Mangrove Restoration — Community-Led Models That Last

JABASU KNOWLEDGE COMMONS · JABASU.ORG

B practice-note Environment

Published: April 2026 · Last reviewed: —

Mangroves are among the most productive and most threatened ecosystems on Earth. For Odisha's coastal communities and climate future, they perform several functions simultaneously that no other ecosystem or engineered structure can match at equivalent cost:

Storm surge protection: Intact mangrove belts of sufficient width reduce wave energy and storm surge height. Research published on Odisha's mangroves found that intact sanctuary mangroves cut immediate coastal forest damage by more than 30% in storms. During Cyclone Phailin, the National Cyclone Risk Mitigation Project documented reductions of up to 50% in flooding and structural losses in coastal areas with functional mangrove belts compared to equivalent unprotected areas. For a state that has experienced multiple severe cyclones and faces accelerating cyclonic intensity under climate change, this protection function is a direct economic and human safety asset.

Carbon sequestration and blue carbon: Mangroves store carbon at rates 3–5 times higher than tropical terrestrial forests, sequestering carbon both in above-ground biomass and in the deep, oxygen-deprived soils where organic material persists for centuries. This blue carbon value is increasingly recognised in carbon markets, creating a potential revenue stream for communities managing coastal mangroves that did not exist a decade ago.

Fisheries nursery function: Mangrove root systems provide the nursery habitat for the juvenile stages of most commercially important coastal fish and shellfish species. The productive fisheries of Chilika Lake and Odisha's coast depend structurally on the mangrove ecosystem. Communities who fish in coastal waters have a direct economic interest in healthy mangroves — their fish stocks, and therefore their livelihoods, depend on them.

Groundwater and soil stabilisation: Mangroves stabilise shorelines, prevent saline intrusion into agricultural land, and recharge coastal aquifers. The communities living adjacent to degraded mangroves experience shoreline erosion, saltwater incursion into paddy fields, and freshwater scarcity at rates not experienced by communities adjacent to healthy mangrove belts.

Despite this, Odisha's mangroves face persistent pressure. The NIDM Coastal Vulnerability Atlas (2024) identifies nearly 22% of Odisha's 480 km coastline — particularly Kendrapara and Jagatsinghpur — as highly vulnerable to cyclone exposure and salinisation. Aquaculture expansion (illegal gherries that blocked tidal circulation and destroyed seagrass beds at Chilika), illegal timber extraction, and infrastructure development all contributed to mangrove loss in the decades before active restoration began.

The restoration challenge: CEEW's analysis of Odisha's technical restoration potential identifies 8,400 hectares of degraded mangrove area that could be restored. At the current average annual restoration rate, full restoration by 2030 would require a 3.5-fold increase in annual implementation. That scale of increase cannot be achieved through government action alone — it requires community-led restoration at the habitation level.

What the Evidence Says About Mangrove Restoration

Community-planting vs. contractor-planting: the survival rate evidence

This is the most important distinction in mangrove restoration practice, and it is established clearly in the evidence. Government-contracted planting — where a contractor is paid per sapling planted, with limited accountability for survival — consistently produces poor survival rates.

Research on government-contracted mangrove plantation in Odisha's Bhitarkanika landscape documents a 65% survival rate for newly planted saplings under the Forest Department's afforestation programme. Sixty-five percent sounds reasonable until you note that this means 35 out of every 100 saplings planted at significant cost die — and that this 65% figure is for monitored government planting in conditions relatively favourable to mangrove survival.

For contractor-planted mangroves in sites that were not carefully chosen for restoration suitability, where tidal hydrology was not assessed before planting, where there was no community engagement to protect saplings during establishment, survival rates in the global literature fall as low as 10–20%.

Community-planted mangroves in sites chosen by communities who understand the local tidal and soil conditions, planted by community members who then have an ownership interest in the saplings' survival, and monitored and protected by those communities against grazing, harvesting, and storm damage — consistently produce higher survival rates in the evidence. A 2021 World Bank-supported coastal resilience assessment in Odisha found that when communities led their own biodiversity interventions including mangrove planting and conservation, and when alternative income sources reduced dependence on extractive activities, both mangrove restoration outcomes and community livelihoods improved simultaneously.

The mechanism is straightforward: communities who planted the saplings, who understand why the mangroves benefit them, and who have alternative income that reduces the temptation to harvest immature trees, protect their investment. Contractors have no equivalent incentive.

Ecological restoration vs. plantation: the species choice evidence

Not all mangrove restoration is equal. A plantation of fast-growing, easily established species (typically Sonneratia or Avicennia) produces green cover quickly, meets planting targets, and may produce none of the ecosystem functions of a genuinely restored mangrove forest.

