

## MEETING MINUTES

Venue: Hotel Ashraya International, Bengaluru

Date & Time: 5 May 2014, 0930 hours

The meeting commenced with a warm welcome to all the by Mr. P.S. Sodhi, Country Program Manager GEF UNDP SGP, CEE Delhi. He glimpsed an introduction to the GEF UNDP SGP and CEE functioning. Ms. A. Swarnamayee Das, Programme Officer, CEE South called upon the partners in a sequence for the proposal presentations. The meeting was also joined by two RCM members (South); Dr. Ashok Alur, Special Officer, University of Horticultural Sciences, Bagalkot and Mr. R.S. Balasubramanyam, Head CSR, Aditya Birla Group, Tamil Nadu and also we had Sh Purushottam, CSR Head Madura Fashions and Lifestyles, Bangalore.

**Mr. Nandakishore, President, We Care Society, Bengaluru, Karnataka** was the first to give the presentation on "Introduction of Better Cotton Initiatives (BCI) Programme in Karnataka". Ms. Kalamani, APMAS raised the question of growing Bt Cotton on the issue of Biodiversity and soil degradation. Dr. Ashok Alur, Special Officer, University of Horticultural Sciences, Bagalkot clarified that Bt Cotton is just a pest resistant variety, modified with the strands from *Bacillus thuringensis*, and has no relation to soil degradation and other issues. He cited the example of Bt Brinjal, which is not officially approved in the country, still the variety in market is mostly Bt Brinjal. He also emphasized that mutant variety risks for biodiversity loss. However if the concern is not Biodiversity Conservation and the variety is beneficial to the community, it is always acceptable.

Dr. Ashok, Mr. Sodhi and Mr. R.S. Balasubramanyam, Head CSR, Aditya Birla Group, Tamil Nadu also commented and gave some collective consensus suggestion as listed below.

1. Define to project strategy
2. Highlight the related issues on Cotton Cultivation
3. Need to indicate the related alternatives for the for the issues on cotton cultivation
4. Activities listing needs to be integrated and also quantified.
5. Demographic information of the area (as in the table below)
6. Detail of the farmers who is going to involve and also a business model explanation as to how much cotton collected, how the marketing to happen, please give a flow diagram
7. The quantified expectations from the project need to be shown very clearly.
8. Land degradation measures need to be given; what is attempted
9. The source of the bio-manure needs to be shown and the related livestock availability in the area.

The next presentation was delivered by **Ms. Manju M. Maria , Project Officer, Malabar Social Service Society, Kannur** on "Environmental Conservation through the Construction of Biogas Plants based on house hold waste, cattle dung and rubber latex water in Kannur, Wayanad and Kasargode Districts of Kerala State, India". Mr. Sodhi suggested the following points.

1. The availability of the raw material and the cattle population need to be given in details on the project villages. No emphasis on the livestock management, animal husbandry practices or fodder, all these aspects need to be carefully incorporated. Type of fodder specs, napier which is commonly grown and also no link to the Govt. depts etc..

2. The project has no innovation as it is asking for all funds and no sharing of costs; community and subsidy from government is not incorporated
3. Different raw material need different bio-gas model, so needs to specify and cannot be generalized. Design etc not given clarity
4. Size of the bio-gas planned needs to be given should be no more than 1/2 cu. mtr
5. The project can increase the scale and also link through govt. sources and SGP should only chip in small.

Dr. Ashok also stressed on the innovation and scale up of the project.

The third presentation was from **Mr. K. Nireekshana Rao, Secretary, SNEHA** on "Climate Resilient Farming Systems for Sustainable Livelihood Enhancement for Women Beneficiaries at Kolleru Lake of Krishna District of Andhra Pradesh". Dr. Ashok, Balsubramanyaim and Sodhi suggested

1. listing of the project activities numerically and included community contribution for the ownership. Also clearly define the sustainability in the project.
2. The design of the integrated fish farming needs to be shown and also the scale livelihood aspect also has to be considered. Community contributions are low and also the scale is low and we need to increase the same.
3. The Income and expenditure comparison table needs to be given. Also more focus needs to be on the business model; links to the technology with the local government departments.

