

# **Workshop on "Status of Common Property Land Resources (CPR-Lands) in Gujarat and Problems of Developing Them"**

Organised by Task Force on Common Property Resources (CPR)

Date: Thursday, July 29, 1999

Time: 10.00 A.M. to 5.30 P.M.

Venue: Gujarat Institute of Development Research (GIDR)  
Gota, Ahmedabab

## **Programme Content of the Workshop**

### **Session I (10.00 A.M. - 10.30 A.M.)**

**Welcome Address :** Dr. Sudershan Iyengar, Director, GIDR & Vice Chairman, Task Force on Common Property Resources.

**Opening Remarks:** Shri S.K. Saiyeed, Settlement Commissioner & Director of Land Records & Chairman, Task Force on Common Property Resources.

**Inauguration:** Dr. P.K. Mishra, Additional Chief Secretary, Revenue Department, Government of Gujarat.

### **Tea Break (10.30 A.M. - 11.00 A.M.)**

### **Session II (11.00 A.M. - 1.00 P.M.)**

#### **Presentation**

1. Studies on Common Property Resources in Gujarat and emerging issues.(Dr. Sudershan Iyengar.)
2. Experiences of NGO's in regeneration activities undertaken for development and management of Common Property Land Resources.

### **Lunch Break (1 (1.00 P.M. - 2.15 P.M.)**

### **Session III (2.15 P.M. - 4.15 P.M.)**

#### **Discussion on Earlier Presentation & Issues.**

Issues:

1. Availability of actual common land (gauchar & revenue) in villages.
2. Extent of encroachment and privatisation of common land.
3. Issues in development of available common lands (gauchar & revenue).

**Tea Break (4.15 P.M. - 4.30 P.M.)**

**Session IV ( 4.30 P.M. - 5.30 P.M.)**

Major Issues, Suggestions and Recommendations.

### **Background information**

Revenue Department of the Government of Gujarat (GoG) appointed a Task Force on Common Property Resources as per Government Resolution no. LND-3999-702-A on 17th March 1999. The Task Force comprised of representatives from the Department, Settlement Commissioner's Office, Gujarat Institute of Development Research (GIDR) and Development Support Centre (DSC). The duration of the Task Force initially was for three months, then further extended for additional six months. The Task Force is to prepare a report on status of land & land use in Gujarat and suggest policy measures for optimum utilisation of Common Property Land Resources (CPLR). The findings and recommendations of the Task force may be useful for working of "Gujarat State Land Use Board" constituted under the Chairmanship of Hon' Chief Minister of Gujarat.

Non Governmental Organisations (NGOs) had done considerable work in development and management of CPLR. To benefit from their experiences Task Force organized a workshop on **29th July 1999**. **The objectives of the workshops were to share the experiences of NGO's and examine problems & prospect in developing CPLR.** The thrust areas for the workshop were :

- a) Types of problems and prospect NGO's face in development of public / common lands (revenue/panchayat);
- b) Types of regeneration activities undertaken with the help of govt. agencies and their success;
- c) Area treated in the common lands under the different government programmes with emphasis on watershed development programme, the issues/ problems involved in it

### **Proceedings**

More than 50 participants belonging to various backgrounds comprising of academic and research institutions, NGO's engaged in the field of CPR

development and government officials participated in the workshop. (A list of participants is appended as Annexure I).

The workshop participants were welcomed by Prof. Sudershan Iyengar, Director, Gujarat Institute of Development Research (GIDR). In his welcome address, Prof Iyengar gave brief outline of GIDR's activities, historic background and efforts on CPR's thematic issue in Gujarat state. He also lauded Shri Anil C. Shah's (*Former Secretary, Rural Development, Government of Gujarat , Former Chief Executive, Aga Khan Rural Support Programme [AKRSP,I] and presently, Chairman, Development Support Centre [DSC]*) efforts on the theme by organising in 1989 "State Level Workshop on CPR" in collaboration with GIDR and thus continued sustained association with the subject.