Ecological mangrove restoration — which Odisha's Forest Department has specifically adopted in Bhitarkanika through a hydrology-first approach — starts from restoring the tidal water flow that natural mangroves require. By removing obstructions to tidal circulation (illegal bunds, aquaculture embankments) and allowing natural colonisation and regeneration, this technique has helped regenerate 100 hectares of mangroves in just four years in Bhitarkanika — faster and at lower cost than planted restoration, with species composition reflecting the natural assemblage rather than whatever was available in the nursery.

This hydrology-first principle is the most important technical insight for any mangrove restoration programme: before planting anything, assess whether tidal hydrology is functional. If the reason an area is degraded is that tidal water can no longer reach it — because of a road embankment, a bund, or an aquaculture enclosure — planting will fail without addressing the hydrological cause. Restoring tidal flow alone is often sufficient to trigger natural regeneration.

Odisha's Community-Led Restoration Models

The Chilika model: Community protection of restored areas

Chilika Development Authority's restoration of the lake ecosystem — including the removal of 152 sq km of illegal gherries, the excavation of the outer channel to restore salinity, and active community engagement — provides the most documented case study of what community participation in coastal ecosystem restoration produces.

At Chilika, CDA engaged fishing communities as dolphin conservation watchers, bird monitors, and turtle protection volunteers. The community had a direct economic interest in the lake's ecological health — their fishing livelihoods depended on it. This alignment of livelihoods with conservation was the foundation of the community engagement model.

The restoration outcomes are documented: Irrawaddy dolphin numbers increased; fish diversity improved; Olive Ridley turtles resumed daytime nesting after a seven-year hiatus. These are outcomes that contractor-executed restoration alone could not have produced — they required sustained community engagement in protection and monitoring over many years.

The transferable lesson: Community fishing groups, SHGs of fishing households, and gram panchayat institutions in coastal villages adjacent to degraded mangroves have a direct economic interest in restoration. Engaging them as co-implementers — not as labour for hire, but as partners with ownership — produces both better restoration outcomes and sustained protection after saplings reach maturity.

The Bhitarkanika expansion model: Replicating success

Odisha's Forest Department, with CAMPA funding, has achieved documented success in Bhitarkanika. The challenge is replicating this in the 47 km of highly vulnerable coastline outside the national park boundary — in Balasore, Bhadrak, Jagatsinghpur, and Puri districts — where mangroves are more fragmented, communities are more directly dependent on extractive activities, and institutional oversight is weaker.

Research on the drivers of mangrove loss in Bhitarkanika and the Mahanadi delta, using a participatory stakeholder assessment, found that aquaculture expansion and illegal timber extraction were the primary causes — both driven by economic pressure from communities adjacent to the mangroves who lacked alternative income. This finding directly informs what a replication model must include: livelihood diversification alongside restoration.

The Implementation Framework: Five Integrated Steps

Step 1: Site assessment and hydrological analysis

Before any planting, assess the site:

- Is tidal water flow reaching the degraded area? If not, what is blocking it?
- What species naturally occur in adjacent intact mangrove patches? These are the species appropriate for this site.
- What is the current condition of the soil? Compacted soils from aquaculture or agriculture require scarification before planting.
- What human activities currently occur in the site (fishing, firewood collection, grazing)? These will need to be managed as part of the restoration plan.

The Forest Department's DFO for the relevant district is the technical resource for this assessment. CIFOR-ICRAF's Bhitarkanika monitoring programme and CEEW's ecological restoration guidance provide the technical standards.

Step 2: Community mapping and interest identification

Which communities live adjacent to the restoration site? What is their relationship to the mangrove area — do they fish in it, collect timber from it, graze animals in it, or have they had no historic connection? What do they understand about why the mangrove is degraded, and what do they understand about the consequences for their own livelihoods?

A series of community meetings — not to present the restoration plan but to understand the community's relationship with the site — produces the information needed to design the community engagement model and identify the interest groups (fishing households, women's SHGs, panchayat institutions) most likely to be genuine partners.

Step 3: Livelihood integration design

The restoration plan must include alternative livelihood components for households currently dependent on activities that damage the mangrove. This is not a separate programme — it is a necessary component of the restoration programme. Without it, saplings will be harvested as firewood during the lean season, or grazing cattle will destroy them during establishment.

