

# THE USE OF SLUICE GATES FOR STOCK ENHANCEMENT AND DIVERSIFICATION OF LIVELIHOODS

## Project Summary

---



---

December 2004

The International Institute for Environment and Development (IIED), the Bangladesh Centre for Advanced Studies (BCAS) and the Marine Resources Assessment Group (MRAG).



## CONTENTS

<i>Contents</i>	2
<i>Background to Floodplain Fisheries in Bangladesh</i>	3
<i>Project Purpose</i>	4
<i>Selection of Study Sites</i>	4
<b>The Study Sites</b>	5
<i>Research Tools and Methods</i>	5
<b>Fisheries and Hydrological Assessment</b>	5
<b>Institutional, Economic and Social Issues</b>	6
<i>Research Results</i>	7
<b>Fisheries and Hydrological Assessment</b>	7
Magnitude and Timing of Migrations	7
Species Compositions	8
Timing of Migrations	8
Differences in Recruitment Potential During the Flood and Ebb Periods.	8
Reproductive Strategies of Migrating Fish	9
Passage Success and Factors Affecting Passage Success	9
<b>Institutional, Economic and Social Issues</b>	10
The Economic Role of Fish and Fishing in the Community	10
The Social/Institutional Framework of Fisheries, Farming and Water Control	12
Changing Sluice Gate Operations: Community Hopes and Suggestions	13
<i>Guidelines for Managing Sluice Gates</i>	14
<b>When to Operate Sluice Gates</b>	14
<b>How to Operate Sluice Gates</b>	15
<b>Institutional, Economic and Social Issues</b>	16
<i>Project Documentation</i>	17
<i>Personnel and Acknowledgements</i>	17

## **BACKGROUND TO FLOODPLAIN FISHERIES IN BANGLADESH**

About 77% of the population of Bangladesh live in rural areas, where each person only has an average of 0.15 acres of cultivated land. Poverty is widespread and affects more than 80% of households. Whilst farming dominates the rural economy, it is not the only livelihood activity. Many households have multiple income sources. Fisheries contributed about 6% of the Gross Domestic Product for Bangladesh in 2000 and 12% of export earnings. Many people also fish on an occasional or part-time basis to supplement their income. Many people also fish for subsistence use. Over 70% of all animal protein consumed in Bangladesh is from fish, but most of the population is protein deficient.

Bangladesh has three main rivers systems; the Padma, also known as the Ganges, the Meghna, and the Jamuna/Brahmaputra, and one of the richest and largest floodplain systems in the world. These three river systems drain a total catchment area of about 1.72 million square kilometres. Nearly 90% of Bangladesh is less than 10 metres above sea level. Two thirds of Bangladesh is vulnerable to floods, and each year about 34% of the country is underwater for six months.

The seasonal inundation of the floodplains supports a diverse and productive fishery. Many wild fish species migrate to the floodplain from the main channels to spawn and feed. The construction of embankments, regulators and sluice gates to manage flooding by controlling water levels upon the floodplain has generated benefits to much of the agricultural sector. Farmers in the empoldered areas can now grow several crops of high yield variety rice (and other crops) whereas previously they could only grow a single crop of flood resistant varieties. However, the structures also block fish migration and dispersal routes, reduce wetland areas and increase fish hatchling and larval mortality when passing through sluice gate vents. Valuable white fish (mostly members of the Cyprinidae and Pangasidae families) are affected most. Life is therefore harder for poor rural fishers.

In areas like Tangail, 'fish friendly structures' have been constructed to limit fish hatchling mortality when crossing sluice gates. But it is also recognised that effective operation and management of both normal sluice gates/regulators and fish friendly structures is necessary to ensure equitable distribution of benefits and costs. Water requirements for agriculture and for fisheries are often different. Sluice gates are often managed according to the needs of rice farmers, who often have different interests to those of fishers, who are often the poorest and least powerful stakeholders.

Effective management requires the involvement of all relevant local stakeholders. These include the Ministry of Land, Department of Fisheries, Bangladesh Water Development Board (which builds and operates sluice gates), Department of Agriculture, other government agencies, non-government organisations, local fishers and fisher societies, sluice gate management committees (where they exist) and other local groups. Some challenges to effective management are technical (for example ensuring sluice gates have not silted up). But others might involve reconciling the needs and interests of different stakeholder groups, mitigating water management conflicts and balancing complex social, economic, environmental and technical issues in decision-making processes. Mutual benefits for fishing and farming are possible, particularly in view of the fact that many fishers are also farmers and vice versa.

