

Social Impact Assessment of
CoB Project Activities

Pardeep Kumar, B. M. S. Rathore and Sudesh Nangia

Jawaharlal Nehru University, Delhi &

Wildlife Institute of India, Dehradun

INDIA

December 1999

CONTENTS

Page

1.0 INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Importance Of GHNP	
1.2 Socio Economic Context Of Ghnp	
1.3 Conservation Of Bio-Diversity Project	
1.4 Social Impact Assessment	
1.5 The Present Study	
1.5.1 Objectives Of The Study	
1.6 Methodology	
1.6.1 Sources Of Data	
1.6.2 Research Design	
2.0 ECO-DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES IN GHNP - A REVIEW	8
2.1 Introduction	
2.2 Stakeholder In Ghnp	
2.3 Cob Project Activities In GHNP	
2.4 Other Activities Undertaken By The Management	
2.4.1 Enforcement	
2.4.2 Direct Income Generation Activities	
2.4.3 Relocation	
2.4.4 Crop Damage Control	
2.4.5 Trust/Society For Long Term Bio-Diversity Conservation	
2.4.6 Programs For Distribution Of Timber/Fuelwood Saving Devices	
2.4.7 Public Health	
2.4.8 New Management Plan	
2.4.9 Review Of Cob Project Activities	
i) First Phase (1994 to 1997)	
ii) Second Phase (1997 onwards)	
a) Re-organization of VEDCs:	
b) Capacity building of VEDCs:	
c) Capacity building of staff:	
d) Community works - shift from civil works to biomass generation activities	
e) Individual works - training and finance	

3.0 CASE STUDY - I

24

3.1 Introduction

3.2 Ecodevelopment Activities

3.2.1 Impact On Local Institutions

3.2.2 VDCs In Sample Villages

3.2.3 Functioning And Capacities Of Vdcs

3.2.4 Resource Use Practices

3.2.5 Impact On Land Use (Agriculture And Horticulture)

3.2.6 Impact On Off-Farm Employment

3.2.7 Impact On Vulnerable Stake Holders

3.3 Summary

4.0 CASE STUDY – II

33

4.1 Introduction

4.2 Dependence On Natural Resources Of The Park

4.3 CoB Project Activities

4.3.1 Inputs

4.3.2 Budget Provisions And Biodiversity Conservation

4.3 Local Institution (Village Ecodevelopment Committee)

4.3.1 General Functioning Of Vedic

4.3.2 Representation Of Village Community

4.3.3 Financial Capacities And Accountability

4.3.4 Community Assets And Their Maintenance

4.3.5 Agreements/Resource Use Practices

4.4 Provision Of Alternative Employment/Income Generation

4.4.1 Impact On On-Farm Employment, Income Generation

4.4.2 Off Farm Employment And Income Generation

4.4.3 Employment In Civil Works

4.5	Increasing Availability Of Natural Resource Around The Village / Decreasing Consumption Of Biomass	
4.6	Negative Impacts On Vulnerable Stakeholders	
4.7	Current Status (Settlement Of Rights	
5.0	CASE STUDY - III	42
5.1	Introduction	
5.1.1	Economic Activities	
5.1.2	Revenue Land	
5.1.3	Village Forests -	
5.2	Eco-Development Initiatives	
5.3	Local Institution	
5.3.1	Adequacy Of Microplan	
5.4	Impact Of Project Activities On Various Stakeholder	
5.5	Negative Impact On Vulnerable Stakeholders	
6.0	EXTINGUISHMENT OF RIGHTS AND DEPENDENT POPULATION	52
7.0	CONCLUSION	77
	BIBLIOGRAPHY	83
	ANNEXURE I	
	ANNEXURE II	
	ANNEXURE III	
	ANNEXURE IV	

PREFACE

Eco-development addresses both the impact of local people on the PAs and impact of PAs on the local people. Whereas management improvement of PA areas has its basic objective as reducing negative impacts of PAs on local people and increasing local Participation in PA management activities and decisions, the village Eco-development aims at reducing negative impacts of local people on PA . Although both the components should solicit support of local people for the PA, but it is the later i.e. village eco-development where both the manager and the people come together by undertaking participatory microplanning and implementation which is crucial for motivating the local people and framing their attitudes and perceptions towards the P.A. Therefore eco-development strategy i.e. participatory micro-planning etc. must ensure the full participation and benefit of vulnerable groups specially women, SC/ST and other socially and economically weaker sections of the project area. It is particularly because they are the people who are relatively more dependent on PA resources for their survival compare to other groups. For example women harvest most of the non timber forest produce, similarly most SCs collect bamboo for making various articles for sale; other weaker sections also depend upon the collection and sale of medicinal plants for their survival.

In addition, a number of activities undertaken for the general benefit and towards conservation of bio-diversity are also likely to affect vulnerable sections the most. For instance road construction may result in the loss of jobs to porters or mule owners. Fuelwood and fodder plantations may decrease the income of those depending on their sale for livelihood, habitat improvement and protection to wildlife can increase damage to crops and livestock by wild animals and artificial cultivation of herbs may decrease the income of those who collect them from PA and sell for livelihood.

It is therefore very important to evolve a mechanism whereby negative impacts of COB project activities can be studied particularly during the project period. It is also necessary to assess and predict the possible future consequences of project activities so that alternative course of actions can be initiated and negative impacts can be mitigated in advance. Recognising the importance of evolving such a mechanism the task of Social Impact Assessment of the ongoing co-project activities has been recognised and given due place in the FREEP-GHNP Research Project. The task has to progress according to the inputs and probable outputs achieved by project implementation in the field. As a number of planned inputs specially on providing alternative employment to the dependant stakeholder are still to be fully accomplished, the present task is still going on. Moreover the Government of Himachal Pradesh recently concluded the final settlement of rights in GHNP thereby extinguishing all the resource use rights in the park. The impacts of denial access of resource use rights to the dependant population are still to be analysed particularly on the vulnerable stakeholder such as landless, SCs and females. Only after assessing the full impact of project investments as well as extinguishment of rights, any alternative course on stakeholders can be recommended. In these circumstances the present report can not be considered final. It is only an interim report aimed at providing a brief analysis of the outputs achieved so far and their effects/impact on various stakeholder groups. We hope it shall be helpful in affecting desirable changes in the project components or in taking alternative course of action on stakeholders wherever desired.

We are highly thankful to Sh. S.K.Mukherjee, Director, Wildlife Institute of India and Project Co-ordinator for providing necessary facilities as well as valuable suggestions throughout the course of the study.

We are grateful to Sh. Anil Bhardwaj, Nodel Officer, Ecodevelopment Cell and Principal Investigator, FREEP-GHNP Research Project for his encouragement, fruitful discussions and valuable suggestions which enriched the contents of this study.

Our hearty thanks are due to all the faculty members, research staff of WII associated with the FREEP-GHNP Project, especially Dr. P.K. Mathur, Dr. V.B. Mathur, Dr. G.S. Rawat, Dr. S.P. Goyal and Dr. S. Satya Kumar for their useful suggestions, advise and assistance during the conduct of research. We also thank Sh. D.V.S. Khati , Dr. P. K. Malik, Dr. Ruchi Badola, Dr. Amita Bavaskar, Dr. R. Tucker, Ms. Maureen DeCoursey, Ms. Camille Richard for fruitful discussion and valuable suggestions, during the tenure of the project.

We are highly obliged to officials of Himachal Pradesh Government particularly present park Director Sh. Sanjeeva Pandey, former Director Sh. Nagesh Guleria, park frontline staff, sub-divisional magistrate and his subordinate revenue staff for extending all possible help in the field.

We thank our field assistants particularly Sh. Chet Ram, Sh. Himmat Ram, Sh. Brij Lal and Sh. Pritam Singh.

We acknowledge with gratefulness the kind gesture of Sh. Iqbal Singh, Director SAVE, his staff and colleagues who were highly cooperative and offered valuable help which enabled successful completion of the study.

Our sincere thanks are due to all our colleagues Dr. V.P.Uniyal, K.Ramesh, Suneet Naithani, Vedhu Jha, Vinod T.R., S.K.Singh, Milind Saxena and Badrish Mehra, who worked with us in this project and shared valuable information on various aspects of this study and also with whom we shared moments of reverie and the evening camp fires at camp site and in the field.

We acknowledge the cooperation and help rendered by WII staff particularly Sh. Sunil Takhur, Shri Ravi Sharma and Shri J.S. Negi of the eco-development cell and Dr. Manoj Agarwal, Sh. Dinesh Pundir, Shri Mukesh Arora and Shri Virendra Sharma of the Computer Section.

Last but not the least, we express our gratitude to the local people of the study area who responded to all our queries patiently and honestly and spared their time for us despite their busy schedule. Their observations, perceptions responses and inquiries enriched the content and quality of this research. We are indeed grateful to them.



1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 IMPORTANCE OF GHNP

The Great Himalayan National park represents the Biogeographic zone - 2A North West Himalayas (Rodgers & Panwar 1988). The area is located between latitude $31^{\circ} 38' 15''$ & $31^{\circ} 56' 41''$ North and Longitude $77^{\circ} 20'$ to $77^{\circ} 52' 11''$ East. Administratively it lies in the Kullu district of Himachal Pradesh, covering a total area of 765 sq. Km. Adjacent to Park are Tirthan and Sainj Wildlife Sanctuaries having an area of 61 and 90 sq. Km. respectively.

The Park falls within one of the globally important Endemic Bird areas (DO2 : Western Himalayas) identified by the ICBP Biodiversity project (1992). One hundred and eighty three bird species including 132 Passerines and 51 non-Passerines have been recorded in the Park which is substantially high compare to other areas of western Himalayas and suggests that the Park supports a substantial proportion of all the bird species occurring within its altitudinal range in the Western Himalayas (Panday 1997, Gaston et al. 1994).

The park supports several endangered mammals and Pheasants such as musk deer, seron, brown bear, blue sheep, chir pheasants and Monal. It is one of the only two national parks in the world to support a population of endangered western tragopan (*Tragopan malanocephalus*) (Collar & Andrew 1988).

The Plant Communities are representatives of temperate and alpine regions and consists of Oak and coniferous forests, high altitude mix forests and Sub alpine as well as alpine Pastures. The park flora includes a number of unusual Plant associations, with little disturbed low and middle altitude Oak forests and alpine meadows above 3800 meters rich in medicinal Plants such as *Aconitum heterophyllum*, *Salvia moorcroftiana*, *Viola serpens*, *Jurinea macraephalay* & *Rheun emodi* etc. (Gaston and Garson 1993).

The park is located on the junction of two great faunal realms; Palaearctic to the north and Oriental to the South (Mackimian et. al. 1986). The present bio-diversity of the Park is rich compared to other areas at similar altitude in the Western Himalayas (Gaston et al. 1981).

The area represents the typical situation of resource and people relationship and varied forestry, wildlife, ecological, socio-economic and cultural values and Practices. It constitutes a large contiguous PA network with the adjacent PAs viz. the Pin Valley National Park in the East, Rupi Bhaba Wildlife Sanctuary in the South East & Kanawar Wildlife Sanctuary in the north west. The GHNP in continuation with other adjacent PAs thus becomes an area of immense bio-diversity conservation. Occurrence of less disturbed temperate and alpine ecosystems in a geographically compact area and inaccessible and rugged terrain representing the ecological, geomorphological and biological values of the North West Himalayas make Great



Himalayan National Park (GHNP) a viable conservation unit (Panday and Wells 1997).

1.2 SOCIO ECONOMIC CONTEXT OF GHNP

Socio-Economic context of Great Himalayan National Park is equally important. There are numerous settlements situated on the Western and North Western boundaries of the Park. In addition, a few villages are inside the Park. The economy of these people is mainly based on forests, agriculture and livestock. Agriculture and livestock economy itself is deeply linked with forests. Apart from the economy, the polity, culture, and the religion of these people have evolved an interaction with the woods. Therefore forests play crucial role in the life systems of these people.

Agriculture is the prime economic activity of the area in which a significant majority of the rural population is engaged. On their small tilled terraces they grow subsistence crops adapted to local conditions. Recently profit making horticulture and modern yield increasing inputs have also been introduced. However, the changes introduced are confined to select pockets only particularly in the areas with motorable roads and other means of communication. In these thin mountain soils, severely deficient in humus and basic chemicals, crops do not grow without manure. The sources of manure are an important element of traditional agro-ecology linking tilled fields with domestic livestock and the forests. Farmers use farmyard manure, including cattle and sheep manure and chaff, mixed with green loppings from small pine fir trees (Tucker, 1997).

Forest use is the other dimension of the villagers subsistence. Historically they had unrestricted access to the forests for firewood and timber. They have been collecting a wide variety of medicinal herbs, bamboos, various grasses and branches of trees for their bonafide agriculture and domestic use. Most of the poor particularly landless, females and SCs make a variety of handicraft item, agricultural implements, households utensils etc. by using bamboo, certain grasses and branches of trees found at the higher altitude forests of GHNP. They either barter these items with the higher caste households or sell them for cash money. For most of them this is the only source of earning their livelihoods. Historically these people have also been collecting certain medicinal herbs in small quantities to fulfill the demand of local and adjoining medicinal practitioners.

The other important non-agriculture use of land in the area has been pastoralism. Households own small number of cattle, sheep and goats for subsistence use. Each spring, when receding snows allow, flocks move upwards through the forest zone into alpine pastures for summer grazing of nutritious upland vegetation (Tucker, 1997). Grazing has important links with agriculture, domestic and forestry sectors. Sheep, goat and cattle are the back-bone of the farming system of this area. Sheep and goat are kept for fibre, meat and manure. Cattle are kept for manure, dairy and ploughing. As the population of the area grew more rapidly during the past century, the total number of livestock in the area also increased accordingly. According



to estimates at present near about 25000 livestock graze in the park in every summer.

According to a study by Richard Tucker (1997) until nineteenth century the pattern of human ecology for the light population of the area was largely subsistence with very limited export of natural resources beyond the area. The sharpest increase came in the form of timber extraction during British Colonial days. Commercial timber trade placed increasing pressure on both forests and subsistence in the hills. Further pressure on these forests from village life grew very slowly until nineteen sixty with the beginning of regional and international markets expanding enormously, giving local people a major new source of income in the sale of medicinal herbs.

Recently some of the research studies have indicated that 70-85% of the household are now gaining cash income from collecting and selling herbs (Tandon 1997). Before long, nearly 60 species of wild plants were being commercially harvested in GHNP and the adjacent areas. In consequence several species of herbs have become rapidly depleted including *Picrorhiza kurroa*, *Valeriana jatamansi*, *Dioscorea delteodea*, *Taxus baccata* etc. Guchhi, the morel mushroom attracts hundreds of collectors in May and June to mid elevation forests. They probably disturb pheasants nesting sites and have cooking and warmth fires which may go wild (Gaston and Garson, 1992). Morels which are in high demand on foreign markets, now bring in large amounts of cash each year in the area.

In short, an increasing pace of population growth coupled with modern market economy has led to mounting pressure on Park resources. While in old time most of the resources were collected for self consumption, today market demand for medicinal plants and other minor produce has increased tremendously.

1.3 CONSERVATION OF BIO-DIVERSITY PROJECT

Keeping in view the growing pressure on Park resources and conserve existing bio-diversity, the Wildlife wing of DFFC (HP) has initiated a World Bank aided project¹ on Conservation of Biodiversity with an Eco-development component in 1994. Under this project the department is taking up several development works in and around GHNP in order to:

- (i) Increase resource productivity in areas peripheral to the Park
- (ii) Reduce dependence through development of alternatives by provision of Non forest based employment, income generation schemes improved agriculture etc.

The basic strategy or mode of development activities is Eco-development which revolves

¹ The project has three major components (i) Improvement in Park Management (ii) Research (iii) Eco-development



around the involvement of village communities in the preparation and implementation of microplans using participatory techniques. Eco-development basically refers to development based on the sustainable use of local renewable resources mainly for the benefit of local people. In rural India this means satisfying basic needs and providing employment, but not at the expense of Environment and not with out participation by the local people (K. Berkmuller 1986). In the case of GHNP, the conservation of biodiversity project envisages to achieve the goal of conserving park bio-diversity through eco-development by achieving its twin objectives of 1. Increase resource productivity in areas peripheral to the park and 2. Reduce dependence through development of alternatives by provision of non-forests based employment, income generation schemes, improved agriculture etc. Developing sustainable resource harvesting regimes is also an integral part of the eco-development project (See project map).

For the purpose of initiating Eco-development activities, a five Km. area around the Western boundary of the Park is being notified as Eco-development project area in 1994. It includes 13 revenue villages consisting of near about 150 hamlets spread over 255 sq. kms. In order to establish new village level organisations for participatory micro-planning and implementation, all the 150 hamlets are divided into 16 units, each having a VDC. In fact each revenue village with its hamlets is recognised as an Eco-development unit with slight modifications in that large revenue villages having several hamlets are divided into two units. The names of all the hamlets with their population, watershed, eco-development committee etc. are given in annexure 1.

By now a number of activities have been taken up in the area. Important of them includes civil works i.e. programmes for improvement of transport and communication; soil and water conservation; Agriculture, Horticulture and animal husbandry improvement programs, bio-mass generation activities (fuel wood/fodder species plantation and sectoral integration etc.)