The opening remarks of the workshop were given by Shri S. K. Saiyed, Settlement Commissioner & Director of Land Records and Chairman, Task Force on Common Property Resources (CPR). In his opening remarks, he stressed the significance of land as a scarce resources, status and size on different categories of common lands in the state and various policy initiatives by the state government such as Formation of Task Force and State Land Use Planning Board under the Chairmanship of Hon' Chief Minister of Gujarat.

The workshop was inaugurated by Dr. P.K. Mishra, Additional Chief Secretary (Revenue Department), Government of Gujarat. Dr. Mishra drew the attention of the participants to concepts and theories of CPLR, circumstances leading to "Tragedy of the Commons" (over use & abuse), needs and identification of strategies to increase the productivity of CPR and recent emerging issues of CPR privatization and their impact on the poor.

Thereafter, Shri Anil. C. Shah, Chairman, Development Support Centre (DSC) was requested by panel to reinforce participants knowledge on CPLR theme. He mentioned about the earlier State Level Workshop on CPLR and number of recommendations emerging from the workshop. He suggested that it shall be useful to review those recommendations and action taken on them by concerned govt. departments. The informal feedback reveals no action by the govt. in the last ten years. He also drew the attention of house that during the last four years, NGO's & GO's have been involved in large scale in the participatory watershed development programme. Most of the NGO's present, were also implementing watershed programme and aware of difficulties in treating common land in watershed programme. The workshop should make specific recommendations for integration of watershed programme & development of CPLR.

The discussions were organised in three sessions.

## Session I

### **Session I was divided into two sections:**

During the first half of this session, Prof. Sudershan Iyengar co-authored by Ms. Nimisha Shukla, presented their paper “*Regeneration and Management of Common Property Land Resources (CPLRS) in India: A review.*” The paper discussed that institutional arrangements facilitating sustainable and controlled use of the Common Property Land Resources (CPLRs) in the rural areas of developing economies for the past many centuries are breaking down fast. The process has impact on the size & status of common land in the villages. The loss of CPLR's institutions apart from declining livelihood support to marginalised landless households, small & marginal farmers has also led to severe ecological degradation of lands. Presently, following four departments- Forest, Revenue, Agriculture and Panchayat are involved in use and regulation of land in the state. However, most of land mass lies with the Revenue Department. Due to the result failure on the part of the state as well as local institutions, two types of major developments have taken place:

- The common property land resources (CPLRs) has turned into open access thereby leading to the "Tragedy of Commons" (over use and abuse), and;
- Land under revenue and forest departments of the state governments and the panchayats is legally and illegally privatised.

Privatization of public land is taking place because the pressure of population in rural areas has increased highly, the regulatory mechanisms have become permissive and the state has taken conscious decisions to distribute uncultivated open access lands to socio-economically weaker households in the villages. Forest department because of its effective presence at the ground level is aware of the nature and extent of encroachments whereas the revenue department does not even have any clear picture about it. There are examples in state, when the productivity of encroached land has improved by first exploiting the ground water facility and then by extending the area under cultivation.

The statistics gathered in the past by the researchers, NGO's working in the field reveals large scale encroachment in the common lands of the village. This when, compared with officials compiled records of encroachment on the Panchayats lands highlights that records are inaccurate to a great extent.

Regeneration activities have taken place with the twin objective of improving the status of the CPLRs and create income earning opportunities for the landless and the poor in the rural area.

Another important regeneration experiment "National Watershed Development Programme" for the last four years is taking place all over the country including the state. The programme calls for the development of both private & public land and water resources within a micro watershed. The initial results are encouraging.

Overall, the experiments being undertaken for the regeneration of the degrade CPLRs in the country are of four types.

- a) Experiments initiated by the forest department, which involve people.
- b) Granting private property rights to poor and landless individuals for crop cultivation.
- c) Using cooperatives as an organisation for development of CPLRs.
- d) Forming people's organisation for the development of CPLRs.

