

# INFORM

Information e-bulletin on Participatory Forest Management



## In this issue

Page 2	<b>Viewpoint</b>
Page 3	<b>Headlines</b>
Page 5	<b>Special Article:</b> <i>Implications of existing and proposed community laws in India</i>
Page 11	<b>In Focus:</b> <i>Forest Development Agencies and the Integrated Village Afforestation and Eco-development (Samanvit Gram Vanikaran Samiriddhi) Yojana</i>
Page 13	<b>Profile:</b> <i>Remembering Anil Agarwal</i>
Page 15	<b>Book Review:</b> <i>Branching Out: Joint Forest Management in India</i> <i>By: Nandini Sundar, Roger Jeffery, Neil Thin and others</i>
Page 17	<b>Index</b>
Page 17	<b>In-site</b>
Page 18	<b>On the Move</b>
Page 18	<b>Lookout</b>
Page 18	<b>Feedback</b>

*Published by*



**Resource Unit for Participatory Forestry**  
**Winrock International India**  
[www.rupfor.org](http://www.rupfor.org)

## VIEWPOINTS

We are pleased to present the fourth issue of *Inform* to our readers. It is our constant endeavour to provide relevant and timely information on participatory forestry issues in India in an user-friendly manner. Based on your feedback, we have decided to bring out a printed version of this bulletin (in addition to the existing electronic version) from next issue onwards. We hope that through the printed version, we will be able to reach out to individuals and organisations not having access to email. In case any existing subscriber (of electronic version) wishes to receive the printed version also, please email us at our contact address.

We pay our sincere homage to Anil Agarwal, founder of the Centre for Science and Environment (CSE) and the environment magazine *Down to Earth*. With the death of Anil Agarwal, India has lost its foremost environmental campaigner, who will always be remembered for his conviction and tenacity in pursuing the environmental agenda against all odds, including serious personal illness. Dr Jayanta Bandopadhyay, Professor at IIM, Calcutta, and Anil's contemporary student at IIT-Kanpur profiles the work of Anil Agarwal in the [Profile](#) section.

It is now widely recognised that local communities can play a key role in conserving and managing forest resources. There are estimated 10,000 community forests protection groups in Orissa alone. There are ongoing debates on the best way of recognising such community initiatives without destroying them by imposing inflexible, formal structures. In this issue's [Special Article](#) Neema Pathak of Kalpavriksh examines the existing legal spaces for recognising community efforts in forest conservation and management.

In our last issue, we mentioned the proposed National Afforestation Programme of the National Afforestation and Ecodevelopment Board (NAEB), Ministry of Environment and Forests (MoEF). In our [In Focus](#) section in this issue, we present more details of this pilot programme running for the past two years under the name *Integrated Village Afforestation and Eco-development Scheme*. This scheme reflects a fundamental shift in the Central Government's approach towards forestry projects. Unlike in the past, this scheme is neither centrally-assisted nor sponsored, but a *Central Sector* scheme under which funds will flow directly from the Central Government to the implementing agency (Forest Development Agency), thus *bypassing* the state government. It appears that this scheme is partly in response to the tree cover target set by the National Development Council (25% by the end of the Tenth Plan and 33% by the Eleventh, i.e., 2112).

We hope you will like this issue. We look forward to your feedback. Best wishes for a joyful and successful 2002.

**Sushil Saigal, Co-ordinator - RUPFOR**  
**Mamta Borgoyary, Editor - INFORM**

[TOP^](#)

## HEADLINES

### (Current news on participatory forestry)

- **Environmentalist Anil Agarwal passes away**

Anil Agarwal, 54, Chairperson of the New Delhi based Centre for Science and Environment (CSE), passed away in Dehradun on January 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2001 after a prolonged illness. The Indian government has honored Mr. Agarwal with the Padma Shri and Padma Bhushan for his work in environment and development.

See [Profile](#) "Remembering Anil" by Dr Jayanta Bandopadhyay.

- **Draft grazing policy prepared by Andhra Pradesh**

The Andhra Pradesh Forest Department has prepared a draft grazing policy with the objective to regulate grazing on forestlands. The grazing fee and regulatory framework abolished during the severe drought of 1968 has been reintroduced through this policy. For the purposes of grazing, forests will be classified into two categories: (1) interior protection forests where grazing will be strictly prohibited, and (2) open forests where grazing will be allowed for a fee. Tribals living within forests have been exempted from grazing fee. The open forests shall be divided into three paddocks and these paddocks shall be closed for four successive months in a year. To ensure that each paddock gets the advantage of the rainy season, a system of rotational closure of different periods is indicated. The grazing incidence will be limited to half hectare (two acres) per cow unit. Only livestock from villages within 5 km of forest boundary will be allowed to enter the forest for grazing. Migratory cattle will be allowed, subject to several restrictions. The entry of goats is proposed to be banned except up to a maximum of four goats as leaders for sheep. Chairmen of *Van Samarakshan Samitis* have been authorised to issue grazing permits. The draft policy has been criticised by a group of NGOs and activists working under the banner of *The Fodder and Grazing Forum*, Hyderabad.