## **PROJECT PURPOSE**

With these conflicting demands on floodplain water resources, this research project has developed the following set of guidelines on sluice gate management and operation for the benefit of those dependent on rice farming and fish production. Building on knowledge from the two research sites, these guidelines will be useful for sluice gate management throughout Bangladesh. The ultimate aim of the project is to manage water in modified floodplains for the mutual benefit of both rice and fish outputs and thus provide improved, more diverse and secure livelihoods. These guidelines will be disseminated with a view to encouraging their implementation by non-government organisations or government extension workers. They include advice on when and how to operate sluice gates, and an assessment of social and institutional factors that influence decision-making regarding water control, fisheries and rice farming. Participatory research approaches used throughout the project have already led to the uptake of the research results by local communities and institutions. Regular feedback, through community meetings and workshops for government officials ensured integration between different sectoral levels, and recommendations uptake by different stakeholders. Continuing refinement of these guidelines will ensure they are relevant to existing institutional circumstances.

## **SELECTION OF STUDY SITES**

Consultations with a number of key institutions and personnel from major projects in Bangladesh provided an understanding of the general background to sluice gates, water management project and their impacts on floodplain fisheries. A number of documents were collected from relevant sources. Consultation, review of the literature and a joint field visit led to finalization of the two floodplain project sites; Pabna Integrated Rural Development Project (PIRDP) in the Pabna District, and the Compartmentalisation Pilot Project (CPP) in the Tangail District. Site selection criteria included consideration of the following factors:

- Sluice gates are functioning
- Water flows in at least in one direction through the gate
- Connection to major river
- Typical gate sizes/designs (the case study gates at Tangail and Pabna are representative of about 78 % of sluice gates in general in Bangladesh).
- Links with previous research/work at site (to facilitate research activities)
- Sluice gate management committee established (even if it functions badly)
- Some local dependence on fish for subsistence/livelihood needs
- Fishers have some kind of political voice, however small
- Proximity to Dhaka and other sites

<b>Sluice gate name</b>	<b>Bawlakhola</b>	<b>Talimnagar</b>	<b>Jugini</b>
<b>River name</b>	Natuabari Canal	Badai River	Lohajang River
<b>Flood control scheme</b>	Pabna Integrated Rural Development Project (PIRDP)	Pabna Integrated Rural Development Project (PIRDP)	Compartmentalisation Pilot Project (CPP)
<b>District</b>	Pabna	Pabna	Tangail
<b>Gate type</b>	Four undershot gates	Six undershot gates	Three combined overshot and undershot gates and two outer gates operated as 'fish friendly' free surface vents.

## The Study Sites



## RESEARCH TOOLS AND METHODS

### Fisheries and Hydrological Assessment

- **Catch and Effort Monitoring Programme** to: provide information on the timing and direction of fish migrations by species at each sluice gate; provide an estimate of the total number and biomass of fish attempting to and succeeding in migrating through each sluice gate; and determine which species and gears (and their operators) are most impacted by the sluice gates and therefore which would benefit most from improved management and operation.
- **The Mark and Recapture Programme** to: determine the passage success (% of fish passing through the sluice gate) and survival rates of different fish species in relation to different hydrological conditions, particularly velocity and turbulence and sluice gate aperture; provide independent estimates of passage success for comparison with those estimated from the catch and effort monitoring programme; and provide data to generate empirical relationships between velocity

or turbulence and gear catchability. As well as providing information directly for the development of guidelines, these can then be used to estimate (approximately) the total catch of fish taken in front of and behind the sluice gate using data from catch and effort monitoring programme by calibrating the catchability coefficients of gears monitored under different hydrological conditions.

- ***Hydrology and Sluice Gate Monitoring Programme*** to: improve understanding of existing sluice gate operations including timing and extent of openings; provide estimates of water depth, velocity and turbulence, pressure etc. under these different modes of operation; provide a hydrological basis to the interpretation of the seasonality of fish migration patterns; and provide information on water quality changes associated with flood seasonality which may act as stimuli for migratory activities; in conjunction with data generated under the programmes described above, to identify optimal hydrological conditions and sluice gate operations (timing and extent of openings) that maximises fish attraction and passage success through sluice gates, and that minimizes mortality rates.
- ***Length Frequency Data Collection Programme*** to: provide an age basis to the interpretation of fish migration patterns; determine seasonal passage attempts and success through sluice gates by age (and length) groups of fish; and help determine the purpose of migrations through sluice gates.
- ***Reproductive State Monitoring Programme*** to: help determine the purpose of fish migrations through sluice gates; and identify the spawning period of fish migrations through sluice gates.
- ***Depletion of Fish Prior to Sluice Gate Passage*** to assess the significance of capture of migrating fish in rivers and canals connecting flood control drainage and irrigation schemes to the main river channel, which may be more significant than the obstruction of migrations through sluice gates.