1.4 SOCIAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Eco-development addresses both the impact of local people on the PAs and impact of PAs on the local people. Whereas management improvement of PA areas has its basic objective as reducing negative impacts of PAs on local people and increasing local Participation in PA management activities and decisions, the village Eco-development aims at reducing negative impacts of local people on PA . Although both the components should solicit support of local people for the PA, but it is the later i.e. village eco-development where both the manager and the people come together by undertaking participatory microplanning and implementation which is crucial for motivating the local people and framing their attitudes and perceptions towards the P.A. Therefore eco-development strategy i.e. participatory micro-planning etc. must ensure the full participation and benefit of vulnerable groups specially women, SC/ST and other socially and economically weaker sections of the project area. It is particularly because they are the people who are relatively more dependent on PA resources for their



survival compare to other groups. For example women harvest most of the non timber forest produce, similarly most SCs collect bamboo for making various articles for sale; other weaker sections also depend upon the collection and sale of medicinal plants for their survival.

In addition, a number of activities undertaken for the general benefit and towards conservation of bio-diversity are also likely to affect vulnerable sections the most. For instance road construction may result in the loss of jobs to porters or mule owners. Fuelwood and fodder plantations may decrease the income of those depending on their sale for livelihood, habitat improvement and protection to wildlife can increase damage to crops and livestock by wild animals and artificial cultivation of herbs may decrease the income of those who collect them from PA and sell for livelihood.

It is therefore very important to evolve a mechanism whereby negative impacts of COB project activities can be studied particularly during the project period. It is also necessary to assess and predict the possible future consequences of project activities so that alternative course of actions can be initiated and negative impacts can be mitigated in advance.

1.5 THE PRESENT STUDY

Recognising the importance of evolving such a mechanism as discussed above for assessing and predicting negative impacts of project activities in GHNP and mitigating and monitoring, the task of Social Impact Assessment of COB project activities has been given due place in the Research project titled "An ecological study of the conservation of Bio-diversity and Biotic Pressures in the GHNP: An Eco-development Approach" with the following objectives;

1.5.1 Objectives of the study

1. To identify strategies to mitigate or minimise negative impacts prior to and during implementation,
2. To identify the possible social consequences of project activities and alternative courses of action on stakeholders. Areas of concern include social organisational structures and decision making processes, socio-cultural issues, distributional impacts, land tenure arrangements, access to and management of natural resources;
3. To monitor effects through the social assessment framework and provide feedback to change project components, increase institutional learning and build trust among project stakeholders.

Broad areas in under the study in which impact of the project activities is proposed to be assessed shall include apart from expected out puts from the activities done:

- a) Community institutions



- b) Participation by primary stake holders
- c) Capacities of local institutions and staff
- d) Resource use practices
- e) Agriculture, horticulture and animal husbandry
- f) Off farm employment avenues
- g) Conflicts and negative impact on vulnerable stake holders

1.6 METHODOLOGY

In order to assess the social impact of various activities under taken in the ongoing conservation of Biodiversity project and obtain required information, the following sources of data, research methods and techniques have been employed;

1.6.1 Sources of data

Three years of research conducted on various parameters in the Great Himalayan National Park , prior to taking up of present study ,has yielded valuable information which has been used as baseline to build up this investigation. In particular, this study draws heavily upon the researches conducted on task 11 'Social context and Socio-economic Conditions of People using Great Himalayan National Park and Wildlife Sanctuaries,task 111intensive micro study to assess the socio-economic conditions of people using GHNP&WLs; task 4 "Feasibility review of identified village eco-development investments and appraisal of the practicality of the eco-development approaches in the project area" and reports on historical development of human impacts on the park as well as on grazing. Data/information published or shared in personal conversations is widely used in this study. Other data/information required for the study has been obtained by employing the following methods of social research;

- a) Rapid Rural Appraisal
- b) Village meetings
- c) Interview with key persons
- d) Other PRA methods.

In addition, secondary sources of information such as official records, membership registers and minutes books etc. have been reviewed for the purpose of the study.

1.6.2 Research design

This research study is part of a larger study titled "Assessment of the Social and Ecological impacts of CoB project activities '. Unlike most of the other tasks under FREEP GHNP RESEARCH PROJECT which focus on ecological conservation as a primary goal, studying either the present status of biodiversity of the park or the extent/impact of human resource use, the present task accords priority to the dependent population; their resource use rights,



their participation in the eco-development activities and decision making processes; distributional impacts ; their socio-economic welfare etc. The study accords special attention to the assessment of negative impacts of the project activities on vulnerable stakeholders particularly scheduled castes, landless and the women. Conducting research on these aspects in every village/hamlets falling in the study area required field work over a substantial period of time. Since this task was taken up on a relatively later stage (partly because of late implementation of the project and partly because time spent on obtaining baseline data on task 2), it was not possible to devote sufficient time in all the near about 130 hamlets of the ecodevelopment area. Therefore, it was decided to optimally use the available time in working intensively on case studies in order to generate good quality data/information. The study was thus organised in the following framework;

- a) First of all, a detailed survey of secondary sources in respect of CoB project activities was made and in-depth interviews with the park management, frontline staff and other concerned persons were held in order to list out the various ecodevelopment activities under taken so far in the area. Thereafter all the hamlets/villages falling in the ecodevelopment area were surveyed by employing Rapid Rural Appraisal methods and a list of stakeholders was prepared and their interests and dependence was analysed in consultation with villagers. In this phase itself, ecodevelopment activities undertaken in each of the hamlets were identified and working of the VDCs was assessed in consultation with different segments of village population. Chapter-II of this study contains most of the information obtained during this phase of the study.
- b). In this phase of the research, three case studies were conducted. In the first case study all those hamlets were surveyed which are primary right holders in respect of park resources and are highly dependent on park by virtue of their being in the immediate periphery of GHNP. Rest of the two studies were conducted in the two ecodevelopment units which were considered fairly functional by the park management and other concerned and where comparatively large investment/inputs were made. Chapter-III, IV and V of this study deal with these case studies.
- c). While the work on this task was still in progress, the Govt. of Himachal Pradesh initiated the process of settlement of rights in GHNP and adjacent Sanctuaries. As most of the residents of the ecodevelopment area (target population of CoB project) are primary right holders in respect of various resource use inside the park and are highly dependent on park resources for their survival, it became necessary to analyse the settlement process and its impact/effects on various stakeholders without which the present study would have remained incomplete. The Fifth Chapter of this study documents the process of settlement/extinguishment of rights of the dependent population and its likely impact on their well being.

The research methodology of the study remained participatory throughout the course of this investigation. Most of the conclusions were drawn by the people themselves in village meetings using a wide range of participatory tools in determining the methods, criteria and indicators of failures or successes of various activities undertaken in the ecodevelopment project area.



2.0 ECO-DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES IN GHNP - A REVIEW

2.1 INTRODUCTION

It has already been discussed in the preceding chapter-I that the economy of the people living in and around forests is mainly based on forests, agriculture and livestock. Agriculture and livestock economy itself is deeply linked with forests. Apart from the economy, the polity, culture and religion of these people have evolved a close interaction with the woods and forests play a very crucial role in the life systems of these people. In case of GHNP and adjacent wildlife sanctuaries, this relationship is more crucial given their total dependence on forest resources. Since the area is very remote with rare social infrastructure, under-developed industrial sector, subsistence agriculture and lack of other means of employment, forests are the only means of subsistence (so far as cash incomes are concerned) for these people. Nevertheless, not all the people living in the area (Eco-development project area) are equally dependent on forest resources or constitute equal pressure on the park. The village communities are heterogeneous rather than homogenous and their level of dependence on park resources vary substantially. Moreover, there are some groups/people who use the forest produce only for their bonafide domestic and agricultural requirements while there are others who extract various forest produce for commercial purposes. Besides there are other groups such as contractors, dealers in medicinal herbs/mushrooms and middlemen who are not dependent on forest resources for their bonafide requirements but for earning more money. Even, out of the resident people, a large proportion having moderate agriculture lands and cattle is less dependent on forest resources compare to SCs, STs, landless and females who have marginal or no property rights and are wholly dependent on the collection and sale of herbs, fuelwood, handicraft articles, agricultural implements and households utensils made of various forest produce for their survival. The later are more vulnerable than the others so far as negative impacts of any development project aimed at restricting access to forest resources are concerned. It is therefore, necessary to find out various stakeholder groups and the extent of their dependence on park resources in order to provide mechanism for safeguarding the interests and soliciting the support of those who are primary stakeholders and dependent on park resources and whose participation and support is crucial for achieving the objectives of CoB project in GHNP.

2.2 STAKEHOLDER IN GHNP

Table 2.1 below provides a brief analysis of various stakeholders, their interests and dependence on park resources;



Table 2.1: Stakeholders and their dependence on GHNP

STAKE HOLDER	INTEREST	THREATS	OPPORTUNITY
<p>Nearly 1500 households living in 130 settlements situated on western end north-western boundary of the park (Eco-dev. area) particularly weaker sections:</p> <p>a) 30% SC population; b) females c) other poor and marginal farmers and backward castes.</p> <p>They are relatively more dependent on forest resources for their livelihood. Also they are likely to be most affected by Conservation of Bio-diversity project.</p>	<p>Collection of medicinal plants and mushroom from March to Sep. They have rights to sell these produce and it is the most important source of cash earning for these people.</p>	<p>Due to many fold increase in the population in the past one century coupled with fast increase in expenditure, the pressure on medicinal plants has increased tremendously. It has posed a great threat to biodiversity and constitute the biggest pressure on park resource.</p>	<p>1. Control on quantity to be harvested and complete ban on unauthorised collectors.</p> <p>2. Rights can be redefined and strictly regulated.</p> <p>3 Intervention in herb market for providing higher rates to collector and exclude middle men and vested interests.</p> <p>4. Attempts can be made to grow the plants outside park area.</p> <p>5. Formation of cooperatives for maintenance and marketing of these plants.</p> <p>6. Income generation through ecodevelopment activities and link these activities with collection of mushroom and herbs.</p>



	<p>Grazing/fodder: After agriculture and herb collection this is the most important occupation of these people. Rights have been granted over a number of 'thaches' inside the park. Thousands of livestock graze in the park in summer months.</p>	<p>Although number of livestock per household has reduced from 200-400 to 20-100 in the past half century but due to manifold increase in population, overall pressure remains almost same. This constitutes the second most important pressure on the park.</p>	<p>Agricultural inputs can be given to grow fodder crops. Pastures around the village can be developed. There can be scientific management of alpine pastures by involving users and such as temporarily closing some 'thaches' and starting rotational use of them.</p>
	<p>Fuelwood: All the household use fuelwood for cooking and heating the houses. Usually one bundle (25 Kg.) is required in summer and two in winter for each household.</p>	<p>At present no direct threat to the park is visible as fuelwood is available near the villages, however it may pose a threat in the future if the forest around villages are not properly managed and improved.</p>	<p>Plantation and afforestation programmes can be started with peoples participation. Sustainable use can be encouraged. Programmes for fuelwood timber saving devices can be launched as part of biomass generation programmes.</p>
	<p>Timber: As most houses are made of timber large quantities are required for repairing and other various articles besides new construction</p>	<p>At present not a big threat as timber rights are outside the park but in future may pose a threat if forest in ecodevelopment area are not managed and improved considerably. The scarcity of timber in ecodevelopment</p>	<p>All forest cooperation activities around the park should be stopped. It gives wrong impression to the resident people besides increasing scarcity in the peripheral area. More plantation should be done involving the user group in management. Non timber devices should be encouraged.</p>



	<p>Other minor forest produce: People collect a number of minor forest products such as wild edibles, bamboo, jungle haldi, precious stones etc. from inside the park.</p>	<p>It does not pose any threat to park as the quantities taken are very less and sustainable. Most of these produces are taken for self consumption. Besides poor people earn some income by making mats and 'kilta' and 'tokkery' etc.</p>	<p>Users can be organised and facilities provided for using these articles sustainably for generating incomes for the poorer section of the society</p>
	<p>Religious right These people used to visit park for religious purposes and certain rights to way are granted.</p>	<p>No potential threat to the park.</p>	<p>With cooperation they may be very useful for checking illegal activities in the park such as felling, poaching etc.</p>
	<p>Poaching This park has been historically famous for dealing in various items of wildlife and the major threat viz, poaching has stopped to a great extent after Wildlife (Protection) Act (1972). However, some people are still continuing the illegal practice of poaching for various reasons.</p>	<p>Grave threat to wildlife and can exaggerate if not handled strictly with the cooperation of local people.</p>	<p>With people's cooperation it can be stopped completely. More frontline staff should be made available with sufficient facilities and equipment's. Surveillance committees consisting of local people and forest staff be formed. It will also help in the overall management of the park.</p>



<p>Nearly 100 settlements comprising of households situated adjacent to ecodevelopment zone within 10 Km of park boundaries.</p>	<p>They have the same interests as described for the former class but are relatively less dependent on forest produce.</p>	<p>Same as described for the former category but in lesser magnitude. However, it is noted that these people may come into conflict with park management due to their exclusion from the developmental activities.</p>	<p>Cooperative could participate in strengthening the management of natural resources; and by public awareness campaigns towards park activities.</p>
<p>Contractors, middlemen, dealers and other vested interests.</p>	<p>There is a huge differences between the prices collectors get and its actual market price. Also vested interests are reported to be involved in sale and smuggling of various forest produce.</p>	<p>Can mislead the resident people regarding park objectives and ecodevelopment activities. They have also been successful to a small extent in certain pockets. Can encourage residents to resist the policies of the park.</p>	<p>To counter them, peoples full participation should be sought. Simultaneously public awareness campaigns should be launched and park staff should remain in constant touch with the local people.</p>
<p>Himachal Pradesh Department of Forest Farming and Conservation (HPDFFC) and Park management</p>	<p>Overall responsibilities for the management of the park, surrounding areas and ecodevelopment activities</p>	<p>No threat.</p>	<p>Can better manage the park and conserve biodiversity by involving the people. Can ensure people's participation in various biodiversity conservation activities by properly implementing the eco-development plans. Can be instrumental in enhancing the income and quality of life of the resident people.</p>



			Can ensure the sustainable use of natural resources. In addition can effectively restrict the illegal activities by people's participation in management.
Various Govt. dept. and agencies	Various agencies working in the area have responsibility to attend to people's needs and development requirement.	People are apprehensive that other development agencies/government depts. are not taking interest in the area under the impression that park shall take care of all the activities. This impression can cause considerable damage to the park in that people shall accept all kinds of work from park management or in turn think that the area has been neglected due to park.	Management can facilitate the coordination among different departments in the area. Sectoral integration is essential in achieving the park goals. People should feel that park is instrumental in bringing other depts. to them. It shall also help in bringing people close to the park.
Panchayats:	Local democratically elected bodies. Interested in all the ongoing activities in their jurisdiction	No threat	Can be utilised in educating the people about the park and coordinating various multi-sectoral activities.
Local NGO's :	Being voluntary organisations their interest is quite natural.	If not taken into confidence, they can come into conflict with management.	In their absence, the local village level institution and committees can be utilized for



		There are only one or two voluntary organizations working in the area. If their cooperation and collaborations can be solicited it shall help in achieving the objectives of biodiversity conservation.	organising people and participating in conservation activities. If there is a need new NGOs can be established by involving local people.
Various village institutions such as Devta Committees, Mahila Mandals, Gyan Vigyan Committee, Yuva Clubs, etc.	These are very popular and influential local institutions. People discuss all their problems on this platforms and seek guidance also.	If not taken into confidence or given wrong impression regarding the goals of park and ecodevelopment. They can jeopardise the activities and without their cooperation's people's full participation can not be achieved.	If taken into confidence they can render most useful service by convincing the people to cooperate and participate fully in the conservation activities. By their cooperation ecodevelopment activities can be made more acceptable and meaningful.
Wildlife Institute of India	Responsible for coordinating research and developing monitoring protocol of the project	No threat.	Can give valuable inputs to the project by providing adequate information for betterment of biodiversity conservation activities.



Donar Agency	To increase resource productivity in ecodevelopment area and reduce dependence on park through development of alternatives by provision of nonforest based employment's, income generation schemes etc.	Since the people have been engaged in forest based employment's, it is not practical and feasible to exclude all forest resources based employment. It shall also pose structural problems and create rift between people and park.	It shall be desirable to initiate some of the employment schemes by sustainably using minor forest produce (MFP) for the poor. This shall help engaging the poor people in income generating activities from forests.
Govt. of India through Wildlife (Protection) Act	Total ban on all human activities inside the park through settlement of rights.	Low degree of political commitment, lack of resources, insufficient infrastructure and heavy dependence of local people on park resources are obstacles in these directions. Any haste can create serious park-people conflicts.	Gradually decreasing people's dependence on park resources by providing alternative employment/sources of income by integrating all the developmental activities. Govt. should give extra resources to the park management for launching more employment generation schemes.