These experiments have shown that the Government agencies, Non Governmental Organisations (NGOs), Co-operatives and Village Level Community organisations that wish to regenerate wastelands should consult all stakeholders before formulating rules and regulation for operation, management and development of CPR. Local consultation, participation, techno-economic support, help and suitable organisational structure may lead to successful regeneration of CPLRs in India.

**The next half of the session was chaired by Shri Apporva Oza. During the second half, NGO's working in the field of CPLR made brief presentation. In all six papers were presented in this session.**

Shri Manubhai Mehta from SavarKundla Taluka Gram Vikas Mandal, in his paper, shared SKGTSM experience in the CPLR development. Due of lack of control mechanisms and negligence by the Revenue Department and Panchayats mainly three type of activities have taken place in CPRs:

- Uncontrolled encroachments on the land
- Soil and Stone mining in the commons
- Regular cutting of valuable species in the common.
- Spread of ganda baval ( prosopis zoriflora)

Also, the amount available under the watershed programme for treatment of both public and private lands are inadequate. Yet, they have able to develop in 4 villages and benefit from it.

Bhartiya Agro Industrial Foundation (BAIF) started with the cattle development programme and slowly by gaining local people confidence entered in the field of common grazing land. BAIF has successfully regenerated the CPR by their WADI, SIDDHI Projects and CPLR development in Watershed programme. The activities mainly undertaken in these projects were horticulture, forestry, nursery etc.

Rajesh Shah's paper "*Common Property Land Resources, in Jambusar Taluka, Bharuch District*" started with brief introduction on status of natural resources profile in Jambusar Taluka and VIKAS earlier efforts in organising poor and accessing CPR. The paper, then outlines VIKAS efforts in mobilizing families of specially set up village co-operative institutions for CPR development to apply to the local officials for the regeneration of common property resources available in their villages. After a prolonged and unstained efforts punctuated by a representation to Mamlatdar, nine organisations of the 79 institutions received about 1150 acres of waste land. VIKAS, then felt the need to collaborate with technical / marketing and financial support organisations. The notable features of VIKAS successful regeneration experiences were:

- Setting of public limited company in 1995, Saline Area Vitalization Enterprise (SAVE) Limited, with specific mission to provide technical and marketing services to VLO's engaged in the development of natural resources and income generation activities. SAVE provides planning and implementation support to village organizations.
- Financial resources were mobilised for the CPR development in these villages after waste land development plans were prepared.
- To make the process of development sustainable and replicable in the long term, credit institutions were linked with the programme realizing their need as well the potential to generate income from waste land.
- Organisational support to the co-operative institutions by setting up of system of collective operations and providing capacity building support for management & operation of the societies.

The paper, at the end sums that VIKAS experience has highlighted the following issues:

- In order to effectively attempt the issue of poverty and regeneration of natural resources, it is necessary to transfer the development rights of CPLR to the organisations of the poor (and not to the individuals). The transfer and development of CPLRs to the poor is a structural issue and hence the villages and Taluka level political structure (in collaboration with local revenue departments) hinders the process. This needs resolution.

- The development of CPLR should be combined with technical and managerial inputs to ensure effective utilisation of natural resources.
- The institutional (banks and FI's) finances must flow towards this kind of development. The FIs will get greater feeling of comfort with ensured technical and managerial support and organisational support.

Apporva Oza's paper "CPLR Issues in Gujarat: *Need for area specific management strategies ?*" and Ashok Gupta's paper "*Common Lands : Indivisibility Become Divisible AKRSP(I)'s Experience in Bharuch and Narmada District* " highlighted AKRSP(I)'s experience in the three districts - Junagadh, Bharuch and Surendranagar and lessons drawn for state CPLR management strategy. The paper points out that with almost similar inputs in all the three districts by AKRSP(I), outcomes have been very different because of the varying socio-economic condition.