### **Institutional, Economic and Social Issues**

- ***Rapid Rural Appraisal*** in about 57 villages to map resources and understand basic village livelihood systems, changing resource use patterns (following sluice gate construction) and institutional involvement in water management.
- ***Household Census*** in six selected study villages to collect enough basic data for conducting the household survey and identify focus group discussion participants. All 1,828 households in these six villages were questioned about age, wealth category, assets mobility, sex, land ownership, and primary, secondary and tertiary employment.
- ***Household Survey*** of 301 respondents from each of the major occupational groups and wealth categories. Information obtained included household level socio-economic issues (e.g. family size, age and gender structure, livelihood and economic activities, and capital assets), changing crop cultivation patterns, fishing and food consumption patterns, household level decision-making mechanisms, and seasonal variation in fishing and subsequent economic impact on livelihoods.
- ***Focus Group Discussions*** (33 conducted) provided information on changing patterns of fishing and crop cultivation, seasonal and temporal variations in resource availability, dependency on fish and problems with fisheries, conflict within the local community in relation to sluice gate operation and views how sluice gate management could enhance natural fish stocks.
- ***Open-Ended Interviews*** to increase understanding of community and institutional level conflict regarding water management decision-making.
- ***Case Study Interviews*** with key informants who have diversified from fishing as their main occupation. This will improve understanding of the reasons for

changing livelihood activities, resultant impacts on livelihoods, dependence on empoldered compartments and adapted livelihood strategies.

- **Observations** of changes in sluice gate operations.
- **Workshops** at village, union and upazila level to share key research findings among participants, obtain feedback and clarification, identify problems with sluice gate operation for those relying on different livelihood activities, identify possible strategies for future sluice gate operation, identify key institutions which should be involved.

## **RESEARCH RESULTS**

### **Fisheries and Hydrological Assessment**

#### **Magnitude and Timing of Migrations**

##### ***Talimnagar Gate***

During the first year of sampling (June-November 2003), about 5t of fish were caught trying to migrate into PIRDP through the Talimnagar sluice gate. These estimates exclude catches from seines, gillnets, traps and other gears whose orientation in relation to the gate is difficult to determine. Total catches including these gears were considerably greater with significant contributions from *Hilsa ilisha*.

Most (about 4t) of this fish catch was caught outside the sluice gate, constituting about 2t migrating passively towards the gate with the rising floodwaters and 2t actively migrating against the ebb as waters drained out of the scheme. The rest (about 1t) was caught inside the flood control scheme divided almost evenly between actively and passively migrating fish.

Active inward migrations against the outflowing water between October and November contributed marginally more (about 2.8t) to the overall catch of inwardly migrating fish compared with passive inward migrations (about 2.3t) caught during the flood period June-September.

During the second year, when sampling was restricted to a much shorter three month period (June-August), about 1t of fish were caught trying to migrate into PIRDP through the gate, most (600kg) of which were caught inside the gate. Most (about 800kg) were migrating passively with the flow of water into PIRDP.

##### ***Bawlakhola***

Fishers at Bawlakhola aimed to take advantage of fish trying to migrate out of PRIDP rather than those trying to migrate in due to site-specific hydrological conditions. However, during the first year, just over 1t of inwardly migrating fish were caught inside PIRDP with three selected gears compared with nearly 3t of fish caught migrating out of the gate.

During the second year, 700kg of inwardly migrating fish were caught, again, almost all inside the gate.

##### ***Jugini***

Fishers at Jugini focussed upon catching fish passively migrating into CPP with the rising floodwaters using nets set inside CPP facing towards the gate. During the first year only 300kg of inwardly migrating fish were caught compared to 500kg in the second year.

Overall, more fish migrated into than out of empoldered areas. The biomasses of passively and actively immigrating fish were approximately equal, but the numbers of fish (potential recruits) were not equal.

### **Species Compositions**

Both passively and actively immigrating fish caught outside the sluice gates were mostly rheophilic whitefish species that typically migrate from the main channel to the floodplains to spawn or feed and then return to the main river during the dry season to avoid the harsh environmental conditions in any remaining floodplain water bodies. These species included *Cirrhinus reba*, *Cirrhinus mrigala*, *Catla catla*, *Hilsa ilisha*, and *Labeo rohita*.

Passively immigrating fish caught by interceptory gears set inside the schemes during the flood season included whitefish and blackfish species. This suggests that passage into the scheme via the sluice gates is possible during this period. But whitefish were often conspicuously absent from catches inside the schemes during the ebb when fish must swim against the flow. This suggests that passage during the ebb flow may be more difficult or impossible for some species. This is consistent with findings from the mark-recapture study.

The proportion of passively immigrating whitefish species caught inside the gate increased significantly at Talimnagar during the second year of sampling when the gate was opened more frequently during the rising flood period.

At Jugini, where the gate remained opened and flow was only in an inward direction, a similar mix of species was caught both inside and outside the gate during both sampling years implying high inward passage success during this period.

### **Timing of Migrations**

The timing of migrations through the sluice gate was assessed using daily catches recorded from liftnets, bagnets and jump traps. This did not take account of changes to fishing effort or gear catchability and therefore provides only an approximate indication of the relative strength of fish migrations with time.