2.3 COB PROJECT ACTIVITIES IN GHNP

It has been noted earlier that since 1994 the forest department of Himachal Pradesh (Park Management) has been undertaking various ecodevelopment activities in the area adjacent to park (Eco-development project area) in order to conserve the biodiversity of the park and adjacent Sainj and Tirthan wildlife sanctuaries. As shown in the project map, the goal of biodiversity conservation is to be achieved by realizing the twin objectives of Eco-development *viz.* reduction of people's dependence on park resources (mushroom, herbs, grazing etc.) improving dependent communities' socio-economic conditions by providing alternative income generation programmes and building in sustainable harvesting regimes. Seen in totality, the objectives are supposed to live to realization of project goal. Definite results or outputs are required to get to the objectives and the outputs can not come through without a set of activities and matching budgetary inputs (see project map). This chapter details out various activities/inputs undertaken in the ecodevelopment project area of the park to achieve the desired outputs. Next three chapters (case studies) shall assess the desirability/feasibility and success of the ecodevelopment activities in achieving the desired outputs and objectives.

The following table 2.2 and lists out various inputs/activities undertaken in the ecodevelopment project area of GHNP. This table is largely based on secondary information, in-depth interviews with the park management, frontline staff and other concerns.

Table 2.2 Activities/Programs implemented in the Eco-development area of GHNP under the Conservation of Biodiversity Project

Activity	Success	Shortfall
Encouraging People's Participation	<p>With the sincere efforts made by management people's participation has been evolved. Eco-development committees have been successfully formed in most of the areas. People participation in preparing and implementing microplans is encouraging.</p> <p><u>Study tours have been organized</u></p>	<p>The degree of participation is less than desired for the success of the project. Eco-development committees are less broad based. No partnership in Management of forest resources. Most of the persons participate for securing of temporary labour work rather than achieving the overall objectives of the Eco-development project. Providing sustainable employment opportunities.</p> <p>Desired participation of other village institutions is lacking.</p>
Site specific microplanning and implementation	<p>Site specific micro planes have been made and implemented in various villages/areas with people's participation through Eco-development committees.</p>	<p>The poorest and SCs did not get due representation and priority which should have been given to them by virtue of their being relatively more dependent on forest resources. Some of them allege that a few influential persons have influenced the activities. Micro-plans lack specific institutional support planning for generating long term employment avenues such as finance, production, marketing etc. In short, these can be criticised on grounds of coverage, lack of problem solving objectives (Biodiversity conservation) and self-sustainability etc.</p>
Public Awareness Campaigns	<p>Public awareness campaigns have been launched by the park staff at grassroot level. Gian-Vigan Samiti was also given assignment to undertake public awareness campaigns throughout the Eco-development area which they have been doing through public meeting, street plays and exhibitions etc. Park Management has also been successful in holding exhibitions and information dissemination activities in various local level fairs, gatherings etc.</p>	<p>Not sufficient particularly due to lack of staff, (staff can't remain in constant touch with people) and organised efforts. Gian Vigan Samiti has been doing it according to their <u>convenience</u>. Cooperation of other departments particularly panchayats and public relation department is lacking. Due to lack of proper information, vested interests have been spreading the rumours that by participating in Eco-development activities, people shall lose their traditional rights over forest resources while in reality there is at least no formal link between Eco-development activities and settlement of rights.</p>
Programmes for the improvement of transport and communication	<p>These have been taken up at large scale as part of trust building as well as actual Eco-development activities. A number of footpaths, mule paths and jeep roads have been constructed or repaired. It has not only mobilized people to participate in Eco- development activities but also provided temporary employment to a number of people.</p>	<p>The programmes do not fall in the category of direct sustainable employment generation activities and provides employment on temporary basis only. Up to the stage of trust building/infrastructure building activities, it is desirable but thereafter direct objective related activities should be substituted.</p>



Soil and water conservation activities.	A number of activities including slope stabilization, minor irrigation and agricultural land development have been undertaken.	Coverage is very less. Only a small number of families benefited.
Agricultural development programs.	A number of activities have been undertaken including distribution of Plants, distribution of improved seeds, demonstrations, workshops and training programmes with the help of agricultural dept. and research institutes etc.	Not sufficient and due to lack of institutional support based on linkages, no substantial gains have been achieved.
Horticulture development	Efforts have been made to introduce new varieties of fruit trees. Free distribution of apple plants and insecticides/pesticides as well as counselling programmes have been undertaken.	It should be done carefully because horticulture particularly apple growing is likely to reduce the bio-diversity. Once trees are grown mature, no other crops particularly fodder/husk crops can be grown. Land is engaged for a long period.
Animal Husbandary programmes	Some activities like artificial insemination and veterianary camps in some parts of Eco-dev. area have been conducted, in which people have shown enthusiasm and participation. Granting loan for purchasing high breed cows etc. is being considered.	Concrete plans have not been made and activities under taken. There seem to be conducted no proper studies regarding the proposed stock improvement, dairy operations etc.
Bio-mass generation programmes, Fuel wood and Fodder plantation, Timber plantation etc.	Plantations particularly of broad leave trees have been done throughout the Eco-dev. area on vacant land adjacent to the villages.	No concrete estimates are available regarding gap in supply and demand. Plantations of mixed fuel and fodder species as well as timber should be taken on priority bases considering the ever increasing future requirements. No arrangement for proper look after are made.
Sectoral integration	Various effort have been made in the past and success have been achieved in two direction viz. 1. On the one hand attempts have succeeded in co-ordinating the activities of various departments. 2. On the other hand organizing public meetings where officials of all deptts come on one platform and listen to people's grievances, have been mooted.	No concrete plans made or institutional linkages established where all the budget of various departments are discussed and priority and policies formulated keeping in view the desired objectives.
Training to Staff	1. Training to front-line staff. a. micro-planning; b. Participatory methodology. 2. Training to officers.	Only a few members of the staff have got training. Further, a number of members got transferred after the training. Therefore the full benefits of training were never realized.

2.4 OTHER ACTIVITIES UNDERTAKEN BY THE MANAGEMENT

2.4.1 Enforcement

The increase in the number of guards, availability of equipment and construction of paths have streamlined the enforcement institutions. Also people's participation has brought down illicit felling and poaching etc.

2.4.2 Direct Income Generation Activities

Management proposes to deposit certain amount of money in the accounts of Eco-dev. Committees of each area. These committees in turn shall provide loans to needy people for establishing household industries/dairy etc. It is also proposed to grant a certain amount as subsidies to the needy people who wish to undertake employment generation activities.

2.4.3 Relocation

Only two villages i.e. Kundar and Majan have been relocated and now there is no village inside the part. However, there are still 2 villages inside the Sainj wildlife sanctuary. The villagers dislocated in the former two villages have not been given any alternative land and houses so far. This attitude of the authorities has caused suspicions and apprehensions in the minds of villagers regarding the intention of the management.

2.4.4 Crop Damage Control

So far nothing has been done. Only a marginal compensation is provided that too in case of death of a livestock/cattle or human. People claim that after the establishment of GHNP, the incidents of crop damage and killings of livestock has increased considerably.

2.4.5 Trust/Society for long term Bio-diversity Conservation

In the fourth year of COB project GHNP Biodiversity conservation society has been formed.

2.4.6 Programs for distribution of timber/fuelwood saving devices

In many villages, management has provided subsidized timber/fuelwood saving devices such as cookers, improved chulahs, compost pits and grain storage tanks etc. However only a few households are reported to have benefited from them.

2.4.7 Public Health

Management has organized many health camps in various villages of the eco-dev. area in collaboration with the health dept. Free medicines have been distributed among the people



who came for treatment in these camps. It has helped in confidence building between management and the villagers.

2.4.8 New Management Plan

Work on preparing a new management plan for GHNP is reported to be in progress.

Table 2.2 has enlisted various activities/ programmes implemented in GHNP area under the COB Project and their success and shortfalls as brought out through the discussions with park management and other concerned persons. A survey of all the thirteen revenue villages of eco. development project area revealed significant variations in the perception of local people regarding management of park resources and impact of eco-development activities. The survey also found significant differences between the work proposals of park management and their actual implementation and effects in the field. Results of this survey which lists the nature and magnitude of various eco-development activities in each of the nearly 130 hamlets falling in the eco-development area are given in Annexure - II of this report. This information was obtained through a Rapid Rural Appraisal in which various social groups in the villages, members and office bearers of villages eco-development committees, frontline staff of the park and other key persons were interviewed.

2.4.9 Review of CoB project activities

Following text provides a brief review of the progress made in achieving the project objectives over the last 5 years.

i) First Phase of the Project (1994 - 97)

The project being an experiment to test the new approach i.e. "participatory management in bio-diversity conservation" initiated in the area for the first time, faced certain difficulties in the initial stages of its implementation. As the concept was new to both the forest department as well as local people, both the partners were reluctant to participate fully in the project implementation. Project's late implementation can largely be attributed to the lack of awareness among the local people about the project objectives prior to implementation. Thereafter, the management initiated public awareness campaigns in the villages to sensitize the villagers about the project objectives by holding exhibitions and other information dissemination activities in various local fairs and gatherings. In addition, a state level NGO "Gyan Vigyan Samiti" was also involved which undertook extensive public awareness campaigns throughout the eco-development area and organised public meetings, street plays, exhibitions etc. It helped in mobilizing some sections of the target population though full participation of all the stakeholders could not be achieved. Meanwhile, the management initiated various trust and confidence building activities in the area and succeeded in forming eco-development committees in many villages.

The preliminary indicative plan for Eco-development Programmes was prepared by the Indian Institute of Public Administration (IIP) by using Participatory Rural Appraisal and other relevant techniques. However this indicative plan was not based on a scientific assessment of the ground realities and also did not include comprehensive micro-plans for possible Eco-development activities. Therefore micro-plans for some villages were prepared with the help of some outside NGOs, such as SPWD, CHIRAG (Nainital) and ACTIONAID (Banaglore) etc. However these were also not found suitable. The basic reason was that this type of exercise was foreign both to the staff and the people. Moreover the effectiveness of micro-planning Process was significantly hindered by the absence of local NGOs and by the fact that authorities ignored other existing traditional local institutions (Amita Baviskar, 1997).

In most of the micro-plans, the linkage between village Eco-development investments and conservation actions were lacking. The management had to resort to traditional semi top down approaches to project implementation particularly due to 2 reasons ; (i) Detailed guidance to the staff on participatory process were lacking . Only a few had the experience based on their work with some past forestry plantation or Joint forest management programmes (ii) lack of awareness among the local people about the project prior to implementation which failed to evolve popular support or participation (Amita Baviskar, 1997).

A review of project activities in this phase reveals that most of the works/activities remained confined to civil works only aimed at both trust and confidence building as well as developing communications and infrastructure. Most of the employment villagers got in this phase was of temporary nature where people worked as casual labourers in the civil works being undertaken in their villages. Only a few activities were aimed at providing sustainable on-farm and off-farm employment avenues and fell short of achieving the project objectives. In short, the project implementation progressed slowly on account of lack of capacities of the staff as well as local community/institutions particularly in areas of microplanning and implementation, ability to collaborate with other stakeholders, to manage financial transactions and assets, to take decision/agreement and their implementation etc. In this phase of the project, participation of weaker sections of the local population particularly the SCs, landless and females remained marginal. Eco-development committees were dominated by a few influential and upper caste stakeholders. Moreover, lack of ability to identify target population and treating all the rural population homogenous rather than heterogeneous resulted in undesirable investments. As per the criteria of investment adopted in this stage, all the villages/microplanning units were allocated funds @Rs.15,000 per household. In other words, all the money to be invested in the eco-development zone was divided by the total number of households and budget allocated to the villages according to their population rather than according to their dependence on the park resources and other relevant considerations. As per the planning, 60% of the total budget allocated to a village was to be spent on community activities and the rest 40% on individual activities i.e. granting loans/subsidies to the dependent/unemployed population for setting up viable income generation units. However, a review of the investments shows that while substantial investments were made in the community works, mostly of civil nature, only a marginal sum could be spent on individual activities. Although a number of programmes



aimed at improving the productivity and profitability of on farm as well as off farm employment avenues were initiated but most of them remained symbolic due to lack of participation, marginal inputs and absence of linkages with other key components such as line departments, marketing, maintenance etc.

ii) Second Phase (1997 onwards)

This phase of the project began with a review of the past performance of the project activities which was undertaken by both the primary stakeholders i.e. park management and local communities. A number of meetings, seminars and workshops were conducted in which assessment of the progress made in achieving the outputs and objectives of CoB project activities was made.

The review brought out the weaknesses in the criteria of investments, functionality of local institutions/VEDCs and their capacities, adequacy of microplans, capacities of frontline staff, distribution of benefits, lack of participation of the weaker sections etc. On the basis of results of this review, park management initiated several remedial steps/alternative course on various stakeholders. Major policy changes/alternative steps were taken to achieve project objectives including the following:

a) Reorganization of VEDCs:

As mentioned above, in the first/initial phase of the project implementation, VEDCs were not broad based. These were represented by a small number of influential and higher caste people and lacked participation of more dependent/vulnerable stakeholders. Moreover, these committees existed only on unit levels (one unit is comprised of several hamlets) where a few individuals enjoyed all powers in decision making and implementation.

To overcome these weaknesses, it was resolved to reorganize the VEDCs. In this reorganization, stress was laid on forming and strengthening the general houses in which the participation/membership of one male and one female from each household was compulsory and in turn these General houses were to choose the executive committees for their respective units. People were made aware that general houses in which every household is represented, should decide the policies and activities to be undertaken in their units and the executive committee is only to implement these decisions of the general house. These measures substantially encouraged the common men to participate in the eco-development activities which in turn increased justifiable distribution of benefits.

b) Capacity building of VEDCs:

A number of training/workshops aimed at building the capacities of local institutions were organised in this phase. Special emphasis was laid to strengthen the VEDCs in areas such as handling financial matters and maintaining accounts and other records, creating community assets and their maintenance, collaboration with other key stakeholders, microplanning, creating mechanisms for conflict resolution etc. The VEDCs were empowered by devolving a number of powers particularly giving them full responsibility to plan and implement the eco-



development activities in their respective areas. It was resolved that all developmental works shall be given to VEDCs for execution. They were also asked to open bank accounts, maintain passbooks, account books and other record of their activities. They were empowered to select the individuals for training in various income generation occupations and grant loans to the needy for setting up self employment units.

c) Capacity building of staff:

A number of training programmes were organised to build the capacity of staff in various required areas. Under this programme, members of the staff both frontline as well as officers were also sent to various institutions/organizations for training in microplanning and participatory management. Though, it helped in various ways to streamline the project activities in various ways.

d) Community works - shift from civil works to biomass generation activities:

The review pointed out that most of the inputs made so far were centered around undertaking various civil works of the trust and confidence building nature and lacked linkages with project objectives. In this phase, it was decided to concentrate on activities which are aimed at increasing the availability of biomass in the vicinity of villages. Plantation of various plant species were undertaken in most of the villages, nurseries were developed in all the 3 watershed areas of the eco-development zone and agreements aimed at their maintenance and protection were entered into between the park management and the local institutions. Other programmes initiated in this phase included water management and developing agriculture and horticulture in the area.

e) Individual works - training and finance:

In order to expedite the process of providing alternative employment avenues to the villagers, a new scheme was formulated. According to the revised scheme, villagers who wanted to establish their own units are to be selected from all the eco-development units and sent for training in various trades of their choice. After successful completion of the training they shall be provided financial assistance in the form of soft loans.

Two types of activities are visualised under this category:

- i) These are the activities which are though capital intensive but not commercial in nature and primarily used for meeting the personal needs of the villagers to reduce their dependence on the biological diversity of the park. For such activities the beneficiaries include local artisans, farmers etc. They will be required to apply to the VEDCs for the items required by them. The VEDCs will forward the list of applicant and items to the society who will make the purchases and supply the same to VEDC. The items will be supplied to the applicant on the condition that he / she will deposit minimum 50% of the cost of the item in the VEDC's fund at the time of delivery. For this purpose, the VEDCs will maintain a separate register and make appropriate cash book entries.
- ii) These are the activities which are of income generating nature and help the villagers to earn livelihoods. These are expected to wean way the people from their dependence on forest resources.



3.0 CASE STUDY – I SOCIAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT OF COB PROJECT ACTIVITIES ON SOME OF THE DEPENDENT VILLAGES

3.1 INTRODUCTION

In this phase of the study all those hamlets are included which are primary right-holders in respect of various resources of the park and are highly dependent on a variety of park resources for their domestic, agricultural, animal husbandry and other socio-religious needs. These hamlets are situated in immediate periphery of the protected area and also collect mushrooms and medicinal plants from inside the park in summer months which is the only source of cash incomes for them. Following hamlets fall in this category:

Sl. No	Village	Phanti	No. of Household
1.	Kunder	Railla	2
2.	Majan	Railla	15
3.	Dhar	Pakhri	5
4.	Shalinga	Pakhri	12
5.	Shungcha	Pakhri	7
6.	Maror	Gara Parli	5
7.	Khruncha	Tinder	4
8.	Dingcha	Tinder	11
9.	Kauncha	Tinder	7
10	Lajeri	Tinder	5

All of the above hamlets were surveyed for the study.

3.2 ECO-DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES

Table below shows the various eco-development activities undertaken so far in the villages surveyed for the study. It also shows the effect these activities are likely to have.



