### Prioritising Conservation to Protect 'Wastelands': The curious case of India's Grasslands

Trishant Simlai, Abi Tamim Vanak, Atte Moilanen and Enrico Di Minin





UNIVERSITY OF HELSINKI



### Parochial Conservation

- Focus on Charismatic Species
- Inviolate Protected Areas
- Ignored Ecosystems







# Grasslands

- Covered 25-30% of India
- Hunting Antelope and Racing Cheetahs
- Shaped by Fire and Grazing
- Post Independence: Unproductive Wastelands







### Unique 'Wastelands'

- Support Pastoral Communities
- Endangered and Endemic Wildlife like the Great Indian Bustard
- Under Risk of Rapid Transformation













## Rationale

- No comprehensive conservation policy
- Limited Conservation Investment
- Need for a Prioritisation Approach
- Spatial Conservation Prioritisation (SCP)
- Decision Support for Conservation Action













## Science- Policy- Action Gap

- Rarely leads to planned conservation action
- Decisions driven by administrative constraints
- Complex Socio Economic and Socio Political Systems





#### Objectives

- Develop the first prioritisation assessment for grasslands at the local administrative unit level
- Account for ecological processes along with socio-economic and socio-political processes
- Develop multiple scenarios for flexible decision support







### Planning Region

- Maharashtra- 35 administrative units
- Largest Proportion of Grasslands
- 15% Classified as Wastelands
- Rapid Transformation in the last decade



## Methods

- Species Distribution Modelling
- Pastoral Grazing Layer
- Spatial Threat Layers
- Unique Threat Indexes for each administrative unit
- Government Schemes, Agricultural Intensification, Land Conversion, Political Instability and Conflict
- Example- Integrated Wasteland
  Development Programme, Inter Pastoral
  Conflict



![](_page_8_Picture_8.jpeg)

![](_page_8_Picture_9.jpeg)

![](_page_8_Picture_10.jpeg)

![](_page_8_Picture_11.jpeg)

![](_page_8_Picture_12.jpeg)

#### Prioritisation Process

- Iterative loss minimisation process producing priority rankings by removing features that lead to smallest loss in conservation value
- Scenario 1: Prioritising in and around Protected Areas
- Scenario 2: Prioritising using Spatial Threats
- Scenario 3: Prioritising using the administrative Unit Threat Indexes and Spatial Threats

![](_page_9_Picture_5.jpeg)

![](_page_9_Picture_6.jpeg)

![](_page_9_Picture_7.jpeg)

![](_page_9_Picture_8.jpeg)

![](_page_9_Picture_9.jpeg)

#### Priority Ranking Maps

Simlai et al 2014: Biological Conservation (in review)

![](_page_10_Figure_2.jpeg)

![](_page_10_Figure_3.jpeg)

![](_page_10_Figure_4.jpeg)

#### Results: Top 10% Priority Rankings of Feature Representations

Feature	Scenario 1 PA	Scenario 2 Spatial Threats	Scenario 3 Administrative Threat Index
Grassland	12%	81%	74%
Great Indian Bustard	11%	52%	35%
Lesser Florican	6%	82%	18%
Indian Wolf	13%	58%	55%
All Features	9%	60%	45%

#### Implications

- First such SCP assessment for Grasslands in India
- There will be Trade Offs
- Re-thinking the traditional PA model in the future
- Explore the potential to incorporate qualitative social science data into SCP
- More interdisciplinary approach

![](_page_12_Picture_6.jpeg)

![](_page_12_Picture_7.jpeg)

![](_page_12_Picture_8.jpeg)

![](_page_12_Picture_9.jpeg)

#### ASK ME QUESTIONS!

THANK YOU VERY MUCH

#### Acknowledgements

- SCCS Australia
- Conservation Biology Informatics Group (CBIG) University of Helsinki
- Durrell Institute for Conservation and Ecology
- Ashoka Trust for Research in Ecology and Environment
- Maharashtra State Forest Department