



The Indian Society of Agricultural Economics

85th Annual Conference

November 11-13, 2025, CCSHAU, Hisar (Haryana)

The Indian Society of Agricultural Economics (ISAE) is pleased to announce its 85th Annual Conference at Hisar, Haryana, from November 11-13, 2025. This Conference is being organised by Chaudhary Charan Singh Haryana Agricultural University (CCSHAU), Hisar, Haryana. Prof. H.R. Sharma, Former Pro Vice-Chancellor of the Central University of Himachal Pradesh, Dharamshala and Former Professor & Head of the Department of Agricultural Economics, Extension Education and Rural Sociology, CSK Himachal Pradesh Agricultural University, Palampur, is the Conference President. Dr. S.K. Pahuja, Dean, College of Agriculture, CCSHAU, will be the Local Organising Secretary of the Conference.

Conference Themes

1. Rural Transformation and Inclusive Development
2. Reimagining Commons and Governance: Pathways to Institutional Innovations
3. WTO, Economic Growth and Environmental Sustainability: Navigating the Intersection

Dates to Remember

- Last date for Paper Submission
July 31, 2025
- Communication from ISAE on the acceptance of the Paper
August 31, 2025

Conference Duration

The Conference will be held for three days, i.e., November 11-13, 2025. As the Conference will start at 9.30 am on 11th November, the delegates and participants are advised to reach Hisar by the evening of 10th November 2025 and schedule their departure in the evening of 13th November or the following day.

Submission of Papers for the 85th Annual Conference

The conference is open to research scholars from both India and abroad. The papers may relate to India at the micro, macro, or regional levels. The papers should be submitted at isaeindia1939@gmail.com. The contributed papers should not exceed 8000 words, including references, tables, graphs and appendices. The papers should follow the current writing style of The Indian Journal of Agricultural Economics (IJAE). For further details, please visit the website <http://www.isaeindia.org>. All papers should include a summary/abstract of not more than 200 words. Based on the recommendations of the Rapporteurs, a decision will be made on the acceptance of the submitted papers for presentation at the conference. As recommended, all accepted papers will be published in the Conference Number of the IJAE either in full length or in the summary form. While the authors are encouraged to submit multiple papers for the Conference, only one full-length paper will be published by any author, either as a first or co-author. The authors must ensure that their papers are original and have been thoroughly checked for plagiarism, and they must give an undertaking while submitting the papers. The authors are solely responsible for any violation with respect to plagiarism.

Dr N.A. Mujumdar Award

The Indian Society of Agricultural Economics (ISAE) gives Dr. N.A. Mujumdar Prize Award to young scholars below 40 years. The Award is given for the best paper on each Conference theme.

ISAE Fellow

The Society awards Fellowships to senior Indian scholars who have made outstanding contributions to the field of agriculture and rural development. A separate call for the Fellowship and complete guidelines for the nominations and details will also be available on our website www.isaeindia.org.

Presentations by Ph.D. Scholars

A special session will be organized for the Ph.D scholars from different Universities/Colleges to showcase their research. An award will be given to the three best Ph.D presentations. It is mandatory for Ph.D. Scholars who present their papers to be a member of the Society. The Ph.D scholars can submit a one-page abstract of their presentation and bring the PowerPoint slides to the Conference Venue. The presentation may be based on their Ph.D. research or any relevant topic pertaining to Agricultural Economics. The abstract should be submitted through e-mail, isaeindia1939@gmail.com by September 30, 2025.

Professor S.S. Johl Award for the Best Ph.D. Thesis in Agricultural Policy

The Society has instituted the Prof. S.S. Johl Award since 2024 to encourage outstanding original research on agricultural policy during doctoral research. The

Award will consist of a Citation. A separate call will be made on this Award, and the details will be uploaded on our website www.isaeindia.org.

D.K. Desai Prize Award

Dr D.K. Desai Award is given annually. The award will be presented during the 85th Annual Conference for the best article published (except the conference papers) in the Indian Journal of Agricultural Economics in 2024.

Dr Anamitra Saha Prize Award

Dr Anamitra Saha Prize Award is given annually. The award will be presented during the 85th Annual Conference for one of the best articles published (except the conference papers) in the Indian Journal of Agricultural Economics in 2024. The preference is given to the article published in the areas of economics of cultivation and farming and the economics of forestry, social forestry and farm forestry.

Dr S.R. Sen Prize Award

This is a biennial award constituted by the Society since 1995. The award is given for the outstanding book published on Agricultural Economics and Rural Development by an Indian author below the age of 45 years. The members are encouraged to nominate the books for this Award.

Professor Ramesh Chandra Agrawal Prize Award

This is also a biennial award. The award is given by the Society for outstanding contributions by Indian scholars in the field of Agricultural Economics. The award will be presented during the 85th Annual Conference of the ISAE. A separate call will be made for this award, and the details will be uploaded to our website.

