – NGOs, GVT, donors (DFID, IFAD)

Dr M K R Nair, the Fisheries Commissioner, requested that the DFID-NRSP project run by the STREAM Initiative of NACA, suggest reforms to the FFDA system or suggest a new tribal rainfed farming component. It would be based on the experience of the work of DFID, of KRIHBCO and the EIRFP, of the NRSP research project “Integrated Aquaculture in Eastern India”, the work of GVT, and STREAM and NACA. He requested that he receive a “Component Concept Note” which would outline the direction of our thinking so that this might enable a slot to be created within the Tenth Five-Year Plan. The Commissioner suggested that project consultations could lead to new recommendations. He supported a Consensus-building Process at state and national levels.

The project activities are shown in a flowchart in the Stakeholders Workshop report, in Appendix 10 on page 31.

The Recipients and Implementers Workshop began the process of:

- Understanding experiences of rural aquaculture services provision from the perspectives of representative recipient groups
- Identifying indicators for the assessment of rural aquaculture services critical to the development of rural livelihoods, and
- Understanding a process for transacting institutional and policy change.

This workshop provided the first opportunity for feedback on the project design and initial ideas for policy change recommendations (the Component Concept Note) from people who live and work in tribal communities of Jharkhand, Orissa and West Bengal. Represented villages included:

- Baripada, Mayurbhan, Keonjhar, Dhenkanal (Orissa)
- Bagda, Hazaribagh, Silli, Bundu, Ranchi (Jharkhand)
- Jhargram, Midnapur, Purulia, Barabazar (West Bengal)

Other participants represented:

- DOF Jharkhand
- FFDA, Dhenkanal, Orissa
- GVT Jharkhand, West Bengal and Orissa
- Birsa Agricultural University, Ranchi, Jharkhand

Although not originally proposed, the need for workshops at the state level was highlighted by the participants.

A Planning Visit took place in August 2002 to:

- Consider documenting experiences of rural aquaculture services provision from the perspectives of representative recipient groups in the form of Case Studies
- Begin defining a process for consensus-building around a new scheme for rural aquaculture services critical to the development of rural livelihoods based on a wide range of stakeholder experiences, and
- Plan the Case Studies and State-level Workshops.

Meetings were held with GVT staff, *jankars* and farmers from villages in Orissa, Jharkhand and West Bengal, and officials of Departments of Fisheries in these three states. Depending on location, discussions, reportbacks and documentation took place in Bangla, English, Hindi or Oriya. Meetings were also held in Delhi with GVT, ICAR and the Fisheries Commissioner.

Three State-level Workshops were held at Purulia, West Bengal; Ranchi, Jharkhand and Bhubaneswar, Orissa. Participants represented GVT and other NGOs, state- and district-level Departments of Fisheries, Indian Council of Agricultural Research (CIFA), a university, Panchayats and recipients. The objectives were:

- Understanding a process for transacting institutional and policy change
- Providing feedback on Case Studies which document experiences of rural aquaculture services provision from the perspectives of representative recipient groups
- Reviewing and refining emerging “indicators of change”
- Providing input into the subsequent Stakeholders Workshop

We will hear today from six Case Studies:

- A Proactive Village - In Support of Aquaculture for Poor and Scheduled Caste Groups (Jharkhand)
- A Progressive Farmer – A Successful Tribal Village Conducting Aquaculture (Jharkhand)
- Group-building, Production Success and the Struggle to Prevent Capture of the Resource (Jharkhand)
- Contrasting Case Studies of Service Provision and Participation (Orissa)

- Recipients' Experiences of Services Provided by NGOs in Support of Aquaculture for Poor and Tribal Groups (West Bengal)
- Service Providers' Perspectives on the Implementation of Government Schemes in Support of Aquaculture for Poor and Tribal Groups (West Bengal)

A review of contemporary approaches from around the world was conducted to inform the process of improving policy on aquaculture service provision to poor people. This is published in a project document entitled "A Review of Lessons Learnt in Enabling People's Participation in Policy-making Processes".

The Stakeholders Workshop was held on the campus of Birsa Agricultural University (BAU) in Ranchi, Jharkhand from 29-30 January 2003. The 82 participants represented state- and district-level Departments of Fisheries, GVT and other NGOs, BAU, *jankars* and recipients, DFID and NACA-STREAM. Discussions, reportbacks and documentation took place in Bangla, Hindi, Oriya and English. The workshop participants provided feedback to "finalize" six Case Studies. They also reviewed and refined emerging "indicators of progress" to feed into a Consensus-building Process. Participants in this process included 21 national and state-level policy-makers and implementers. They prioritized 42 recommendations for policy change derived from stakeholders who participated in previous project activities (see Appendix 3 of Indicators of Progress, Consensus-building Process and Policy Recommendations). This resulted in 13 recommendations for policy change (see Table 2 on page 6 of the report).

A street-play written by Rakesh Raman, was performed in villages in Jharkhand which feature in Case Studies 1 and 2 and will highlight for us at this workshop the lives of recipients of service provision and the impacts of policy change recommendations.

All of the project activities have been documented and are provided for each participant here as published documents, PowerPoint presentations, film documentaries and a street-play. All of these are also included on the CD-ROM in the workshop pack.

Progress of the Case Studies

In the original Project Workplan [Table 3 of the Inception Report – May 2002], it was stated that, from July 2002 through February 2003, the Project would “conduct Case Studies in tribal areas, highlighting service provision from recipients’ viewpoints, and eliciting recommendations for change”. These would be carried out “in Jharkhand, Orissa and West Bengal, in collaboration with GVT, DOF and FFDA, facilitated so that service recipients ‘can be given space to explain how it is for them’, using a variety of media and local languages.”

During the Rural Aquaculture Service Recipients and Implementers Workshop in May 2002:

- Participants (in state groups) suggested issues which need deeper understanding, the groups whose “voices” would be documented, the organizations and agencies which could conduct the studies, and the methods and media which could be used [Appendix 10 of Rural Aquaculture Service Recipients and Implementers Workshop – May 2002].
- Issues were reviewed for relevance to people’s experiences of service provision; the most appropriate ones selected; contact person(s) were identified to liaise with those organizations, agencies and persons who would collaborate in doing the Case Studies.
- Proposals for Case Studies were elicited, with detailed descriptions using the framework in Appendix 10.

During the Planning Visit in August-September 2002:

- Case Studies were set up with those from GVT and the Departments of Fisheries who would carry them out with service recipients and providers.
- Six preliminary Case Study descriptions were drafted, with Duration, Location, Key Informants, Method, Media, Content, Budget [Pages 13-24 of Rural Aquaculture Service Recipients and Implementers Workshop – May 2002].

State-level Workshops

- One objective was “providing feedback on the six Case Studies which document experiences of rural aquaculture services provision from the perspectives of representative recipient groups” [Appendix 3 of State-level Workshops – October 2002].
- The wisdom of the May 2002 workshop recommendation – that there needed to be these State-level Workshops – was borne out in the constructive feedback on the six Case Studies in their various stages of progress.

Stakeholders Workshop

- Following each set of two Case Study presentations, participants worked in eight groups to provide feedback [Appendix 3 of Stakeholders Workshop – January 2003].
- Most feedback was about policy recommendations, which seemed to be of most concern to participants.
- It was noted that each Case Study looks at service provision from a particular perspective. For example, Case Studies 1 and 2 feature particular individuals and

communities. Perspectives from other sectors such as banking emerge from Case Study 6.

- Thus, the variety of Case Studies provide a range of perspectives on experiences of service provision.

Presentation: Case Studies 1 and 2

Mr Ashish Kumar showed the two film documentaries comprising Case Studies 1 and 2:

- A Proactive Village – In Support of Aquaculture for Poor and Scheduled Caste Groups (Jharkhand)
- A Progressive Farmer – A Successful Tribal Village Conducting Aquaculture (Jharkhand)

The two Hindi-language films are available on the project CD-ROM. Illustrated English scripts follow their descriptions in the Case Studies document.

