

Group Presentations

Presented in posters and reported to plenary

Groups made up of majority representatives (i.e. NGO group contained mostly people from NGOs), although there extras that did not fit into these groupings were included in each group.

	NGO group	DoF group	Research group
Give your opinion on the relevance of the project to improve livelihoods of the poor.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Poor people have no access to fish pond aquaculture (except only employment) • Low cost procuring fish from capture fisheries to fish ponds • Easy access to women • Conserve the nature • In the open rivers that are accessible to all including the poor – the fish stocks are declining due to pollution 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The project has direct and positive relevance to improve the livelihoods of the rural poor / better-off • SRS are cost effective • Nutritive • Could easily be made available in the traditional waters where there are access for fishing by all people • The project would otherwise encourage the conservation of the species through the conservation of the habitats which is the primary reason why the SRS have declined over the years 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Resource --> Use of poor's small HH ponds, rice fields, roadside canals, other natural waterbodies can be of use • Consumption, nutrition (HH), employment, improve self as well as community, IGA for poor. • Conservation - Restoration of SIS and natural species • Ornamental fish • SRS in large pond - source of livelihood for poor fishers • Managed perennial waterbodies
What are your experiences on SRS in aquaculture? How could our project results most compliment them?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Importance of pesticides in terms of impact on SRS consider experience in IPM. • Need to consider rice cultivation systems since major focus is on rice-fish complex • System loss through use of certain gears (drag nets) by rural poor searching for a living • CARE experience in community ARM – Experiments in 1997 on relative yield of paddy field open to SRS and closed control. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Until recently, SRS used to be regarded as undesirable • Still being overexploited • Has been important in rural aquaculture • Presently some SRS being stocked with cultured ones experimentally • Some SRS (specifically predators) should be removed, and others encouraged to thrive • Trials to be undertaken with respect to mixed culture with conventionally cultured ones • Policies formulated and laws made for protection / conservation of SRS • Should be encouraged as a "poor mans balanced diet" • Marketing channel to be streamlined 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New management guidelines, including breeding fish, sanctuaries. • IPM - SRS research-relationship.

<p>Which of the implications identified in our preliminary study are more useful?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The interdependence of the natural productivity and introduced system is of crucial importance for the sustainability of the natural production system. So clear direction and more research should be conducted to check on Biodiversity in fact a comprehensive E/A should be conducted before hand. • Consider and go for holistic approach, integrating all the sectors, i.e. ecological consideration should be there focusing ecosystem functionality. • Access arrangement for the poor should be studied in depth before intervention with SRS 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "Even in intensified rice..." - because of rice based agriculture - insecticide and water sharing • SRS still for poor because have access & affordable • Systems linked • Non-fish important (less so in Bangladesh) • All are important 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aquatic systems tend to be linked.... • Even when aquaculture is well established, SRS are still important. • Even in intensified rice production, some aquatic organisms are important • Non-fish aquatic organisms.... - not so important except as food for animals.
<p>In what form would you like to receive further information that the project produces?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Brochure, leaflets, poster, abstract form, reports, pictorials • Summary for other countries • For professionals – email • (Internet not widely available) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Posters, leaflets, brochures, bulletins • Mass media - TV, radio & newspapers • Electronic media - web-site, e-mail & CD • Seminars, workshops • Journals 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bulletin, Leaflets, Field notes, Posters - Printed materials in local language. • Video (limited availability) • Radio - agricultural programmes
<p>Do you have any questions or clarification about any aspects of the project?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have any need for training • Is the sample – 6 villages x 5 farmers in each country wide enough? Need for review • Policy advocacy – change existing revenue oriented wetland management. • Access arrange for private flood plain ecosystem • Recruitment would only be within the habitat or from source. • Dry season refuge issue. 	<p>None</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How to benefit large numbers of people all over Asia?