Travel Grants for Young Scholars

The Society will provide travel grants to the young scholars to encourage them to participate in the 85th Annual Conference at Hisar. Approximately 20 such travel grants will be given, depending on the funds available with the Society. The travel grants will preferably be given to the members of the Society, especially the life members. The details will be uploaded on our website.

Registration Fee Exemption for the Students

The Society will encourage the host institute to exempt the registration fee of a limited number of students to enable them to participate in the 85th Annual Conference at Hisar. The details will be uploaded on our website.

Details for Society's Membership and Fee Payment

The membership fee for the ISAE is as follows:

Life Membership Fee	: Rs. 7500
Annual Membership Fee	: Rs. 1500
Student Membership Fee	: Rs. 1000

The fee may be paid through NEFT/RTGS and the details are given below:

Account Name	: The Indian Society of Agricultural Economics
Account Number	: 54025434745
Bank Name	: State Bank of India
Branch	: M.G. Road, Fort, India
IFSC Code	: SBIN0020634
MICR Code	: 400002467

Please send the scanned payment proof to our email isaeindia1939@gmail.com.

Key Contact Persons for the 85th Annual Conference**President of ISAE**

Prof. Dinesh K. Marothia
Indian Society of Agricultural Economics,
C-104, First Floor, Sadguru Complex I,
Near Vagheshwari, Gen. A.K. Vaidya Marg,
Goregaon (East), Mumbai - 400 063
Email: presidentisae1939@gmail.com

Conference President

Dr. H.R. Sharma
Former Pro Vice-Chancellor
Central University of Himachal Pradesh, Dharamshala &
Former Professor & Head
Department of Agricultural Economics, Extension
Education and Rural Sociology
CSK Himachal Pradesh Agricultural University, Palampur - 176 062
Email: hansrajsharma1955@gmail.com

Local Organizing Secretary

Dr. S.K. Pahuja
Dean, College of Agriculture,
Chaudhary Charan Singh Haryana Agricultural University,
Hisar – 125 004.
Email: dcoag@hau.ac.in

Hon. Secretary and Treasurer

Dr. Kamal Vatta
Professor
Department of Economics and Sociology,
Punjab Agricultural University, Ludhiana – 141 004.
Email: secretary.isae@gmail.com

SUGGESTIVE OUTLINES ON CONFERENCE THEMES FOR POTENTIAL CONTRIBUTORS

THEME I

RURAL TRANSFORMATION AND INCLUSIVE DEVELOPMENT

Rural transformation refers to processes and dynamics of economic, social and political changes and development in rural communities. It encompasses structural changes, occupational diversification, consumption changes, and changes in inter- and intra-community relations and their dynamics, going beyond programmes' driven rural development. It need not always be a positive change accompanying rural development (Majumdar, 2020). Rural transformation can help reduce social inequalities, deprivation and poverty and lead to human development and sustainable well-being (Wang et al., 2023).

Multiple factors determine the pace and pattern of rural transformation. Technology is one of the important determinants of the nature and scale of rural transformation (Biggs et al., 2011). In an agrarian context, rural transformation is also seen as agribusiness development leading to a process of commercialization and industrialization of rural production through 'appropriationism' and 'substitutionism' wherein the former refers to the use of technology to appropriate or extract as many resources as possible like green revolution or artificial insemination in livestock, and the latter (substitutionism) to moving away from a direct and linear dependence on agriculture to utilize alternate means of producing food and fibre like enzymes or other non-cultivated sources of vitamins and protein, e.g. lentils composed from sources other than farm produced pulses. Both processes highlight the increasing role of biotechnology, leading to a process of 'bio-industrialization' (Goodman et al., 1987).

The role of information and communication technology (ICT) in rural transformation is also important as various types of technologies have penetrated rural areas and households, like mobile telephony and internet access, which have far-reaching implications for different dimensions of rural development including gender, education and awareness about health and nutrition. The process of rural transformation can be a pathway to accomplish Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) like the reduction of poverty in all forms, end hunger, achieve food security and improved nutrition; and promote sustainable agriculture; ensure healthy lives and promote well-being for all at all ages; promote sustained, inclusive and sustainable economic growth, full and productive employment and decent work for all and reduce inequality.

The direct and indirect interface of corporate agencies in India's rural and agribusiness sector has implications for various rural stakeholders and issues like incomes, livelihoods, exclusion/inclusion, institutions and sustainability (Dutta, 2019; Singh, 2012; Surabhi, 2021; Sutradhar and Das, 2020). It is essential to ask whether corporate agencies can play a transformational role in people's livelihoods or if they

are only transactional in their operations to leave behind an unchanged condition or worsen the context. The increasing role and engagement of new channels like direct buying agencies, contract farming, online buyers, and private wholesale markets and their implications for facilitating rural transformation need to be understood and documented.