Statement by Recipients

Three representatives of the “recipients” group (fishers, farmers and *jankars*) made statements which reflected their perspectives on the policy change recommendations.

Mr Bhim Nayak, Mr Md Rushtam Khan and Mr Ras Behari Baraik from Jharkhand

The problems of fish farmers and fishermen of Jharkhand are the following:

- Lack of knowledge about feed, medicines, manures and the government schemes for training and other facilities
 - Due to shortage of fish seed in Jharkhand, farmers are dependent on seed from West Bengal which proves to be costly, so hatcheries should be constructed at block level
 - Because the banks do not sanction the loans on time, most of the ponds remain fallow
 - The Department of Fisheries should make available seed, feed and other inputs locally to the farmers
 - Financial assistance should be given for integrating fish culture with duckery, poultry, piggery and dairy
 - Wherever some ponds or check-dams are going to be constructed, local people should be consulted for the location so that water retention is for longer periods
 - Fish should be insured to save the farmer from flood or disease
 - License should be given for sale or purchase of fish
 - Housing schemes should be extended at 100% subsidy
 - Schools should be constructed for the better future of the fishermen’s children
 - Government ponds should be cleaned and excavated regularly as per the requirement
 - Fishermen living in municipal or “notified areas” should also be covered under schemes such as housing and loans, just like those in villages
- Volunteer agencies should be made at village level.
 - Government should take an active interest in development.

- Aquaculture training should be organized by GVT at CIFA.
- Women should also get equal opportunity to work in the field of aquaculture.
- All information regarding aquaculture should be available at local level.
- Conflicts should be solved by common understanding between groups.
- GVT should also organize training programs for farmers of other villages.
- Training centers should be organized at village level.

Mr Ashok Kumar Sahoo and Mr Pabitra Mohan Baral from Orissa

- More training should be organized by the government and NGOs for the betterment of fish farmers.
- Women should be encouraged in the field of aquaculture.
- From these types of workshops we have come to know many things.

Mr Kuddus Ansary from West Bengal

- After all of the discussion, it is clear that if villagers can get fish seed in a timely manner, then many of the problems will be solved.

Presentation: Case Studies 3 and 4

Dr K P Singh gave two PowerPoint presentations which comprised Case Studies 3 and 4:

- Group-building, Production Success and the Struggle to Prevent Capture of the Resource (Jharkhand)
- Contrasting Case Studies of Service Provision and Participation (Orissa)

The two PowerPoint files are available on the project CD-ROM. The full texts of the studies are in the Case Studies document.

Statement by GVT

Four representatives of GVT states and positions made statements which reflected their perspectives on the policy change recommendations.

Ms Jhinuk Ray, Senior Community Organizer, Jhargram, West Bengal

The central or basic theme of the project is a participatory approach involving the community, from planning to implementation and monitoring, to initiate the process of sustainable livelihoods through Self-Help Group formation. A participatory approach involves six steps:

1. Village entry
2. Rapport-building and discussions with the community
3. Organizing PRA, CPA and IFPRA programs at village level
4. Prioritization of development options
5. Development of workplans
6. Implementation of needs-based activities after group formation, focusing on gender and poverty

Group meetings and discussions, along with rules and regulations, lead to cohesiveness and accountability among members.

Aquaculture is one of the components of the farming system. At the beginning, having to assess the need to start fish rearing activity, proper norms and modalities are formed and followed by the group. Through training, exposure and establishing a network, a vision of success and sustainability has been developed among members. Good quality fingerlings and minimum inputs are supplied to the SHGs supported by GVT, whereas the funds of SHGs are used mainly towards feed and pond management. The growing interest in harvesting good yields developed teamwork that helped to overcome social barriers. Gradually the SHGs generated strong funds that are being used for providing loans to the community through establishing a micro-credit system.

Participatory monitoring systems have also been developed. Now the SHGs are thinking to form Fishermen Committees to lease ponds for more than ten years for improving the livelihood.

Mr Kamalendu Paul, Field Specialist Social Development, Baripada, Orissa

A *jankar* is a person selected democratically by group members who has a leading role in establishing linkages among the community, line departments, NGOs and others. The *jankar* has easy access to the community besides a high degree of acceptability and sense of belonging. He or she has the responsibility to impart knowledge and skills to the community, manage conflicts, monitor activities and explore para-professionals in aquaculture at the village level.

Training enhances *jankars'* knowledge and awareness levels, develops their confidence and a clear vision. The community and *jankars* get adjusted to changing situations and are thus able to sustain. It is necessary to provide groups with water-testing kits and nets also along with the training.

Mr S L Yadav, State Coordinator, Purulia, West Bengal

Jankars should transfer proven and tested processes and technologies developed by GVT to a much larger community for wider uptake and replication. *Jankars* can successfully do horizontal dissemination as they could communicate in the local language and as such are highly acceptable. The community can also easily approach *jankars* and it is the cheapest and most effective way of technology dissemination. It also helps to monitor the entire activity effectively through the *jankars*. GVT is in the process of establishing a model aquaculture village where the whole cycle of aquaculture activities will be demonstrated to farmers from nearby and distant villages.

Dr Virendra Singh, GVT East Project Manager

GVT is looking for suitable partners to make the establishment of model villages a success.

Presentation: Case Studies 5 and 6

Dr S D Tripathi, Mr Gautum Dutta and Ms Jhinuk Ray gave two PowerPoint presentations and showed a film documentary which comprised Case Studies 5 and 6:

- Recipients' Experiences of Services Provided by NGOs in Support of Aquaculture for Poor and Tribal Groups (West Bengal)
- Service Providers' Perspectives on the Implementation of Government Schemes in Support of Aquaculture for Poor and Tribal Groups (West Bengal)

The two PowerPoint files and film documentary are available on the project CD-ROM. The full texts of the studies are in the Case Studies document.

Statement by Departments of Fisheries

Representatives of state Departments of Fisheries made statements on aquaculture development from their perspectives.

Mr Rajiw Kumar, Director, Jharkhand

- Jharkhand was inaugurated as a state on 15 November 2002. After 1992, the government schemes stopped. In the 8th and 9th Five-Year Plans, there was only 56 *lakhs* provided by the Bihar government. In the last year of the 9th Plan, there was 374 *lakhs* in state schemes.
- The Department of Fisheries built 300 houses for villagers and 200 were made in 2001-02. In 2003, the target is 800 and 400 have been built.
- Seed should be provided in villages and for that tanks are needed as there are some limitations with earthen nurseries. Cement tanks are better. Generally, earthen nurseries are built in tribal villages with 40% subsidy and Rs 2,500 worth of equipment.
- GVT is a good platform to benefit villagers in Jharkhand. There are some problem areas that are affected by militant groups. The MCC sometimes capture ponds and forbid aquaculture so many ponds are not used and crowded with weeds.
- There are only 243 DOF staff in Jharkhand with 113 being fourth-grade, so we need to depend on NGOs. In the next fiscal year, the Jharkhand DOF wishes to collaborate with GVT.

Mr P R Rout, Assistant Director of Fisheries, Dhenkanal, Orissa

- In our state we have many water resources for fish culture as a profitable enterprise. Thirteen districts have expanded to 30, and in almost all we have FFDA. Of 52,000 ha developed, 39,000 ha are now under FFDA beneficiaries, while others are derelict as some beneficiaries have stopped.
- Yields of 2 t/ha can be increased to 4-5 t/ha through semi-intensive aquaculture by giving proper training. The right selection of beneficiaries is the most important issue. In spite of motivation, some farmers are getting low production. We are arranging loans but credit remains outstanding even though we are using loan recovery officers.
- Farmers should be trained to double their fish production. They should also be trained in polyculture programs.

- We are not able to provide advanced fingerlings to farmers. Seed production is with the government sector but needs to be transferred to the private sector as government does not have the facilities.
- FFDA is less implementable in the field.
- Many tanks are used by the community and are needed during droughts so fish culture should not be taken up in these ponds. Those not needed for this should be leased out for at least five years and the policy on the length of leases should be changed.
- The price of the lease rises 10% per year and will soon be out of the reach of poor people.
- Reservoirs of 200 ha may be leased out only to entrepreneurs as they can manage them properly.
- Many people are not aware of schemes – we need more adequate staff.
- Government should formulate policies to inform poor people of fisheries programs through such means as videos and posters.

