

The Rufford Small Grants Foundation

Final Report

Congratulations on the completion of your project that was supported by The Rufford Small Grants Foundation.

We ask all grant recipients to complete a Final Report Form that helps us to gauge the success of our grant giving. We understand that projects often do not follow the predicted course but knowledge of your experiences is valuable to us and others who may be undertaking similar work. Please be as honest as you can in answering the questions – remember that negative experiences are just as valuable as positive ones if they help others to learn from them.

Please complete the form in English and be as clear and concise as you can. We will ask for further information if required. If you have any other materials produced by the project, particularly a few relevant photographs, please send these to us separately.

Please submit your final report to jane@rufford.org.

Thank you for your help.

Josh Cole, Grants Director

| Grant Recipient Details | | | | |
|-------------------------|---|--|--|--|
| Your name | Your name Hema Ramani Gautam Patel | | | |
| Project title | Protection of Green Zone in the Mahableshwar-Panchgani Eco Sensitive Zone (ESZ), Satara District, State of Maharashtra, India | | | |
| RSG reference | 12.05.07 | | | |
| Reporting period | 2007–2008 | | | |
| Amount of grant | GBP 4700 | | | |
| Your email address | hema.ramani.r@gmail.com gautampatel@gmail.com; gautam@gautampatel.com | | | |
| Date of this report | 12 June 2009 | | | |



1. Please indicate the level of achievement of the project's original objectives and include any relevant comments on factors affecting this.

| | Not | Partially | Fully | | | | | |
|--|----------|-----------|----------|---------------------------------------|--|--|--|--|
| Objective | achieved | achieved | achieved | Comments | | | | |
| (Please see detailed final report for a fuller explanation and analysis) | | | | | | | | |
| Deletion of various | | Yes | | Meetings held at various levels; | | | | |
| provisions in the ESZ | | | | several suggestions by the BEAG | | | | |
| Master Plan | | | | accepted; some still under discussion | | | | |
| detrimental to the | | | | at the State Government level | | | | |
| preservation and | | | | | | | | |
| conservation of the | | | | | | | | |
| ESZ, or contrary to the | | | | | | | | |
| provisions of the ESZ | | | | | | | | |
| notification | | | | | | | | |
| The inclusion of areas | | Yes | | Meetings held at various levels; | | | | |
| which, though | | | | several suggestions by the BEAG | | | | |
| forested, had not | | | | accepted; some still under discussion | | | | |
| been legally so | | | | at the State Government level | | | | |
| designated, as forest | | | | | | | | |
| areas protected under | | | | | | | | |
| the ESZ | | | | | | | | |

2. Please explain any unforeseen difficulties that arose during the project and how these were tackled (if relevant).

The attached final report has this information. The most significant difficulty was the delay of several months caused by abrupt changes by the government in the administration hierarchy, requiring the previous officer's successor to carry on the work started by his predecessor. It is also difficult to predicate the sometimes glacial pace at which government works.

3. Briefly describe the three most important outcomes of your project.

- (a) Incorporation of surveyed forest lands into the Master Plan, protecting these ecologically fragile forests from destruction on account of development;
- (b) Restricting development proposals on hill slopes, by village expansion and construction of roads and a highway.
- (c) Perusading local communities and stakeholders to acknowledge the benefits to them of the BEAG's various proposals, and gathering their support to various proposals.

4. Briefly describe the involvement of local communities and how they have benefitted from the project (if relevant).

Addressing the local communities by broad occupational divisions, the BEAG has been able to persuade them to accept and acknowledge the benefits of BEAG's proposals. Local hoteliers,



residents, the association of tour guides, the association of refreshment stall owners and the association of horse owners (who hire out horses to tourists) have all accepted that an augmentation of the Green Zone is patently in their interest. They have joined with the BEAG in demanding better civic governance and, specifically, improved basic infrastructural facilities for sewage and solid waste management.

5. Are there any plans to continue this work?

The work is not yet complete. The BEAG continues to lobby with the State Government, advocating its proposals. It will continue to do so at the next level, the Central Government's Ministry of Environment & Forests. Independently, the BEAG is formalizing a proposal for a Public-Private Partnership between manufacturers of bottled drinking water, the local authorities and the residents/stakeholders for segregation, collection and recycling of plastic waste.

6. How do you plan to share the results of your work with others?

The Master Plan, with BEAG's inputs, should serve as a template for other hill stations in India. Depending on the outcome, the BEAG will advocate its adoption as a 'model' plan for similar sites elsewhere in the state and in the country, or will lobby for improvement and further protection to the Green Zone.

The BEAG intends to continue independently monitoring the implementation of the Master Plan at the ground level; if necessary, the BEAG will seek judicial intervention.

The proposals for sewage and solid waste management and plastic recycling, if established, will serve as a pilot for similar initiatives in other hill stations. Once established, they will function independently with local inputs.

7.Timescale: Over what period was the RSG used? How does this compare to the anticipated or actual length of the project?

The RSG was used for a period of roughly 15 months (April 2007 to June 2008). Although the grant was sanctioned in September 2007, the work had begun earlier and the funds were used to cover expenses incurred till then also. The project was expected to be complete in its intiali conceptualization by June 2008, but, as explained, was delayed by changes in government administration appointments and by delays inherent in government functioning.



8. Budget: Please provide a breakdown of budgeted versus actual expenditure and the reasons for any differences. All figures should be in £ sterling, indicating the local exchange rate used.

Exchange rate as on 26 April 2007: £1 = Rs.80.759 Detailed statement separately attached.

| Item | Budgeted | Actual | Difference | Comments |
|--|----------|-----------|------------|----------|
| | Amount | Amount | | |
| Travel to ESZ | | £ 261.67 | | |
| Travel to Satara | | £ 391.73 | | |
| Travel to Pune | | £ 411.69 | | |
| Local travel to Government secretariat | | £ 7.43 | | |
| Stationery, printing etc | | £ 414.81 | | |
| Salary and wages | | £ 2786.07 | | |
| Office overheads at 10% | | £ 427.34 | | |
| TOTAL | | £ 4700.74 | | |

9. Looking ahead, what do you feel are the important next steps?

The BEAG must continue its work till the Master Plan is finally sanctioned. Thereafter begins the work of monitoring its implementation on the ground (including, if necessary, petitioning court against the authorities for an order directing such implementation). Independent initiatives for waste and sewage management, recycling plastics and environmental empowerment of local stakeholders also continues.

10. Did you use the RSGF logo in any materials produced in relation to this project? Did the RSGF receive any publicity during the course of your work?

No.