

CRZ Vs. CMZ-----Dr.B.Madhusoodana Kurup

MSS Commission changed a rule to management plan which cannot be justified. Violation of CRZ notification- rampant in Kerala- 2000 cases on violation of CRZ- regulatory nature of the notification should be maintained

MSS report diluted the spirit of CRZ notification. Action plans not compatible with objectives, observations and conclusion, and erodes spirit of CRZ

Action plan MSS not compatible with TOR 3-revisit CRZ notification 1991 to recommend suitable amendments to make regulatory framework CRZ 1991-protect the coast and coastal communities from degrading coastal environment.

Commission ignored principle - cost is for coastal community (Fishermen). Ignored the fishermen interest- even no special mention about the community

CRZ replaced by CMZ. Flexible and liberal approaches given to CMZ activities- doubtful, how far fulfill the basic objectives of coastal environmental protection and safe guard the interest of fishermen community/coastal community

CRZ- III of the CRZ notification reclassified as CMZ- II in MSS commission- Unbridled development in CRZ III the pretext of EIA. Local body CM plan + EIA- threat to coastal community

The entire coastal area will belong to CMZ- II as per MSS Zone III of CRZ notification- totally wiped out from Kerala CRZ III- up to 200m NO DEVELOPMENT ZONE.- used for various occupational need of Fishermen.- fish drying, mending net, dispensaries, schools, shelters, 200-500 m zone dwelling units following traditional rights and customary uses of the fishing village. MSS report- development based on management Plan of Local Bodies- Mostly suiting non coastal communities- privileges of fishermen jeopardized- totally wiped out

MSS report help in promoting activities related to industries, tourism, housing of effluent class, etc., instead of protecting the interests of fishermen Violations till 2004- legalized if MSS report is implemented No buffer zone for the Ecologically Sensitive Areas (ESA) as in CRZ notification.

The list is incomplete The limit of coastal zone is extending up to 12 nautical miles in the seawards side. This area is not categorized in CMZ Local bodies will be entrusted with the management of various zones CMZ

vis a vis CRZ disadvantageous: Only promote non coastal protection and non coastal community related activities

Majority of coastal panchayaths come under CMZ- II category- where the plan is prepared by the majority non- coastal communities. Instead of permitting activities essential for the coastal communities, most of the permissible activities will be related to industry, tourism and defense. Coastal Zone activity conflicting and interest varied-Capability of the local bodies in managing the coastal zone- doubtful Capability of local bodies in managing territorial waters -22 km?One of the major fishing ground – highly volatile.Fishing acts and regulations.who will impose?Role of Fisheries Dept questioned?

Role of concerned government department in the governance in the coastal zone requires more clarity

Status of bed of inland water bodies not mentioned anywhere in the report. The vulnerability line with regards to inland water bodies- not defined.

MSS committee not have adequate representation from coastal communities, community based organizations and NGOs. Action plans proposed do not reflect the suggestions of the committee and the elaborate discussions and observations based on revisit to CRZ. Only concern is protection of people and property from hazards of the sea. Pollution from inland sources and damages to coastal ecosystem – not considered.

The concept that coastal zone belongs to coastal communities diluted. List of CMZ- I is not complete.

Diluted the concept that the entire coastal zone is unique compared to land areas

Coastal morphological features such as cliffs, beaches etc. are left out from the protective cover

The norms for CMZ II – too general

CMZ III consists only 'other open areas '

Limiting to land ward boundary of the local bodies as limit, may exclude some areas very close to sea and estuaries while includes some very far off

HTL replaced VL. Vulnerability line delineation may not be easy and scientifically acceptable due to limitation of data available and assumptions involved. Vulnerability to hazards from sea alone is considered. Vulnerability line does not consider ecosystems and threat to ecosystems from land based activities.

HTL delineation through geomorphologic signature is simple and easily understandable to coastal communities- replacement with vulnerability line may make things incomprehensive

The Logic behind the replacement of HTL by Vulnerability Line not justified-HTL –easily identifiable geomorphological feature- Vulnerability Line-elevation,Geology,sea Level trend,shore line changes,tidal range,and wave height-Sufficient data is not available for Vulnerability computation-Accuracy questionable?

The methodology suggested for the computational procedure of VL – complicated and limits transparency and understandability HTL is more scientific and accurate.

Every chance of vested and political interests creeping into the Preparation of IMPs local bodies Maintain structure and spirit of CRZ notification in the CMZ concept. Make modification and strengthening areas of CMZ which are essential for

- 1) sustaining the livelihood of coastal communities
- 2) protection of coastal area.

Dr.B.Madhusoodana Kurup
Professor(Fisheries)
School of Industrial Fisheries
Cochin University of Science and Technology
Fine Arts Avenue
Cochin-682 016, Kerala .India