Mr A K Ray, Joint Secretary (Fisheries), West Bengal

- We are all learners.
- With aquaculture as it is in West Bengal, I felt unhappy about the three villages in West Bengal [in the Case Studies], especially for Nahda, which is a 100% tribal village.
- NACA-STREAM are trying to streamline the livelihoods of downtrodden people, and GVT are taking care of our poor countrymen.
- I am grateful to Dr Tripathi for highlighting the problems and will look into the problem regarding the posting of officers. FEOs (Fisheries Extension Officers) are at a minimum honors science graduates appointed through the Public Service Commission. The FEO sits in the Block Development Office (BDO) office which covers a vast number of villages. It is not possible to take care of all villages. They are also CEOs of Primary Cooperative Fisheries Societies. Problems also crop up there. The FEO follows government rules and local cooperatives will be inclined to go their own way.
- This project is representing the picture in our poor villages.
- With global over-fishing, we need a rescue plan – inland fishing is the answer. We need to rely on aquaculture.
- Aquaculture needs to be tended with love and dedication.

Performance of Act One of *Mahajal – The Big Fishing Net*

The workshop's first day ended with act one of the street-play *Mahajal – The Big Fishing Net*. Written by Rakesh Raman and performed by his theatre troupe of 15 members, *Mahajal* is a dramatic interpretation of the outcomes of the six Case Studies. Act One set the context of situations commonly found in tribal communities and in particular the livelihoods of fisherfolk.

The Hindi and English scripts of *Mahajal* have been published in a separate document. A film of the street-play can be found on the project CD-ROM.

Presentation: Indicators of Progress

Rural Aquaculture Service Recipients and Implementers Workshop

- To begin developing indicators, participants were asked to respond to: “How will we know if progress is being made towards people’s participation in policy change?”
- Most suggestions were potential indicators concerning improvement of people’s livelihoods and technical aquaculture, natural resources and socio-economic changes [Appendix 9 of Rural Aquaculture Service Recipients and Implementers Workshop report – May 2002].
- These were instructive outcomes: it was perhaps too early to try to define indicators. They would need to be developed “in some other way”, although there were some useful suggestions made by participants.
- One useful suggestion was that agreement of indicators should be a continuous process, and be revisited before and during the Stakeholders Workshop.
- Participant feedback was also given on policy recommendations in the draft Component Concept Note, especially related to people’s participation in policy change [Appendix 9].

State-level Workshops

- Before the workshops, documented outcomes of previous project activities were reviewed, with reference to the Objectively Verifiable Indicators (OVIs) in the Project Logframe (Revised 26-04-02) [Appendix 5 of Inception Report – May 2002].
- A statement was drafted of “Emerging Indicators of Progress Towards Transacting Institutional and Policy Change” [Appendix 4 of the State-level Workshops report – October 2002].
- Original policy recommendations in the draft Component Concept Note [Appendix 3 of the Inception Report – May 2002] were incorporated into “Emerging Indicators ...”
- Participant feedback was incorporated from fourteen discussion groups of stakeholders in West Bengal, Jharkhand and Orissa [Appendix 5 of the State-level Workshops report – October 2002].

Stakeholders Workshop and Consensus-building Process

- Feedback was given on revised “Indicators ...” from participants in the Stakeholders Workshop [Appendix 6 of the Stakeholders Workshop report – January 2003].
- Suggested policy changes were then compiled into a document called “Proposed Changes for Consensus-building Process” [Appendix 7 of the Stakeholders Workshop report – January 2003].
- This version formed the initial discussion document for the Consensus-building Process which commenced after the Stakeholders Workshop.

Indicators of Progress

I. Opportunities identified to improve the delivery of aquaculture services and support by government and non-government actors

1. Understanding built of the strengths, resource use priorities and constraints of farmers and fishers
2. Recipients play a role in defining the services and support they need
3. Feedback from recipients and implementers effectively communicated

II. Priorities for institutional and policy change agreed by key actors

1. Recipient suggestions for change incorporated
2. Implementer suggestions for change incorporated
3. Project suggestions for change incorporated
4. Recommendations formulated for scaling up:
 - Capacity building in participatory and livelihoods approaches of fisheries officers
 - Awareness raising of poverty-focused aquaculture options among fisheries officers
 - Development of innovative extension and communication approaches, including the use of mass media and links with other service providers in Asia-Pacific
 - Development of a STREAM National Communications Hub

III. Policy change promoted by key actors within the government system based on multi-level consensus on priorities for change

The project had not yet reached the point of discussions about the mechanisms of actual policy change. It is expected that indicators of progress for this will begin emerging during the Consensus-building Process and Stakeholders Workshop.

Presentation: Policy Recommendations

Appendix 3 – Evolution of Policy Change Recommendations – presents a matrix which tracks statements of policy change issues by project activity and stakeholders.

Two underlying aspects of this project have been:

- To give people a voice in policy-making processes that have an impact on their livelihoods – the project process
- To find ways to improve the delivery of aquaculture support services for scheduled castes and tribes – the recommendations

Who has had a voice?

- Poor men and women including tribal and other marginalized and disadvantaged groups, Fisheries Commission, Fisheries Division of ICAR, technical and learning centers, Fisheries Secretaries, Directors, their assistants and officers,

NGOs, GVT and donors (during fieldwork, workshops, Case Studies, comments by stakeholders and a Consensus-building Process)

- The experience of DFID, KRIBHCO and the EIRFP, the NRSP research project “Integrated Aquaculture in Eastern India”, the work of GVT and STREAM and NACA (these were drafted into a Component Concept Note requested by the Fisheries Commissioner)

What are the recommendations for policy change? Forty-two have emerged which were categorized into those concerning:

- Training and information
- Planning
- Inputs
- Other support
- Participation

These were prioritized into 13 recommendations concerning:

- Focus of services and support
- Improving service delivery
- New directions

Agreed Prioritized Changes

Focus of Services and Support

Integrated aquaculture may be encouraged and loans and other facilities extended on a priority basis so that farmers may not suffer during aquaculture stress periods

The role of the Department of Fisheries is seen as the expansion of aquaculture, inland and marine fisheries and looking after the welfare of fisherfolk. – Vision Statement of the Department of Animal Husbandry and Dairying

People and government recognize the need to improve service delivery:

- A high-level committee of experts was convened by the government (2000)
- The Fisheries Commissioner requested support with greater consultation from NACA-STREAM
- Yield gaps and shortcomings have been reported in academic papers
- There is high consensus among project stakeholders

So what do we have to say on improving service delivery?

Improving Service Delivery

- *Timeliness of delivery of services, support and materials*
- *Procedure should be simplified for getting government schemes and bank loans*
- *Government needs to change how information is made available to farmers, since information on its schemes to support fish culture is required to be known to farmers*

- *Develop infrastructure for timely production of fingerlings at local level*
- *Site selection for pond construction should be given proper emphasis*
- *Leases should be given to Self-Help Groups for ten years (it should be considered if these should be members of the Fishermen's Development Committee)*

The Fisheries Commissioner asked us to recommend new directions. So what do we have to say about new directions for support?

New Directions

- *Encourage the formation of self-selected Aquaculture Self-Help Groups based on common interests among farmers and fishers*
- *Provide support to establish group savings and micro-credit schemes among Aquaculture Self-Help Groups*
- *Capacity-building of Jankars and recipients and equipment for water quality testing (which should be provided) is essential on a priority basis as they are the main connecting link for technical knowledge between the government, technology and farmers*
- *Insurance schemes for aquaculture*
- *Establishment, defining and identification of model aquaculture villages for benefits to be disseminated to nearby "untouched" villages*
- *Single-point under-one-roof service provision (see Box 1 in "Indicators ..." report)*

Timeframe for Change

The statements below are taken from the Vision Statement of the Department of Animal Husbandry and Dairying. They are followed by statements which relate them to certain of the policy change recommendations and ways forward (in italics).