- **AusAid planning Sustainable Rural Livelihoods Project in Himachal Pradesh**

Australian aid agency AusAid is planning to support a sustainable rural livelihood project in the Rampur block of Shimla district. The main objectives of the project are (1) capacity development of local communities to help diversify and expand their livelihood strategies, and (2) natural resource stabilisation and establishment of sustainable management practices leading to livelihood opportunities. The project will be implemented over a 15 year period and split into phases. The approximate annual investment in the first phase is likely to be around Rs 77 million.

- **Meeting of JFM nodal officers held in Delhi**

A meeting of JFM nodal officers of various state Forest Departments was held in New Delhi on December 5, 2001. The current status of JFM in the country and various emerging issues were discussed. Representatives from 19 state Forest Departments and officials from the Ministry of Environment and Forests (MoEF) participated in this one-day meeting.

[TOP^](#)

- **Uttaranchal approves revised JFM Rules**

The Government of Uttaranchal recently approved the revised JFM rules (*Uttaranchal JFM Rules 2001*) for the state. These are likely to be notified soon.

- **Campaign for participatory forest management in Karnataka**

A group of NGOs, NGO networks, and Centre for Interdisciplinary Study in Environment and Development (CISED, Bangalore) have launched a "Campaign for Participatory Forest Management in Karnataka" for promoting "a truly participatory, widely acceptable, sustainable, equitable and economically viable model of forest management". Expressing dissatisfaction with the implementation of the current JFM program in Karnataka, the campaigners have proposed an alternative model. The details of the proposed approach are available on the website: [www.envirodebate.org/new4m/jfm/index.php/pfmk2](http://www.envirodebate.org/new4m/jfm/index.php/pfmk2)

- **Kerala issues a separate order for NTFP management**

The Government of Kerala has issued a special order (*G.O. (Rt) No. 40/2001/F&WLD (G) Department, dated February 2, 2001*) for the management of non-timber forest produce (NTFP) by tribal communities. Under this order, tribal Forest Protection Committees (FPCs) are to be constituted at the hamlet level. Interestingly, the area of operation of these committees has been kept as "area traditionally foraged by the inhabitants of the tribal hamlet". There is a provision to constitute a credibility fund (@Rs 3,000/ FPC member) and a core fund. The credibility fund is to be used by the FPC as a revolving fund for various NTFP related activities.

- **Van Panchayat workshop held in Haldwani**

A two-day workshop on forest conservation and the role of people's participation was organised by the Uttaranchal Forest Department on 8 and 9 December 2001 at the Forest and Van Panchayat Training Institute in Haldwani. The Hon. State Minister for Environment & Forests of Uttaranchal, Shri. Mohan Singh Rawat Gaonwasi was the Chief Guest for this workshop and presided over the event. The workshop brought together top forest officials of the state and local members of Forest Protection Committees and Van Panchayats, face to face on a common platform thereby enabling a free and frank exchange of opinions and ideas on forest management. The key issues discussed were the new Van Panchayat Rules, potential JFM-Van Panchayat conflicts, sustainability of the programme etc.

[TOP^](#)

## SPECIAL ARTICLE

### **Implications of Existing and Proposed Laws and Policies on Community Forestry Initiatives in India**

(Contributed by Neema Pathak, Kalpavriksh, Apt. No 5, Shri Dutta Krupa, 908, Deccan Gymkhana, Pune 411004, telefax: 020-5654239, E-mail: kvriksh@vsnl.com)

#### **Introduction**

The last few years have shown a greater acceptance of local communities' efforts at forest conservation and management. It is also becoming clearer now that these local efforts at conservation, regeneration and/or management have continued for generations against all odds and are practised for a variety of reasons. These could range from countering depletion of life sustaining resources and maintaining watersheds to seeking ecological benefits, conservation of wildlife and biodiversity and or religious/cultural sentiments. Local institutions, which used to achieve these objectives, are also diverse; these could either be traditional or revived structures, or sometimes even completely new ones. One common thread in these efforts is that their roots lie in traditional knowledge systems and experiences. The mechanisms and approaches followed are locale specific, based on the nature and character of the residing human society, surrounding natural resources, nature of interaction between the two, and other internal and external factors influencing the community and the resource. The strength of these systems lies in the social rules that they follow and local systems of conflict that they adopt.

[TOP^](#)

In many community conserved areas (though definitely not all) villagers have indicated and often demanded that management of resources is a joint activity of the communities and government officials or NGOs. Communities often do realise the difficulty of managing natural resources on their own, especially given the internal and external social dynamics and political and commercial forces. Even where they do not envisage any direct collaboration with government agencies, they do desire and often need some legal recognition of their efforts.