At Talimnagar, catches were not recorded outside the gate until mid July when gears were set. Thereafter, catches increased rapidly, peaking in October as waters began to ebb. Catches inside the gate were recorded from June onwards with peak catches also recorded in October. At Bawlakhola, virtually no fish were caught outside during the rising water period because adverse hydrological conditions meant gears could not be set. Catches taken inside were highly variable with little discernable pattern. Catches at the Jugini gate varied and showed little discernable trend.

### **Differences in Recruitment Potential During the Flood and Ebb Periods.**

Examination of length frequency distributions indicates that fish are significantly larger during the ebb compared to the early flood reflecting rapid growth between these periods. This implies that the passive migration phase is more significant in terms of potentially augmenting the number of recruits to fisheries inside the flood control scheme compared to the active phase.



For example, the mean weight of marbled gobies *Glossogobius giuris* during the early passive migration phase (July) is about 1g (corresponding to a 5cm fish) compared to 8g (for a 10 cm fish) during the active migration phase (October). One tonne of passively migrating fish caught during July would comprise nearly a million individuals, compared to 125,000 individuals during October. Thus, the numbers of fish migrating during the ebb may be 10 times more per unit biomass of fish, than that migrating during early flood season.

### **Reproductive Strategies of Migrating Fish**

Monthly comparisons of the gonadosomatic index indicate that the species selected for sampling tend to spawn during the rising water period, around June or July. This compares well with results for the same and other species reported elsewhere.

Combining available estimates of length at maturity with length frequency data indicates that fish passively migrating into PIRDP via Talimnagar or Bawlakhola during the flood period are both immature and mature individuals. However, by the time water begins to flow out of the scheme, almost all the individuals of sampled species were sexually mature.

### **Passage Success and Factors Affecting Passage Success**

The influence of a wide range of hydrological and sluice gate operational factors on passage success through the three sluice gates was examined. These included sluice gate aperture, current velocity, water pressure, turbulence and volumetric flow.

Passage success into the flood control schemes via the sluice gates varied from less than 5% to 100% at Talimnagar and Bawlakhola, but was consistently above 40% at Jugini where the sluice gates were open throughout the study.

Whilst passage success was positively correlated with sluice gate aperture at both Talimnagar and Bawlakhola, passage success was found to be significantly dependent upon only the flow of water entering the scheme ( $\text{m}^3\text{s}^{-1}$ ) as measured inside the scheme. Passage success was found to increase linearly with increasing flow.

At Jugini, sluice gate aperture was not significant in determining passage success, but the aperture consistently exceeded  $7\text{m}^2$  without considerable variability. It may be that beyond some threshold, sluice gate aperture becomes unimportant, and that other factors such as flow and turbulence become more important.

Passage success at Jugini was significantly dependent only on the turbulence of water measured outside CPP. Passage success increased as turbulence decreased. A similar but not significant trend was also found at Talimnagar.

Marked fish were released twice during the ebb flood at Talimnagar. The results indicate that whilst some fish released inside PIRDP were recaptured, none of those released outside PIRDP were recaptured within seven days and less than 5% were recaptured within three weeks of their release. This suggests that passage success is negligible during the ebb flood when the gates are often fully open and water flow outwards is very high. It is likely that fish cannot swim against the strong outward flow during this period.

Differences in species caught inside and outside the Talimnagar gate support this conclusion. Whilst similar species were caught inside and outside the gate during the rising water period, during the ebb, several whitefish species (that typically return to the main channel during the dry season) caught outside the gate were conspicuously absent from catches inside PIRDP. Similar species were also caught both inside and outside the Bawlakhola and Jugini gates during the rising water period.

Rheophilic whitefish species were more abundant during the first year of sampling compared to the second. This may reflect the greater frequency at which the gate was opened during the first compared to the second year of sampling and/or differences in the duration of the sampling period.

Examination of the sampled size structure of migrating fish suggests that passage success is independent of fish size.

### **Institutional, Economic and Social Issues**

#### **The Economic Role of Fish and Fishing in the Community**

The population of the two study sites is 6,850 in PIRDP and 2,986 in CPP. Village size varies between 943 and 2,060 people. 51.7% of the total population are male. The average household size is 5.7 in PIRDP villages and 5.5 in CPP villages. Both of these figures are larger than the national rural average household size of 4.9.

Respondents identified their own household wealth categories. In the two CPP study villages, 79% of households said they were poor or very poor. In the two PIRDP study villages, 55% of households said they were poor or very poor. Only 1% of households are rich in PIRDP, and only 6% are rich or very rich in CPP. One of the study villages in CPP (Kathua Jugini) has about 160 new families (38% of the total number of households) who migrated here from the Jamuna riverbank area after their land and properties were lost to bank erosion and floods.

The dominant natural capital asset of the villagers is land. Land holding size determines people's wealth and social status. An average of 54% of households in PIRDP study villages are effectively landless. This figure is 68% for CPP villages. Very few households own over 500 decimals of land in any study villages.

Standards of education are low in all study villages. In PIRDP, some 36% of household heads are illiterate and about 21% can only sign their name. However, education is improving, and better literacy levels mean that livelihood opportunities are increasing.