Schemes to be evaluated and revised for the 10th Plan within one year.

- *Therefore the opportunity to revise the 10th Plan for the provision of support through Self-Help Groups has a one-year window.*

All the revised schemes for the 10th Plan should be finalized and implementation to be started within two years.

- *There is then another year to begin their implementation with improvements in local level infrastructure for fingerling provision and the timely supply of inputs and services.*

Insurance schemes for aquaculture to be made operational in one year.

- *The need for insurance is a shared vision of Consensus-building Process participants and the Departments of Fisheries.*

Management information system for the sector to become operational within five years.

Extension materials to be available through the internet in all regional languages within ten years.

- *There is a role for learning and communications support.*

Performance of Act Two of *Mahajal* – *The Big Fishing Net*

Following the presentation of the policy recommendations and before the subsequent open discussion, act two of *Mahajal* was performed. Incorporated into the interpretation were the project's 13 policy change recommendations.

Open Discussion

Mr M S Ashok: I can see the richness and detail. I wonder whether some of the arguments you make could be taken much further than where you are now. By way of analysis or recommendations, this could be taken further, which is what I suggest.

Mr William Savage: On Wednesday, Dr Tripathi and Graham Haylor met with Mr Pattanaik and Dr Ayyappan and out of those discussions came the suggestion to look at the state levels, where policies and schemes move to being implementable. Dr Ayyappan and the Joint Secretary would strongly endorse links with planning processes at state and even district levels.

Mr M S Ashok: District-level planning is where the action is. At that level, the districts often complain about the nature of handed-down schemes.

Mr William Savage: We have to take into account the different situations where “the action takes place”.

Dr Chauhan: I'm really thankful to the organizers to invite me and I have heard your experiences and comments and those of the governments and recipients. The schemes are made by central government after deliberations with state government officials and district level and even some beneficiaries. Here, the main scheme is the FFDA inland aquaculture, which has been on-going for 28 years. I have been involved from the beginning. Many constraints have come up. How to overcome these is crucial. We have to work within funding and procedural constraints. At present a number of activities are covered under FFDA: training of fishers, integrated fish farming and other schemes. Seed is a most essential input, and establishment of seed hatcheries is key. The Government have no intention to produce seed, as this will be done by the private sector. From the 9th Plan onwards this would be taken over by the private sector with technology from ICAR. For species other than Indian major carps, we have to wait to get technology, including freshwater prawn. For training there are 429 FFDA's covering the whole country: in Jharkhand 13, Orissa 30 and West Bengal 16. There is fisheries extension and ten-day training. Where is the shortcoming? Maybe at the state level. There are few limits from the national level. Feed is also essential but we have done little on this. However, (prepared) feeds are costly. In Punjab, farmers are more progressive and feed fish a range of inputs and manufactured feeds.

Mr P R Rout: Is there a provision from state or national governments to provide fingerlings in villages?

Dr Chauhan: Orissa claims they are self-sufficient in seed. I don't know why the seed is not available. The private sector seed suppliers in West Bengal are well known and good suppliers.

Mr William Savage: There are clearly government figures and district-level understanding of seed availability which are different. This is an important difference in perspectives.

Mr Gangwar: There is a problem with getting loans.

Dr Joshi: The banks are so liberal just now. How can we ensure that the recommendations made today are incorporated into policy statements?

Mr William Savage: In the 13 recommendations, some relate to the banking situation.

Mr M S Ashok: Subject to the passing of the private sector banking bill, things are opening up. I can facilitate channels and information with these banks.

Mr Pedro Bueno: Dr Tripathi talked of 0-20% repayment rates, so banks might be reluctant to fund these activities. If they are not bankable activities, then the farmers have not been helped enough. There are many issues here.

Mr William Savage: There have not been opportunities for capacity-building. Also in Dr Tripathi's presentation there was a comment that the loans were not made available at the right time so were not useful.

Mr P K Mishra: Availability of fingerlings is one thing but the original question was about timely availability. Does the central government have control over the timely supply of seed? If we can have better networking at grassroots levels, transfer of information will improve. What can be the mechanism to develop to overcome these constraints? Can NACA-STREAM play a role here?

Mr William Savage: We need to work as closely as possible with people who make changes or do not make changes.

Dr Virendra: On these financial issues, in the GVT project in Purulia district we have 118 groups and 115 loans have been received, i.e., credibility has been built.

Mr William Savage: Trust is important – banks trusting groups and communities trusting banks.

Mr Ashish Kumar: Banks see who is the person to repay the loan, e.g., Ras Behari who has repaid his truck loan and now is being offered more.

Mr Ray: Finance is basic to life. Banks need to get back the money. Dr Tripathi pointed out that capability to repay is a key issue. With other directors, I have attended meetings with banks. They showed interest in the schemes where they can get back their money. NABARD are now nurturing one scheme for freshwater prawn culture. In respect of seeds, FFDA have been doing a lot. FFDA is undergoing changes. "Culture not capture" has to be the policy to have better seeds.

Mr Kuddus: In the field it is different. These things are easy to say, but in Barabasa where I live there is no such implementation. The FEO does not visit.

Mr Ray: The project I am discussing is being piloted in the district of West Bengal called 24 Paganas district. I have been asked by Mr Pattanaik to look into replicating this. But an equal approach will not work in all states and districts.

Mr William Savage: We need to look at these differences in realities between state and local-level perceptions.

Mr Pedro Bueno: From the Consensus-building Process, the timely delivery of inputs is highlighted. “Allowing farmers more control” as a recommendation was not selected by the process. As for seed, I agree with Dr Chauhan about engaging the private sector in seed supply (from lessons learnt from elsewhere).

Mr John Gaunt: Thank you for including me in the workshop. Let us go back to the introduction and recognize the long history of DFID-NRSP involvement which has been productive. Many things have changed over that time. Changes have included a shift of focus from production issues to livelihoods issues and these are reflected in these partnerships. We need to think of how to scale up and that leads us to thinking about policy and wider-scale impact. In this discussion, we have been probing roles and responsibilities. Given this shift, I’ve picked up a sense that, as poverty alleviation is our focus, it seems projects and agencies have been seeking to take on elements of risk and risk management, e.g., support of inputs (50% cost-sharing), technical support (empowering risk-taking), Self-Help Groups as a way of managing risk, and specifically insurance. Would it be useful to recognize that in enabling poor people to explore new opportunities, that we aggregate these recommendations around the issues of (understanding) risk (management)?

Mr William Savage: We have come up with several elements that are more “psycho-social elements”, away from fish and institutions and about relationships, including risk and trust.

Commitments

In opening the discussion on commitments, participants were asked to think about two questions:

- How we can commit to taking forward the work?
- What kind of commitments could be made?

Dr Graham Haylor: The Joint Secretary, Mr Pattanaik, has said that he would like to receive our outputs from this project and would discuss the recommendations with the Secretary and Minister.

Dr Ayyappan: I was glad to have the word “commitment” clarified. Associations with STREAM and GVT can be through NACA so that ICAR could ease administrative processes. Through the Centre for Policy and Planning in New Delhi, small programs would be initiated. There could be two or three small interventions. We have eight institutions, of which three are dealing with aquaculture. We can have joint projects to expand this. ICAR can develop and fund small focused projects on policy research. When making policy papers for the three states, many are not yet in “black and white”. We can find a route to incorporate the outputs

of this project and associate with these recommendations. The Planning Commissions in different states can associate with STREAM and I will strongly support this.

Mr William Savage: You have clarified the relationship between ICAR (GOI) and NACA (India is one of 16 member countries), to work within the NACA agreement where there is scope to work together – so the mechanism for collaboration is this.