The major issues from the three districts were:

- *Role of the state* : In all the 3 districts, the AKRSP(I) had to single handle initiate CPLR activities as support from the Revenue Department and Village & Taluka level Officials in removing the encroachment was negligible.
- *Land Records and Ground Reality*: Land record upgradation is a major issue by itself, since in some cases, even after encroachment is regularized, the land records are not updated. Transparency in land records is almost negligible.
- *Involvement of Panchayat (elected village councils)*: In all the 3 districts, Panchayat leaders are not really interested in conserving their common grazing land. They either participate in encroachment or do not take stand against encroachers or soil mining as they are worried about their re-election prospect. However, recent examples have shown that if capacities are built of panchayat leaders and inputs are provided, greater involvement of Panchayati Raj Institutions (PRIs) may be possible.
- *Low involvement of the underprivileged*: In most decision making processes related to CPLRs, women and poor are not involved or consulted as separate group despite being a primary stakeholders for dependence on CPR.

The paper focused that before deciding strategy for CPR management for any district / region the followings factors need to be considered. This would decide the degree of difficulty in CPLR management and help an external agency in planning their investment and strategy.

- \* Land values / returns from agriculture / agricultural labour rates.
- \* Dependency on CPLR for fodder & fuelwood.

- \* Land distribution status - degree of landless.
- \* Importance of animal husbandry as an occupation.
- \* Degree of heterogeneity- existence of intra-village conflicts.
- \* Existing productivity of CPLRs.
- \* Actual control over the CPLRs - role of traditional / historical leadership.

Trupti Jain's of UNNATI's paper "*Mechanism to Manage the Grazing Land : A proposal*" examines the declining size of the grazing land. It also drew the attention of the participants to the fact that large percentage of grazing lands are encroached. The paper quotes that in Katch, large grazing lands have been transferred for industrial purpose. The author further argues that the present policies of Land Acquisition and Gujarat Panchayat Act are also not favour of people's participation. It mentions by example that the govt. has recently amended Land Acquisition Act and Gujarat Panchayat Act for sale and purchase of lands (both agriculture & non agriculture) in the villages. The amendment notifies that open sites or waste vacant or grazing land in a Panchayat shall be lawful for the state government to acquire for public purpose. The word "Public Purpose" has a very broad definition which includes industry, mining and building residence etc. It is argued that, Gram Panchayat is the lowest constitutional governing institutions and in direct touch with the local needs, should be given power to manage the grazing land. They may be also consulted and consent be obtained before the state government takes decision on the acquisition of land for industrial or other purpose within a village. Her presentation also suggested modalities as how the PRI's can act as an executive arm to manage the grazing land.

VIKSAT's paper "*Working on Panchayat and Revenue Lands: Some Suggestions*" highlighted their experience, involvement and management of revenue and panchayat lands in the villages of Mehsana and Sabarkantha districts of Gujarat. The following suggestion and the major constraints faced were:

- Common lands belonging to the Panchayat are increasingly encroached upon by the influential persons/ groups.
- Revenue lands in ecological fragile zones are allocated for mining in many areas thereby, leading to conflicts between the allottees and the community involved in the NRM.
- Allotment of revenue land, including the fringe revenue lands (borders between two villages) should be done by taking the village Panchayat in confidence.
- Lengthy procedures, highly bureaucratized, time consuming for allotment of rights of waste lands to individuals / co-operative institutions / organisations / co-operatives.



The chairperson, based on brief presentations of NGOs and other papers, noted following issues:

1. Need for clarity in role of the Revenue Department in promotion of the Common Lands
2. Need of area specific approach for the development and management of the Common Property Resources (CPR).
3. Integration of the watershed programme and CPR development.
4. Nature of controlled access in the lands and external support to CPR.
5. Delays due to lengthy legal process in obtaining rights for management and development of CPLR.
6. Need of institutional arrangements for the regeneration, protection and development of CPLR
7. Promotion of horticulture activities in commons to ensure economic benefits for the dependents on CPR and those protecting & developing them.
8. Promoting women's institutions for protection and management of the CPR as their products - fuel and fodder are generally gender specific.