Many studies have shown that collectives like co-operatives and producer companies empower marginalised producers and workers in multiple ways (Shah, 2016; Singh, 2023). The role of these organisations in transforming rural livelihoods, including their negative outcomes for marginal farmers, landless workers and women, needs to be examined (Breman, 1978 and 1990; Ebrahim, 2000; Visaria and Joshi, 2021).

From the perspective of agricultural development and rural transformation, the role of APMC markets assumes significance as these agencies have been around for decades across major states (Krishnamurthy, 2018). The role of these agencies continues to be a live issue of policy and public discourse on agricultural market reforms. The experience of these markets needs assessment as they are hubs of interaction among rural producers, urban buyers and consumers. Similarly, village panchayats and urban local bodies are constitutionally mandated bodies at the local level and have powers in various area of local life and face issues of devolution of funds, functions and functionaries across states with varied degrees of success. In Adivasi areas, the role of state interventions like forest corporations, forest panchayats, and the Forest Rights Act needs to be examined.

Public action in rural economy and society can also impact rural transformation (Bhattarai et al., 2018; Murty and Reddy, 2017), which needs to be assessed for its effectiveness and impact at national and state levels. The role of Civil Society Organisations (CSOs) and other community organisations in facilitating and creating enabling conditions for rural transformation is an equally important area of enquiry. The state has implemented numerous programs and policies like MGNREGA, NRLM, NFSA, and PDS to help the rural poor. There are programmes for economic development like RKVY, PMKSY, DDUGKY, and PMGSY. The impact of such initiatives on rural transformation and their inclusiveness needs to be examined to improve their results. These multi-stakeholder approaches to rural transformation need to be examined more holistically.

Several village studies have been carried out to assess the nature and level of transformation and agrarian changes in rural areas, including the role of urbanisation and migration (Choithani *et al.*, 2021; Judit *et al.*, 2017; Datta et al., 2014; Jodhika 2014; Himanshu *et al.* 2013; Rawal et al. 2008; Rigg, 2006). Agrarian structure determines many aspects of rural transformation, and land is still central to it, though it is not necessarily its ownership (Singh, 2020).

Social transformation issues like gender, caste and marginalised communities and their changing dynamics, including access to resources like credit and other policy support mechanisms, must be assessed for their last mile reach and impact. Despite several interventions, rural development and transformation remain challenging with the continued persistence of social inequalities and agrarian distress.

Given the above context, paper writers under this theme can examine various issues falling under the broad aspects of rural transformation, leading to a comprehensive understanding of the nature and pattern of the ongoing rural transformation in India:

- i. Livelihood diversification and increasing importance of non-farm sources of income; informal and casual employment as drivers of rural income, casualisation of workforce; and an increasing number of pluri-activity households and its implications for the land market.
- ii. Changing dynamics of rural labour market, rural wages, gender, assets creation, household consumption, poverty, vulnerability, and income inequality.
- iii. Changing livelihood strategies and interventions as pathways to rural/agrarian transformation at the village/household level, including changes in agrarian structure, tenancy, interlinked agrarian markets, agrarian distress, and depeseantisation and de-agrarianization.
- iv. Micro/village level studies on the process of livelihoods increasingly becoming de-linked from farming; poverty and inequality from land ownership, and poverty and inequality from occupational diversification.
- v. Diversification of agriculture, including crop and crop-related enterprises, and off-farm diversification, including issues related to part-and full-time farming.
- vi. Drivers of rural transformation including the role of migration, gender and caste; the emergence of rural towns as hubs of employment generation, increased rural connectivity, mechanisation, technology, microfinance, rural banks and skill development initiatives in hastening the process of rural transformation.
- vii. Role of different rural development programs and policies like MGNREGS, NRLM, and NFSA-based PDS in facilitating the ongoing process of rural transformation.
- viii. Comparative analysis and assessment of the ongoing process of rural transformation in India vis-à-vis rural transformation in other developing economies in Asia and Africa.

- ix. Role of community institutions/organisations like FPOs, SHGs, Cooperatives, APMCs, Panchayats and NGOs in rural transformation, and constraints and issues of inclusion in the working of these bodies, including their activities and projects in facilitating or constraining rural transformation.
- x. The nature and extent of participation of households of different categories, including scheduled castes, scheduled tribes, religious minorities, and landless and near landless, in the ongoing process of rural transformation and its impacts on their livelihoods and levels of living.
- xi. The effect of ongoing rural transformation at the national/regional/state/district levels and impact of rural development as measured by quantitative indicators including implications for attaining SDGs.