Dr Chauhan: We have already discussed with the Joint Secretary most of the points made by state governments and recipients. We are aware and most of these have been incorporated into our activities, but there may be some communication gaps, between states and GOI, between state and district, and district and farmers. Loan facilities are a big thing. The Ministry of Agriculture are not in a position to say much, but NACA-STREAM should have a workshop with the Ministry of Finance, banks (NABARD) and others to discuss loans, not for big entrepreneurs but for farmers and the crucial issues. We are trying to diversify the culture activities, in cold water, saline soils and others. We are finalizing schemes for the 10th Plan and are ready to incorporate these policy recommendations which would be agreed by the Expenditure Finance Committee after agreement from the Secretary and Minister.

Mr William Savage: Everyone does agree on paper and in concept we can all see most of the elements are there. But you did say there are so-called communication gaps. We can all learn to be better communicators. When we begin to look at follow-up activities and look for roles in the collaborations and relationships, could on-the-ground activities and assessments be an area on which we could concentrate?

Dr Chauhan: Yes

Mr William Savage: You do see places where some of the suggestions could be incorporated in the 10th Five-Year Plan?

Dr Chauhan: Yes, definitely.

Mr William Savage: How might we know that you, the Commissioner, Secretary, Joint Secretary and Minister found these useful?

Dr Chauhan: Send them to the Joint Secretary. We will examine them and the changes such as FFDA scheme support to farmers groups. FFDA is flexible, with many powers given to states so they can make changes. Communication gaps need to be sorted out.

Mr Rajiw Kumar: Related with Jharkhand, if people want to go for training, we will support. We are working for individuals, then they can make a group if they want ponds.

Mr William Savage: Financial matters are one area which is generating much discussion and a matter that needs to be followed through on.

Mr P R Rout: There is some problem at bank level. Investment is required. One acre is needed for profit. In the case of small farmers, loans are a problem.

Dr Tomar: We have been talking about influencing policy for the last two days. This morning I asked Bill what statement to make. We all are here to find the answers, said Bill. When he talked of statements and recommendations, then we found the answers. When they came in

the beginning, the project team said they wanted some kind of association to scale up what is being done for the betterment of poor people. This is our agenda also. DFID has asked whether our interventions are economical. Are policy-makers making use of these for the betterment of the poor? So GVT immediately agreed to work together with STREAM. Aquaculture has been an important economic activity. The machinery we developed to reduce drudgery has been taken up by the government. Our communities have said that there are pro-poor policies but they are not benefiting from them, and could we find out for them. You have seen our recommendations and reports. Now we want some things from government. The “under-one-roof” recommendation is a good one. KRIBHCO are doing this through Farmer Service Centers with two persons in each and a turnover of Rs 10 million. One of the solid recommendations, timely supply of fingerlings, also lets us build on this to try to get these centers established. Another aspect is training: CIFA is a long way to go. GVT make this available within communities: training centers with resource persons from the government or elsewhere. This will go a long way to enhancing aquaculture. Another aspect is communication. With the support of NACA-STREAM, there should be a Communications Hub where we can develop training in local languages, somewhere near the community, where there are a lot of activities related to aquaculture.

Mr Pedro Bueno: I’d like to pick up on what Dr Tomar and Dr Ayyappan said, and also the fishers, farmers and *jankars* statement from the project document on “Lessons Learnt” (page 9). The STREAM Hub is a done deal. We are waiting for a Technical Cooperation Program from FAO to provide regional support. Dr Ayyappan left a broad hint to NACA: research on policy issues with ICAR funding. This could lead to something like SAPA in Vietnam. I commit to this. There was a hint from Dr Tomar and, as printed in the “Lessons Learnt” document, there is a strong desire to provide initial assistance to Self-Help Groups. Networking SHGs is in the same spirit as NACA with governments sharing and saving resources, becoming more self-reliant, less vulnerable and more cohesive. NACA commit to providing support to networking.

Mr John Gaunt: My mission in attending the workshop was to report back to NRSP management on follow-up. There is a commitment to build on this relationship. NRSP is a program about research and understanding. It has gone from production-poverty and livelihoods to policy (and scaling up). We have to understand that the lesson learning aspects have been particularly important. Through this project we are learning about how to transact policy change. There are commitments being made and a co-funding question mark from NRSP. We are discussing one project. The NRSP project portfolio is 30-50 and there are five in India. Common themes are emerging: communication, finance, the role of Self-Help Groups. Lessons from other NRSP projects are transferable and many are broadly relevant. A state-level focus and STREAM Communications Hub may have relevance to other projects also. NRSP will follow up in the context of this project, our portfolio as a whole and our relationships in India.

Follow-up Actions and Next Steps

STREAM colleagues proposed these actions to follow up the Policy Review Workshop:

- Write up, publish and circulate the outcomes of this workshop.
- Conclude the documentation of the project, including progress towards policy change and lessons learnt, and the transaction process and lessons learnt.
- With Joint Secretary and Fisheries Commission, share the policy recommendations and communicate on the progress of their consideration.
- Seek to progress partnerships under NACA-STREAM with GVT and GOI (ICAR and the DOF at national and state levels).
- With ICAR, GVT and other colleagues, progress towards a partnership agreement based around supporting communications and the development of a STREAM India National Communications Hub.
- With fisher, farmer and *jankar* colleagues, continue to find opportunities to enable their participation, and consider how to take up issues and linkages with other departments such as rural development and transport.

Following a telephone discussion with the Joint Secretary – and between the Policy Review Workshop “open discussion” and “commitments” sessions – the ICAR Deputy Director General (DDG) and Graham Haylor brainstormed which policy-related Government of India activities were expected to take place in coming months and the potential role for STREAM in these activities. A set of proposed policy change activities and potential follow-up by the STREAM Initiative, with a provisional timeframe, is captured in the table on the next page.

Date	Proposed Policy Change Activities	Planned Follow-up by STREAM	Notes
Around November 2003	Annual Meeting of Secretaries and Commissioners of Animal Husbandry and Fisheries, including the Joint Secretary and the DDG ICAR	Presentation of the project outcomes and live performance of the street-play	Proposed by DDG ICAR
On-going	State-level plans to be developed in Jharkhand, Orissa and West Bengal by state Planning Commissions	Presentation of the project outcomes and live performance of street-play to state Planning Commissions	Proposed by DDG ICAR
	ICAR can develop and fund small focused projects on policy research	Collaborate with ICAR on further case studies of service provision	Proposed by DDG ICAR
Until May 2004	National five-year planning process; schemes to be evaluated and revised for the 10th Plan	Revise 10th Plan for the provision of support through Self-Help Groups	DDG ICAR and Joint Secretary to actively support
	Insurance schemes for aquaculture to be made operational in one year	Share vision of Consensus-building Process participants and the Departments of Fisheries	DDG ICAR and Joint Secretary to actively support
September 2004	Fish Expo India, International Centre, Delhi	Showcase the Policy Review Process and street-play	Proposed by DDG ICAR
Until May 2005	All revised schemes for the 10th Plan should be finalized and implementation started	Promote improvements in local-level infrastructure for fingerling provision and the timely supply of inputs and services	DDG ICAR and Joint Secretary to actively support
By 2008	Management information system for sector to become operational within five years	Partnership agreement between ICAR, GVT, DOF and STREAM Communications Hub	DDG ICAR and Joint Secretary to actively support
By 2013	Extension materials to be available through the Internet in all regional languages within ten years	Partnership agreement between ICAR, GVT, DOF and STREAM Communications Hub	DDG ICAR and Joint Secretary to actively support