Sl. No.	Village	Activity	General Impact
1.	Kunder	No activity since the village was to be relocated but nothing happened so far.	People are against the park for their exclusion from the eco-development activities.
2.	Majan	- As above -	- As above -
3.	Dhar	a) Stone soling of village street. b) Distribution of some fruit plants.	a) Confidence building. b) No immediate positive impacts.
4.	Shalinga	a) Stone soling of village streets b) Construction of a water tank c) Distribution of some fruit seedlings, Pressure Cookers etc. d) Plantations of broad leaf trees near the village.	a) Confidence building b) Confidence building c&d) Marginal increase in incomes and increased availability of biomass in the coming years.
5.	Shungcha	a) One bridge b) One bridle path c) Distribution of fruits seedlings and spray pumps on subsidized rates. d) Approx. 2 hec. Area planted with broad leaf tree species.	a&b) Increased transport facilities c& d) Marginal Increase in fruit production and biomass expected in the coming year.
6.	Maror	No activity (since the village was to be relocated)	People become hostile towards park.
7.	Khurencha	Construction of water tank which is not being used by the villagers.	People are suspicious of the intentions of park management. They complain the money come for their welfare is being utilised elsewhere
8.	Dingcha	a) Stone soiling of village streets b) Distribution of apple seedlings subsidized rates. c) Distribution of cookers, agricultural implements on subsidized rate.	a) Trust & confidence building b) No immediate positive impact. Only few plants were taken by a few villagers. c) Very marginal impact expected because only a few household purchased them.
9.	Kauncha	a) One rain shelter b) Bridle path from Kauncha to Khuranca c) Distribution of pressure cooker spray pumps and fruit seedlings on subsidies rates.	a&b) Increased interaction between park staff and villagers.
10.	Lajeri	a) Stone soling of village streets. b) Distribution of some fruit seedlings	a) Confidence building b) No immediate positive impact.



Impact of project activities in some of the desired areas has been analyzed below:

3.2.1 Impact on Local Institutions

As has been mentioned in the foregoing pages of this report, all project activities are to be undertaken through the preparation and implementation of microplanes made by the local communities/primary stakeholders. Local communities were to be involved by establishing village level institutions called VDCs in which each household of the village was to be represented by one male and one female member. These institutions (VDCs/general house of the village) were to again chose their executive committees comprising members of all social groups within the village. These executive committees are responsible for managing the day to day affairs of the VDCs and take important decisions regarding eco-development activities.

There are near about 150 small villages/hamlets in the eco-development project areas. Most of them have a population of less than 15 households. Park management considering the difficulty and non feasibility of establishing 150 VDCs clubbed all the hamlets falling in the eco-development zone into 18 units taking into account their proximately, other similarities into account. In this way only 18 VDCs were formed. These are named after the principal village of the unit. On the initiative of the park management villagers meetings were called at the principal villages of each eco-development unit, where only a few people from villages other than the principal village where meeting was held, turned up. In some of these meetings executive committees for each of the units were formed without first forming general house or hamlet level committees. In this way only those few persons who came to the principal village for this meeting, participated in the formation of VDCs executive committees. Further, since the meetings took place at principal village of each unit, the number of villagers attending the meeting were more from this village while there has been only a token presence of villagers from other hamlets of the unit. Therefore these executive committees were dominated by the persons from the principal villages.

3.2.2 VEDCs in Sample Villages

Out of all the 10 villages surveyed in this study only Shalinga is the principal village of its unit and hence is the headquarter of this unit. This committee is dominated by villagers from this village. In rest of the villages surveyed, there was found no eco-development committee of any sort. However it was admitted that one or two persons from each of these villages are members of executive committee/VDC of their respective unit. People from these villages who are members of the unit level executive committee were neither nominated nor elected



by the villagers/villages they represent but on the contrary suggested and nominated by either the residents of principal village or park staff in order to give token representation to all villages in the unit.

3.2.3 Functioning and Capacities of VDCs

For most of the project period these executive committees worked as a vehicle for forest department who invested money in various civil works aimed at building trust and confidence between park staff and local villagers. Recruitment of labour for these works was done through these committees and they drew power from their authority to provide short-term employment in these works to anyone they want. Secondly distribution of energy and timber saving devices such as pressure cookers, grain storage tanks and pumping sets etc. was done through them. People alleged favoritism on the part of committee members while providing short term employment in civil works and distributing above mentioned devices.

In short these committees are neither properly functional nor have the popular mandate. Meetings generally take place when forest department team comes for preparing micro-plans where members of these committees participate in rural appraisals (PRAs) and formation of micro-plans. Activities included in the micro-plans are decided by a few influential members of the executive and sometimes no resident of a small hamlet is consulted while deciding the activities for that hamlet. All the villages surveyed in this study except Shalinga complain that they were not consulted while preparing micro-plans/deciding activities for their villages. Moreover most of these eco-development committees are dominated by influential (high caste and rich) people of the villages and representation of women, schedule castes and other weaker sections is only symbolic.

These VDCs/local institutions have practically no financial powers. All the activities identified are though sometimes implemented jointly by VDCs and park staff, payments are solely made by the forest staff. Most of the committees were also not found capable of maintaining official records and this is done by the concerned forest guard who happen to be member secretary of the respective VDC.

Recently these committees are going through drastic changes. In some areas village level broad based committees comprising members from each household have been formed and old executive committees have been replaced by members elected by these newly formed village level committee.

These new VDCs have been granted ample powers and responsibilities to plan and implement the eco-development activities for their respective areas. It has been resolved that ;



- a. All eco-development works shall be given to VDCs for execution.
- b. Each VDC shall open an account in the bank and shall handle its own financial affairs.
- c. The VDCs shall keep and maintain all records such as bank passbook, membership registers and minutes books etc.
- d. VDC shall be responsible for just and fair distribution of the usufruct derived and
- e. It shall select the individuals for grant of loans for self employment works.

As most of the VDCs are not capable to undertake the responsibilities devolved upon them recently, programmes for their capacity building are being implemented. Some training workshops have already been concluded and others are in the pipe line. It is hoped that soon these local institutions shall become capable of discharging their responsibilities.

3.2.4 Resource Use Practices

Affecting changes in the resource use practices of the villagers is the most important objective of the eco-development project activities. Collection of mushrooms, various medicinal plants and grazing livestock in summer months constitute the major dependencies on the park. In addition the villagers surveyed in this study also collect various woods, grasses, branches of trees, fuelwood and fodder from inside the park because of their close physical proximity to the park. Discussion on this aspect with the villagers focussed on following major areas:

- a) Change in the weight/volume of mushrooms and medicinal plants collected by these villagers.
- b) Change in the number of collectors brought about by the project activities.
- c) Change in the number of livestock either at home or grazing in the park.
- d) Change in the weight of other MFP.
- e) Agreements/decisions taken or taken and implemented by the villagers in respect of use/management of above resources.

It was revealed that so far no agreements or decisions have been taken by the residents of these villages in this regard except village Shalinga where agreements of this sort find mention in the village micro-plan. However in case of Shalinga village, these agreements were never taken seriously or implemented by the villagers. So far as rest of the nine villages are concerned, villagers expressed the apprehension that their resource use rights are going to be curtailed or regulated by the government but they said they are not prepared to give up or regulate their resource use practices unless they are provided with alternative employment

and other compensation by the park authorities. It is probably due to total lack of awareness about eco-development goals and values. Lack of broad based VDCs in these villages have further accelerated the situation. These villagers seem to perceive the project as a source of short term employment/loans etc. and for getting subsidized resources such as pressure cookers, spray pumps, agricultural implements and sewing machines etc. There is an urgent need for initiating strong awareness and extension programmes followed by establishment of broad based general houses (VDCs) in each of the villages.

It was found that though there have been marginal and sometimes substantial changes in the weight of mushrooms and medicinal plants collected by the villagers but these changes occur due to various climatic and other related factors rather than due to project activities/interventions.

3.2.5 Impact on Land Use (Agriculture and Horticulture)

During the meetings in the villages surveyed in this study, an assessment of the change in land use practices particularly the effect of eco-development activities on agriculture and horticulture was assessed. In all the villages surveyed, crops are by and large grown for self consumption/domestic use and not for sale. Almost all the villagers present in the meetings said that since yields of various crops are very low, there is no surplus produce to sell in the market. However a few households in Salinga and Kauncha villages admitted that they have started some new cash crops in the past two years particularly Garlic and Gobhi but it is their own initiative and park staff or VDCs had no role in it. It was found that no activity aimed at improving agriculture has been initiated in these villages so far. In short there was found no notable change neither in the net area under various crops (change in the cropping pattern) nor in the productivity of various agricultural products effected by project interventions. Corn, Kodra, Saryara, Kathu, Mash, Razma, wheat and Paddy remained the major crops in these villages in all these years.

So far as horticulture is concerned, people in all the 10 villages surveyed admitted that park staff distributed seedlings of fruit trees at subsidized rates. They also contended that since the seedlings were limited in number and many people wanted to buy them, only those who had influence could get them. Further, since these were given on cash payments, only those households who had cash money could buy these seedlings and the poor and weaker households could not take them. Many villagers did not want to grow fruit trees because they felt that in the absence of roads and transport it shall not be profitable to grow apple etc. In addition, spray pump were also distributed by the park staff through VDCs on subsidized rates. However here again the number of pumps was very limited and only a few influential and rich households bought them while the weaker and poor had no access to it.



Discussion in these village meetings brought out the following two important facts regarding the horticulture improvement programmes in the area.

- a) Only a few households have planted fruit trees. They too have planted a few ones (5 to 50). It shall take 3 to 5 years to mature these plants. Therefore the income if any shall come after many years and it shall be very small given the number of plantations. Meanwhile farmers will have to invest money for their maintenance (pesticides, pruning etc.) from their pocket.
- b) The land on which these are planted, shall get engaged for many years. Farmers shall be deprived of the annual product including fodder and biomass etc. grown on this land for a very long period and they shall compensate it from the existing forests.

Given these facts, it is strongly suggested that before initiating horticulture development programmes, a detailed feasibility analysis should be undertaken.

3.2.6 Impact on Off-farm Employment

Providing alternative employment to substitute and enhance the incomes of substantially and genuinely dependent households is one of the most important objectives of the COB project. Microplans list a number of measures aimed at providing alternative employment to dependent stakeholders and improving the already existing off farm employment avenues in the area. This list includes providing training in bee keeping, handlooms, tailoring and other such professions to the villagers and later provide them loans on easy interest for setting up their own units. In all the 10 villages surveyed in this study, it was found that in the last 3 years of the project, no one has got any alternative employment facilitated by project activities. It was however admitted by the villagers that in the past 2/3 times some sewing machines, carpentry equipment, looms etc. were distributed by the park staff on subsidized rates and a few people also bought them but in the absence of financial and marketing linkages they are not in a position to earn money out of it.

Recently a number of efforts are being made by the park management to expedite the process of providing alternative employment avenues to the villagers. For this purpose, villager who want to establish their own units are selected from all the eco-development units and are going to be trained in various trades of their choice. After successful completion of the training they shall be provided financial assistance in the form of soft loans.

In addition, programs were also initiated to strengthen the already existing employment avenues. For such activities the beneficiaries include local artisans, farmers, etc. They will be required to apply to the VEDC for the item/ implements needed by them. The VEDC will

forward the list of applicants and items to the /Society who will make the purchases and supply the same to the VEDC. The item will be supplied to the applicant on the condition that he/she will deposit minimum 50% of the cost of the item in the VEDC Fund at the time of delivery. For this purpose, the VEDC will maintain a separate register and make appropriate cash book entries.

For setting up household level units, the applicant, as identified in the microplan, would be required to apply for the loan to the VEDC. After the applicant enters into an agreement with the VEDC, a loan to an extent of 2/3rd of the total cost would be given to the applicant by the VEDC. The VEDC will forward the application and the agreement to the /Society who will credit the amount into the VEDC account. The applicant would be expected to meet 1/3rd of the cost of the enterprise. The interest rate to be charged and the repayment schedule would be decided by the executive body of the concerned VEDC. The VEDC would be required to maintain a register for such transactions and make appropriate cash book entries.

It was found that many needy villagers have applied for loans and training however so far only a few have been sent for training. This scheme is expected to bring about a substantial change in the present employment scenario in the eco-development project area.

3.2.7 Impact on Vulnerable Stake Holders

Vulnerable stake holders such as females, SCs, landless and other economically weaker sections are supposed to be the primary beneficiaries of the project investment and activities. Therefore, the social benefit of project activities either the enhancement of income and employment or the increased availability of natural resources should reach them in the first instance. However during the study it was found that under the project the whole village community has been considered homogenous rather than heterogeneous. Eco-development planning seems to have not taken into account diversity of various economic/social groups within the villages. Moreover not all the villages falling in eco-development area are homogenous or have equal dependence on park resources. Some villages are very near to the park boundaries, situated on high altitudes without access to any transport and communication facilities while the others are far away from the park, situated near the roads and have relatively less dependence on the P.A. Strangely park authorities have put all the villages and all the villagers at par. All the money to be invested in village level eco-development activities has been divided equally among nearly 2000 households in all the 150 hamlets. It is certainly not desirable and instead more dependent and vulnerable stake holder should have been allocated more money. Secondly mode of investment of this money



is decided by a few influential office bearer of the executive committees in which these sections have no substantial representation and therefore money is invested in areas identified by and beneficial to the influential persons.

Secondly villagers of the sample villages complained that a number of devices/item such as pressure cookers, spray pumps, grain storage tanks, looms etc. which are distributed on subsidized rates are purchased by the rich and influential, because poor and vulnerable stakeholders seldom have the cash money to buy them and even if they have money they can't get it because of limited number of items which are given to influential persons only.

It shall not be out of place here to mention that due to lack of social power and consequent lack of effective participation, these vulnerable groups of stake holders have been rendered at the receiving end because neither they have been accorded special consideration given their vulnerability nor are they getting their share in the general scheme of things. There is an urgent need to identify and empower these sections. Recently some steps taken by the management in this direction such as organising these groups, encouraging and facilitating them to form their own self help groups; providing them training for setting up small enterprises etc. are likely to increase their participation in decision making process. It is also necessary to restructure the present unit level executive committee (VDCs) and form hamlet level committees in which all the households particularly the females and other weaker sections should be represented as is envisaged in the project document.

3.3 SUMMARY

The foregoing analysis shows that even after three years of project implementation, a large number of dependant population is not fully aware and convinced about the objectives and values of the COB project. Most of the work done in the villages is of civil nature such as construction of temples, rain shelters, stone soling of village streets, and leveling of grounds etc. which have no direct linkages with the project objectives except building trust and confidence between the park department and local villagers. Further the local institution/VDCs lack capacities to handle their responsibilities. They also lack popular support and participation and are controlled by those who are least dependent on park resources. Recent steps taken by the management to make there committees broad based and build their capacities is likely to improve the situation substantially.

Although there is a mention of various agreements between park management and local villagers aimed a bringing change in the current resources use practices, in practice these agreements are seldom implemented. There is an urgent need to make aware the stake holders about the project objectives and to bring about changes in the resource use practices in consultation with all dependent villagers. This can be done by soliciting full participation of all social groups which is currently lacking. Efforts made at improving agriculture and horticulture are not sufficient. There is a need³² to identify the thrust areas in agriculture sector and implement schemes by involving all line departments. Irrigation facilities have to be

4.0 CASE STUDY – II

SOCIAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT OF COB PROJECT ACTIVITIES ECODEVELOPMENT UNIT –FARYADI

4.1 INTRODUCTION

Faryadi ecodevelopment unit falls in Tirthan Wildlife Range of Great Himalayan National Park. It is consisted of Faryadi village and some surrounding house holds and has a total number of 57 households. The total population of the unit is 337 persons out of which 173 are males and the rest 164 are female. Out of all 57 households, 26 are Rajputs while the remaining 31 are Scheduled caste and other backward castes. Though most of the households possess agricultural land, Rajputs are the primary landholders while most of the SCs and other weaker sections have marginal land holdings. The later category earns their livelihood by making and selling various handicraft items used for agricultural and domestic purposes. A few Rajputs are also in Government service. People of this village own a few livestock of which cows are predominant compared to other nearby villages where sheep and goat have predominance over other animals.

4.2 DEPENDENCE ON NATURAL RESOURCES OF THE PARK

In this unit most of the SC families have very small land holdings and the agricultural produce from that is insufficient for even catering their food requirements. In order to earn cash income for buying ration and meeting other household requirements, most of them are engaged in making various handicraft articles used for agricultural and domestic purposes such as *Mats, Kiltas, Tokri, Mud pots, etc.* They collect Bamboo, Wild Zinger, and branches of certain trees, clay and some wood species from inside the park for making these articles. Each family engaged in this occupation earns near about 20 –50 rupees per day by selling them to the needy higher caste farmers and other residents inside as well as outside the village.

In addition many villagers irrespective of their caste collect mushrooms and a number of medicinal plants from the park area, besides grazing their livestock. Selling mushrooms and medicinal plants is the most important source of earning cash incomes for them. However, people of this unit are not dependent on park resources for fodder, fuel wood and timber though they occasionally collect some woods and branches of trees for making their agricultural implements, household utensils and performing religious ceremonies.