**Mr. R. Velmurugan, Managing Trustee, EDUCATR**, presented on "Community- led biodiversity conservation of native fodder species, grassland eco system and establishment of fodder banks in 10 villages of Usilampatti block, Madurai District.

Dr. Ashok, Mr. Sodhi and Ms. Das also commented and gave some collective consensus suggestion as listed below.

1. Define to project strategy
2. Activities listing needs to be integrated.
3. Demographic information of the area (as in the table below)
4. Detail of the farmers who is going to involve
5. The quantified outcomes from the project need to be shown very clearly.
6. The species of the fodder to be planted; animal husbandry practices need to be shown and also link with the concerned veterinary officers to be mentioned. We also need to see the use of community as the organisers; their roles and involvement is missing.
7. Link with the line departments and other technical institutes like IGRI.
8. Income and Expenditure comparison table.
9. Can link the activities with livestock, dairy farming, etc.

**Mr. P. Vivekanandan of SEVA** presented on "Conservation of Vembur Sheep breed through capacity building, value addition and marketing".

Mr Vivekanandan was guided by the team on the following;

1. While this is a good idea but we need to see that the community contribution is increased and also that after the 10 units a system of how the kids will be shared with other communities to be defined in the strategy; we have to ensure that more people are benefitted from this.

2. The design of the units to be constructed needs to be mentioned and shown in the proposal. Also a draft agreement needs to be done with the unit holders that they will continue to do the conservation of the breed and share the kids as 1,3,5,7th at least for three years free with other HHs as a strategy to proliferate the conservation.
3. There is no focus on the fodder use and development. You need to incorporate the fodder plantations of the local species and also of Napier slips in the region.
4. We should also incorporate the link with the Veterinary sciences deptt.; proper vaccination etc needs to be made integral in the project
5. The role of the locals as - paravets - need to be defined and we should also quantify how much we envisage the increase in the breed by numbers.

The next presentation was on "Scaling up of a proven grassroots innovation: Energy Efficient Community Chulha for Anganwadies and Schools, (Idukki dt Kerala)" by **Mr. T.J. James of the Peermade Development Society**. Suggestions were made

- Scale up the number of the schools from 10 to at least 50/75, anganwadis and get a letter from ICDS, Govt Deptt that they have no objections on this. Agreement also needs to be done with each school that they will take care of the cook stove. Draft copy of agreement to be attached.
- Linkages with MNREGA, ICDS, Govt. department, etc. to seek their contributions; also the contributions in sharing costs need to increase and redefined in the proposal.
- Design of the cook stove to be added in the proposal and also the calculation on wood saving needs to be mentioned through the design stove.
- We also need to see the use of community as the organizers in the program and in each school there has to be a person made responsible for the aftercare of the cook stove.

The programme was followed with the presentation on "Implementation of energy efficient cook stove in Sirsi Forest Region, Western Ghats, Karnataka" by **Mr. Prashant Mahajan, Development & Education Manager, Earthwatch Institute India Trust**.

The following suggestions were made by Mr. Sodhi, Dr. Ashok and Dr Bala.

1. There are some strong points in the project like Youth Training, involving volunteers as Citizen Scientists etc. this should be seen as a co financing and the project costs should not be used
2. The Volunteer Group needs to be linked from the private sector, and accounted as a co financing.
3. The scale of the project needs to be increased. We should really have at least 500/600 stoves and good community contributions should also be shared and defined in the project. Design of the stove should also be mentioned in the proposal.
4. We also need to see into the value addition of Garcinia FRUIT with people and create a better interface with markets on butter, and other products.
5. Linkage with NGOs and other sectors (corporate, institutes) needs to be indicated. The project can also be for 30 months and also the adm costs can be more shared through EI and we also need to see the use of community as the organisers

**Mr. V. Gangi Reddy, Project Manager of RRDS**, delivered the presentation on "Eco-Friendly Alternative Energy for Rural Families". Mr. Sodhi and Ms. Das make the following points.