Appendix 1 Participants

Government of India		
1.	Dr S Ayyappan	Deputy Director General (Fisheries), ICAR, Delhi
2.	Dr A D Diwan	Assistant Director General (Marine Fisheries), ICAR, Delhi
3.	Dr Chitranshi	Assistant Director General (Inland Fisheries), ICAR, Delhi
4.	Dr D P S Chauhan	Deputy Fisheries Development Commissioner, Delhi
State		
5.	Mr A K Ray	Joint Secretary, Fisheries, West Bengal
6.	Mr Rajiw Kumar	Director of Fisheries, Ranchi, Jharkhand
7.	Mr Ashish Kumar	Deputy Director of Fisheries, Ranchi, Jharkhand
8.	Mr P R Rout	Assistant Director of Fisheries, Dhenkanal, Orissa
GVT		
9.	Mr Chandra Pal Singh	Chairman, KRIBHCO/GVT
10.	Dr V S Tomar	CEO, GVT, Delhi
11.	Mr J S Gangwar	Additional CEO, GVT, Delhi
12.	Dr Virendra Singh	Project Manager, GVT East, Ranchi
13.	Mr P K Pathak	GVT Jharkhand State Coordinator, Ranchi
14.	Mr P K Mishra	GVT Orissa State Coordinator, Baripada
15.	Mr S L Yadav	GVT West Bengal State Coordinator, Purulia
16.	Dr K P Singh	Field Specialist Aquaculture (retired), GVT East, Ranchi
17.	Mr Kamalendu Paul	Field Specialist Social Development, GVT, Baripada, Orissa
18.	Mr Gautam Dutta	Field Specialist Aquaculture, GVT, Purulia, West Bengal
19.	Mr K C Mahapatra	Community Organizer, GVT, Dhenkanal, Orissa
20.	Mr Keshabanand Patra	Community Organizer, GVT, Baripada, Orissa
21.	Ms Jhinuk Ray	Senior Community Organizer, GVT, Jhargram, West Bengal
Recipients		
22.	Mr Bhim Nayak	Farmer, Fulwar Toli, Bundu, Jharkhand
23.	Mr Ras Behari Baraik	Farmer, Chhota Changru, Silli, Jharkhand
24.	Mr Md Rushtam Khan	Jankar, Lakhnu, Hazaribagh, Jharkhand
25.	Mr Pabitra Mohan Baral	Pradhan, Batagaon, Dhenkanal, Orissa
26.	Mr Ashok Kumar Sahoo	Jankar, Khajuria, Dhenkanal, Orissa
27.	Mr Kuddus Ansary	Jankar, Khawasdi, Purulia, West Bengal

DFID-NRSP		
28.	Dr M S Ashok	Cirrus Management Services Pvt Ltd
29.	Dr John Gaunt	Member of Steering Committee
Rockefeller Foundation		
30.	Dr Dinesh Joshi	Rockefeller Foundation, Delhi
Theatre Troupe		
31.	Mr Rakesh Raman	Director and Technical Official
32.	Ms Meena Raman	Production Manager
33.	Mr Shankar Oraon	Male Narrator
34.	Ms Rankita Raman	Female Narrator
35.	Mr Kisan Prasad	Old Man
36.	Mr Rajendra Mirdha	Machua
37.	Ms Gauri Das	Sugni
38.	Mr Ramesh Kumar	Raghuwa
39.	Mr Ashok Kumar	Nandu
40.	Mr Pawan Kesri	Tena
41.	Mr Mayank Raman	Jitu
42.	Mr Parmeshwar Sahu	Kaku
43.	Ms Nira Oraon	Machali Rani
44.	Mr Manish Kumar	Government Official
45.	Mr Chotu Panda	Drumist and Singer
NACA-STREAM		
46.	Mr Pedro Bueno	Director General, NACA, Bangkok
47.	Dr Graham Haylor	Director, STREAM
48.	Mr William Savage	Communications Specialist, STREAM
49.	Dr S D Tripathi	Consultant, Mumbai
50.	Mr Rubu Mukherjee	Consultant, Bhubaneswar
51.	Ms Rebecca Cajilig	Program Officer, STREAM

Appendix 2 Agenda

Thursday, 24 April	
0830	<i>Arrival and Registration</i>
0930	Inaugural Session
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ Welcome and Brief on GVT □ Brief on NACA □ Brief on GOI-NACA □ Statement of Project History and Workshop Objectives □ Address by Guest of Honor □ Inaugural Address □ Vote of Thanks
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ Dr V S Tomar, CEO, GVT □ Mr Pedro Bueno, Director General, NACA □ Dr S Ayyappan, DDG Fisheries, ICAR □ Dr Graham Haylor, STREAM Director □ Mr Chandra Pal Singh, Chairman, KRIBHCO/GVT □ Mr P K Pattanaik, Joint Secretary □ Mr J S Gangwar, Additional CEO, GVT
1030	Introductions
1045	Overview of Agenda Mr William Savage, NACA-STREAM
1100	<i>Break</i>
1115	The Project Dr Graham Haylor, NACA-STREAM
1145	Progress of the Case Studies Mr William Savage
1155	Presentation: Case Studies 1 and 2 Mr Ashish Kumar
1215	Statement by Recipients From Jharkhand, Orissa and West Bengal
1245	<i>Lunch</i>
1400	Presentation: Case Studies 3 and 4 Dr K P Singh
1430	Statement by GVT GVT Team
1500	Presentation: Case Studies 5 and 6 Dr S D Tripathi, Mr Gautam Dutta and Ms Jhinuk Ray
1545	<i>Break</i>
1600	Statement by DOF Mr Rajiw Kumar and Mr A K Ray
1630	Performance of Act One of <i>Mahajal - The Big Fishing Net</i> Mr Rakesh Raman and troupe
1715	<i>Finish</i>
1900	Workshop dinner All

Friday, 25 April		
0930	Review of Day One and Overview of Day Two	Mr William Savage
0945	Presentation: Indicators of Progress	Mr William Savage
1000	Presentation: Policy Recommendations	Dr Graham Haylor
1030	<i>Break</i>	
1100	Performance of Act Two of <i>Mahajal - The Big Fishing Net</i>	Mr Rakesh Raman and troupe
1130	Open Discussion	
1230	<i>Lunch</i>	
1400	Commitments	
1500	<i>Break</i>	
1530	Follow-up Actions	
1630	Closing Session	
1700	<i>Finish</i>	

Appendix 3 Evolution of Policy Change Recommendations

Focus of services and support									
<i>Integrated aquaculture may be encouraged and loans and other facilities extended on a priority basis so that farmers may not suffer during aquaculture stress periods</i>									
Project Activities	Inception Report	Implementers and Recipients Workshop	Planning Visit	State-level Workshops	Stakeholders Workshop	Lessons Learnt	Indicators, Consensus-building and Recommendations	Policy Review Workshop	
R		Integrated aquaculture is necessary		Integrated fish farming to be encouraged (with ducks, pig, poultry) Including prawn would bring more profit	Prawn culture (integrated with fish) should be taken up so that farmers can benefit more			Financial assistance should be given for integrating fish culture with duckery, poultry, piggery and dairy	
D-S							Priority 4		
G	Use of seasonal water bodies for aquaculture a new and successful undertaking, with NRSP and ICAR Production “niches”			Integrated aquaculture may be encouraged and loans and other facilities extended on a priority basis so that farmers may not suffer during aquaculture stress periods					

(continued)

POLICY REVIEW WORKSHOP

Focus of services and support								
<i>Integrated aquaculture may be encouraged and loans and other facilities extended on a priority basis so that farmers may not suffer during aquaculture stress periods (continued)</i>								
Project Activities	Inception Report	Implementers and Recipients Workshop	Planning Visit	State-level Workshops	Stakeholders Workshop	Lessons Learnt	Indicators, Consensus-building and Recommendations	Policy Review Workshop
P								
I							Priority 4	Integrated fish farming is covered under FFDA

R = Recipients, D-S = State Departments of Fisheries, G = GVT, P = Project, I = Government of India

Improving service delivery								
<i>Timeliness of delivery of services, support and materials</i>								
Project Activities	Inception Report	Implementers and Recipients Workshop	Planning Visit	State-level Workshops	Stakeholders Workshop	Lessons Learnt	Indicators, Consensus-building and Recommendations	Policy Review Workshop
R		Difference is due to timely supply and quality of inputs No recipient contribution to design of services and support		Nets , seed and feed (and training) to be provided at the right time For credit, have to contact officers in time Arrangement for cold storage and feed production at block level	Oxygen containers for carrying fish			
D-S				Material inputs to be provided to women Low-cost technology and institutional finance available Involvement of community in all steps	Timing and availability of loans and inputs will increase output		Priority 7	
G								