4.3 COB PROJECT ACTIVITIES

Ecodevelopment activities were first initiated in this unit in the middle of 1997 when frontline



staff of the park held a meeting with the villagers and informed them about the COB project. After some days again a meeting was held where forest staff and villagers deliberated over the project objectives and planned activities for meeting these objectives. It was in this meeting that ecocodevelopment committee (VEDC) was formed and micro plan for the village was prepared. From then onwards, a number of activities have been undertaken in this unit. In the following pages these activities along with their impact on various sectors are analysed.

4.2.1 Inputs

A sum of rupees 8,44,000 was allocated for undertaking required ecocodevelopment activities in this unit. Its distribution in respect of undertaking various activities aimed at achieving the COB project objectives is shown in Table 4.1.

Table 4.1 Budget allocated for various ecocodevelopment activities in Faryadi Ecocodevelopment Unit

Name of the activity	Budget allocated	% of total budget	Budget spent till Date	% of budget spent	Balance	% balance
Civil works	482000.00	57.11	270000.00	56.02	212000.00	43.98
On farm employment / income generation	246500.00	29.21	58200.00	23.61	188300.00	76.39
Off farm employment / income generation	37000.00	4.38	7000.00	18.92	30000.00	81.08
Biomass / energy saving devices	54500.00	6.46	1700.00	3.12	52800.00	96.88
Increasing availability of natural resources	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Strengthening VDC	24000.00	2.84	5000.00	20.83	19000.00	79.17
Total	844000.00	100.00	341900.00	40.51	502100.00	59.49

4.2.2 Budget provisions and Biodiversity Conservation

The conservation of biodiversity project with the definite goal of biodiversity conservation envisages doing the same by having certain distinct objectives. The twin objectives of ecocodevelopment remain; reduction of villagers' dependency on park resources and improving their socio economic conditions by providing alternate income generation programmes and building sustainable harvesting regimes. Increasing resource productivity in areas adjacent to villagers and provision to alternate avenues of sustainable employment are central to ecocodevelopment programmes. Seen in the totality all budgetary provisions should be made to address these objectives.



Budgetary provisions for undertaking ecodevelopment activities in this unit are shown in Table 4.1. It reveals that a highly significant proportion of the total budget (57%) is being spent on civil works most of which are of a trust and confidence building nature. These works include construction/repair of bridal paths, stone soling of village streets, leveling of *Devta* grounds, etc., and provide temporary employment for some men days to the local villagers who work as laborers during the work. Since the village is already on motorable road, these activities in no ways facilitate transportation of men and material and most of them are planned to enlist the support of villagers for CoB project. On the other hand budget provisions for developing sustainable alternative employment/income generation activities both on farm as well as off farm, seem to be insufficient with the later having a marginal share of 4% only. More over, near about 80% of the total money allocated to on farm and off farm employment schemes is left unspent compared to only 43% of the total money allocated for civil works. Strangely, no budgetary provisions are made in the micro plan to increase the bio mass/natural resource availability in the village forests and areas peripheral to the park. A brief analyses of the budgetary provisions outlined in the village micro plan indicates the need to undertake urgent feasibility review of the planned activities in the light of project objectives and make required adjustments. An account of various ecodevelopment activities undertaken in the unit so far and their impact on various desired areas is given below.

4.3 LOCAL INSTITUTION (VILLAGE ECODEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE)

VEDC was formally formed in this unit on 8/7/97 when a forest department team visited the village. Representatives from most of the households attended this meeting and office bearers/executive committee was formed the same day. Although it was decided that one male and one female from every household of the village will be members of the VEDC, but this general house or VEDC was never formed. In practice only a five member executive committee is existent which is popularly known as VEDC of this unit. So far no meeting of the general house has taken place in the past 2 years except once when villagers gathered to listen to some higher forest officials who visited the village in connection with COB project activities. The executive committee is comprised of only five members out of a supposed house of 114 members. Though SCs and females form a significant majority of village population and are comparatively highly dependent on natural resources, their representation in the executive committee is symbolic, which is dominated by three comparatively better off Rajput males.

4.3.1 General Functioning of VEDC

The executive committee of the unit is almost nonfunctional in the absence of popular public support, lack of capacity in maintaining official documents, lack of financial and other decision making powers *etc.* In principal they are responsible for maintaining official records, Bank accounts, enter into agreements within village as well as with other agencies, sanction loans to the needy and supervising all the ecodevelopment activities in the unit. In practice, all the



official records including attendance and minute book of the VDC, Bank passbook etc. are kept and maintained by the forest staff. VDC's main job is to maintain muster rolls of laborers when ever forest department initiates any civil works, however all payments are made by the forest department.

4.3.2 Representation of Village Community

Very low representation of village community particularly of females, SCs and other weaker section has been noted. It was also found that in addition to their low representation and negligible role in decision making, SCs are seldom allowed to share the benefit of ecodevelopment activities and other facilities provided by the government in the village.

4.3.3 Financial Capacities and Accountability

VEDC's financial capacities have already been discussed in the forgoing paragraphs. It is found that although in principal most of the money allocated for the ecodevelopment activity in the unit is to be spent through and by VEDC, in fact only a token amount of Rs. 10-15,000 has been transferred in the VEDC's account till date and that too is maintained by the forest staff.

4.3.4 Community Assets and their Maintenance

Some community assets such as bridal paths, plantations of *Discoria* and broad-leaved tree species and water tank etc. were created through ecodevelopment activity in which people also contributed through *Sharmdan*.

4.3.5 Agreements/Resource use Practices

In the initial stages of formation, VEDC entered into agreement with forest department that they shall help in enforcement initiatives. The committee also agreed to formulate and implement agreements aimed at practicing sound resource use practices. However, owing to sharp differences with park staff in connection with prosecuting the offenders, the VEDC refused to further help the staff in enforcement. No agreements aimed at regulating the resource use or adopting sound resource use practices have been made or implemented so far. On the contrary, owing to the attempt of park management to enforce the law and regulate resource use rights of the people inside the park, conflict between the two key stake holders i.e., local community and park staff has intensified.

4.4 PROVISION OF ALTERNATIVE EMPLOYMENT/INCOME GENERATION

4.4.1 Impact on on-farm employment, income generation



In order to provide alternative employment or generate additional employment and to enhance the incomes of the dependent villagers, on farm employment and income generation activities are perceived as a priority area in COB project planning. An analysis of this unit's micro plan also suggests that people exceedingly preferred these activities to all others except civil works. During the meeting with villagers of this ecocodevelopment unit, an assessment of the change in land use practices particularly the effect of ecocodevelopment activities on agriculture, horticulture and allied activities was made. It was found that although a few households in the village have started some new cash crops in the past two years, but it is their own initiatives and is in no way effected by the COB project activities. It was also found that so far no activity aimed at improving agriculture has been initiated. In short, neither there has been any notable change in the net area under various crops (changes in cropping pattern) nor in the productivity of various agricultural products over the last two years.

So far as horticulture development is concerned, two main activities undertaken in the past two years are;

- i) **Distribution of apple seedlings on subsidized rates** – Although there is a provision for distributing 3,000 seedlings of fruit trees in the micro plan, till date only 1,400 have been distributed. It is learnt that only those households bought the seedlings who have comparatively larger land holdings. A significant proportion of villagers who have marginal land holdings did not planted them because neither they had surplus land to engage for longer periods without any return nor had surplus money to buy rations in case they put their total land under horticulture as well as to maintain the fruit trees.
- ii) **Distribution of spray pumps** – It is proposed to distribute nine spray pumps to the farmers who grow fruit trees under the ecocodevelopment initiatives. However, by now only two pumps have been distributed which were bought by comparatively better off farmers.

Although no significant employment or income generation can be expected from these activities immediately, these are expected to increase the incomes of better off farmers in the long run.

Development of animal husbandry, bee keeping, poultry farming, etc.- these activities have been considered significant in providing alternative employment to the dependent stakeholders. A provision of rupees 1,70,000 has been made for promoting these avenues in the micro plan. It was planned to train the needy households in these activities and then to provide them soft loans for setting up their units. VEDC and park management was to facilitate all required financial, marketing and technical inputs. However, it was found that by now no one from this unit is neither trained nor financed by the implementing agencies with two exceptions. In the first instance, one person got training in bee keeping. However, he has not



been given any financial help or loan etc. for setting up his unit so far. In the second instance, two females were given soft loans of Rs. 6,000 each for setting up diary. Though both of them bought one cow each, however due to inferior quality of cows and consequent less milk production, no incomes are generated from sale of milk and it is used for self consumption only.

Plantation of Discorria : As per the provisions of micro plan, *Discorria* was planted in two hectares of forestland near the village. In the beginning VEDC properly looked after the plantations and its growth was satisfactory. However, of late a number of villagers encroached upon the area and occupied portions of the land for agriculture or domestic purposes.

4.4.2 Off Farm Employment and Income Generation

A large number of females in the unit know weaving various woollen articles such as *Shawls*, Caps, Socks, Scarves, etc. from the wool produced by their livestock. In addition, most of SC males as well as females know various handicraft skills such as making various agricultural and domestic tools and utensils by selling which they earn their incomes. In addition, many of the poor villagers in the unit are carpenters and blacksmith etc. Hence, there are ample opportunities for encouraging these household level employment and income generation avenues. Nevertheless, given their inadequate representation in decision making, a meagre sum of Rs. 37,000 which is only 4% of the total budget allocated for the unit ecodevelopment activities, has been provided for these activities in the micro plan. Further, while the project is nearing completion only Rs. 7,000 have been invested for promoting these activities which is highly insufficient for either developing already existing units or for setting up new units.

There is an urgent need to modify the components in micro plan and allocate more funds for the development of handicrafts and other household level employment generation avenues in the unit.

4.4.3 Employment in civil works

Civil works worth Rs.2, 70,000 are either completed or in progress while works worth Rs. 2,12,000 are to be undertaken in the coming months. Most of these works include;

- a) **Stone soling of village streets** - It has been noted that the streets were already pucca, but the villagers wanted it to be cemented. However, the dept. and the VEDC again repaired / constructed it with stone which is disapproved by most of the villagers and it resulted in more suspicion rather than confidence and trust between the villagers and the park management.
- b) **Construction of three bridal paths** - Three bridal paths leading to nearby villages and forests have been constructed during the last two years under COB project activities.

These shall help in making the transport of material from one place to other place easy and can be considered part of developing social infrastructure of the village. However, there are large-scale conflicts among the villagers and VEDC on the one hand and the VEDC /villagers and the park staff on the other in respect of recruitment of laborers, selection of contractors and mode of payments etc.

- c) **Construction of check dam and check wall** - These works have not only checked soil erosion but also prevented the occurrence of floods which had become the common phenomena in the village since past many years.

These civil works have provided short term temporary employment to some of the dependent households and may seem significant from the point of view of generating some men days employment to the villagers but in fact they can not be considered as an programme for providing sustainable alternative employment to the dependent households.

4.5 INCREASING AVAILABILITY OF NATURAL RESOURCE AROUND THE VILLAGE / DECREASING CONSUMPTION OF BIOMASS

Last year a five hectares plot of forest land falling in the vicinity of the unit was planted with broad-leaved tree and grass species. In the initial stages of plantation, it was protected and looked after by the people and the VEDC. However, the confrontation between the park management and the local people owing to the management's enforcement initiatives left these plantations without any care and protection. Moreover, a number of persons destroyed the plantation and encroached upon this land. Today, most of these plantations are in a very bad shape and without any protection.

Forest dept. and the people instead of blaming each other, should not only protect these plantations but also plant more trees and grass species because in future, a decrease in the availability of biomass to the villagers seems imminent due to denial of access to natural resources in the national park.

Park staff has also provided pressure cookers, kerosene stoves and fodder machines to some of the households in this unit on subsidized rates. A few households were found to be using these gadgets, however, it is likely to have a little effect on bio mass consumption as most of the households still use fuel wood for cooking. Also major quantities of fuel wood are required to keep the houses warm in winter and not for cooking purposes.

4.6 NEGATIVE IMPACTS ON VULNERABLE STAKEHOLDERS

Majorities of the population of this ecodevelopment unit are from economically weaker sections



having less than two *bighas* of agricultural land which is hardly producing sufficient food grains for their self-consumption. These people are not in a position to spare their lands for fruit plantation and wait for years to get the returns. In short, by no means they are able to benefit from the on farm employment and income generation activities planned in the micro plan. Given their number and dependence on park resources substantial part of the budget should have been allocated for off farm employment and income generation activities such as developing already existing handicrafts, household level income generation units etc. However, only 4% of the budget have been allotted for these activities compared to 30% on on-farm activities.

Further, these sections are the worse hit by the recently initiated enforcement and settlement moves by the collector and the park Director. Although these people do have recorded rights to grazing etc. in the park, but the right to other minor forest produce (MFP) collection doesn't find mention in the forest settlement report of 1886 which the authorities are now trying to enforce. However, these people are highly dependent on various MFP for their handicraft articles. They also have been collecting mushroom and other medicinal plants for earning their livelihood. The recent directives from the park management maintains that all park resources can be taken by the right holders only for their bonafide domestic use and prohibits everyone from selling any type of park resource collected in exercise of their legal or traditional rights. It is submitted that right holders have unrestricted rights to sell this produce as per the relevant law. Denying the villagers' access to these resources without providing them with any kind of compensation or alternative employment etc. is severely affecting the economy of all vulnerable stakeholders.

Under these circumstances, the micro plan deserved to be revived immediately for allocating more funds for meeting the employment and income needs of these people. Budget allocation on off farm employment and income generation schemes must be increased from 4% to 40% by transferring the unspent money of civil works. By now, only Rs. 7,000 have been invested for providing alternative off farm employment to these people which is such a marginal amount to affect the current status of employment and incomes of these groups. There is also an urgent need to reconstitute the executive committee of the VEDC thereby, giving proper representation to these sections. General house should be formed and strengthened and its capacity in the required areas should be enhanced through training etc.

4.7 CURRENT STATUS (SETTLEMENT OF RIGHTS)

People of this ecodevelopment unit have legal rights of grazing unlimited number of livestock in the park. Traditionally, they also collect a variety of minor forest produce for making handicraft articles as well as mushrooms and medicinal plants for earning their livelihoods. Most of the villagers particularly the SCs have marginal land holdings and hence, their dependence on



park resources is significant. Some months back, collector GHNP made a proclamation under section 21 of Wildlife (Protection) Act 1972 for the acquirement of the people's rights and inviting objections and claims. The proclamation which was published in certain news papers etc., did not come to the notice of the villagers. Therefore, no one except a few who lives in or adjacent to cities, could file their claims for compensation in the stipulated time. Strangely, park management also overlooking all principles of participatory approaches and for the reasons best known to them concealed this information from the villagers in general and VDCs and frontline park staff in particular. Whenever villagers inquired about the matter, they maintained their usual assertion that people's right in GHNP shall never be taken away and the whole project is for reducing pressure from GHNP by providing them with voluntary alternative employment and introducing sound sustainable resource use practices. However, when this information reached the villagers that their rights are certainly going to be restricted in GHNP and they shall also not get any compensation because of their failure to submit claim forms in time, they confronted the park staff as well as executive committees of the VDCs. Park management retaliated with issuing an order prohibiting all traditional resource users from collecting any forest resource from inside the park. They also prohibited all the legal right holders from selling mushrooms and medicinal plants, although it is lawful for them to collect and sell these produces for earning their livelihood. All these actions were effected by the park management even without any formal notice or award /proclamation by the collector. These actions on the part of the management, besides making what was lawful and genuine unlawful and illegal over night, had two fold effect on the residents of this ecodevelopment unit. On the one hand they were deprived of raw material for making handicraft articles and income from mushroom /medicinal plants, on the other hand of the cash compensation which they could have received if filing of their claim forms would have been facilitated by the VDCs.

Local villagers who are very sensitive about their resource use rights in the park got completely disillusioned with the COB project activities because of the above said actions of park management. People expected VDCs to be their own institution, but the non performance of any sort in this matter by the VDC due to complete non cooperation and concealment of all facts by the park staff to them, made them highly suspicious and unwanted in the eyes of the villagers. That seems to be the reason, today villagers are taking independent actions under the leadership of members of the political parties, *Panchayats*, *Devta* institutions and dealers of medicinal plants among other. In the process VDCs are completely isolated and people's perception about the COB project suffered a severe setback. These latest steps by the management have put park staff in direct confrontation with the local people and COB project has become the worst sufferer in the whole process.