REFERENCES

- Bhattacharai Madhusudan, P.K. Viswanathan, Rudra N. Mishra & Cynthia Bantilan (eds.) (2018). "Employment Guarantee Programme and Dynamics of Rural Transformation in India: Challenges and Opportunities, Springer,
- Biggs, Stephen, Justice, Scott and Lewis, David (2011). Patterns of rural mechanisation, energy and employment in South Asia: reopening the debate. *Economic and Political Weekly*, XLVI (9), 78-82
- Breman, J (1978). Seasonal migration and co-operative capitalism: The crushing of cane and of labour by the sugar factories of Bardoli, *Economic and Political Weekly*, 13(31/33), 1317-1360.
- Breman, J (1990). Even dogs are better off: The ongoing battle between capital and labour in the cane-fields of Gujarat, *The Journal of Peasant Studies*, 17:4, 546-608,
- Choithani Chetan, Robbin Jan Van Duijne, Jan Nizman (2021). Changing Livelihoods at India's Rural-Urban Transition, *World Development*, 146. 1-17.
- Datta, Amrita, Gerry Rodgers, Janine Rodgers & BKN Singh (2014). Contrasts in Development in Bihar: A Tale of Two Villages, *The Journal of Development Studies*, 50(9) 1197 -1208
- Dutta, S (2019). Capitalist Development and Rural livelihoods, *Economic and Political Weekly* Vol.54 (26-27)June 29.
- Ebrahim, A (2000). Agricultural co-operatives in Gujarat, India: Agents of equity or differentiation? *Development in Practice* 10(2), 178-188.
- Goodman, D, B Sorj and J Wilkinson (1987). *From farming to biotechnology: A theory of agro-industrial development*, Basil Blackwell, Oxford.
- Himanshu, Lanjouw, P. and Murgan R (2013). Nonfarm Diversification, Poverty, Economic Mobility, and Income Inequality: A Case Study in Village India, *Agricultural Economics*, 44, (4-5) 461-473.
- Judit, J., Wichmann, B., and Brent, M. S. (2017). Characterizing Social Networks and their Effects on Income Diversification in Rural Kerala, India, *World Development*, 94,. 375-392.
- Jodhka S.S. (2014). Emergent Ruralities: Revisiting Village Life and Agrarian Change in Haryana, *Economic and Political Weekly*, 49, 26/27, 7-17.
- Krishnamurthy, M (2018). Reconceiving the grain heap: Margins and movements on the market floor, *Contributions to Indian Sociology*, 52(1).

- Majumdar, K (2020). Rural transformation in India: Deagrarianisation and the transition from a farming to a non-farming economy, *Journal of Developing Societies*, 36(20),182-205.
- Murty C S and M S Reddy (2017). AP Licensed Cultivators Act in Retrospect and Prospect, *Journal of Land and Rural Studies*, 5(1), 1-11
- Rawal V, M Swaminathan & Dhar, N S (2008). On Diversification of Rural Incomes: A view from Three Villages of Andhra Pradesh, *The Indian Journal of Labour Economics*, 51 (2), 229–248.
- Rigg, J. (2006). Land, Farming, Livelihood and Poverty: Rethinking the Links in Rural South, *World Development*, 34 (1), 180-202.
- Shah Tushaar (2016). Farmer Producer Companies: Fermenting New Wine for New Bottles, *Economic and Political Weekly*, Vol. 51, No. 8, Feb 20. pp. 15-20.
- Singh, S (2012). New Markets for Smallholders in India. Exclusion, Policy and Mechanisms. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 47(52),
- Singh, S (2020). Ownership versus Control: The changing dynamics of land use in liberalised agricultural context of India, in Mishra and Nayak (eds.) *Land and livelihoods in Neoliberal India*, Singapore: Palgrave Macmillan, chapter 3,,57-70
- Singh, S (2023). (Farmer) Producer Companies in India as New Generation Co-operatives: Case studies of performance and Impact from West Bengal, *Annals of Public and Cooperative Economics*, 94 (35).DOI:10.1111/apce.12436.
- Surabhi, G (2021). Contract Farming in Southern India: Can the state make it beneficial for small farmers? Ph D thesis, MIDS, University of Madras, August.
- Sutradhar R and A Das (2020). Supermarkets and Rural inequality in India: A case study of reliance Fresh, *Intl Jrl of Rural Management*, 16(1), 81-104.
- Visaria, L and H Joshi. 2021. Seasonal sugarcane harvesters of Gujarat: trapped in a cycle of poverty, *Journal of Social and Economic Development* 23(suppl.), 23(7), S113-S130.
- Wang, D., Chen, C., & Findlay, C. (2023). A review of rural transformation studies: Definition, measurement, and indicators. *Journal of Integrative Agriculture*, 22(12), 3568-358