(continued)

Improving service delivery								
<i>Timeliness of delivery of services, support and materials (continued)</i>								
Project Activities	Inception Report	Implementers and Recipients Workshop	Planning Visit	State-level Workshops	Stakeholders Workshop	Lessons Learnt	Indicators, Consensus-building and Recommendations	Policy Review Workshop
Stakeholders	P	FFDA provides package of technical, financial and extension support Question as to how far poor and disadvantaged groups profit from national and state government schemes Policy changes necessary to bring these groups into the mainstream and take advantage of government services						From the Consensus-building Process, the timely delivery of inputs is highlighted
	I						Priority 7	

Improving service delivery								
<i>Procedure should be simplified for getting government schemes and bank loans</i>								
Project Activities	Inception Report	Implementers and Recipients Workshop	Planning Visit	State-level Workshops	Stakeholders Workshop	Lessons Learnt	Indicators, Consensus-building and Recommendations	Policy Review Workshop
R		Bank loans for agriculture activities	Process for bank loans makes them unattractive Local sources are more flexible	Subsidy and loan should be provided by government Loan facilities from banks to be made easier Bureaucratic attitude to be avoided Need simple rules and regulation	System of getting loans should be easier and more effective, more democratic			
Stakeholders	D-S						Priority 2	We are arranging loans but credit remains outstanding even though we are using loan recovery officers

(continued)

POLICY REVIEW WORKSHOP

Improving service delivery								
<i>Procedure should be simplified for getting government schemes and bank loans (continued)</i>								
Project Activities	Inception Report	Implementers and Recipients Workshop	Planning Visit	State-level Workshops	Stakeholders Workshop	Lessons Learnt	Indicators, Consensus-building and Recommendations	Policy Review Workshop
G		Provide loans and cash "on time"		Easier loan facility	Bank loans in names of groups instead of individuals	Lending to groups would improve loan recovery Applications should be processed in a transparent way		There is a problem with getting loans
P								Loans were not made available at the right time so were not useful
I	Procedure for financing loans should be simplified and time-bound (High-Level Committee)						Priority 2	Loan facilities are a big thing

Improving service delivery								
<i>Government needs to change how information is made available to farmers, since information on its schemes to support fish culture is required to be known to farmers</i>								
Project Activities	Inception Report	Implementers and Recipients Workshop	Planning Visit	State-level Workshops	Stakeholders Workshop	Lessons Learnt	Indicators, Consensus-building and Recommendations	Policy Review Workshop
Stakeholders	R	<p>Best way to get information through Block officers, Farmers have to approach government Government needs to change how information is made available to farmers, since information on its schemes to support fish culture is required to be known to farmers Linkages and relations formed with government officials</p>	<p>People aware that information is available through IT resources, but frustrated that providers not accessing these resources since few provisions available Importance of language in provision of information Local language bulletins well received, though most extension material is in English</p>	<p>Lack of information and facilities from government Information on provision of government facilities to be provided Need information about improved techniques Government provides training, but villagers don't know if it's relevant More and simplified communication Radio, TV and journals</p>	<p>Information is a constraint</p>	<p>Local languages should be used Government should visit villages for consultations to inform of policies</p>		
	D-S				<p>Awareness of government schemes to interested farmer groups Provide modern audiovisual equipment</p>	<p>Consultation needs to be enhanced</p>	<p>Priority 3</p>	<p>Many people are not aware of schemes – we need more adequate staff</p>

(continued)

POLICY REVIEW WORKSHOP

Improving service delivery									
<i>Government needs to change how information is made available to farmers, since information on its schemes to support fish culture is required to be known to farmers (continued)</i>									
Project Activities	Inception Report	Implementers and Recipients Workshop	Planning Visit	State-level Workshops	Stakeholders Workshop	Lessons Learnt	Indicators, Consensus-building and Recommendations	Policy Review Workshop	
Stakeholders	G	Innovative extension techniques	Information and feedback from all levels		Develop information system about schemes	Community ASHG not given sufficient information Leaflets and other documents needed Farmers not aware of schemes Communication gap between community and government Two-way channels of communication Awareness- generating meetings	Government and bank officials could be invited to visit villages to improve understanding and communication Excluding groups from consultation means inappropriate policies Better schemes will result from improved links among village, block and district levels		All information regarding aquaculture should be available at local level
	P	Capacity -building and awareness-raising for fisheries officers							
	I	Need for coordination and adequate extension was recognized (High-Level Committee)			Database on water resources and farmers Increase use of non-traditional resources and systems			Priority 3	There may be communication gaps, between states-GOI, state-district, and district-farmers

Improving service delivery								
<i>Develop infrastructure for timely production of fingerlings at local level</i>								
Project Activities	Inception Report	Implementers and Recipients Workshop	Planning Visit	State-level Workshops	Stakeholders Workshop	Lessons Learnt	Indicators, Consensus-building and Recommendations	Policy Review Workshop
Stakeholders	R	Nurseries for fry-rearing Government to supply fry and fingerling through block-level centers		Hatcheries need to be constructed for seed production Difficulties in seed production with shortage of nursery and rearing ponds				After all of the discussion, it is clear that if villagers can get fish seed in a timely manner, then many of the problems will be solved
	D-S			Shortages of fish seed Captive fingerling nurseries for stocking in reservoirs Need to have adequate seed Hatcheries set up	Proactive groups should be encouraged to establish hatcheries Importance should be given to stocking of advanced fingerlings		Priority 1	Seed should be provided in villages and for that tanks are needed as there are some limitations with earthen nurseries

(continued)

Improving service delivery									
<i>Develop infrastructure for timely production of fingerlings at local level (continued)</i>									
Project Activities	Inception Report	Implementers and Recipients Workshop	Planning Visit	State-level Workshops	Stakeholders Workshop	Lessons Learnt	Indicators, Consensus-building and Recommendations	Policy Review Workshop	
Stakeholders	G			<p>Fingerlings raised in seasonal ponds could be stocked in perennial ponds</p> <p>Develop hatchery for quality seed production</p> <p>Availability of fingerlings on time at doorstep</p> <p>Develop infrastructure for timely production of fingerlings at local level</p>				<p>Good quality fingerlings and minimum inputs are supplied to the SHGs supported by GVT</p>	▲
	P							<p>Engage the private sector in seed supply</p>	
	I	<p>Ensure timely supply of fingerlings of desired species and proper size (High-Level Committee)</p>						<p>Priority 1</p>	<p>Government have no intention to produce seed, as this will be done by the private sector</p>

Improving service delivery										
<i>Site selection for pond construction should be given proper emphasis</i>										
Project Activities	Inception Report	Implementers and Recipients Workshop	Planning Visit	State-level Workshops	Stakeholders Workshop	Lessons Learnt	Indicators, Consensus-building and Recommendations	Policy Review Workshop		
Stakeholders	R	Pond constructed for cattle drinking water, irrigation and aquaculture Additional ponds, excavation and repair needed Need clear idea about proper use of water bodies Hand over Panchayat ponds to "societies"	Limited participation by recipients has led to improper site selection	Government funding is there, but site selection remains an issue	Ponds should be constructed in proper places			Wherever some ponds or check-dams are going to be constructed, local people should be consulted for the location so that water retention is for longer periods		
	D-S	Panchayat tanks renovated and handed over to ASHG's		Need clear demarcation of ponds, rules and regulations			Priority 6			
	G									
	P									
	I							Priority 6		

