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PREFACE

We are happy to present to you “Green Tapism: A Review of the Environmental Impact Assessment Notification - 2006”. This Notification was issued on 14 September 2006 and its journey from the draft stage to its final form and after has been marked by controversy and widespread protests.

This review was undertaken acknowledging the widespread concern that the EIA Notification was manipulated to suit certain vested interests thus putting to enormous risk the ecological and livelihood security of India. The fact that the Notification is the only legal instrument that explicitly mandates and defines the process for public involvement in environmental decision-making, and that this very process was being undermined, compelled us even more to undertake this task. In so doing we have had to review the objectives by which the Union Ministry of Environment and Forests (MoEF, which issued the Notification) was established. Clearly the mandate has always been to make the task of conservation and environmental management everyone’s responsibility and not subject to “expert systems”. In that sense it is natural to expect that MoEF would meaningfully involve the public in all stages of the process of formulation of the Notification.

As we discuss in this review, the Ministry made no effort to actively involve the public besides organising token consultations with a few invited NGOs (which, by no stretch of the imagination, can be considered to adequately represent the wider public). During the finalization of the Notification, however, the Indian Environment Ministry went so far as to firmly shut its doors on the public and admittedly consulted only industrial and investor lobbies. State Governments and parliamentarians too were not accorded such a privilege. This has serious consequences to democratic decision making in India.

The resulting legislation clearly subordinates environmental and social concerns to the interests of industry and investment. This Notification was hurriedly finalized and is atrociously drafted. Rather than simplifying the process of environmental decision making in an effort to include the wide public, the Notification complicates clearance procedures to such an extent that even officials within the Ministry have difficulty understanding its provisions and implement them. A good indication of this is about 10 documents as notes/ circulars/ corrigenda that the Ministry has already issued in clarification since the Notification came into effect about seven months ago. Foxed by widespread demands for clarification regarding operational difficulties with the Notification, the Ministry has weakly responded by even decreeing a carte blanche abeyance of the Notification’s operation till 30 June 2007. The Notification is in operation, and yet it is not.

We empathise with you if you have had problems understanding the EIA Notification – 2006. We too have struggled to understand many parts of the Notification, and in some cases we have simply not been able to appreciate what is being stated.

We sincerely feel that at a stage when India is fast expanding its manufacturing and infrastructure sectors, and the consequent environmental and social impacts are being felt almost everywhere, the formulation of EIA norms represent a wonderful opportunity to help rationalize the push-pull factors between sustaining development and ensuring ecological and livelihood security. We fear that this opportunity has been lost as the Union Ministry of Environment and Forests - driven by a zeal to promote itself as a pro-investment Ministry – has compromised the very purpose for which it was constituted.

It is likely that the EIA Notification – 2006 will cause widespread confusion when it is fully implemented. We also fear that this Notification will unnecessarily burden courts with a variety of litigations. All of this could easily have been avoided if the Ministry had adopted a transparent approach and had objectively listened to all views, and not just those of powerful industrial and investment lobbies. The misery resulting from the Notification’s complicated and confusing approach will most likely be borne by project-affected communities, who most often are the economically and politically weaker sections of our society. This is a truly unfortunate outcome of this Notification.

In our review, we make a very strong case for this Notification to be repealed. We would be grateful for your support if you agree with our position, and do welcome your criticisms if you disagree with our views. In any case, we hope this review will fuel a healthy debate on the nature and consequences of the EIA Notification – 2006.

The responsibility for all omissions and misinterpretations remains fully ours.
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