THEME II

REIMAGINING COMMONS AND GOVERNANCE: PATHWAYS TO INSTITUTIONAL INNOVATIONS

Commons, or common-pool resources (CPRs), encompass a diverse array of natural and cultural assets, including lands, forests, water bodies (such as wetlands, streams, rivers, canals, irrigation channels, tanks, and reservoirs), fisheries (both inland and maritime), wildlife, agro-biodiversity, sacred groves and natural sites (including sacred hills, worship places, and mountains), and traditional collective knowledge. These resources have historically been central to sustaining local livelihoods and providing vital ecosystem services across the globe (Jodha, 1986; Singh, 1994; Marothia, 2002, 2024). In particular, communities—especially in India and other developing countries—have traditionally been the primary stewards of these commons. However, over time, challenges such as weak property rights, ineffective institutional frameworks, and the erosion of local governance systems have contributed to the

widespread degradation of these resources, often pushing them into an open-access state.

A key issue in commons research has been the confusion of open-access situations with common-property resources, particularly in light of Garrett Hardin's (1968) concept of the "Tragedy of the Commons." Influenced by this misinterpretation, many scholars and policymakers have proposed privatization or state control as solutions to manage commons. However, resource economists and scholars from diverse disciplines have increasingly challenged this view. They argue that the decline of common-property regimes is not necessarily due to intrinsic flaws in the system but rather the inadequacies in the specification of property rights and institutional frameworks. Instead of dismantling community-based governance systems, reinforcing property rights and institutional structures can enhance the sustainability of commons management (Wantrup & Bishop, 1975; Ostrom, 1990; Bromley, 1989, 1992; Marothia, 2002).

Elinor Ostrom's groundbreaking work on commons and CPRs has significantly shifted the approach to governance. In her 2009 Nobel lecture, Ostrom emphasized that contemporary studies on institutional arrangements for managing CPRs and public goods at various levels, both build on classical economic theory and develop new theories to address issues that do not easily fit within the dichotomy of 'the market' and 'the state.' Researchers are moving away from simplistic models and adopting more nuanced, complex frameworks to tackle the varied challenges faced by contemporary societies. As Ostrom (2010) argues, humans possess intricate motivations, and they create diverse institutional structures—whether private, governmental, or community-based—that operate at multiple levels, yielding positive and negative outcomes (for importance of Contextual Factors in Commons see Edwards and Steins, 1999).

Empirical studies, including those conducted in India, have shown that commons can be managed sustainably under various property regimes—state, common, or private. However, these resources remain susceptible to degradation. Effective resource management often involves a combination of state, community, and private governance, with these regimes intersecting and interacting in complex ways. The primary governance models—state, private, common, and open-access (Bromley, 1989; 1991; 1992; Ostrom, 1990; Gibbs & Bromley, 1989)—have been further elaborated by Townsend and Polley (1995), who emphasized the diverse ways in which natural resource governance is shared among the state, communities, and private groups across different levels of decision-making. Distributed governance, as defined by these scholars, includes external collaborations between governments and local communities and internal arrangements within local institutions or among resource users. The interests and capacities of governments, local communities, and private entities shape the effectiveness and outcomes of resource management (Townsend & Polley, 1995; see Marothia, 2024 for applications of distribution and polycentric governance frameworks in the Indian context).

Historically, agrarian societies relied on strong institutional frameworks to manage natural resources. In India, resources such as land, forests, water, fisheries, wildlife, and agriculture were traditionally viewed as community assets. Research indicates that sustainable management of common property, especially in drought-prone, flood-prone, and forested areas, enabled communities to adapt to environmental challenges. However, in recent decades, the condition of these commons—particularly their size, quality, and governance—has deteriorated. Demographic pressures, rapid industrialization, and urbanization have placed increasing strain on land, forests, and water resources. Additionally, the centralization of governance, along with oligopolistic control over market-driven commons, has weakened the sustainability of these resources and the effectiveness of their governance systems (Gupta, 1986; Jodha, 1986; Marothia, 2002).

Modern agriculture, particularly under private property regimes, has also generated significant negative externalities. Technological advances in farming have distanced agriculture from its natural ecosystems. Inputs such as bio-chemical, biotechnological, and agro-mechanical innovations have disrupted the interconnections between agriculture and ecosystems, often resulting in ecosystem degradation. In adopting a reductionist approach, the field of agricultural economics has tended to overlook the intricate relationships between agriculture and ecosystems—land, water, forests, flora, and fauna—and their intrinsic value.

Reimagining Commons and Governance

Commons must be understood holistically, as they include tangible natural resources like land, water, forests, and wildlife and intangible assets such as human-made resources (e.g., cultural knowledge, digital resources, and even outer space). While tangible commons—such as forests, groundwater, and community lands—are more easily understood, intangible commons, such as traditional knowledge systems associated with these resources, are equally vital. Community spaces, such as temples, sacred groves, and areas used for social, religious, economic, and cultural purposes, also form part of the commons. These spaces are governed by collective norms, which are both traditional and evolving.