POLICY REVIEW WORKSHOP

Improving service delivery								
<i>Leases should be given to Self-Help Groups for ten years (it should be considered if these should be members of the Fishermen's Development Committee)</i>								
Project Activities	Inception Report	Implementers and Recipients Workshop	Planning Visit	State-level Workshops	Stakeholders Workshop	Lessons Learnt	Indicators, Consensus-building and Recommendations	Policy Review Workshop
R		Long-term leases (for employment of villagers) Membership for Harijans in Committees	Semi-urban groups not eligible for schemes	Long-term lease of government ponds (ten years) Procedures to be simplified Group leases more helpful than to individuals	Pond settlement process of government should be simplified ASHGs should get pond on long-term lease			
D-S		ASHGs provided with tanks and inputs		ASHGs now a preference for reservoir development	Proactive farmers should have long-term leases Leasing rights should be given to state fisheries departments Water bodies should be leased to cooperatives		Priority 5	[Ponds] ... should be leased out for at least five years and the policy on the length of leases should be changed
G		Leases to groups, minimum of 3-5 years		Improved leasing system for allocation of ponds to groups	Panchayat ponds should be handed over to ASHGs			SHGs are thinking to form Fishermen Committees to lease ponds for more than ten years for improving the livelihood

(continued)

Improving service delivery										
<i>Leases should be given to Self-Help Groups for ten years (it should be considered if these should be members of the Fishermen's Development Committee) (continued)</i>										
Project Activities	Inception Report	Implementers and Recipients Workshop	Planning Visit	State-level Workshops	Stakeholders Workshop	Lessons Learnt	Indicators, Consensus-building and Recommendations	Policy Review Workshop		
P										
I	Lease period for Panchayat and village ponds should be increased (High-Level Committee)						Priority 5			

New directions										
Encourage the formation of self-selected Aquaculture Self-Help Groups based on common interests among farmers and fishers										
Project Activities	Inception Report	Implementers and Recipients Workshop	Planning Visit	State-level Workshops	Stakeholders Workshop	Lessons Learnt	Indicators, Consensus-building and Recommendations	Policy Review Workshop		
Stakeholders	R	Groups formed, development programs discussed, collective decisions Recipients have mobilized themselves Cooperatives need to be formed Participatory approach	Groups share organization and implementation of aquaculture Self -selected groups perform better	Increased awareness of rights Organization and encouragement of groups Selection through group discussion in village Selection of those interested in fish culture	There should be fishermen's cooperatives Aquaculture should start with village groups					
	D-S		FFDA moving towards supporting groups	Need understanding of group rules and regulations		Groups without capacity to consult with government may need others to assist	Priority 9			

(continued)

New directions									
<i>Encourage the formation of self-selected Aquaculture Self-Help Groups based on common interests among farmers and fishers (continued)</i>									
Project Activities	Inception Report	Implementers and Recipients Workshop	Planning Visit	State-level Workshops	Stakeholders Workshop	Lessons Learnt	Indicators, Consensus-building and Recommendations	Policy Review Workshop	
Stakeholders	G	Through participatory approaches, development of social capital, farmers benefited from aquaculture Self-selecting, self-sustaining groups	Participation of women	Strength- building through cohesive group Group dynamism enables unity and common vision Group norms for conflict management Group approach to Panchayat Marketing through cooperatives	If ASHG are strong, community can raise its voice against injustices Linkage between ASHGs and PRI system	Through strong ASHGs, people can articulate thinking to authorities		Group meetings and discussions, along with rules and regulations, lead to cohesiveness and accountability among members	
	P	Encourage formation of ASHGs						Self-Help Groups as a way of managing risk	
	I							Priority 9	

POLICY REVIEW WORKSHOP

New directions									
<i>Provide support to establish group savings and micro-credit schemes among Aquaculture Self-Help Groups</i>									
Project Activities	Inception Report	Implementers and Recipients Workshop	Planning Visit	State-level Workshops	Stakeholders Workshop	Lessons Learnt	Indicators, Consensus-building and Recommendations	Policy Review Workshop	
R		Importance of savings Money earned deposited in group fund Share of “outside” contribution should be more	Group funds generated from activities						
D-S		Increase in number of bank accounts and ASHG's					Priority 11		
G	Lower-interest credit available	Increased number of ASHG's and group funds		Some groups have large savings Funds used for social development (schools)	Form ASHG's and avoid loans from private parties with high interest rates			SHG's generated funds to provide loans to community through micro-credit system	
P	Provide support to establish group savings and micro-credit schemes among ASHG's								
I							Priority 11		

Stakeholders

New directions								
<i>Capacity-building of Jankars and recipients and equipment for water quality testing (which should be provided) is essential on a priority basis as they are the main connecting link for technical knowledge between the government, technology and farmers</i>								
Project Activities	Inception Report	Implementers and Recipients Workshop	Planning Visit	State-level Workshops	Stakeholders Workshop	Lessons Learnt	Indicators, Consensus-building and Recommendations	Policy Review Workshop
R		Now 12-14 jankars in a cluster Training and exposure visits		Trained farmers responsible for increased awareness Lack of skill in organizing proper facilities for fishing Jankars should be given training in aquaculture	Water quality testing kits should be provided to villagers			Aquaculture training should be organized by GVT at CIFA
D-S				Need proper training and guidance for farmers Physiochemical parameters of pond need proper measurement Capacity -building of Jankars and recipients and equipment for water quality testing (which should be provided) is essential on a priority basis			Priority 12	

(continued)

POLICY REVIEW WORKSHOP

New directions									
<i>Capacity-building of Jankars and recipients and equipment for water quality testing (which should be provided) is essential on a priority basis as they are the main connecting link for technical knowledge between the government, technology and farmers (continued)</i>									
Project Activities	Inception Report	Implementers and Recipients Workshop	Planning Visit	State-level Workshops	Stakeholders Workshop	Lessons Learnt	Indicators, Consensus-building and Recommendations	Policy Review Workshop	
G	Jankars develop skills and experience	Jankars trained at CIFA Capacity-building in all villages		Awareness-building through exposure and community training Exposure-cum-lesson-learning visits of jankars, NGO and GO officials	Use of skilled jankars for aquaculture program			Through training, exposure and establishing a network, a vision of success and sustainability has been developed among members	
P									
I							Priority 12		

New directions									
<i>Insurance schemes for aquaculture</i>									
Project Activities	Inception Report	Implementers and Recipients Workshop	Planning Visit	State-level Workshops	Stakeholders Workshop	Lessons Learnt	Indicators, Consensus-building and Recommendations	Policy Review Workshop	
R				Financial support during natural disasters Need insurance schemes	Insurance for ponds, fish and farmers needed Provision for compensation for natural disasters			Fish should be insured to save the farmer from flood or disease	
D-S			Insurance schemes might be an answer	Started insurance schemes for fish farmers Can approach insurance companies if groups are well organized	Clear policy on fish pond insurance in case of natural disasters		Priority 10		
G					Provision of insurance should be there				
P								Insurance schemes as a way of managing risk	
I							Priority 10		

Stakeholders

New directions									
<i>Establishment, defining and identification of model aquaculture villages for benefits to be disseminated to nearby "untouched" villages</i>									
Project Activities	Inception Report	Implementers and Recipients Workshop	Planning Visit	State-level Workshops	Stakeholders Workshop	Lessons Learnt	Indicators, Consensus-building and Recommendations	Policy Review Workshop	
Stakeholders	R								▲
	D-S						Priority 8		
	G				Successful villages become models for others Establishment of model aquaculture villages	Develop model integrated aquaculture village		GVT is in the process of establishing a model aquaculture village where the whole cycle of aquaculture activities will be demonstrated to farmers from nearby and distant villages	
	P								
	I						Priority 8		

New directions										
<i>Single-point under-one-roof service provision</i>										
Project Activities	Inception Report	Implementers and Recipients Workshop	Planning Visit	State-level Workshops	Stakeholders Workshop	Lessons Learnt	Indicators, Consensus-building and Recommendations	Policy Review Workshop		
R		“Agriculture” has one window for service provision		Shop for fishery provision to be set up by government in every region Service-providers should be knowledgeable				Department of Fisheries should make available seed, feed and other inputs locally to the farmers		
D-S							Priority 13			
G				Government to develop facility for aquaculture program Single-point under-one-roof service provision				The “under-one-roof” recommendation is a good one		
P										
I							Priority 13			
Stakeholders										