Many householders have multiple livelihoods. These provide income but also reduce household expenses or maintain family and socio-cultural needs. Livelihoods include agriculture (people who cultivate their own land, sharecrop in and out land, mortgage or lease in and out land, cultivate vegetables or work as a wage labourer on land), fishing (full-time, part-time or for subsistence purposes), wage labour, business, vehicle driving/pulling, professional skills, household work, service and other non-agricultural occupations.

Over the last few decades, agricultural productivity has increased as a result of high yield variety rice cultivation, the adoption of modern agricultural technologies, rural infrastructure development, marketing networks and other modern forms of

communication. Irrigation is also common. Before sluice gate construction, the PIRDP beel area was underwater for seven to eight months a year and people cultivated a single rice crop (deep water aman paddy). Crop production was uncertain and floodwater often damaged the aman rice. These days, two or three crops are grown each year (including high yield rice varieties), and many different crop types are cultivated using irrigation. Onions are a particularly important cash crop. In CPP, vegetable cultivation has increased since sluice gate construction, but many other crops are no longer cultivated. High yield rice variety cultivation has increased, thus increasing food security. It is, however, harder to attribute changes in cropping patterns to sluice gate construction.

In PIRDP, the most common primary occupation of household heads is agriculture (at 48.9%) followed by fishing (at 17.5%). In CPP, the most common primary occupation of household heads is agriculture (at 21.8%), with only 7.7% having fishing as their primary occupation. In PIRDP, the most common secondary occupation of household heads is wage labour (30.4%), followed by fishing (29.4%). In CPP, agriculture is also the most common secondary occupation of household heads. Fishing is comparatively less important as secondary occupation.

Some 37% of households sampled in CPP rely on fishing to some degree, and 27% of these rely on fish for 80% to 100% of their family income. The remaining 73% only rely on fishing to provide 20% or less of their total family income. In PIRDP, about 27% of households rely on fishing to some degree for income, and of these, about 22% rely on fishing to provide 80% to 100% of household income.

In PIRDP and CPP villages, crop cultivators, service holders and those involved in business (as their primary household head occupation) have more valuable household assets than other occupational groups such as fishers, wage labourers, rickshaw pullers, household workers and carpenters. Poorer groups (mainly wage labourers, sharecroppers and small farmers) often engaged in fishing for both consumption and livelihood purposes.

Many people have shifted from their traditional livelihoods to new ones. In the past, people were primarily dependent on agriculture, business and fishing in the floodplain. More recently, people have become involved in business, pulling rickshaws, vegetable cultivation etc.

Seasonal variation is also observed, especially where rural livelihoods depend on agricultural activities. However, recent increases in irrigation mean that livelihood insecurity resulting from seasonal changes in demand for agricultural labour is reduced, as crops can be planted almost all year round. Diversification of livelihoods has also helped reduce seasonal vulnerability.

Recent construction of road networks has increased diversification opportunities, as has the installation of a power supply and other development initiatives. Local people felt that since sluice gate construction, income levels are generally higher and poverty has been reduced. Communications development, better marketing systems for agricultural goods, new employment opportunities at national and international levels, introduction of modern agricultural systems, and NGO programmes to eradicate poverty and enhance livelihoods have also all helped improve livelihoods.

Local people felt fishing had decreased in recent years, whereas livelihoods from farming, business, pulling rickshaws or vans, service provision and skilled labour had

increased. Several professional fishers have migrated from villages in the PIRDP area to India, and subsistence fishing is almost redundant for most months in CPP. Many fishers have adopted alternative livelihoods such as pulling rickshaws or running small businesses.

Before sluice gate construction, fishers used larger meshed nets made from cotton thread. These days, fishers use nylon nets with a smaller mesh size. Some of these damage small fish. Dewatering (excavation of ponds and then pumping water out to collect fish) has also increased. This damages brood fish stocks and results in low fish production.

Where the primary occupation of the household head is agriculture or service holder, PIRDP households show the greatest increases in household assets since sluice gate construction (at 69%). Only 10% of these households claimed a decrease in household assets. The assets of households where the primary occupation of the household head is fishing show the largest reductions, except those of housework. In CCP, household assets have increased most where the primary occupation of the household head is business or 'other occupations'. Household assets have decreased most where the primary occupation of the household head is weaving or fishing.

Where the primary occupation of household heads is fishing, dependence on this one source of income tends to be higher than where household heads rely primarily on other livelihood sources. Fishers tend to be very dependent on fishing as their sole income source. This might make them more vulnerable than those who rely primarily on other occupations.

Rice and fish are traditionally the staple food for Bengali people, but households now consume less fish compared to the past. Fewer fish are caught in the open water, and if they can afford it, most people must therefore buy fish to eat from the market. Before sluice gate construction there was a shortage of rice, but this is no longer a problem. People also consume more meat and vegetables than previously.