The study of the commons requires a paradigm shift. As Peter Linebaugh famously stated, “There is no commons without commoning,” a notion expanded by Johannes Euler: “There is no commoning without commons” (Euler, 2018). This critique urges us to conceptualize commons not merely as resources but through the social processes of “commoning.” Euler challenges Ostrom’s framework by advocating for a broader view of commons beyond just “goods and services,” encouraging a reimagining of economic concerns such as productivity, income, and livelihood within the context of commoning. The roles of technology, finance, and institutions in

restoring and developing degraded commons should also be examined through this broader lens.

The Need for Innovative Governance Institutions for Commoning

A comprehensive review of commons literature by Agrawal, Erbaugh, and Pradhan (2023) identifies three critical areas for future research: (a) a stronger focus on issues of power and equity, (b) applying insights from commons governance to new societal spaces, and (c) advancing causal analysis using large-scale public datasets. These areas provide valuable directions for developing innovative governance frameworks for commons and commoning.

One promising avenue for governance is **community stewardship**, which engages local stakeholders in managing commons through democratic decision-making processes, ensuring sustainable benefits for future generations. This approach is evolving, with ongoing field experiments offering valuable insights into its potential (Foundation for Ecological Security, 2024 documented many cases on community tenure security over commons). Another promising avenue is governance through Panchayati Raj Institutions (PRIs), supported by constitutional amendments and acts such as the Panchayat Extension to Scheduled Areas (PESA) Act (1996) and the Forest Rights Act (FRA, 2006), which provide a robust framework for grassroots natural resource management. While the implementation of FRA has been inconsistent, with a focus on individual forest rights (IFR) rather than community forest rights (CFR), initiatives rooted in the principles of Gram Daan and Gram Swaraj demonstrate promise, as seen in the case of Lekha-Menda in Gadchiroli, Maharashtra.

Themes for Exploration in the Conference

In line with the overarching theme of *Reimagining Commons and Governance: Pathways to Institutional Innovations*, we invite papers that explore the following sub-themes:

1. Dimensions of commoning and implications for commons/common pool resources.
2. Commons, ecosystem services, and the commoning of agri-food systems.
3. Community stewardship and collective action for commons governance.
4. Relevance of institutional arrangements and property rights regimes in managing village, peri-urban, and urban commons.
5. Techno-economic tools and frameworks for commons governance.
6. The role of the state and the market in commoning and commons governance.
7. Commons and livestock development, particularly small ruminants.
8. Commons and biodiversity conservation.

9. Collective traditional ecological knowledge and sustaining commons
10. Commons and the livelihoods of marginalized populations.
11. Commons for sustaining traditional food systems (e.g., tubers, aquatic crops, aromatic and medicinal shrubs and herbs).
12. Sacred commons and ecosystem services derived by traditional/indigenous communities.
13. Rural development programs and common lands (allotment and encroachment issues).
14. Review of national and state land use policy in the context of commons.
15. Common lands and green energy and their impact on livelihoods and populations.

REFERENCES

- Agrawal, Arun, Erbaugh, James, and Pradhan, Nabin (2023). The Commons, *Annual Review of Environment Resources* 2023. 48: 21.1-21.28.
- Bromley DW (1989). Property Relations and Economic Development: The Other Land Reform. *World Development*, 17: 867-77.
- Bromley D W 1991. *Environment and Economy: Property Rights and Public Policy*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Bromley D W (ed.) (1992). *Making the Commons Work*, San Francisco: ICS Press.
- Ciriacy-Wantrup, S V and R C Bishop (1975). Common Property as a Concept in Natural Resources Policy. *Natural Resources Journal*, 15(4): 713-728.
- Edwards, V.M. and N A Steins (1999). A Framework for Analysing Contextual Factors in Common Pool Resource Research. *Journal of Environmental Policy and Planning*, 1: 205-221.
- Euler, Johannes (2018). Conceptualizing the Commons: Moving Beyond the Goods-based Definition by Introducing the Social Practices of Commoning as Vital Determinant, in *Ecological Economics*. 143(2018), pp 10-16.
- Foundation for Ecological Security (FES) (2024). *Our Commons: Celebrating Commoning and Community Stewardship; Commons Convening - Illustrated Report, Collaborating for impact - Pathways from the commons convening 2024 Report*, Anand, Gujarat. Available at FES Website.
- Gibbs, C J N and D W Bromley (1989). Institutional Arrangements for Management of Rural Resources: Common Property Regimes. In Berkes, F. (ed.), *Common Property Resource: Ecology and Community-Based Sustainable Development*, London: Belhaven Press, pp. 22-32.
- Gupta, A K (1986). Socio-ecology of Stress: Why Do Common Property Resource Management Projects Fail? In *Proceedings of the Conference on Common Property Resource Management*, National Research Council, Washington, D.C: National Academy Press, pp. 305-322.
- Jodha, N S (1986). Common Property Resources and Rural Poor in Dry Regions of India, *Economic and Political Weekly*.
- Marothia, D K (2002). (ed.) *Institutionalizing Common Pool Resources*, New Delhi: Concept Publishing Company.
- Marothia, D K (2024). *Multiuse Wetlands Governance- Challenges and Institutional Choices*, London and New York: Routledge