#### **How legal recognition can promote community initiatives!**

- Villagers in Mendha-Lekha of Maharashtra have been conserving the surrounding forests for more than two decades. They tried to influence other villages to be involved in the efforts. Surrounding villagers kept seeing their action as an act of rebellion and anti-establishment. However, after the village became a part of the official Joint Forest management program, government agencies started using Mendha as an example to spread the message in the surrounding village, the villagers' effort gained valuable local recognition.
- In Bhaonta-Kolyala, Rajasthan, social rules and sanctions have worked fine to regulate the use of resources within the village. However, the villagers get into serious conflicts while trying to regulate use by surrounding villagers. Some kind of legal authority in this case could help them protect their forests better.
- Villagers in Botha village in Buldhana district of Maharashtra are protecting their forests under a Joint Forest Management agreement. However, while discharging their duties against politically influential outsiders they got involved in legal cases. A lack of legal protection against such situations has caused serious hardships to the village community leading to a dampening of enthusiasm towards conservation.



For the last two centuries, community efforts at forest management have remained invisible to legal policy makers and implementers. Forest management and conservation laws and policies adopted by the country have reflected the colonial attitude of distrust of “colonised masses” hence a deliberate alienation of local people from the rights and responsibilities over their surrounding resources. This trend of ignoring the needs and aspirations of local residents in the conventional forest management practices has continued even after independence.

However, recent years have seen a slight shift away from top down policies, and efforts have been made to devolve powers to actual, local users of the forests. Despite these changes the actual devolution on ground has not been achieved to the extent that it should have been. The following section is a short analysis of what legal provision exist in the country to support community initiatives, how complementary or contradictory are they to the community efforts and what steps could be taken to provide better support.

### **Legal initiatives to support community forestry**

According to many activists and researchers, one of the best provisions if used in its right spirit, for devolving the power of forest management and sustainable use, is in the Indian Forest Act (1927). This Act, along with other forest categories, has a provision for Village Forests (section 28) where the government can hand over a patch of forest to the local community for use and management. This provision, however, has rarely been used in the country as yet. Many Reserved Forests where the communities are conserving the resources could be ascribed this category to provide long-term tenure security to the conserving community.

The National Forest Policy of 1988 clearly specifies meeting the livelihood of local people as one of its major objectives, placing it above industrial and commercial needs. It also emphasises the need for devising participatory mechanisms (including participation of women) to meet the above objective. This policy was translated into action by starting the JFM programme in 1990, which has subsequently been adopted by about 27 states in the country. Official figures indicate that millions of hectares of forests are being regenerated in the country as part of this programme. In response to criticism and dissatisfaction from implementation point of view, the MoEF issued guidelines in February 2000.

Another interesting, albeit under-utilised, provision is under the Environment Protection Act 1986. This specifically pertains to areas faced with industrial or commercial threats. Under this Act, certain areas can be declared as Ecologically Sensitive (ESA). Ascribing to this category restricts the access of certain kinds of industry to the area. Local communities for lack of awareness and clarity have not used this provision much.

In 1996, the 73rd amendment in the Constitution was brought about and the Panchayat Raj Act of 1991 was extended to the Schedule V (tribal dominated) areas. This Act emphasise a more decentralised system of governance by giving more decision making powers to the rural local level institutional bodies, like the *panchayats* and the *gram sabhas*. Panchayati Raj (Extension to Scheduled Areas) Act or PESA as it is popularly called is a revolutionary Act. It confers ownership and decision-making rights over the

[TOP^](#)

NTFPs to local institutions. The Act also mandates consultation with local communities regarding many developmental and other issues such as land alienation. Though a powerful Act, the political will to implement it is clearly very low. In most states the state governments, going against the spirit of the Act, have excluded the most valuable of NTFP from being conferred on the village communities. Nationalised forests and legally protected areas have also been excluded from the jurisdiction of the Act. While little effort has been made to explain or implement the provisions of the Act on ground the government is proposing to amend Schedule V of the constitution itself to open up tribal areas for commercial exploitation.

India is a signatory to Convention on the Biological Diversity (CBD), whose section 8j clearly specifies that indigenous communities and their knowledge and practices related to conservation need to be safeguarded and that the communities themselves need to be involved in the management practices. It also specifies that benefits derived from such knowledge and practices should be shared equitably with the holders of the same. Section 10c of CBD states that in any forest use activity, local customary sustainable practices should be encouraged and protected. However, encouragement and protection of sustainable traditional practices of the communities is only possible if they are allowed to interact (for both use and management) with the surrounding resources, and circumstances are created for them to be able to continue or revive such practices. The need is to identify areas where sustainable new or customary practices are used by communities for conservation of biodiversity and wildlife, as this will help the implementation of the provisions of the CBD just mentioned.