### **The Social/Institutional Framework of Fisheries, Farming and Water Control**

Sluice gate management committees exist at Talimnagar sluice gate in PIRDP and Jugini sluice gate in CPP. No committee exists at Bawlakhola sluice gate in PIRDP, where farmers send written applications to the Union Chairman, who forwards these to the Upazila Water Development Board office, which instructs the gate operator.

In PIRDP, fishers or farmers sometimes bribe or force the gate operator to open the sluice gate. Powerful local people also create pressure to operate the sluice gate. The gate operator does not always follow decisions made by the Upazila Nirbahi Officer (UNO) who chairs the sluice gate management committee, and who receives written applications for gate operation and chairs a meeting to make decisions on gate operation. A lack of coordination between committees also results in poor water management decision-making. Cooperation within the sluice gate management committee is inadequate and committee members do not supervise gate operation well. Some sluice gate management committee meetings are attended by few of the government committee members. Meetings are hard to get to for some committee members, and travel costs are considerable. Many committee members are overworked and cannot attend all meetings. The committee does not represent all relevant stakeholders, and only has one representative from the farming and one from

the fishing community. The current fisher's representative has been absent for many months.

Bangladesh Water Development Board officials at Tangail usually instruct the Jugini sluice gate operator. Applications from, or consultation with the community on gate operation does not occur.

Many different formal and informal institutions operate in study villages. In CPP, an average of 60% of study village inhabitants were involved in at least one organization. Many households were involved in more than one. In addition, nearly all village households are involved with non-government organisations, which provide credit and savings facilities. About 93% of households received credit and some 7% of households were involved in money saving schemes. Loans are used to construct houses, sink tube wells or raise household income from different livelihood activities.

### **Changing Sluice Gate Operations: Community Hopes and Suggestions**

Local people felt that water management problems resulting from sluice gate operation included: gate operation according to farmers' needs, which reduces fish recruitment and disadvantages fishers; local elites influencing gate operation; individuals benefiting at the expense of farmers and fishers; faulty gates; farmers at different elevations having different water needs; crops in different seasons having different water needs; and local people in different areas having different water needs.

Local people felt that bottlenecks for improved sluice gate management included: poor cooperation within the sluice gate committee; poor coordination of government, community and other stakeholders; inadequate fisher representation on the committee; decision-making without field verification or monitoring; pressure groups influencing gate operation; inadequate gate operation guidelines; unavailability of government officials at key times; no supervision/monitoring of sluice gate management; low local awareness levels; and faulty sluice gate structures.

The most popular suggestion for increasing fish production without damaging rice production included opening the sluice gate during the first tide and early rising floodwater. Other suggestions included: law enforcement, particularly banning spawn and fish fry collection in rivers, dewatering and using fine mesh nets; a government programme releasing fingerlings in the beel; preventing fishing in certain months; banning certain fishing gear; establishing fish sanctuaries; re-excavating rivers, canals and beels to improve water flow and provide permanent water bodies; and controlling use of chemical pesticides and fertilizers.

Suggestions for future institutional involvement included: government implementation of suggested solutions; and involvement of different groups (government and non-government) in sluice gate issues.

Following a successful well-attended Upazila level workshop, the value of an annual general meeting near the sluice gate to discuss when the gate should be opened was recognised.

Additional suggestions by local government officials for improving water management and reducing poverty included: paying more attention to the needs of fishers in sluice gate management; paying less attention to the needs of fishers in sluice gate management; providing alternative livelihood opportunities for fishers if

fishing becomes regulated seasonally; and improved direction and management of the sluice gate management committee.

Communities living outside the empoldered areas have suffered in recent years. These villages are significant in size, with about 18,000 people living outside CPP, and 12,000 in three villages outside CPP. This is more than three times as many people as those living inside the empoldered study areas. Fishers have suffered as perennial water bodies have become seasonal, and as traditional Hindu fishing practices, such as avoiding fishing in certain seasons, and using large mesh sizes also no longer occur. Sluice gate and embankment construction has increased sand deposition which means land is less fertile. It has also reduced rice and jute crop production due to flooding. Such flooding occurs when rising floodwater cannot enter the empoldered area, or when water is suddenly released from the empoldered area. Historically floodwater used to disperse more rapidly into the wider floodplain, but now it stays for longer thus increasing crop damage. Non-scheduled sluice gate operation is also problematic. As is construction of infrastructure such as bridges and culverts, which may also impede water flow, and thus increase flooding. Currently all benefits accrue to those living inside the embankment. The fact that water cannot access the floodplain in the early flood period means that rivers are losing depth due to siltation. This then means that water overflows into nearby villages and fields. Suggestions for improved water management and poverty reduction include: giving people outside the empoldered area more say in sluice gate management; supervision by government and involvement of non-government organisations (for example with implementing development projects) and the army (for example with embankment construction); more regular opening of the sluice gate; new embankments and raised river banks to protect villages from flooding; river dredging and channel construction; plantations on river banks to reduce erosion; and repairing existing embankments and roads.