Based on the presentation of NGO's, Dr. Mishra drew the attention of the participants that some of rural land should be reserved for grazing, future expansion and distribution to the poor under different govt. schemes. The nature and definition of CPLR is changing; it no longer has common or open access but restricted access for development and protection. He also raised a very important question that in changed circumstances, what should be role of the Revenue Department & Panchayats, what kind of information's do they needed to perform the roles and kind of institutional arrangements needed to protect CPRs .

## **Session II**

**The next two sessions - discussion on the major issues and recommendations for the future were clubbed together and the session was jointly chaired by Shri Anil C. Shah and Prof. Sudershan Iyengar.**

The session started with the presentation of "*Three Villages- Case Studies*" by the members of Task Force, Prof. Sudeshan Iyengar and Shri Pankaj Kumar. The Task Force had visited three villages: Abhapur Village of Vijaynagar Taluka in Sabarkantha District, Kinara Village of Ranapur Taluka in Ahmedabad District and Nagnesh Village of Limdi Taluka in Surendranagar District. The villages were selected randomly. The Task Force members looked into the village records, had conversation with villagers and govt, officials. The issues which emerged during the visit were:

- There is large difference between the actual land status and the official village records.
- Lack of updating and maintenance of land records in the village. In one of the villages the land records were as much as 100-120 yrs old.
- At the village level, the revenue dept. functioning is very weak.
- Delays or no process in change in land use entry into govt. records due to involvement of various departments - District Land Records, Revenue Department and Taluka Panchayat.
- Large scale encroachment in Revenue & Panchayat lands.
- The rights of lands earlier allocated for the grazing purpose and other public use such as village ponds were transferred for housing, allocated under different govt. programmes without actually bothering for their appropriateness and consulting the local institutions and people.

Thereafter, other NGO's and Govt. Officials from different department were also requested to share their views and examples of successful experiments in regeneration of CPR. Gram Vikas Trust (GVT) - Dwarka, UTTHAN - Ahemdabad, NTGCF - Anand, Sadguru Water Development Foundation - Dahod, Manav Kalyan Trust (MKT)- Khedbrahma, SAARTHI- Panchmahals and Mr. P.P. Rawal from Commissionerate of Rural Development (CRD) shared their experiences.

**All the issues that were discussed were classified into:**

- 1. Status of CPR - lands and issues related to encroachments.**
- 2. Issues related to the development of CPR-lands.**

The workshop considered the follow up on the recommendations of first workshop on CPR - Land held 1989 and found that the action by concerned was yet to completed. The workshop keenly desired a few of the recommendations of the earlier workshop. The recommendations thus, consisted of the those from earlier workshop & new ones.

### **1. Status of CPR-Lands and issues related to encroachments.**

The problems of encroachment on common property land was duly recognised by the researchers, government officials and NGOs. Based on the research findings and the experience of the NGO's, it was agreed that the magnitude of the encroachment was also fairly high jeopardizing the dependence of poor on common land and adversely affecting the scope for wasteland development. It was therefore recommended that:

- a) A clear, and stern message should go from the State Level down to the talati and Gram Panchayat that Government is seriously concerned about the need for protecting the Government lands(including the lands assigned to Panchayats as gauchers) and would take disciplinary action against those found negligent in their duty to protect govt. land. (Action: Revenue Department)
- b) Deterrent Penalty should be introduced on all types of encroachment. (Action: Revenue Department)
- c) Provision should be made to allow the acquisition of private land for housing for the government housing programmes for the poor, if there is insufficient Gaucher/waste land. (Action: Revenue Department)
- d) To reduce disputes and litigation, early action should be taken with regard to the demarcation of Panchayat land boundary. If need be special survey squads should be appointed for the purpose Action: Revenue/ Panchayat Department).
- e) There should be clear cut demarcation of the gauchar land in the villages and it should not be diverted for any other purpose, unless unanimously approved by the Gram Sabha. (Action: Revenue / Panchayat Department).
- f) Update of Land Records and process of change in land use entry in official record should be given immediate priority.
- g) The Government should come out with clear stand on encroachment and evolve single and reliable mechanism to remove the encroachments. Workshop noted with anguish the present legal position that if a Panchayat fails to remove encroachment in the commons, it can be punished but the encroachment would continue!
- h) If the NGO's are working as Project Implementing Agency (PIA) under the Watershed Programme, they along with the Watershed Committee (WC) and Watershed Association (WA) should make a collective effort to remove the encroachment. There should be not attempt at regularisation of encroachment.
- i) The present legal provision to remove encroachment on the Panchayat managed land was with the Taluka Panchayat and Taluka Development Officer. It is observed that the mechanism is inadequate and hence, higher level official, preferably the District Development Officer (DDO) should be empowered by improving policies to remove encroachment in the event of failure on the part of Taluka Panchayat.