As a follow up to CBD, India has proposed the Biological Diversity Act, which is soon to be tabled in the Parliament. This Act also emphasises the participation of local communities in decisions regarding conservation and use of biodiversity. It provides for the declaration of Biodiversity Heritage Sites, which has been advocated as a category that can be used by the communities involved in domestic or wild biodiversity conservation. As of now there is no clear definition or any guidelines for this category. However, once the Act is passed it is expected that detailed rules or guidelines will be formulated to enact its provisions.

One Act that has caused the highest degree of conflicts between the administration and the local communities so far has been the Wildlife Protection Act of 1972. In its present form the Act provides for two categories of protected areas (PAs) for wildlife conservation: National Parks (NP) and wild life sanctuaries (WLS). Both have been misinterpreted as strict categories (though NP is stricter than WLS) not tolerating any kind of local human presence, use or responsibility. If positively interpreted, the Act provides spaces to involve local communities in the management of WLS but a distrust and negative interaction for generations between the local people and the PA authorities has remained unexplored. In recent years, there have been some participatory programmes in the periphery of PAs; however, these programmes have also concentrated on diverting the human pressures from the PAs instead of empowering the communities for their support in conservation.

A lesson towards creating stakes for local people in the management of PAs can be learnt from the participatory approaches that other countries in the region such as

[TOP^](#)

Nepal have followed. In Nepal, under a common national law certain areas are declared conservation areas. Each conservation area has a separate set of specific rules and regulations for its management with the local people, depending on local situations.

There are many examples within the country where local communities have directly shown their interest in biodiversity conservation. Chakrashila in Assam is a legally protected area declared so on the insistence of the local people for the protection of the endangered Golden Langur. Local youth among predominantly hunting tribals in parts of Manipur have imposed a moratorium on killing of endangered species such as the Sangai. The well-known Bishnoi community in Punjab and Rajasthan protect wildlife in areas that they inhabit. Local communities in Uttaranchal and Rajasthan have fought a strong mining lobby to protect the surrounding ecosystem even as the official agencies failed to do so.

This is not to say that all areas can necessarily be managed with or by the communities. There definitely is a need for completely inviolate zones for conservation. However, identification of these zones and management practices, must be encouraged. There is a need for the Act to be used in a way that it supports and encourages positive initiatives wherever relevant and fights negative forces where needed, rather than applying its provisions uniformly all over the country. PAs have so far been excluded from all devolutionary legislation such as the JFM programmes and PESA.

A proposed amendment to the Wild Life Protection Act is currently under consideration. This amendment will include two new categories of PAs, namely Conservation Reserves and Community Conserved, in which community participation in wildlife and biodiversity conservation is envisaged. However, there are no clear guidelines as to what kinds of areas can be declared Community Reserves? Who can declare them and how? What will it mean to declare an area a CR? What will be the management and control regime for these reserves and how they will function? Given such ambiguity, the communities and those who work with them continue to be confused and sceptical about these proposed categories.

Finally, there are various states, which for example have passed regulations, rules or laws to support community conservation initiatives. The Asha Van, a traditional system of forest management among the Jamatia tribe in Tripura, which is recognised by the government. Anchal Van in Arunachal Pradesh also practices traditional systems of forest management and is recognised by the state.

It is clear that there are enough spaces in the existing legislation to provide stronger teeth to community forestry efforts. However, it is not enough to have legal provisions only; the way they are interpreted and implemented is equally, if not more, important. There are numerous examples where external legal or administrative intervention has actually resulted in the breakdown of a well-functioning community effort. For example, in Buldhana district in Maharashtra successful JFM was initiated by a forest officer in some villages, which led to the regeneration of highly degraded resources in the area. Subsequently part of the area under JFM came under a newly formed wildlife sanctuary



(Gyanganga Sanctuary), consequently the restrictive provisions of the law applicable for a legally protected area. The people's effort at conservation and the strong local institution were discounted and became officially defunct overnight creating a serious conflict situation.

#### **How self-initiated institutions become defunct when legalised?**

- In Kailadevi Sanctuary local people formed *van suraksha samitis* (VSS) for natural resource management. Subsequently, these VSS became a part of the eco-development scheme for the area. The situation now is very different, whereas in the past these VSS had numerous meetings as and when needed. Now many months pass by before a single meeting is held because the concerned officials are not in position to attend (Das pers. comm. 2000).
- Twelve villages in Karnataka were managing surrounding ecosystems for over fifty years under the Forest Village Panchayat rules established by the then government. In 1970, after the state-controlled Reserves Forests were completely exhausted of timber because of excessive harvesting, the government contracted out well-stocked forests under community control to the contractors. It took 20 years for the villagers to fight against the government and reclaim what was rightfully theirs. In the meantime, while most villagers surrendered forests under their control to avoid the harassment of a legal case, others lost interest in conservation and management. Today forest management continues only in Halkar village.