- Ostrom, E (1990). Institutional Arrangements for Resolving the Commons Dilemma: Some Contending Approaches. In B.J. McCay, and J.M. Acheson (eds.), *The Question of the Commons: The Culture and Ecology of Communal Resources*, 2nd ed., Tucson: University of Arizona Press, pp. 250-265.
- Ostrom, E (2010). Beyond Markets and States: Polycentric Governance of Complex Economic Systems. *American Economic Review*, 100: 1-33.
- Singh, K (1994). *Managing Common Pool Resources: Principles and Case Studies*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- Townsend, R E and S G Polley (1995). "Distributed Governance in Fisheries". In Susan Hanna, and Mohan Munasinghe (eds.), *Property Rights and the Environment – Social and Ecological Issues*. The Beijer International Institute of Ecological Economics and the World Bank, Washington, D.C., pp. 33-40.

THEME III

WTO, ECONOMIC GROWTH AND ENVIRONMENTAL SUSTAINABILITY: NAVIGATING THE INTERSECTION

Sustainability issues related to trade and agricultural growth have been intensely debated in the context of climate change and other environmental concerns at various multilateral and regional forums, including the WTO, FAO, and OECD (Bellmann, 2022; Ash & Cox, 2022). Generally, 'sustainability' in agriculture is discussed through the lens of environmental concerns. 'Sustainable Development' emphasises the importance of integrating environmental protection, social equity, and economic prosperity to create a more resilient, equitable, and prosperous future for people and the planet (WTO, 2023). The economic and social dimensions, particularly from a farmer-centric approach, are equally crucial, as highlighted under the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). For instance, SDG 2 aims to end hunger and malnutrition while doubling small-scale farmers' agricultural productivity and income. Agriculture that neglects to protect and enhance rural livelihoods, equity, and social well-being will ultimately be unsustainable. Given the various economic and social challenges faced by poor farmers, such as small landholdings, inadequate institutional infrastructure, and market failures, any reform process aimed at regulating agricultural subsidies must adopt a holistic understanding of 'sustainability', encompassing economic, social, and environmental concerns. Furthermore, sustainability should not be achieved at the expense of farmers' livelihoods or the viability of agriculture (Sharma et al. 2024). In this light, food security and poverty concerns are as critical as soil health and farm returns in pursuing sustainable agriculture.

The WTO provides a multilateral forum where members negotiate legally binding commitments to curtail the flexibilities to provide agricultural subsidies. At the 12th Ministerial Conference (MC12), WTO members declared that they would make progress towards the promotion of sustainable agriculture and food systems, as well as resilient agriculture practices. The sustainability issue related to agriculture has been

discussed in different committees of the WTO in multilateral and plurilateral¹ manner. The Sanitary and Phytosanitary (SPS) Committee discusses issues related to sustainable food systems. Interested members in the Committee on Trade and Environment (CTE) are engaged in plurilateral discussions under Trade and Environmental Sustainability Structured Discussions (TESSD) where, among others, the environmental effects of agriculture subsidies are examined to reduce carbon emissions to achieve climate goals under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) (Bacchus, 2023). Concurrently, the WTO members are negotiating the disciplines on agriculture subsidies under the Committee on Agriculture Special Session (CoASS). The relevant question is how can the multilateral and regional agreements comprehensively facilitate economic, social, and environmental sustainability? The AoA provides detailed provisions on domestic support, and reduction in trade-distorting support is one of the objectives of the reform programme through agriculture negotiations under Article 20. Notably, the preamble of the AoA requires the reform programme to be made equitably and address the issues related to food security and environmental protection. Additionally, it makes the Special and Differential Treatment (S&DT) an integral element of the negotiations.