## **GUIDELINES FOR MANAGING SLUICE GATES**

### **When to Operate Sluice Gates**

Fish try to migrate into such flood control schemes throughout the year. Opportunities to improve recruitment therefore exist all year round, but improved management during the rising flood period compared to the falling ebb period is likely to bring the greatest benefit.

Research has shown that the numbers of fish attempting to migrate through sluice gates into flood control schemes during the early flood may, per unit biomass, be ten times greater than during the ebb.

Fish generally spawn in May-July before the ebb. To maximise recruitment, sluice gates should be operated so fish can enter schemes during the rising flood period before they spawn.

Few (if any) fish can penetrate sluice gates during ebb flow when outflowing current speeds exceed the maximum swimming speeds of most fish. During the early flood however, fish can passively migrate into schemes with in-flowing water and in some cases pass apparently unhindered through sluice gates.

## How to Operate Sluice Gates

Research has also shown that during the rising flood period, sluice gates should be operated in such a manner as to:

- **Maximise the flow of water (volume of water per unit time) into the flood control scheme during the rising flood period.** In effect, managers should try to maximise the transport of water (and therefore fish) through the gates.
- **Maximise the frequency of gate openings.** Fish biodiversity and production benefits from more frequent gate openings, particularly during the rising flood period. Monitoring the catch rates of fishers landing both adult and juvenile fish in the main fish in the main channel may provide a good indication as to when the gates should be opened.
- **Minimise the turbulence of water outside the gate.** Turbulence appears to obstruct the smooth passage of fish through the gate. Advice from hydrologists or engineers should be sought on how best to operate gates to minimise turbulence.
- **Ensure that ebb flow velocities do not exceed the maximum sustainable swimming capacities of fish.** These velocities can be easily calculated from empirical formulae using estimates of the mean length and weight of sampled fish immigrating during the ebb flow period (see Fisheries Assessment and Data Collection Methodologies, MRAG Ltd, April 2003 for method calculation).
- **Try to create ebb flows that attract the most fish towards the sluice gate.** These optimal attraction velocities can be estimated for each species or group of species by plotting estimates of liftnet catch rates against corresponding water velocity sampled during the ebb flow period. Optimal velocities will correspond to the peak catch rates (see Fisheries Assessment and Data Collection Methodologies, MRAG Ltd, April 2003 for method calculation).
- **Control fishing activities along channels connecting the gate to the main rivers.** With more than 50% of fish potentially being caught before they even reach the sluice gates in some cases, controlling fishing activities along channels connecting gates to main rivers may be equally, if not more, important than changing sluice gate operations.

Such interventions might offer a first step towards improving the recruitment of fish that is acceptable to farmers and other stakeholders who might be disadvantaged by increased flows of water into flood control schemes during the rising flood period.

Preventing fishing in channels connecting sluice gates during the early flood period should also benefit the local fishery. Activities during this period exploit sexually immature fish that are still growing rapidly. Reducing the effort during this period could potentially increase the size of spawning stocks thereby improving overall yield, as well as yield-per-recruit both inside and outside flood control schemes. Fishing activity in these channels might be permitted to resume during the ebb flood when (i) passage success through gates into flood control schemes appears insignificant, (ii) most fish have reached sexual maturity, (iii) and seasonal rates of growth have slowed.

## Institutional, Economic and Social Issues

<b>Recommendations</b>	<b>Stakeholder responsible for implementing recommendation</b>
<b>Recommendations for Improved Sluice Gate Management</b>	
Sluice gate management committees should be established where they do not currently exist.	Bangladesh Water Development Board (BWDB), Local Government (Upazila Parishad)
Where sluice gates management committees exist, they need support to ensure they function effectively. Members need encouragement to ensure they actively undertake their responsibilities. This may involve providing funding to cover committee member and meeting costs. Such funds could come from government, which collects rent from leasing out <i>jalmohals</i> and from the water tax.	Ministry of Finance, Ministry of Land (MOL), Ministry of Water Resources and Department of Revenue
Sluice gate management committees may need training to help them function effectively.	BWDB, Department of Fisheries (DOF), Local Government and Engineering Department (LGED), Department of Agricultural Extension (DAE), non-government research organisations
Sluice gate management committees could benefit from more farmer and fisher representatives on them. This could include local people from outside the empoldered areas. The local community should elect such members. Farmer members should represent a range of different areas (and elevations) within (and outside) the flood control area.	BWDB, DAE, Upazila Parishad, LGED and Union Parishad
Each sluice gate management committee needs site-specific guidelines on gate operation. This should include information on gate maintenance and how to monitor gate operations. Guidelines should stipulate how regularly the sluice gate committee should meet, and provide site-specific technical information on aperture, current speed, recommended times of opening etc.	BWDB in consultation with others (including LGED and Union Parishad)
Sluice gate management committees should ensure sluice gates are opened early in the season to allow fish to migrate into the floodplain during the early flood season.	Sluice Gate Management Committees
Maintenance is necessary to ensure gates function effectively. This requires funding, which could come from the Water Tax (if enforced) or another source.	BWDB
The regular Upazila level monthly coordination meetings should incorporate sluice gate management as an agenda item, particularly before the early flood season.	Upazila level government officials
Sluice gate operation needs supervision by a sluice gate management committee member to ensure gates are operated according to agreed principles.	Sluice gate management committee
<b>Recommendations for General Improvements in Water Management</b>	
The Fish Act needs to be implemented/enforced. This includes preventing collection of fish spawn and hatchlings/fry, use of fine mesh nets, and de-watering (pumping out all water from beels/canals/rivers using low lift pumps to facilitate fishing).	DOF and the local Upazila level administration. Coordination may be needed with other Upazila level administration.
Further research on levels of inundation within the empoldered floodplain area may be required to understand which land (and who it belongs to) will be inundated first when flood water rises. This data could come from detailed Global Positioning System data, or from interviews with local people. Such data would	Research orientated non-government organisations, donors.