1. The biogas model needs to be indicated, the design and cost sharing, subsidy etc.
2. The feasibility of the project in the area needs to be planned better.

3. The project needs to be focused. The project lacks innovation, scale and proper links and co financing and all needs to be defined carefully.
4. The distribution of the solar lamps is not GEFable, suggested Mr. Sodhi as it is a Government subsidy. The linkage with NEDCAP, Mandal in A.P. was also suggested.
5. The role of the community as facilitators is not mentioned at all, thus the sustainability is an a issue, no links to livestock, animal husbandry practices etc defined.

The next presentation was on **"Supporting Value Chain in Climate Smart Vegetable & Fruit Production in selected villages of Mahabubnagar district, AP-** with Special Focus on Women and School Students" by Mr. T.N. Reddy. Mr. Sodhi suggested

1. The need of business model
2. Linkage with community Radio-systems, funded by the Information dept.
3. He also explained that we have to develop and list the revenue generating model of the listed farmers in the CCACs
4. Mr. Puru of Aditya Birla Group suggested they can also link with MYRADA. Mr. Raghuvansh Saxena, Country Director, Earth Watch also suggested that some insurance companies are also interested in supporting Climate Change project. So the linkage can be built up.
5. Dr. Ashok suggested that the National Disaster Management also supports such activities and we must really explore the possibilities; we also need to create the much needed links with CRIDA and MNREGA. The selection of the specs is most important in this model and links with agriculture deptt is a must; role of the local commun itis as owners need to be defined.

There was a lunch break at 1300 hours. The post lunch session started at 2300 hours and **Ms. Kalamani of Mahila Abhivruddhi Society, Andhra Pradesh (APMAS)** presented on "Soil Regeneration - A Ray of Hope for Making Dry Land Farming Sustainable". Mr. T.N. Reddy of CARE suggested introduction of varieties of crops depending to the area. **Mr. Vivekanandan of SEVA suggested introduction of breeds which are suitable for the area.**

Dr. Ashok; Sodhi made many suggestions as follows.

1. The achievability of the project objectives is questionable in the proposed time-frame, so it needs to more realistic in nature; all activities need to be linked to the watershed deptt and also quantified in terms of areas treated in villages and community contributions.
2. The actions need to be scaled up in numbers.
3. Integrate and introduce more crops eg. Drumsticks, mango, etc.
4. The role of communities as the organisers need to be defined and all the planning needs to be done on revenue maps and a system for watershed management needs to defined. The budget needs to be reworked in terms of the new points, including measures on livestock management.

**Dr. Ashwini Kumar BJ, Coffee Board of India Research Chair, IIPM,** gave the presentation on "Community-based interventions to address land and water degradation caused by Coffee processing and production activities in the Western Ghats".

He was guided on several aspects that the idea is innovative but we need to have the quantification of the benefits which will occur in terms of areas for contamination restored, a chart was later made by Mr Sodhi, also that the adm. costs are too high and needs to be reduced and also that a letter from coffee board needs to be taken for thier support in Ecopulpers; and also that these machines are viable and will be managed by the communities.

Mr Balasubramaniam explained to all the importance of SMART principles in proposals.

He was followed by Mr. T.Rama Rao, mentor of the Chaitanya Bharathi on "Enhancement of livelihood opportunities for fishermen community at North coastal area of Vizianagaram District". Mr. Zerish Nazir of Hand in Hand presented on "Waste to Energy".

The next presentation was given by **Mr. G. Ravindra Kumar, Executive Director, Collective Activities for Rejuvenation of Village arts and Environment (CARVE)**. The topic was on "Rejuvenation of sweet orange and promotion of alternate orchards". Mr. Sodhi suggested the below points.

1. Scaling up the project
2. The project strategy needed to be defined.
3. The diseases to the fruit and crop need to be identified and also the management.
4. The linkage with line departments, station at Nagpur, etc need to be made
5. Marketing strategy needs to be made.