There is a strong need for the park management to learn from the numerous past experiences, which highlight the inadequacy of enforcement approaches to meet the objectives of biodiversity conservation. Experiences show that illegal/de-facto resource use practices are more harmful than the regulated de-jury resource practices. Should people be compelled to indulge in unlawful resource use practices by denying their just compensation in lieu of denial of access to natural resources or they be made partners in conserving biodiversity and



5.0 CASE STUDY - 3

SOCIAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT OF COB PROJECT ACTIVITIES ECODEVELOPMENT UNIT SHANGARH

5.1 INTRODUCTION

Shangarh revenue village is comprised of 14 hamlets spread over an area of more than 200 hectares. This village falls in the Sainj Wildlife Range of GHNP Eco-development project area. For the purpose of undertaking CoB project activities, Shangarh village has been designated one unit by the Park Management. This cluster of hamlets has a total of 167 households with a total population of 760 persons. Rajputs are the majority caste having 111 households out of 167 followed by SCs (57). There are a few Brahmin households (5) whose main occupation is to perform religion ceremonies and conducting prayers etc. in the village temples. Rajputs are the prime landholders while the SCs own only marginal land holdings. The cluster has a literary rate of 60 percent. Near about 160 boys and girls are attending schools at present. It has a population density of 7 person per household. Almost half of the village's total population is married and it has a sex ratio of 835 females for per 1000 males.

5.1.1 Economic Activities

Subsistence agriculture, rearing livestock and collection of mushrooms and medicinal plants are the major economic activities of the villagers of Shangarh revenue village. So far activities aimed at earning cash incomes are considered, collection of mushroom and medicinal plants is the most important activity in which a majority of the villagers are engaged (70%). Out of this group, a majority is from SCs, marginal farmers and other weaker sections. Near about 20% of the population has agriculture as their prime occupation for earning cash incomes, most of them are comparatively big farmers. Although almost all the households have sheep and goats but only 5% of the households have it as their primary occupation. A few households (2%) are engaged in various govt/forest department's service and 3% of the households work as wage labour in various govt/forest departments.

5.1.2 Revenue Land

Total revenue landholding of the area is 1757 bigha (126 ha.). Near about 70% of this total land of the cluster is agricultural which is mainly used for growing various traditional and modern crops important among them are wheat, corn, Razma, Saryara, and Maize etc. Out of

the remaining land, 5% each is occupied by orchards and vegetables, 1% by Ghasnies (grassy blanks) and the remaining 19% is fellow land.

5.1.3 Village Forests -

The area is very rich in natural resources. Main forests of the area are conifers and broad lived species. On the lower areas, mostly broad leafed species of Kosh, mandrru, shagri, chaluna, Oak, Kail and chil etc. are dominant while on the higher areas of the cluster, coniferous forests of deodar, kail, tosh and kharshu etc. are predominant. In between cultivated lands, patches of Oak trees are found.

Dependence on Forest/Park resources

a) Collection of Mushroom & Medicinal plants –

Collection of Mushroom & medicinal plants in summer is the most important economic activity of the people living in this area. They have exclusive rights to collect mushroom and medicinal plants from certain forests in GHNP. Mushrooms are collected from March/April to May while medicinal plants are generally collected after this upto the arrival of monsoon. It has been found that SCs, landless and other weaker sections of the village are comparatively more dependent on mushroom and herbs collection compared to the other households. It has been found that an average household engaged in the collection earns an income of Rs. 2 to 10 thousand from the sale of the mushroom & herbs.

b) Collection of other N.T.F.P./MFP

In addition to the above mentioned forest resources, people particularly the SCs, collect various minor forest produce such as bamboos, wild zinger, branches of certain trees etc. from inside the park for making various household utensils, agricultural implements and other items such as *Tokri*, *Kilta*, *Mats* etc. These people earn their livelihoods by selling these articles to higher cast people of the area.

c) Fodder

As has been mentioned in the forgoing pages, that almost all the households rear livestock & therefore fodder is one of the most important forest resources required for animal husbandry and agriculture sector. There are two major practices employed by the people in respect of fulfilling fodder requirements for their livestock;

i) Collection of fodder species



People collect a number of fodder species according to their availability in different seasons. Usually one to three bundles of fodder are collected by an average household depending on the number of livestock, every day . This practice is often employed in the monsoon and winter season. People also store fodder for use in winter when most of the area become snow bound .

ii) Grazing

There are a number of alpine pastures in the park in which livestock from adjoining villages graze in summer. People of this area have exclusive grazing rights over certain alpine pastures in GHNP. Between June & Oct. near about 500 sheep and goats from this area graze in the park every year.

e) Fuel wood collection

Almost all the households in the area irrespective of cast, status and occupation, collect branches of dry trees and sometimes the portion of fallen trees for meeting their fuel wood requirements. Fuel wood is not only required for cooking food but also for keeping the house warm in winter months. The area remain snow bound in winter months and therefore people have to store large quantities of fuel wood before the arrival of winter. According to VDC and forest department estimates near about 2200 metric tons of fuel wood is consumed every year in this cluster of hamlets.

f) Timber

Timber and woods are required by the villagers for making various household utensils and agricultural implements besides house constructive , repair of buildings, temples etc. However timber collection is controlled by the forest department through a timber distribution system under which only one tree can be given to one household for bonafied domestic use. Further it can be given to those only who don't have adequate houses and once granted, the concerned household can not apply again before the expiry of 5 years.

It has been found that while collection of Mushroom, medicinal plants and grazing constitute some pressure on the park, collection of other minor forest produce is sustainable and does not cause any negative impact on the park/wildlife sanctuary.



5.2 ECO-DEVELOPMENT INITIATIVES

A number of activities were planned in the area under the CoB project to reduce pressure on park resources by increasing the availability of forest resources in the vicinity of the villages and by providing alternative employment to the dependent households. The following table highlight various activities initiated in this unit & budget allocated for each of them in the microplan:

Table 5.1 : Various ecodevelopment activities and approximate budget

Community Works	
Repair of bridle Path Neuli to Lapah	- 40,665 (11Km.)
Repair of Birshargarh Bridge (Birshangarh)	- 6,118
Construction of Bridge(Birshangarh)	- 12,417
Construction of play ground Shangarh	- 16,738
Construction of Bawdi Shangarh	- 6,182
Construction of Bridle path Birashangarh to Ropa	- 39,702
Construction of Bridle path Dharali to Sunder nagar	-65133
Play ground	-10,000
Construction of Kuhl Patara Nala to Shangarh	- 30,000
Construction of Bawdi Goshti and Barshanagarh	- 9750
Construction toilet at Shangarh	- 11436
Compost pit Dagahra	- 2000
Construction of Devta temple Shangarh	- 50,000
Construction of Devta ground	- 9984
Grafting of fruit plants	-14750
Construction of stall feeding 4nos.	- 6823
Repair of Bridle path shangarh to Lapah	-12,632
Construction of Bridle path from Behali to Titri	- 37511
Construction of Bridge at Shangarh	- 30,000
Chakkatalai Birshangarh	- 29,982
Construction of Kuhl at Shangarh	- 30,000
Construction of play ground	- 10,230
Compost pit shangarh	- 4015
Construction of Bridle path Titri to Devta Thali	- 47955
Construction of Bridle path Dharali to Kotlu	- 34,724
Check dam Barshangarh Nala	- 49,431
Grass planting	- 2562
Construction of cattle pond	- 2233
Repair of village path Chamrda to Gosti	- 4575
Chakkatalai Madana,Katwali,Dagara ⁴⁵	- 27526
Construction of water tank Dharali	- 14851



Table 5.1 shows that out of a total sum of nearly 11 lakh rupees earmarked for community works in the microplan, a sum of Rs.1,63104 or nearly 15 percent of the total budget is being invested in improving the productivity of agriculture and horticulture. Out of this, near about Rs.142333 is being spend on providing / strengthening irrigation facilities in the area by constructing check dams and kuhls etc. while the rest of Rs. 20,000/- are invested on the distribution of seedlings and constructing compost pits.

The table further shows that so far as increasing the availability of biomass in the vicinity of the villages is concerned only a marginal sum of Rs. 2500/- is earmarked in the microplan which is only symbolic and is not likely to bring about any impact on the current availability of biomass to the villagers.

On the contrary a highly significant proportion of budget, more than 80%, is allocated for civil works. Out of this, a sum of nearly Rs. 45,000 or 5% is being spent on providing drinking water etc. to the villages while the rest of the budget is being spent on constructing bridle paths, jeep road, stone soling of village streets etc. It is submitted that while a portion of it is aimed at strengthening the transport and communication, rest of the money is being spent for soliciting the support of local villagers for the CoB project.

An analysis of the budget allocation on various ecodevelopment activities indicate that most of the investments lack proper linkages with the project objectives. Although people get employment in civil works, but it is purely of temporary nature and is not expected to divert pressure from the natural resource in the long run. What is required is providing sustainable employment avenues which are socially accepted and economically feasible. It also shows that inputs on improving animal husbandry, increasing the availability of biomass near villages and strengthening the existing employment avenues are marginal and needs to be increased substantially. There is also an urgent need to undertake feasibility review of the planned activities in the light of project objectives and make required adjustments.

Individual Activities

According to the proposals made in the microplan, dependent households who want to establish their own self employment units are to be selected for training and after successful training they were to be provided with loans/subsidies for setting up their units. In addition local artisans, farmers, etc. were to be provided with subsidised tools and implements. A survey of the villages in these units revealed that a number of needy artisans, farmers, etc. have been provided required implements. However, training and loan for setting up household level units have been provided to a few only. The survey could not find any functional units in the area. Most of the budget allocated for individual activities is still pending unspent.

5.3 LOCAL INSTITUTION

To find out the functionality of the local/ village institution (VEDC) meetings with key village persons were held. It also included the members of the VDC. After going through the records and general discussion, they were asked to assess the strength of their VDC by identifying the indicators of good VDCs and giving their VDC scores against each criteria / indicator on a 0-5 scale. Table below shows the capacities / strength of Shangarh Eco-development committee in respect of each of the indicator identify by the villagers.

Table 5.2 : Strengths and weaknesses of local institution/VDC

Indicator	Score/points 0- 5	Remarks
Collaboration between Department and VDC	4	--
Participation of all , particularly poor & females	3	Marginal participation of Sc's in VDC
Capacity to take decisions	4	All microplans are made by forest department
Capacity to maintain accounts & Power to control financial transactions	2	Financial transactions controlled by department
Lack of disputes/ Capacity to resolve disputes	3	There are number of disputes
Providing sustainable employment to the dependent people	1	Only casual employment in civil works
Capacity to convince others	2	People do not obey the decisions of VDC
Capacity to withstand approach/favoritism	3	VDC President/ Forest Guard prefer their relatives for employment.
Capacity to maintain natural resources	2	People don't have the authority to manage forests.
TOTAL	24/50	

The table above shows that people of the unit perceive their VDC fairly functional giving it 24 marks out of 50. They found their VDC lacking in formulating programmes for providing sustainable employment to the dependent populations and in capacities to handle financial transactions, maintaining records. They also found their VDC lacking in entering into and implementing the agreements aimed maintaining natural resources by developing sustainable resource use practices.

Discussions held with the villagers , members of the VDC & front line forest staff revealed that in practice, there is no general house and the executive committee of a few persons is known



as VDC. Most of its office bearers are Rajputs and SCs and females have not got full representation. Most of the decisions are taken jointly by forest department and the office bearer and later conveyed to the villagers. Females want the training for setting up of tailoring, weaving & other household level units while males and officer bearers of VEDC want civil works because they get instant incomes from them. Females complain that from civil works they get no direct benefit. Females and SCs are also in favour of fodder, fuel wood and other plantation because they are more dependent on these forests resources. However, most of the investment are made on the civil works.

5.3.1 Adequacy of Microplan

It is noted that all the microplans made in different units are similar in their contents and microplan for this unit is no different. The microplan does not make any serious attempt to address the objectives of the CoB project. Instead a highly significant proportion of money is being allocated to civil works, while a very marginal sum of money is allocated to the activities aimed at increasing the availability of biomass. It also does not spell the mechanism to introduce sound resource use practices though it mention it as one of the objectives. It also mentions some agreements which the FD and VDC are committed to fulfil but lacks the processes of its implementation and monitoring. Villagers complained that they had only a marginal role in the preparation of microplan & it has been made by a team of forest department officials. There is an urgent need to revise the microplan.

5.4 IMPACT OF PROJECT ACTIVITIES ON VARIOUS STAKEHOLDER

In order to assess the impact of various activities initiated under the CoB project, the villagers were first asked to assess the dependence of various stakeholders on the park/forest resources by giving scores to each of the stakeholder group against each type of dependency on a 0-5 scale. They were further asked to similarly assess the impact of each of the activity initiated in their area on each of the stakeholder group. Following tables 5.3 and 5.4 show the assessment made by villagers.

Table 5.3 : Dependency on various village stakeholder a park/forest resource.

Stakeholders	Mush room/ Guchhi	Medicinal plants	Fuelwood/ Fodder	Bamboos/ branches of Trees	Grazing	Forest Labour	Total
Farmers with more than 10 Bighas Ag. Land	2	0	2	0	2	0	6
Farmers (less than 10 Bighas land)	2	0	3	0	2	1	8
Landless & poor (Higher Caste)	4	3	4	2	3	4	20
SCs & Backward	5	4	4	3	4	4	24
Females	5	2	5	2	0	0	14
Artisans	5	2	3	5	3	2	20

Table above shows that villagers admitted that SCs, Backwards, artisans and females are highly dependent on natural resources of the park compared to other social groups. The table further reveals that while all the stakeholder groups are by and large equally dependent on forest resources for grazing, collection of mushroom and fuelwood; there are sharp variations in the level of their dependence on bamboo, medicinal herbs and labour work in the park over which SCs, poor, females and artisans are more dependent than the other group. .

**Table 5.4 : Impact of Various Activities on Different Stakeholders**

Stakeholder	Water Management	Repair of Village path	Horticulture/Agri culture development	Increasing biomass*	Distribution of tools/implement s	Civil to works	Total
Big Farmer	5	2	4	0	4	3	18
Small farmer	3	2	3	1	3	3	15
Landle ss and poor	0	2	0	0	1	4	7
SCs and Backward	0	2	1	1	0	2	6
Females	2	2	0	3	2	0	9
Artisans	0	2	0	0	2	0	4

Note -* - No substantial efforts made so far.

Table above shows the impact of various ecodevelopment activities on different stakeholder groups as perceived by the villagers. It reveals that the farmers are the biggest beneficiary of the project activities followed by small farmers and women folk while the SCs and artisans have relatively less benefitted from project activities. The table further reveals that activities like improving irrigation facilities, distribution of agricultural implements and other programmes aimed at developing agriculture/ horticulture have largely benefitted the comparatively better off groups of rural society while activities such as repair of village streets, provision of drinking water etc. have by and large equally benefitted all social groups in the village.

Both the tables 5.3 and 5.4 suggest the need to review criteria of investment and make more inputs in the activities beneficial to the most dependent social groups as brought out by the table .

5.5 NEGATIVE IMPACT ON VULNERABLE STAKEHOLDERS

Due to denial of access inside the park, some of the social groups are likely to be severely negatively affected; important of those are -

- a. Local artisans - Their only source of income is to sell household and agricultural



implements and utensils. They make these articles by using species of bamboo and some species of grasses, branches of trees found inside the national park. Now that their access to the resources of GHNP is going to be restricted, they are likely to be severely affected if viable alternatives are not provided to them.

- b) Marginal farmers and landless - They are highly dependent on both medicinal plant collection as well as grazing. In the absence of alternatives/ adequate compensation they are also going to be adversely affected as denying access to park resources shall also affect their agriculture and animal husbandry besides affecting their cash incomes.
- c) Females - They collect Mehndi, Mushroom and some species of plants for earning cash incomes. Some poor women also earn their livelihoods by selling fuelwood etc. Denying access to park resources is likely to adversely affect their incomes. Further stopping grazing in the park shall also increase their work load manifold because they will have to go for fodder collection in the absence of grazing.



6.0 EXTINGUISHMENT OF RIGHTS AND DEPENDENT POPULATION

This chapter is largely a documentation of settlement of rights process undertaken in GHNP. Information/data for this chapter was obtained through participant observation method, survey of all available literature and Govt. records as well as discussions and interviews with a large number of persons including Govt. officers, various right holders, local level institutions and other key persons.

- 1) The Great Himalayan National Park situated in the Banjar Tehsil of Kullu Distt. was first notified under section 35(1) of the wildlife protection act 1972 by the Himachal Pradesh Govt. on first March 1984 vide notification No. 6-16/73SF-II, on the basis of extensive wildlife surveys by National and International scientists. However given the fact that the area intended to be constituted as the said park included a number of hamlets/ villages, rehabilitation of which seems to be very difficult to the Govt. hence the Govt. excluded most of the hamlets (buffer zone) from the intended area of GHNP vide a renotification on 30 July'1990. However on 22 April'1994, the Govt. once again issued notification number 3-6-16/73SF-II under section 35(I) of wildlife protection act 1972 in supersession of the previous two notifications mentioned above thereby once again modifying the proposed boundaries of the intended Park.

- 2) As it has already been mentioned in the preceding chapters of this report, a large number of people living on the western and northwestern boundaries of the park are highly dependent on the park resources for there various bonafide needs. Since the area is very remote with rare social infrastructure, under developed industrial sector, subsistence agriculture and lack of any other means of employment, forests are the only means of subsistence for these people. It is important to note that in the last forest settlement all the forests and waste lands including village commons were declared the property of the state classified as protected forests thereby depriving the villages ownership of village commons . However to make good the loss suffered by the villagers in this settlement, a variety of resource use rights were admitted to them. The settlement itself admits that these rights are highly valuable and in certain circumstances may amount to the de-facto ownership of the forests. At the time of the said notification of intention to constitute Great Himalayan National Park under section 35(I) of the said act, the following three types of rights were enjoyed by the people of surrounding villages which were to be subsequently settled by the collector as per the provisions of section 21 to 26 of the wildlife protection act 1972 ;
 - a) *Recorded/Legal rights* : These are the rights which were recorded by the forest department in the forest settlement of 1886 and includes rights of grazing livestock,

timber distribution and collection of a wild variety of minor forest produce. The document in which they are mentioned is popularly called Anderson's settlement report of 1886. In this report, names of the hamlets/villages and the type of resource use rights they were entitled to, are mentioned against each forest.