Some of the pertinent questions that link WTO, Economic Growth and Environmental Sustainability include issues concerning agricultural subsidies, food security, sustainable food systems, Sanitary and Phytosanitary measures, climate change, environment-related trade measures, smallholder inclusivity, domestic and international agricultural policies, and other policy concerns. Disciplining agricultural subsidies is increasingly influenced by climate negotiations, which aim to alleviate environmental concerns. This is evident from the discussions at the WTO, the Conference of Parties (COP), and other multilateral organisations, including the OECD, FAO, UNEP, and G20. Issues related to food security also, to a great extent, influence the debate related to the linkage between the WTO, growth and sustainability. Ensuring food security for the vulnerable section of society is another significant challenge for developing countries, including LDCs. More than 735 million people, or 9.4 per cent of the world's population, are estimated to suffer from hunger in 2023 (FAO, 2024). Given the undernourishment trend, achieving the sustainable development goal (SDG) related to zero hunger by 2030 is difficult. More than 75 developing and least-developed countries at the WTO are demanding a permanent solution to the issue of public stockholding for food security purposes (Sharma and Shajahan, 2024). Despite intense discussions and multifaceted discussions across international forums, there is a substantial divergence among members due to differing national priorities.

In the upshot, many countries, including India, currently face the monumental task of alleviating environmental concerns while safeguarding the needs and interests of poor farmers and addressing the challenges of food insecurity. The thematic sessions

¹WTO plurilateral initiatives are discussions at the WTO in which only a subset of members are participating.

seek to facilitate dialogue on the linkage between the WTO, trade agreements, and agricultural growth to achieve comprehensive sustainability, addressing relevant environmental, social, and economic concerns.

In this backdrop, the session invites papers on the following key questions and other allied topics:

1. How can trade rules be reoriented to address the challenges of global hunger, livelihood security, and climate change?
2. How can we ensure greater cohesion in discussions across parallel multilateral forums on the interlinkage between agriculture, trade and sustainability?
3. What role can research and development in agriculture play in enhancing sustainability, increasing productivity, and ensuring food security?
4. How can agricultural trade rules and policies incentivise innovations in climate-resilient farming techniques and sustainable practices?
5. How can repurposing agricultural subsidies support social, economic and environmental sustainability without adversely affecting food security?
6. How can countries implement policies that promote carbon sequestration in agriculture while balancing trade competitiveness?
7. To what extent can unilateral measures such as EUDR promoting environmental objectives act as disguised trade protectionism? What are the possible impacts of such measures on smallholder agriculture, socioeconomic inclusivity, and mitigating climate change?
8. How can international trade agreements be structured to address the unique vulnerabilities of smallholders and resource-poor farmers while ensuring inclusivity?
9. Should there be binding commitments on environmental sustainability within trade agreements, and if so, how can they be enforced equitably?
10. What are the challenges, opportunities, and likely obligations for developing and least developed countries under the multilateral trade and environment negotiations?
11. What reforms are required to ensure a level playing field for low-income or resource-poor farmers and address developing countries' concerns about inherent imbalances in the AoA?
12. How can countries frame effective domestic policies to ensure food security and balance socio-economic and environmental sustainability? What are the significant factors that can influence such policy-making decisions?
13. How WTO trade related intellectual property rights can affect sustainable use of medicinal flora in south Asia including sourcing, valuation, conservation

and pricing. What are the challenges in preserving community's knowledge of medicinal flora and ensuring equitable benefits to local and marginalized communities under the multilateral trade regime?

REFERENCES

- Ash, K, & Cox, A (2022). Desktop analysis of agricultural subsidies and environmental impacts. <https://iit.adelaide.edu.au/ua/media/1975/wp10-desktop-analysis-ash-and-cox-final-1.pdf>
- Bacchus, J (2023). Sustainability and the WTO Trading System, *Background papers, Trade and Climate Change Workshop*. <https://drive.google.com/file/d/1Fc2Wh3BDT7am9Zmv7laNYAu3YvqdAegY/view?pli=1>
- Bellmann, C (2022). Trade and Sustainability in the Agricultural Sector: Options for Multilateral Trade Cooperation, *Forum on Trade, Environment and the SDGs, Policy Brief*. <https://tessforum.org/latest/trade-and-sustainability-in-the-agricultural-sector-options-for-multilateral-trade-cooperation>
- FAO (2024). The State of Food Security and Nutrition in the World: Financing to end hunger, food insecurity and malnutrition in all its forms. <https://openknowledge.fao.org/server/api/core/bitstreams/d5be2ffc-f191-411c-9fee-bb737411576d/content>
- Sharma, S K, Mathur, P, Shajahan, A A, Ganti, L S, Goswami, A (2024). "WTO negotiations and repurposing agriculture subsidies for a sustainable future". *International Environmental Agreements: Politics, Law and Economics*, Springer, <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s10784-024-09643-z>.
- Sharma, S K, Shajahan, A A, (2024). "WTO and a Permanent Solution for Food Security: Striving for a Hunger-Free World". *Food Security*, Springer, <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s12571-023-01426-9>.
- WTO (2023). Principles guiding the development and implementation of trade-related environmental measures, Submission from the African Group. (G/AG/W/239).