Another very good example is the manner in which JFM is being implemented in certain states, creating conflict situations between local communities, forest department, NGOs and other state agencies. While JFM has been successful in some states in others it is impinging upon the existing systems of community forestry. In Uttaranchal about 10 percent of forest area is under the control of the local villagers managed by Van Panchayats, which were established under the Van Panchayat Act of 1931. The land under the Van Panchayats could legally belong to the Forest Department, the Revenue Department or could be a community owned land. Although many Van Panchayats are in need of a serious overhaul and evaluation, many others are still very effectively managing their forests and sharing benefits with the village communities.

Since JFM is a programme implemented by the Forest Department, the collaborating government agency by default becomes the forest department irrespective of the legal status of the land. It's not surprising therefore that in states such as Orissa, Uttaranchal and others where the tradition of self-initiated community forestry is very strong the amendment is being seen as a tool by the Forest Department to assert greater control over community controlled lands. In these states a special effort has been made by the forest department to bring successful ongoing community efforts under JFM. Under the Van Panchayat system, the village communities had the complete authority over the management of forests with minimal interference from government agencies; they also have a complete right over the benefits being generated by these forests. Under JFM these communities will have to share both the authority and benefits with the Forest Department. JFM has thus seen strong criticism and outright rejection by the communities in these states. It is a contradiction in terms that a provision meant to empower the communities is imposed on them against their own free will!

The reasons why existing legislation has not been able to meet the requirements of community forestry efforts are plenty, some of which include:

1. The diversity of objectives and approaches followed in community initiatives are neither understood nor appreciated by official agencies. Thus blanket rules and regulations are expected to address all kinds of community efforts and local situations.
2. There is little desire among the powers that be to empower local communities for a meaningful democratic forest management system. Devolutionary laws and policies are often seen by implementing agencies as yet another scheme or programme. The concept of a greater democratic approach has neither been internalised nor philosophically accepted among these agencies.
3. There has been little effort towards a consultative process with the local communities themselves in designing and implementing policies most applicable to their area.
4. Most laws endorsing participatory approaches are vague and open to politically motivated interpretations.
5. There is no mechanism or system by which these laws can be effectively implemented and their impacts monitored (following the spirit of the law and addressing the diversity of local situations).
6. There exists little knowledge and understanding among the communities about the available spaces in the law. Little has been done by the government agencies to help the local communities understand these laws.
7. Most laws and policies provide flexibility to take into account local, traditional systems of management rather than displacing them or co-opting them. However, a lack of imaginative approach, unbiased interpretation and implementation restricts their applicability and in many cases leads to their outright rejection by the communities.
8. Various laws often appear to be contradictory and it remains unclear in a conflicting situation, which should prevail. For example in areas where both JFM and PESA are applicable it is not clear what would be the inter-relation of the two. In an area like Buldhana or Uttaranchal, where one programme is already in progress, can a completely different law be enacted, overriding the existing one?

### ***Conclusion***

It needs to be understood here that a community initiative, whether at natural resource conservation or for any other purpose, is a positive social process. Social processes are time consuming and complicated. There may exist many contradictions difficult to understand for an outsider, especially if the interactions are short. A question here that needs to be addressed is can national policies relating to natural resources be built around such a pace and such contradictions? If yes, how? If the pace needs to be changed what are the factors that need urgent attention? Should a greater role as an extension officer by the government agencies be considered rather than the sole implementers? Villagers often do not seem to have time or either resource to carry the initiative out on their own, or to sustain it beyond a point. Situations are often more complex than may appear here.

Yet communities must be credited for having resolved important issues, such as encroachments, destructive commercial exploitation of resources, over-exploitation of resources, and so on. It is therefore important to stress that these efforts despite their limitations are viewed as positive processes. Obstacles during this process should not be viewed as failures but as constraints, which can be solved within the concerned social and ecological context. Only this may take longer than normal "project or programme cycles", yet may prove more sustainable in the long run.

[TOP^](#)

## IN FOCUS

**(Interesting/emerging issues on participatory forestry)**

### **Forest Development Agencies and the Integrated Village Afforestation and Eco-development (Samavit Gram Vanikaran Samiriddhi) Yojana**

**Contributed by Mamta Borgoyary**

#### **Introduction**

Afforestation program in the forestry sector is generally implemented by the State Forest Departments through planned mechanisms. However, given that there is a general declining trend in fund allocation to the forestry sector, the available funds are more concentrated on establishment and other capital investments, thus restricting investments in afforestation activities.