- b) *Unrecorded/Traditional /de-facto Rights* : Since 1886, the time of last settlement of Kullu forests, a number of hamlets/villages situated on the immediate boundary of the Park (0 to 8 Kms.) who are legal right holders in respect of grazing etc. also started collecting and selling medicinal plants and mushrooms for earning some cash incomes. During the last fifty or more years, their dependence on the collection and sale of medicinal plants increased sharply due to increased requirement of cash incomes for meeting their day to day needs of modern society. It is also because agriculture and pastoralism do not fetch any cash incomes and can hardly fulfill the domestic needs. Although their rights to sell medicinal plants were not recorded in the settlement of 1886, they were neither prohibited by forest department nor by the existent legal right holders from collecting medicinal plants and mushrooms. On the contrary their rights to do so were always admitted by the forest department who issued permits to the traders for buying and transporting the said material collected by these people. It will not be out of place to mention that collection and selling of medicinal plants has become the only source of incomes for these people. Their dependence and rights to collect medicinal herbs is also established by a number of studies conducted by forest dept. officers, national and international scientists and Govt. of India.
- c) *Natural /Human Rights* : People of the surrounding villages/hamlets have been from the time immemorial, using a vast variety of Park resources in highly sustainable quantities for meeting their bonafide domestic, agricultural, cultural and religious needs. They use different species of flora for the treatment of diseases; bamboo and certain grasses/branches of trees for making household utensils and agricultural implements; certain woods and species of flora for cultural and religious ceremonies etc. Poor and land less make a variety of handicraft articles and earn their livelihoods in the absence of any other avenues. Although these rights do not find mention in the said settlement report of 1886 (primarily because the report attempted to settle only major rights particularly grazing, timber, hunting etc. due to their being the major forest activities at that time) but these were always respected and allowed by the authorities right from the kings, the British and the forest department after independence.



Table below describes the various rights and right holders in GHNP: -

Sr. No.	Category of rights	Type of right	Description of right holder	Remarks
1.	Recorded / Legal right	i) Human settlement And agricultural lands	Hamlets of Kunder with two houses and 54 bighas of agricultural land.	
			Hamlet of Majhan with 6 houses and 87 bighas of land.	
			Part of Dhar hamlet (Balugad) with one house and 19.11 bighas of land.	
			Agricultural lands of Shakti and Maror hamlets in Homkani and Kamba forests of the Park	
		I) Grazing	498 Hamlets/ Villages having exclusive rights of grazing over near about 150 pastures.	List of Pastures is given in Annexure II
		ii) Minor forest produce	10 Hamlets on the periphery who collect various forest produce such as grasses, branches of trees, bamboo's , different woods for their bonafide domestic and agricultural requirements	
		lii) Timber Distribution	1 Hamlet	
		Iv) Full Rights	3 Hamlets who have most of the forest produce rights such as timber, medicinal plants, grasses, branches of trees etc.	
		v) Medicinal plants	13 Hamlets who have right to collect and sell mushrooms and medicinal plants.	
		Vi) Rasus	Rasus are incharge of pastures, it is a hereditary post. There are near about 100 rasus in the park.	



2.	Traditional /Di-Facto Rights	i) Collection and sale of medicinal plants and Mushrooms.	Approximately 120 hamlets on the periphery of the Park	Eco Development area of Park
		ii) Collection of certain grasses, bamboos and branches of trees etc.	SCs and landless households of the above mentioned 120 hamlets who earn their livelihoods by selling handicrafts articles and agricultural and household implements / utensils.	
3.	Natural /Human rights	Collection of a wide variety of floral species in highly sustainable quantities for meeting their bonafide domestic (Health care, food, fiber, spice etc.), cultural and religious requirements.	All the households of 120 hamlets mentioned in category II i.e. Traditional rights.	

- 3) Immediately after the first notification under section 35 (1) of the wildlife protection act for declaring its intention to create the said park, the Govt. instead of proclaiming section 21 of the said act inviting claims from the interested people / right holders, initiated steps to acquire/relocate private lands and human settlements mentioned at serial No. 1 of Paragraph 2 of the above table. Notification for the acquisition of private lands was first made vide notification no. 6-16/73 dated 1.3.1984 which was subsequently substituted vide notification of even no. dated 30.7.1990 and lastly vide notification of even no. dated 22.2.1994. In the first place it tried to relocate the two tiny settlements (hamlets) namely Kunder and Majhan with their agricultural lands. It will not be out of place to mention here that these hamlets having two and six houses each were not the permanent dwelling places of these families but used as second houses in summer by the owners when they visit the area for grazing their livestock and harvest the crops after the snow melts. These households originally belongs to a hamlet called Pashi situated 5 K.M downwards. From 1985 to 1990 a number of efforts were made by the administration to relocate these settlements by agreement between the villagers and the Govt. Ultimately an agreement was arrived at between the owners of hamlet Kunder and the Govt. whereby they were given some forests lands near the hamlet of Pashi and in the town of Sainj. These people (in all two households) occupied the alternative lands indicated by the Govt., constructed their houses over it and made it cultivable. They also dismantled their houses at Kunder and as such there remained no hamlet



called Kunder at the spot. However these people were not handed over relevant documents of ownership in respect of the alternative land given to them on the plea that these will be handed over to them after completing certain formalities such as conversion of forest land for non forestry purposes etc. So far as the hamlet of Majhan is concerned, the same policy was adopted by the Govt. whereby the households were given alternative lands in the hamlet of Pashi of which they are the original inhabitants and most of them also abandoned their houses and agricultural lands at Majhan. At present there are three temples and only four depleted houses at this hamlet. In short Govt. succeeded in relocating the above two hamlets from the Park while all other resource use rights including agricultural lands were allowed to continue by the Govt.

- 4) As mentioned, the Govt. took no steps to settle the resource use rights of the people in the said park as per the relevant provisions of law (proclamation under section 21 and comply the subsequent sections of wildlife protection act 1972). In 1994 the Himachal Pradesh forest department concluded that people living very adjacent to the park boundaries are highly dependent on the park resources for their livelihoods. Collection of a wild range of medicinal plants and mushrooms is the only source of cash incomes for them and that this heavy extraction of these species has resulted in destruction of wildlife habitats as well as the medicinal plants themselves. In order to conserve the bio-diversity of the park and to reduce human pressure from it, the department /Govt. initiated a World Bank funded conservation of bio-diversity project covering all the villagers / right holders mentioned at serial no. 2 of paragraph 2 (Table). The project aimed at **(a) providing alternative employment to the villagers (b) increasing availability of biomass/natural resources in the vicinity of the villages.**

Under the project an amount of nearly Rs. 3 crores was to be spent on meeting the twin objectives of providing alternative employment and increasing the availability of natural resources around the villages. This was to be done by evolving the local villagers in the execution of the project. For this purpose all the 120 villages mentioned at Sr. No. 2 (table) in Paragraph 2 were divided in to 15-20 units and village Eco development committee were formed. The preceding chapters of this report have already described the steps taken by the Park Management to achieve the objectives of this project & their impacts on dependant population/successes in achieving these objectives.

- 5) On 22-8-97 the Supreme Court of India directed all state Governments to issue proclamation under section 21 of the wildlife protection act 1972 within two months and settle the rights with in one year. However the Govt. did not issue the said proclamation with in two months as directed by the honorable court. Only on 3-1-1998 the collector issued the proclamation under section 21 of the said act and also subsequently published it in newspapers. He sent some of the copies of the said

proclamation to SDO (civil), Tehsildar etc. asking them to give it wide publicity. However the inquiries have revealed that this proclamation did not reach the right holders / dependent population mainly because neither the illiterate and ignorant forest dwellers read newspapers (also due to lack of roads etc. newspapers don't reach these remote villages) nor any other official visited the villages to communicate or publish the proclamation. It is evident from the fact that not even a single person out of 50,000 people living in nearly 500 villages who are legal right holders in respect of resource use rights in the park and for thousands of them park resources are the only source of subsistence, filed any objection or claims for compensation (para 3 on page 2 of the award, Annexure - 4). As such this proclamation can not be held proper because it did not seem to conform/comply to any of the provisions contained in the relevant acts/ law. The procedure for issuing proclamation is mentioned in the wildlife protection act and land acquisition act which read as follows :

Section 21 of wildlife protection act - when a notification has been issued under section 18 (sec. 35.1 in case of National park), the collector shall publish in a regional language in every town and village in or in the neighborhood of the area comprised therein; a proclamation-

- a) Specifying, as nearly as possible, the situation and the limit of the sanctuary / National park ; and
- b) Requiring any person claiming any rights mentioned in section 19, to prefer before the collector, within two months, from the date of such proclamation, a written claim in the prescribed form, specifying the nature and extent of such right with necessary details and the amount and particular of compensation, if any, claimed in respect thereof.

According to section 9 of the land acquisition act (rights are acquired under land acquisition act) the following two kinds of notices are to be given -

- Public or general notice to be given at convenient places on or near the land to be acquired section 9 (1).
- Special or individual notices to the occupants of such land and all such persons who are known or believed to be interested in such land section 9 (3).

A survey of relevant records and in-depth interviews with officials and right holders found that the procedures / provisions mentioned above were not properly followed. The said proclamation under section 21 seems to have remained in the Govt. files and correspondence only. This view is also supported by the fact that all the panchayats and Eco-development committees have passed the resolutions reaffirming that no



proclamation under section 21 was published in their villages as required by the law. It was also found that the said proclamation published in the newspaper was also incomplete, as it did not prescribe the relevant form / proforma for preferring the claims and objections as mentioned in the act among other things. It is also submitted that the collector further claimed to have once again called upon the people having rights in the park to file their claims etc. vide order no. 2281-85/R ADM dated 7.12.98. However, the dependent population/rightholders expressed ignorance about any such notification/proclamation.

- 6) On 7.12.1998, the collector directed subordinate revenue and forest officials to immediately prepare the particulars of villager's property in the said park. They were directed to accord this work top priority because all the rights in the said park are to be settled with in one month because honorable Supreme Court is reviving the progress made in this regard. They were also warned of stringent action in case of failure to accomplish this task. It seems that the collector was also under the impression that only the rights to private lands / houses etc. are to be acquired under the act and consequently sought this information from the subordinate officials and thought of settling all of them with in one month's time. The authorities did not realize that near about 50000 persons (more than 10,000 families) are dependent on the said park for their various forest resource requirements and have legal and traditional rights in respect of those park resources and that given the legal procedure for settling these rights, one month's time is highly inadequate. It is alleged and widely believe by a large section of public that the government initiated the settlement of rights in GHNP to exclude certain areas from the park required for constructing portions of Parvati Hydrel Power Project rather than honouring Supreme Court directives .
- 7) On 5.1.99 the collector summoned the people having private lands in the proposed park (mentioned at sr. no. 1 of paragraph 2 table) at forest rest house, Sainj (principal town of one valley of the proposed park). The other officers present there included the sub division magistrate of the area (SDM), Tehsildar and other subordinate staff. Many forest department officers including chief wildlife warden (H.Q. Shimla), park Director, DFO Seraj, Collector forests and other staff were also present there. Two officers from the said Parvati hydrel project were also present in the rest house. All the officers held closed door meeting which lasted more than three hours while the villagers waited outside. Villagers were eager to know the reasons for their being called there, although they had some idea that the matter relates to their lands in the park. After the meeting, the collector alongwith chief wildlife warden, park director and other officers came to the villagers and declared that it has been decided in the meeting that all private lands falling in the proposed park shall be acquired with the exception of nearly 10 hectares

of land belonging to the hamlets of Kunder and Majhan.

The villagers pointed out to the collector that proceedings for acquiring lands of Kudar and Majhan was initiated by the Govt. as early as 1984 and that between 1987 and 1990, all the households (that time there were six houses in Majhan and two in Kunder) have shifted to the alternative sites demarcated by the forest department. It was also told to him that residents of Kunder had already dismantled their houses long ago and constructed new ones at the alternative sites at village Pashi and as such there exists no hamlet / village called Kunder at the spot but only near about 5 hectares uncultivated land (See paragraph 3). In case of Majhan hamlet, it was pointed out that the Govt. has been harassing the villagers since the past 15 years for getting them out of the area. Now that all of the households have already constructed new houses in their original village Pashi on the land indicated by the forest department and shifted there, there is no use of not acquiring the uncultivated agricultural lands measuring approximately 10 hectares along with 5-6 old damaged houses. It was also brought to collector's notice that since 1990 villagers have shifted and settled in their new houses in their original village Pashi, it shall not be possible for them to again go back and settle in Majhan hamlet.

At this the collector told the villagers that the so called alternative lands which they claim to have got by virtue of their agreement with the forests / revenue departments are illegal encroachments since they don't have legal documents of ownership. They were advised to forget what happened in the past and to occupy their abundant agricultural lands at Kunder and Majhan respectively otherwise criminal cases shall be registered against them for trespassing and occupying Govt. lands.

The collector was further reminded by the villagers that acquiring or leaving some hectares of lands is not a big question for the people but what bothers the people is their fear of the extinguishment of resource use rights of thousands of villagers in the park because the park forests are the only source of their subsistence. It was also told that these people are legal right holders in respect of their various resource requirements and these rights and resource use practices are recorded in various forest and revenue department documents. The collector declared that he is soon going to extinguish all types of rights from the park and if any one has any problem or want to claim compensation, he should submit it in the prescribed form along with relevant documents countersigned by Patwari, forest ranger and Park director by 24th of January 1999. When he was asked to prescribe the relevant form, he replied that he himself is not aware of that and it is their responsibility to find out the same.

Later on inquiries revealed that the meeting was called to finalize the exclusion of



certain park areas in and around the erstwhile hamlets of Kunder and Majhan for the said hydel project and it was only a pretext to brand it a meeting held for settling the people's rights. The following two grounds were cited to justify the exclusion of these areas from GHNP.

- a) That the Chief wildlife warden has stated in the meeting that the area is not significant from ecological, faunal, floral, geomorphological or zoological point of view.
- b) That there exists two villages of Kunder and Majhan and these should not be relocated because villagers do not want to shift from there.

However, both the above grounds for exclusion of park areas are untenable because;

- (i) The Govt. notified its intention to constitute the area as a National Park on the bases of elaborate and extensive wildlife surveys by National and International experts who strongly recommended these areas to be constituted as a National park. After the initial notification of the park, a number of research studies / surveys etc. have established this area to be highly significant from both floral as well as faunal point of view. They have also established that the Govt's opinion in declaring the area as a National park was right besides conforming the validity of the research / wildlife surveys conducted by experts prior to initial notification by the Govt.

Secondly as per the provisions of wildlife protection act, chief wild life warden or the collector has no authority or jurisdiction to assess suo-motto and arbitrarily whether the area deserves to be a National park or not. They also have no reason to suspect the wisdom of the Govt. in declaring its intention to constitute the area as a national park, particularly in case of the present area, which was notified on the bases of extensive scientific surveys. More so what prompted them to assess this part of the proposed park only and respect the Govt.'s wisdom in respect of all other areas of the park. Further it is surprising that chief wildlife warden declares this area to be insignificant as a national park despite all the evidences to the contrary.

- (ii) The other ground for excluding these areas from the proposed park i.e. presence of two villages namely Kunder and Majhan is equally questionable. As has been mentioned in paragraphs 3 and 9, that there exists no village called Kunder at the spot now a days and villagers of Majhan have also shifted their residences many years back to a nearby village called Pashi due to sustained efforts by the

forests and revenue department over the past several years. What remains in Kunder is only few hectares of uncultivated agricultural lands and in Majhan only 5-6 old and damaged houses with nearly 10 hectares of uncultivated agricultural lands. Now forcibly pushing these people back to their abundant fields and houses which have already got damaged to a large extent due to non use for several years and ask them to vacate the alternative areas occupied by them, amounts to grave injustice to them. The submission of the authorities that these areas are being excluded in the interest of these people is highly ridiculous and malafide. More over when the Collector is acquiring all other private lands with agriculture, trees, fruits/ orchards and houses etc. in the different areas of the proposed park as well as highly valuable resource use rights of more than 500 villages then what is special interest of the so called hamlets of Kunder and Majhan. (Infact it is against their interests).