- j) Apart from the present mechanism, where total no. of encroachment cases and removed recorded, it was found extremely necessary to monitor how much land was encroached and what use they were put. They should receive at the district level and then forwarded to the state level. It will also be useful to regularly review of the complied situations.
- k) There should be selection criteria and procedures for allocations of common lands of Revenue Departments and Panchayats to industries.

## **2. Issues related to the Development of CPR-Lands:**

With regard to the development of CPR-lands following specific recommendations were made:

- a) The GR of 1-1-1987 concerning allotment of revenue wasteland needs to be reviewed carefully and a modified GR should be brought keeping the following in view: (Action: Secretary , Rural Development)
- The priority of group/VA over the individuals other than IRDP potential beneficiaries;
  - Problem of minimum and maximum allocable land: it was suggested that maximum limit should be removed/increased in the case of group/VA allotment;
  - The maximum possible time should be specified to process the application for the land allotment
  - A checklist should be prepared and published which would contain the information necessary in the processing of application for land allotment
- a) The allottees most of whom would be potential IRDP beneficiaries, should be given benefit of assistance under such schemes of agriculture and horticulture development on allotted lands. DRDAs should be charged with the responsibility of co-ordinating assistance for the development of government land allotted to the poor.(Action: Secretary , Rural Development)
- b) Orientation programme for legislators and Panchayat members should be organised to emphasise the need, relevance and scope for wasteland preservation and development. ( Rural Development/ Panchayat).
- c) There is a need to document different models suiting different agro-climating regions. The State government should encourage and promote documentation of case studies & success stories by both govt. officials, research organisations and NGOs. DSC offered, if the government was willing to source financial support for documentation and would help in identifying them.

- d) State government should prepare and declare a comprehensive perspective plan for proper land use and wastelands development.
- e) Wherever possible, Government Agencies and NGO's should try to identify common villages where CPR - land development projects and watershed programme be integrated. This has been already achieved in Savarkundla (Amreli dist.), Okhamandal (Jamnagar dist.), Bhiloda (Sabarkantha dist.), Jamkondarana (Rajkot dist.), Jambusar (Bharuch dist.) and other places, which should be studied.
- f) Development assistance to the Panchayat by the State Government should depend upon their ability to maintain, protect and develop the CPRs.

## Annexure 1

### List of Participants Who Attended the Workshop on "Problems and Prospects of Development of Common Property Land Resources in Gujarat", July 29, 1999

1. Ms. Shital Lodhia  
Centre for Development Alternatives  
(CFDA)  
Ahmedabad
2. Mr. Rajesh Shah  
VIKAS  
Ahmedabad
3. Prof. D.S. Keer  
Gram Vikas Trust  
Dwarka
4. Mr. Jagdish Pandya  
Manav Kalyan Trust  
Kheroj, Khedbhrama  
Sabarkantha
5. Mr. Ravi Shankar  
N.M. Sadguru Water and Development  
Foundation  
P.O. Box 71  
Dahod
6. Mr. Kaushik Raval  
UTTHAN  
Ahmedabad
7. Ms. Nafisa Barot  
UTTHAN  
Ahmedabad
8. Mr. M.V. Ramachandrudu  
DSC  
Ahmedabad
9. Mr. R.K. Gurjar  
ASC  
Ahmedabad
10. Mr. A.K. Joshi
11. Ms. Pratima Singh
12. Ms. Nimisha Shukla  
Department of Economics  
Gujarat Vidyapith
13. Dr. Amita Shah  
GIDR  
Ahmedabad
14. Chhagan Vaghela  
DSC  
Dhari
15. Ms. Vidya Udayan  
Research Student  
School of Planning  
Ahmedabad
16. Mr. Parsottam N. Vankar  
AKRSP(I)  
Netrang SHT
17. Mr. Mahendra K. Patel  
AKRSP(I)  
Netrang
18. Mr. Manoj Mishra  
AKRSP(I)  
Opp. Raj Sobhag Ashram  
Sayla
19. Mr. Kirti B. Patel  
AKRSP(I)  
Opp. Raj Sobhag Ashram  
Sayla
20. Mr. Dinesh P. Moghariya  
AKRSP(I)