Besides the funds allocated through the state government, the MoEF supports several Centrally Sponsored Schemes and Central Sector Schemes aimed at afforestation and biomass regeneration, to reduce the pressure on forest resources and Meet local sustenance needs of the poor. The funds for these schemes are routed through the State Forest Departments. Some of the main schemes implemented by MoEF are:

- Integrated Afforestation and Eco-Development Projects scheme
- Area oriented Fuelwood and Fodder Projects scheme
- Conservation and Development of Non-Timber Forest Produce Including Medicinal Plants
- Association of Scheduled Tribes of Rural Poor in the Regeneration Degraded Forest Areas

A review of these schemes by MoEF revealed some glaring deficiencies:

1. No timely flow of funds to the field execution committee
2. Negligible element of people's participation in the formulation of projects and execution of schemes
3. No significant eco-development work in village areas
4. No linkages with the Ministry of Rural Development employment generation schemes
5. Multiplicity of schemes with the same objectives operating in same areas
6. Disjointed implementation of schemes
7. Lack of co-ordination among various agencies operating in the same area

### **Proposed Umbrella scheme**

To overcome these deficiencies, MoEF proposes to operate an umbrella scheme of "Integrated Village Afforestation and Eco-development (Samanvit Gram Vanikaran Samiriddhi Yojana)", incorporating the elements of ongoing schemes. With enhanced financial allocation from the Planning Commission in the Tenth Plan period. The scheme will aim at providing employment to the local village community through the afforestation program thereby creating valuable forest assets for the village community and other durable community assets for overall eco-development of the target villages. The scheme will be implemented through the JFM approach. The restructured program is proposed to be implemented in a phased manner in the territorial forest/wildlife divisions in the country through a Federation of JFM Forest Committees to be known as "Forest Development Agencies (FDA)". Each forest division will constitute the planning unit or the project area for the FDA.

Some of the salient features of the proposed FDA are as follows:

#### **A. General (composition and administrative)**

On an average one FDA will comprise about 25-50 villages and all households needing income augmentation will be targeted.

1. The following criteria will be used while selecting the villages:
  - Preponderance of Scheduled Caste/Scheduled Tribe population
  - Willingness of people to participate in forest conservation efforts
  - Existence of Forest Protection Committees/Eco-development Committees
  - Extent of degraded forest land
  - Degree of dependence on biomass resources etc.
2. All fund requirements will be planned through the Micro-planning and Participatory Rural Appraisal exercise
3. Establishment of FDA and the creation of JFM resolution will be pre-requisites for the introduction of this scheme
4. FDA will be headed by the respective Territorial/Wildlife Conservator of Forests
5. Other members will include representative district officials of developmental departments, Village Forest Committees (VFC) and Eco-development committees (EDC)
6. FDAs to be registered as Federation of VFCs/EDCs under the Societies Regist. Act
7. All the VFCs and the EDCs will be registered with the Forest Department
8. The local forest block officer will be the *ex-officio* member secretary of the VFC/EDC
9. FDA will constitute the administrative, supervisory and monitoring mechanism, while the respective VFCs and EDCs will undertake actual implementation of the projects employing local labourers only
10. The scheme has begun as a pilot project from 2000-2001 in few selected FDAs in all the states which have accepted the scheme

#### **B. Project preparation, submission and approval**

1. FDAs are required to submit an integrated project (Planned through a micro-planning and PRA exercise) in the format as provided by MoEF.



2. Labour component should be at least 60% of the total project cost
3. Assistance to FDAs will be in the form of grants in aid from the central government
4. A broad range of community assets can be created through this scheme
5. Financial assistance to the tune of Rs 2 lakh will be provided to each FDA
6. Forest Department will provide technical assistance in the preparation of the project proposal
7. Projects will be of five years duration and should be submitted at least six months in advance of the financial year from which the project is proposed to be implemented
8. The project proposal is to be submitted to the NAEB by the FDAs through respective State Forest Departments

### **C. Funding pattern and financial procedure**

1. Centrally sponsored schemes and grants in aid will be released through FDAs
2. Funds will be released in two instalments: First instalment by second month of the financial year after approval of the project proposal, and second instalment after utilisation of at least 80 percent of the initial instalment amount.
3. FDAs will maintain a separate bank account which will be operated by the chief executive

For further information on FDAs contact Arvind Kumar, Sr AIG, NAEB, Ministry of Environment and Forests, Paryavaran Bhawan, CGO Complex, Lodhi Road, New Delhi-110003

## **PROFILE**

**(Profiles of organisations/institutions/individuals with innovative contributions to participatory forestry)**

### **Remembering Anil Agarwal**

**(Contributed by Jayanta Bandyopadhyay, Professor, Centre for Development and Environment Policy, Indian Institute of Management Calcutta 700104)**

Those who had followed the recent worrisome decline in the condition of the health of Anil Agarwal, as much those who have been shocked by the sudden news of his death in Dehradun on 02 January 2002, will remember him most respectfully as a pioneer activist who had promoted and taken environmental struggle and justice in India to new heights. In his passing away at an early age of 54, India, as well as the countries of the South have now lost a visionary and an imaginative crusader.

During the late 1960s and early 1970s, Anil and I were contemporary students at the Indian Institute of Technology in Kanpur. He was a powerful speaker and had diverse extra-curricular interests. He was deeply influenced by the ideals of Mahatma Gandhi and was concerned about various public interest aspects of the relationship between science, technology and society. As he came close to the completion of the B. Tech.