**Mr. P. Ravi Kumar, Chief Functionary & Project Director of ANKITA** (Association for Needy and Kindle the Illiterate through Action) presented on "Sustainable cultivation & marketing practices of red chilly & sweet orange growers in dry belt of Nalgonda district, Andhra Pradesh". Dr. Ashok has appreciated the linkages made by the project. Mr. Sodhi suggested incorporating the following points.

1. Objectives need to be focused
2. The goals are not focused
3. The strategy of implementation is not clear and needs to be indicated. What is innovation is not clear.

The next presentation was given by **Mr. M. Madhukar Reddy, Secretary of Society for Sustainable Agriculture & Forest Ecology (Safe)** on "Sustainable agricultural livelihoods for climate resilient communities". Dr. Ashok made the following inputs.

1. The seed availability needs to be indicated.
2. The alternative crop strategies need to be indicated.
3. Linkages to scientific institutes like IMD, CRIDA, etc and Director, Agriculture (Research and Extension) need to be defined.

The last presentation was from the **Non-Conventional Energy and Rural Development Society (NERDS)** on "Community based electrification of Kodanthur Tribal Settlement and Thalingi Field Settlement with

**biogas and hydel Energy for their livelihood” by Mr. Kamaraj.** In that context, Mr. Sodhi made the following inputs.

1. Quantification is needed.
  2. Cost benefit analysis
  3. Detail of community contribution and dimension of the micro-hydel
  4. Demographic information
  5. Other livelihood alternatives.
  6. Incremental benefits.
  7. Value addition of milk
  8. Micro-enterprise to prevent cattle selling.
- The workshop closed with some key suggestions for the Country Program Manager GEF UNDP SGP.

- A. Define to project strategy
- B. Activities listing needs to be integrated.
- C. Demographic information of the area (as in the table below)
- D. Detail of the farmers who is going to involve
- E. The quantified expectations from the project need to be shown very clearly.
- F. A business model is suggested to be planned and mentioned.
- G. Co-financing needs to be incorporated.
- H. The linkage (partnerships) needs to be made.
- I. Agreement letters need to be collected.
- J. Community Mobilization needs to be strengthened.
- K. The project activities timeline and budget need to include those activities where the GEF funds are not required. This will increase the co-financing component.
- L. Admission cost cannot exceed 20% of the fund request.
- M. No office rent will be funded.
- N. For travel and accommodation, maximum 25 Lacs INR can be funded.

He also shared that CEE is the only NGO implementing agency for GEF. Mr. Sodhi and Ms. Das requested the partners to submit the revised proposals by 17 May 2014 as the RCM is planned on 23 May 2014. They thanked all the participants and resource persons.

.....



## WORKSHOP

### *"GEF/ UNDP SGP OPS WORKSHOP ON STRENGTHENING THE PROPOSALS FOR PARTNERS/ CIVIL SOCIETIES"*

**5<sup>th</sup> May 2014 at Ashraya International Hotel, Bangalore, Karnataka**

- |          |  |
|----------|--|
| 9.30 am  | Welcome Note and Introduction of the participants by<br>Ms. A. Swarnamayee Das, Programme Officer, CEE South Bengaluru |
| 9.40 am  | Introduction to CEE and SGP by Dr. Shailaja Ravindranath, Regional Director, CEE South, Benagaluru                     |
| 9.50 am  | Introduction to the Workshop by Mr. Prabhjot S Sodhi, Country Program Manager GEF UNDP SGP, CEE Delhi.                 |
| 10.00 am | Presentation by the Partners/ Civil Societies (14 Nos) & discussion  |
| 01.30 pm | Lunch  |
| 02.30 pm | Continuation of the Presentation by the Partners/ Civil Societies 4 Nos) & discussion                                  |
| 03.30 pm | Presentation in strengthening the proposals by Mr. Prabhjot S Sodhi, Country Program Manager GEF UNDP SGP, CEE Delhi   |
| 05.00 pm | Closing note by Ms. Aheibam Swarnamayee Das, Programme Officer, CEE South.   |