facilitate a cost-benefit analysis for the entire empoldered floodplain, with a view to ensuring that possible losses of agricultural land are easily offset by gains from fish recruitment. It would also ensure fishers who benefit do not do so at the expense of the poorest farmers (who may rely on low lying land, which gets inundated first).	
Establish fish sanctuaries in the beels and major rivers.	DOF and MOL
Existing sanctuaries may need re-excavation if they have become silted up.	BWDB and MOL
Fishing gear control: prevent use of <i>Bandh Jal</i> in channels connecting the river with the floodplain area. Such fishing gear stretches across the whole channel and catches large quantities of fish, thus preventing them from reaching floodplains.	DOF and Upazila level local administration. Coordination may be needed with other Upazila level administrations.
Stop hatchling collection in channels linking the floodplain with the river, in order to maximise fish recruitment in the floodplain. This may require consideration of alternative livelihoods for fishers relying on hatchling collection in channels.	DOF and local Upazila level local administration. Coordination may be needed with other Upazila level administrations.
Channels to sluice gates may need re-excavation (where siltation has occurred) to ensure water can flow freely to the floodplain.	BWDB
Hold an annual general meeting before the first floodwater comes. Involve local non-government organisations, fishers' societies and all interested local stakeholders in this.	Sluice gate committee/BWDB/Local government

### **PROJECT DOCUMENTATION**

Information contained in this summary is supported by the following documents. These are available on request from project personnel.

- Literature Review, BCAS and IIED, September 2004
- Methodologies for Understanding Institutional, Economic and Social Aspects of Sluice Gate Management, BCAS and IIED, September 2003
- Fisheries Assessment and Data Collection Methodologies, MRAG Ltd, April 2003
- Final Sociological Report, BCAS and IIED, January 2005
- Fisheries Assessment Report, MRAG Ltd, January 2005
- Protocol for Sluice Gate Management, IIED, BCAS and MRAG, January 2005

### **PERSONNEL AND ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

This project was funded by the UK Department for International Development (DFID). The research was conducted by a team from three institutions: The Bangladesh Centre for advanced Studies (BCAS), the International Institute for Environment and Development (IIED) and the Marine Resources Assessment Group (MRAG). Researchers included Mr Sarder Shafiqul Alam (BCAS), Mr Liaquat Ali (BCAS), Shyamal Kanti Barman, Dr Ashley Halls (MRAG), Dr Saleemul Huq (IIED), Monirul Islam, Dr Ian Payne (MRAG) and Dr Hannah Reid (IIED). Field staff included Ms Salina Akhter, Mr Ruhul Amin, Mr Anwar, Mr Alamgir Hossain, Mr Sheik Bella Hossain, Mr Amal Kumar, Mr Nirmal Kunda, Mr Golam Mostafa, Mr Rafiquzzaman (Liton) and Mr Solayman.

The research team would like to thanks the following people for their advice and support: Michael Akester (DANIDA), Professor John Beddington (MRAG), Dr Saleha Begum (Fourth Fisheries Project), Anwal Bhoysan (BWDB), Darrell Deppert (Winrock International), Dr Gerry Gill (ODI), Gertjan de Graaf (NEFISCO), Fazlul

Haque (MACH Project), Sachindra Halder (CNRS), Kazi Hashem (MACH Project), Anisul Islam (CNRS), Monirul Islam (IWM), Zahirul Islam (Fourth Fisheries Project), Erik Keus (DANIDA), Duncan King (DFID), Christophe Magnet (Fourth Fisheries Project), Dr Chris Mees (MRAG), Dr Ainun Nishat (IUCN), Diana Patterson-Fox (MRAG), Dr Atiq Rahman (BCAS), Noorul Amin Talukdar (BWDB), Dr Paul Thompson (ICLARM).