Degree at IIT Kanpur, I could see the sprouting of a committed science journalist in him. On the completion of his B. Tech. Degree in 1971, Anil did not take up a job as an engineer but started his professional life as a science journalist. In 1972 he attended the Stockholm Conference on the Human Environment and this probably focussed the vision of the science journalist in him more closely on the problems of the natural environment. Following this, when he returned to India, he wrote extensively on the famous forest protection movement - Chipko.

After a few years of working in London, Anil returned to New Delhi to establish the Centre for Science and Environment (CSE). Over the last two decades this visionary little man went on to address crucial environmental issues in India and publish the trend-setting reports on the State of India's Environment and to establish the periodical Down to Earth. From the CSE, Anil tirelessly documented the growing environmental crises and raised questions on the views of the policy makers. As an environmental activist in India, Anil Agarwal stood out for his understanding of the need for research and for the involvement of the people. In the background of the enormity of the environmental challenge at levels from local to the global, Anil was an impatient man - and himself worked very long hours. Very frequently, his urge to do more in less time led him to being a hard taskmaster for his colleagues, which often made him an unpopular 'boss'.

Whether at the local level of people based water conservation in arid areas of Rajasthan or at the global context of catching the industrialised countries on the wrong foot in the case of global warming, Anil has set in motion a process of informed challenge to the established policy making systems. His article, co-authored with Narain, entitled 'Global Warming in an Unequal World' created quite a political tremor in the Rio Earth Summit in 1992 and has set a clear trend in the analysis of North-South environmental relations. In India he had initiated a very potent and healthy process of strengthening participation of the common people in environmental movements. However, the critical effectiveness of the work of Anil Agarwal comes from the fact that without any hesitation, he confidently took the critical conflicts in environment to the doorsteps of the policy makers.

Anil Agarwal has become an Indian name in environment respected in all parts of the country and the world. At the untimely demise of an old friend, I salute his courage in facing his own illness over the last five years, as much the courage with which he addressed the growing illness of the natural environment. To those at the CSE and Down to Earth, Anilji can not be replaced. However, his mission will remain with all of us. Memories of Anil as a friend, Anilji as an institutional leader and Anil Agarwal as a humanist journalist will continue to inspire the younger generation to work fearlessly for environmental justice as an integral part of social justice.

## BOOK REVIEW

**(Critical reviews of books relevant to participatory forestry)**

### **Branching Out: Joint Forest Management in India**

**By: Nandini Sundar, Roger Jeffery, Neil Thin and others**

**Oxford University Press, 2001**

**Pages: 289**

**Price: Rs 595**

**(Contributed by Sandeep Sengupta)**

In a refreshing change from a primarily program-oriented body of literature on JFM in India, 'Branching Out' provides a comprehensive analysis of the complex socio-political realities within which JFM has sought to entrench itself as the dominant discourse in present day forestry. In six chapters, this book attempts to understand the basic and often missed underlying themes that affect the success or failure of participatory forest management in the country.

Chapter 1, while providing a brief history of JFM in India, identifies the various problems faced by the forestry sector and examines the underlying causes influencing changes in national forest policy, in the wake of economic liberalisation and global capitalism. Criticising the traditional paradigm of "scientific forestry", this chapter recognises the emergence of new non-state actors such as civil society in the new era of "participatory forestry". It also underlines the vast uncertainties that face the forestry administration in defining the differing objectives of forest management today.

Chapter 2 explores through field-level research the different ways by which JFM has actually evolved in practice on the ground in different states. The examination of JFM in four states Gujarat, Madhya Pradesh, Orissa and Andhra Pradesh- clearly reveals the variations in problems, management initiatives and degree of community involvement, not only across states but also across divisions and villages as well.

Chapter 3 assesses JFM from a village-level perspective and analyses the elements of community, power and choice that exist therein. It recognises the 'reality' of asymmetry of power between the elite and marginalised sections within village communities. Further, it examines gender dimensions within JFM and also the shifting locus of control between the villagers and the forest department. Besides, the chapter questions the 'jointness' of JFM and enquires as to whether, despite the rhetoric, there has been any real devolution of decision-making to the people at all and to what extent they have been given a choice in the construction of their own needs.

**TOP^**

Chapter 4 looks at the actual silvicultural management practices in JFM that determine the use of forests. The perception of the forest department towards forest use by villages is classified into three typologies - Forest Department-tolerated interference, Forest Department-approved involvement and Forest Department-disapproved practices respectively. This framework is then used to examine the changing legitimacy of timber felling, grazing, encroachments, employment, NTFP collection, etc, in JFM areas.

Chapter 5 critically appraises the interests and actions of NGOs and international donor agencies in promoting JFM, and examines their relationship with the forest department. This chapter also tries to understand the attitudinal changes that have taken place within the Forest Department and analyses the drivers behind this change.