- Opp. Raj Sobhag Ashram  
Sayla
21. Mr. Gautam K. Bhavsar  
BAIF  
Bhavnagar
22. Ms. Trupti Jain  
UNNATI  
Ahmedabad
23. Mr. Sujit Kumar  
VIKSAT  
Ahmedabad
24. Mr. M. Dinesh  
NTGCF, Anand
25. Mr. Giriraj Singh  
SARTHI
26. Mr. Sanjay Prasad, IAS  
Collector  
Gandhinagar
27. Mr. Anil C. Shah  
Chairman, DSC  
Ahmedabad
28. Mr. P.K. Mishra, IAS  
Additional Chief Secretary (Revenue)  
Government of Gujarat  
Gandhinagar
29. Mr. S.K. Saiyed, IAS  
Settlement Commissioner  
Ahmedabad
30. Mr. V.C. Patel, IAS  
Development Commissioner  
Gandhinagar
31. Mr. Pankaj, DSC  
Ahmedabad
32. Mr. P.P. Raval  
Commissionerate of Rural Development  
Gandhinagar
33. Mr. G.K. Shah  
Deputy Director (PIA)  
Gujarat State Land Development  
Corporation  
Gandhinagar
34. Mr. C.S. Ballal, IAS  
DDO  
Surendranagar
35. Mr. R.R. Ghauhan, IAS  
Collector  
Navsari
36. Mr. T.Y. Bhatt  
Deputy Collector (Revenue Inspection)  
Gandhinagar.
37. Mr. M.N. Khalyani  
Deputy Collector (INSP) RIC  
Gandhinagar
38. Prof. R.M. Pandya  
Marag, Chotila
39. Mr. P.B. Patani, IAS  
Collector  
Anand
40. Mr. Vinay Vyas, IAS  
DDO  
Jamnagar
41. Mr. Manubhai Mehta  
Kundla Gram Seva Mandal  
Savarkundla
42. Mr. M.B. Pandya  
Vivekanand Research & Training  
Institute  
Bhavnagar
43. Mr. J.P. Gupta, IAS  
DDO  
Panchamahhal, Godhra
44. Mr. V.S. Patel  
VRTIF  
Mandvi Kutch

45. Mr. B.O. Shah  
Deputy Conservator of Forests  
Gandhinagar
46. Mr. Niraj Joshi  
AKRSP(I)  
Navrangpura  
Ahmedabad
47. Mr. Ashok Kumar Gupta  
AKRSP(I)  
Navrangpura  
Ahmedabad
48. Mr. Apoorva Oza  
AKRSP(I)  
Navrangpura  
Ahmedabad
49. Dr. Czech Conroy  
Natural Resources Institute  
England
50. Mr. Manu Chawda  
BIAF  
Bhavnagar
52. Mr. Nikhilesh  
NTGCF Ltd.  
SHT-Dahod
53. Mr. V.S. Gadhvi , IAS  
Collector  
Ahmedabad
54. Mr. Dilipsinh Chauhan  
Under secretary  
Narmada & W.R. Department
55. Dr. Yashesh Awantaji  
Coordinator (Forestry Programme)  
VIKSAT
56. Prof. Sudarshan Iyengar  
GIDR Ahmedabad