Documented alternative livelihoods for coastal communities adjacent to Odisha mangroves:

- **Mangrove nursery management:** Training community members to maintain nurseries of native mangrove species for both restoration planting and sale to other restoration programmes. Creates income from the restoration process itself.
- **Eco-tourism guiding:** Trained community guides for Bhitarkanika wildlife tours, Chilika dolphin tours, and Olive Ridley turtle-watching programmes. Community-run olive ridley turtle-watching programmes in Odisha already attract thousands of eco-tourists annually, with proceeds supporting local livelihoods and conservation simultaneously.
- **Sustainable fisheries:** Training in fish trap design, net types, and seasonal harvesting protocols that allow fishing to continue at sustainable levels while protecting the mangrove ecosystem.
- **Coir rope making and handicrafts:** Women's SHG enterprises in coir and other non-extractive activities that provide income during periods when fisheries and other coastal activities are restricted.

Step 4: Planting with community ownership

The planting event is often the most visible part of restoration and the least important for long-term outcomes. It matters primarily as a community event that builds ownership — the people who planted the trees are more likely to protect them.

Technical planting guidance:

- Plant at the appropriate intertidal zone for each species — Rhizophora in lower, wetter zones; Avicennia and Aegiceras in mid-intertidal; Ceriops and Bruguiera in higher zones. Species planted in the wrong zone will not survive.
- Collect propagules (seeds and seedlings) from adjacent healthy mangrove patches wherever possible — local genotypes have better establishment rates than nursery stock from distant sources.
- Plant during the post-monsoon period (October–December in Odisha) when tidal conditions are most stable.
- Space at 1–1.5 metre intervals — closer planting creates competition; wider spacing delays canopy closure and increases vulnerability to wave damage.

Step 5: Monitoring and adaptive management

The three years after planting are the most critical for survival. A planted mangrove patch that is not monitored and adaptively managed will lose much of its investment to: wave damage to young saplings in cyclone season; grazing; illegal harvesting; and natural mortality in patches where hydrological conditions were not right.

Monthly monitoring visits by a community committee — walking transects, counting living vs. dead saplings, identifying stressors — produce the data needed to adapt the programme. Adaptive management means: replanting in patches where mortality is high; working with the Forest Department to address illegal harvesting if it is occurring; and reporting on the health of the restored patch to the CAMPA-funded district officer who is the funding accountability point.

Government Scheme Convergence

CAMPA: Compensatory Afforestation funds are the primary government mechanism for mangrove restoration. CAMPA funds are held at the state level and allocated through the State CAMPA authority to district Forest Departments. NGOs can advocate for CAMPA allocations to be used for community-led restoration in specific degraded sites, and can partner with the Forest Department as implementation support organisations.

MGNREGS: Mangrove plantation and protection works are permissible MGNREGS activities in coastal areas. The community mangrove committee can propose worksite selection to the gram panchayat, creating paid employment for community members whose labour produces restoration outcomes. This convergence — CAMPA for materials and technical support, MGNREGS for labour costs — is the most sustainable financing model for large-scale community restoration.

NCRMPP (National Coastal and Riverine Mangrove Protection Programme): A central scheme providing funds for mangrove protection and management in coastal states. Odisha has accessed this funding; NGOs can advocate for its application in specific restoration priorities.

PM-JANMAN for coastal PVTGs: In coastal areas with PVTG communities (Paradip's fishing PVTGs, some Kendrapara communities), PM-JANMAN funds may be applicable for livelihood diversification components of restoration programmes.

Measuring Restoration Success

At 1 year: Sapling survival rate above 70% in planted patches; no evidence of illegal harvesting in the restoration site; at least one community monitoring record.

At 3 years: Canopy closure beginning in planting areas; natural regeneration beginning between planted patches (indicating the hydrological restoration is working); documented reduction in shoreline erosion in monitored transects adjacent

to restored areas; community monitoring committee meeting regularly and maintaining records.

At 5 years: Measurable increase in fish catch from community fishers adjacent to restored areas (this is the most meaningful livelihood indicator, and it takes 3–5 years to materialise as juvenile fish populations respond to improved nursery habitat); biodiversity indicators showing species return (bird surveys, crustacean diversity); ongoing protection without NGO presence required for compliance.

Related Knowledge Commons content: Environment & Climate Sector Primer (Sector 07) · Practice Note: Community Forest Rights — From Title to Conservation · Practice Note: Climate-Resilient Agriculture for Tribal Farmers

Evidence Grade: B — Multi-study. This Practice Note draws on the IJPREMS Bhitarkanika restoration analysis (2025), CEEW's ecological mangrove restoration paper (July 2025), the APRFJ blue carbon and restoration potential study, the Sustainability Journal participatory stakeholder assessment of mangrove loss drivers (2023), World Bank coastal resilience documentation, and official Odisha Forest Department ISFR 2023 data. Last reviewed: April 2026.

Questions or corrections: knowledge@jabasu.org

Published by JaBaSu Trust. For corrections or additions: knowledge@jabasu.org