Chapter 6 attempts to bring the various threads of JFM together as articulated in the previous chapters and explains the wider patterns of change that have determined the paradigm shift towards socially responsible forestry, not only in India but also in other parts of the world. The authors conclude that even though it is still too early to assess whether or not JFM has been a success, the democratisation of institutions and processes leading to equitable access to resources and livelihoods, should nonetheless be the priority objective while managing forest resources.

The book provides a thought provoking insight into the dynamics of JFM in India. Not only do the authors cover the institutional and governance aspects of JFM, but also delve deeper under the surface to understand the political economy of various factors that are actually at play at various levels. The book encourages the reader to think of JFM not just in terms of a program alone, but beyond it as a social movement geared towards greater empowerment of hitherto socially excluded classes in relation to the changing nature of both the market and the state. On the whole, more than being just another book on forestry or even on JFM, this book thus manages to contextualise both forestry and JFM, to the fundamental issue of development in India itself.

[TOP^](#)



## INDEX

### (List of recent articles, papers and journals in the area of participatory forestry)

<b><u>BOOKS AND ARTICLES</u></b>	
Ritchie, B., McDougall, M., Haggith, M., and Burford de Oliveira, N. (2000)	Criteria and Indicators of Sustainability in Community Managed Forest Landscape, CIFOR.
Wunder, S. (ed.) (2000)	The Economics of Deforestation: The Example of Ecuador, MacMillan and St. Martin Press in association with St. Anthony's College, London.
Shambaugh, J. et al (2001)	The Trampled Grass: Mitigating the impacts of armed conflicts on the environment, Washington D.C., USA, Biodiversity Support Program.
FAO (2001)	Global Forest Resource Assessment 2000, FAO Forestry paper 140.
Kalpavriksh and IIED, (2000)	Where Communities Care: Community based wildlife and ecosystem management in South Asia, Kalpavriksh, New Delhi.
<b><u>JOURNALS AND NEWSLETTER</u></b>	
Humanscape	A monthly magazine published by the Foundation for Humanisation. Contact: humanscape@vsnl.net
Commonwealth Forestry News	The international newsletter of the Commonwealth Forestry Association. Contact: <a href="mailto:Philip.Wardle2@cs.com">Philip Wardle2@cs.com</a>

## IN-SITE

### (List of participatory forestry related websites)

Institute/Organisation And website address	Brief note on the contents of the site
<b>Uttaranchal Forest Development Corporation</b> <a href="http://www.uafdc.com">www.uafdc.com</a>	Website contains information on all activities of the Uttaranchal Forest Development Corporation, and also details of eco-tourism packages within the region.
<b>The European Tropical Forest Research Network</b> <a href="http://www.etfrn.org">www.etfrn.org</a>	The website contains information on all activities of the institute and has very useful references and downloads on people and forests
<b>International Network on Forests and Communities</b> <a href="http://www.forestsandcommunities.org">www.forestsandcommunities.org</a>	The International Network of Forests and Communities (INFC) was founded in October of 1998, following the International Workshop on Ecosystem-Based Community Forestry, held in Saanich to promote the long-term health of forests and forest-dependent communities worldwide. This website contains all information on their activities and provides country profiles on status of community forestry.

## ON THE MOVE

Mr. A.N Prasad DIG in charge Forest Conservation Act in the Ministry of Environment and Forests has taken over as Resident Commissioner, Jharkhand.

[TOP^](#)

## LOOKOUT!

(List of upcoming events)

### CONFERENCES/WORKSHOPS

The International Conference in Eco-balance and LCA

Date: February 13-15, 2002

Venue: Indira Gandhi Institute of Development Research (IGIDR), Bombay

For more information see [www.igidr.ac.in/lca](http://www.igidr.ac.in/lca)

Workshop on Joint Forest Management and Watershed Development

Date: January 21 & 22, 2002

Venue: Indian Institute of Technology, Chennai

Contact: Thiru.Bhagwan Singh, IFS, email: [inforest@md3.vsnl.net.in](mailto:inforest@md3.vsnl.net.in)

[TOP^](#)

## FEEDBACK

For any further inquiries/suggestions, please contact:

Ms Mamta Borgoyary

Editor, INFORM, Resource Unit for Participatory Forestry

Winrock International India

7, Poorvi Marg, Vasant Vihar

New Delhi 110057

Ph: 91-11-6142965, Fax: 91-11-6146004

Email: [mamta@winrock.ernet.in](mailto:mamta@winrock.ernet.in)

We welcome you to send us relevant articles/news/events/announcements that you would like to disseminate widely. We are also in the process of starting a working paper series on community forestry; we invite you to send us interesting and innovative papers for consideration for publication under this series. Should you like to unsubscribe, kindly send an empty reply mail with "unsubscribe INFORM" as the subject of the email. You will automatically be removed from our mailing list.

### INFORM TEAM

**Editor** : Mamta Borgoyary  
**Team Members** : Sushil Saigal and Sandeep Sengupta  
**Design and Layout** : Bhawani Shankar Tripathy

[TOP^](#)