- 8). Within hours, the news that all types of resource use rights of the people in the said park are going to be totally extinguished in a few days spread in the Sainj town and within days to the other towns (Gushaini and Banjar) and the major villages situated on the road sides. It was the first time since the initial notification of the park in 1984 that the collector had declared his intention to extinguish all types of rights from the proposed park. He has given only a few days to file claims and objections that too with a number of formalities. The illiterate and ignorant resource users hardly knew anything about the law and the steps to be taken in such a situation. They ran after the forest staff who instead of helping them, concealed the relevant facts from them and even misguided them that their rights shall be allowed to continue by their chief wildlife warden. Even the office bearers of the VDCs, who work jointly with forest department and other local institutions, were not informed by the park staff. Out of more than five hundred villages having resource use rights in the said park, unreliable and incomplete information regarding this subject was available in only a few. There prevailed utter confusion all around and people were highly nervous and helpless what to do. Some concerned & educated people of the area held a meeting at Gushani on 12 January 1999 where it was resolved that ;
- a) Collector has not published the proclamation under section 21 as required by law,
 - b) Now he has given very short time for filing claims, that too before a few people and it shall not be possible to inform all the right holders spread over a vast and inaccessible area in more than 500 villages.
 - c) Resource use rights are the backbone of the economy and society of this area. In the absence of resource use rights, the agricultural, animal husbandry and house hold industry etc. can not sustain.



- d) As it is not possible to inform all the right holders within the stipulated time therefore an association or committee should be formed which apart from informing all the right holders shall represent the interests of all before the collector.

On the same day (12.1.99) a committee named GHNP right holders welfare committee was formed which was asked to prepare an exhaustive list of various rights and right holders in GHNP in consultation with all key persons and submit it to the collector. The committee was also asked to represent the right holders till the time every right holder is informed by the Govt. and till all the willing right holders have filed their cases for compensation.

The people present were asked to write applications asking cash compensation or employment in lieu of their resource use rights in the said park and mail these to the collector by registered post.

- 9). Meanwhile the authorities particularly the collector and the Park Director presumed/ concluded that no one is likely to file claim forms and that claim forms should also not be accepted at this stage. Inviting and accepting several thousand claim forms and disposing off all of them was likely to consume substantial period of time. Therefore the authorities further proceeded to act upon section 22 of the Wildlife Protection Act 1972 instead of implementing section 21. Section 22 requires the collector to find out these rights so far as they can be obtained from the Govt. records/ other documents as well as from the witness of any person. The last settlement report which was finalized in 1886 and is popularly called Anderson's settlement report 1986, is of special importance in this matter. The said report is part of Govt. record as well as forest record and is still used by forest department in granting timber etc. to the villagers. In addition there existed other park documents, revenue records and research reports etc. which contained description of some of the rights and resource use practices of local population in the said park. The authorities while acting upon section 22 of the act decided;
- ◆ To admit only the Anderson's settlement report of 1886 which is very old and contains only a few major rights. It is to be mentioned that a number of rights got unrecorded at the time of this settlement 125 years back and a number of new rights were acquired by the indigenous people over the past more than one century. The author of this settlement had himself admitted that the record can not be considered final & the process must be ongoing.
 - ◆ Not to take cognizance of the all other rights such as rights appended to the major



rights mentioned in the said settlement, other tangible and fundamental socioeconomic and religious rights which got unrecorded in the last settlement as well as rights acquired by the people during the past one century such as collection of medicinal plants, mushrooms and bamboo etc. for earning their livelihoods (de-facto rights). It is submitted that these rights were always honored and admitted by the forest department. These rights find place in the records pertaining to the conservation of Bio-diversity project currently being implemented in the proposed park, Micro plans jointly prepared by local villagers and the forest staff and a number of research reports written by National and International experts including the park Director and one Chief wildlife warden of the state. More over the forest and revenue departments particularly park Director have always been issuing export permits for taking out the medicinal plants etc. collected by near about 120 villages (Eco Development project area of the proposed park). These studies also establish that these one hundred twenty villages have been earning their livelihoods by exercising these rights for a long time, unhindered & un-irrupted from any quarters.

However, to the surprise of collector, the said settlement report of 1886 revealed the description and names of several thousand right holders having a variety of resource use rights in the proposed park. It posed the same problem which the authorities were trying to avoid i.e. notifying several thousand persons and determining values / compensation in respect of a variety of rights such as timber, grazing, medicinal plants, woods for agricultural implements and household utensils, branches of trees, a variety of grasses, wild edibles, various spices of flora for ethnobotanical and socio religious requirements and other minor forest produce. It would have again consumed a lot of time while the authorities wanted to wind up the whole process as quickly as possible .

Consequently the right holders whose rights the collector has taken cognizance of by virtue of his decision to admit the said settlement report of 1886, were not notified. Further instead of acquiring these rights, the authorities discovered a strange method of extinguishing them. According to this method, these rights were neither to be acquired nor taken away by agreement between the government and the right holders but they were simply to be transferred unilaterally in the forests/ forest lands outside GHNP (near the villages) without even informing the villagers, even if there are not sufficient forests outside GHNP in which these rights can be settled and if there are some degraded forest these were already heavily loaded with the rights of private persons.

It is important to mention here that the authorities particularly the Park Management was supposed to know very well that it is not practical and legally possible to unilaterally transfer the resource use rights of several thousands households spread



over more than seven hundred square kilometer area of the proposed park, in the few forests available outside the said Park because of the following reasons;

- ◆ Several thousands households who have legal rights to grazing have exclusive rights over more than 150 best quality alpine pastures over which their 25,000 to 35,000 livestock graze. There are only a few pastures outside the said park and these too are legally occupied by other persons. Hence there is no way to allocate alternative grazing sites to these livestock because there is none available.
- ◆ As livestock and cattle are the backbone of subsistence economy of this area and every household keeps some of them for agriculture and domestic purposes. All the grasses available in the forests outside the said park / in the vicinity of villages are cut, dried and stored by the villagers for use in snow bound winter months and no grasses etc. are left to be fed to the livestock in the remaining months. That is precisely the reason that livestock is grazed on the far-flung alpine pastures of the proposed park in the summer months. It therefore shows that there is no grasses / pastures etc. in the forests outside the said park which can be given as alternatives to the right holders.
- ◆ A variety of forest resources including certain type of woods for making agricultural implements and household utensils, bamboo and certain grasses / branches of trees for making various handicraft items (this is the only source of livelihoods for the poor SCs and land less), various spices of vegetation required for indigenous health care system as well as socio religious requirements are found only on the higher altitude forests most of which form part of the proposed park. When these spices are not found in the forests outside the proposed park, then how they can be transferred / settled in these forests.
- ◆ According to the relevant provisions of law and past conventions it is not with in the jurisdiction of collector and the Director to settle rights in the forests outside the proposed park most of which are reserved, protected or part of wildlife sanctuaries. Rights in the forests outside the said park can only be settled by a collector appointed by the Govt. for this purpose. The present Collector had jurisdiction only over the forests proposed to be constituted as the said park and not over the forests outside the proposed park. Neither the collector had obtained any prior permission from the State Govt. in this regard.
- ◆ The right holders has to walk long distances on inaccessible slopes and by risking various dangers for exercising their resource use rights in the proposed park. Had these resources been available in the forests outside the proposed park, why the people invest so much labour and time in getting these resources from the proposed park. It clearly demonstrates that no forests are available outside the proposed park, which can provide the natural resources over which several thousand people

have legal rights.

- ◆ All the forests outside the proposed park are already loaded with the legal rights of private persons and it shall lead to large-scale inter-villages conflicts if other people are made to occupy or take out resources from them.
- ◆ If several thousand right holders and more than 25,000 livestock is allowed to take natural resources and graze in the few forests left outside the proposed park, it shall lead to ecological disaster for this area by tremendously / many fold increasing the resource use pressure on these few and already degraded forests.

Despite having all the above knowledge about the fallacy of the notion of alternative forests, it was decided to transfer the resource use rights of thousands of villagers in the so called alternative forests though only on papers and in utter disregard to the life and property of the innocent, illiterate and ignorant right holders.

- 10). On 23.1.99 the Collector again directed the subordinate forest staff to provide him the list of right holders and suggest forests outside the proposed park and as far as possible in the vicinity of concerned villages for transferring the rights enjoyed by the people in the proposed park because the rights in respect of grazing / pastures, timber distribution, woods for agricultural implements / households utensils, bamboo, wild edibles, roots and branches of trees, various grasses and other minor forest produce are not going to be acquired. They were also directed to complete this work within a fortnight and that it is mandatory and failure to do so shall result in very serious complication for which sole responsibility will rest on them. The order also indicated that it is a Supreme Court matter, hence, time bound and the matter has to be disposed off within a months time.

It is important to note that the authorities initiated and tried to implement these decisions before January 24th, 1999 the date arbitrarily fixed by the Collector himself for filing claims etc. in respect of resource use rights in the proposed park.

- 11). The same day, on 23.1.99, the GHNP right holders welfare committee (described in para 10) submitted a written memorandum along with an exhaustive list of various legal, traditional and other rights enjoyed by the people in the proposed park, areas where each type of rights are exercised as well as the description of the right holders. Through the memorandum the collector was urged to;
- (a) Publish a detailed proclamation under section 21 of the wildlife protection act in every village and town in and around the proposed park so that the right holders can submit their claims forms etc.



- (b) Given the total dependence of local villagers/right holders on the areas of proposed park for their cash incomes, agricultural, livestock/ cattle, domestic, cultural and religious life, these areas be excluded from the boundaries of the proposed park.
- (c) If acquiring rights is very essential then the dependent population be provided employment/ cash compensation for their survival.

Later on copies of this memorandum were sent by registered post to various high level functionaries of the state including Chief minister, Forest Minister, Financial Commissioner, State human rights commission, Local M.P. and MLA among others with a request to intervene in the matter and insure that the settlement takes place according to the provisions laid down in law.

- 12). After submitting the said memorandum, the said committee organized public meetings in various villages to acquaint them with the real situation. In a meeting on 31.1.99 at Gushaini in which hundreds of right holders participated, it was decided that since the Collector has not taken any action whatsoever on the memorandum submitted to him on 23.1.99, hence a reminder should be presented to him. A detailed memorandum/ reminder signed by a number of right holders, condemning the attempts of the Collector to unlawfully deprive thousands of people of their resource rights and asking him to act according to law i.e. issue proclamation under section 21 of the said act, prescribed the claim form etc. was prepared in the meeting. This memorandum was submitted to the Collector on 2.2.99 through the area SDM.
- 13). Meanwhile the said right holders committee continued its efforts to inform the people about the Govt. decision to extinguish their rights from the proposed park and the means and methods to safeguard their interests. More meetings were held in the principle villages of Sainj valley (Sainj town and Neuli village) of the proposed park.. Local people who are very sensitive about their rights were getting more and more nervous and restive day by day. People decided that a delegation of right holders should personally go to the Distt. head quarters and discuss the matter with the Collector. Consequently on 10.2.99 hundreds of people from the far-flung villages went to Distt. head quarter to meet the Collector. It is also to be mentioned here that by their hard work the said right holders committee has also discovered the so called prescribed Proforma in which claims were to be filed. It was form 8 B of the land acquisition act mentioned in Himachal Pradesh wildlife rules.

The delegation requested the Collector that if their rights are taken away by the state then their survival will become extremely difficult and they shall be left with no option



but to beg. They are said to have requested to him provide them poison in lieu of their rights because without rights they shall not be able to feed their families and livestock.

Some of the educated youths and members of the said committee informed the Collector that they have discovered the format of the claim form and now want his permission to visit all the odd several hundred villages and get their claim forms filled up and submit them to him with in two months time.

The collector is said to have complained that if they don't have trust in him then they should not have come to him and go to the people whom they think can protect their interests. He was angry that the said right holders committee has complained against him to several persons and that he has received some communication from the human rights commission regarding this matter. He refused to accept their request to get the claim forms (form 8B of land acquisition act) be filled in and submitted to him with in two months. He declared that he is considering the whole matter afresh and shall soon publish the proclamation in all the villages having rights in the proposed park and claim forms shall be accepted thereafter only. He asked them not to waste their time in such type of futile activities and instead concentrate on their work and leave the protection of their rights on him.

- 14). The people present there believed his words and after this meeting with the collector almost stopped their efforts / activities such as meetings etc. They felt relieved from the imminent threat to their livelihoods and got engaged in their usual occupations in the hope that whenever required the collector shall inform them through publication of proclamation in their villages and their claim forms shall be accepted after that.
- 15). Suddenly an order passed by the park director on 23.3.99 shocked the villagers. The order was a kind of extra legal mini award which extinguished all the de-facto., traditional, appended and tangible resource use rights of thousands of villagers in one stroke saying the department never knew who is a right holder and who is not. The order also curtailed their rights enshrined in Anderson's settlement report to a large extent by prohibiting the sale of any kind of forest produce particularly mushroom and medicinal plants which the villagers have been doing for the last several decades. It is important to note that the said settlement report allows the sale of medicinal plants by the resident people. The order maintained that he has only recently come to know about the numbers and description of people having resource use rights in the proposed park when the District Collector cum Collector GHNP gave him a list of them.

When the collector and other revenue officials associated with the settlement process



were contacted, they vehemently denied giving the director any such list. Collector maintained that instead of giving the director any such list, he had asked the director to provide him any such list if it existed at all. He further expressed surprise at the order of the Director saying how he has been managing the Park all these years without knowing any thing about who the right holders are.

This order inflicted severe hardships to the dependant population and they protested against it. When they approached the Director, he said that within weeks all kind of rights in the proposed park are going to be extinguished therefore what is the harm if I have issued this order. He said that this should be taken in the light spirit because it is only intended to sound the villagers and gearing up the forest staff for the enforcement duties.

- 16). Within a fortnight of the above mentioned order of the Director, the collector called meetings of concerned staff to finalize the extinguishment of resource use right in the Park. The meetings were held on 7 and 8 April 1999 at Larji and Sairopa range offices respectively and attended by subordinate forest staff, revenue staff and other concerned officials beside the collector and the director. The respective Range officers have also called some of the office bearers of the VEDC in these meetings.

In the meetings the names of alternative forests in which various rights in the proposed park were to be shown transferred were discussed. Here once again the subordinate forest staff as well as VEDCs members present pointed out the fact that practically there are no forests\ pastures in their area outside the proposed park where a variety of resource use rights exercised by several thousand villagers can be settled. At this the Director declared that they should not worry about these things because the Collector had agreed to give him crores of Rupees for growing various forest resources for the affected people. Some of the VEDCs members again pointed out that it not easy to grow the forest resources required by local people at will because most of the resources they need are found on higher altitudes in their natural habitat only. They also said that since most of the higher altitude forests fall within the proposed park and director's planing being only a hypothetical preposition, some of the resource use areas should be excluded from the proposed national park. They also said that various forest resources required by the right holders such as various spices of medicinal plants, trees, bamboos, branches of trees, grasses and other minor forest produce usually take from a few years to hundred years to grow even in favorable conditions. Most of them may grow or not grow outside the park areas and it will always be an uncertainty. They cited the example of this very proposed park saying that the director has not been able to grow even a single blade of grass despite spending crores of Rupees in the past several years under the COB Project. It was also pointed out that even if the director makes his best efforts to grow the various forest resources which will take at least a few years, how the people will survive in the meantime till director's efforts brings fruit. They also demanded that they be given the opportunity and responsibility

to inform the right holders and submit their claim forms so that the villagers can get some compensation.

At this stage the Collector intervened and declared that the question of excluding their resource use areas from the proposed park can not be considered and that the date for filing claim forms has already passed long back, therefore people deserve nothing, however he is giving near about seven crores Rupees to the park director for growing forest resources. He further said that he has directed the park director to spend this money in consultation and through dependent population, therefore the VEDCs should take this opportunity and get benefited by it. He also assured that the park shall not be closed for the right holders till alternative arrangements are made for them including allotment of alternative pastures / forest areas and growth of various forest resources on them by the park director.

When this meeting was going on in the Sairopa range office of the proposed park, hundreds of right holders from the nearby villages gathered at the meeting site on hearing about the said meeting. They wanted to meet the collector, however were not allowed to enter the range office by the forest staff present there. Later on 2-3 Pradhans present among the people, were called inside by the concerned ranger. After some time when the collector along with other officers came out of the range office after concluding the meeting to leave the venue, the villagers gathered there came around his car. They requested him to tell them the matter, some asking about the proclamation under section 21 which he had promised to publish and the acceptance of claim forms. He assured people present that there is no hurry and proclamation shall be published shortly, thereafter they should file their claims etc. He also assured them that their interests shall be fully protected.

- 17). In the third week of April the collector summoned the few villagers who had submitted their applications for claims asking cash money or employment in lieu of their resource use rights before January 24, 1999 (the date arbitrary fixed by the collector on 5.1.99 at Sainj rest house before some people) as per the decision taken in the villagers meeting at village Gushaini on 12.1.1999 where the said right holders welfare committee was formed. Strangely, the collector did not call the representatives / members of the said committee even though they has submitted written memorandums / claim application before January 24, 1999 . However, the collector even did not meet the villagers whom he had called and his staff asked the claimants to put their signatures on a paper for the purpose of registering their presence and asked them to go, assuring that they shall get some money if not all that is demanded by them in their applications.



- 18). On 21. 5.99, the collector quietly issued the final award under section 35 of the wildlife protection act. Strangely the collector did not notify thousands of poor right holders whose rights were the subject matter of the award and who were still waiting for the proclamation under section 21 to be published as promised by the collector and to submit their claim forms. On the contrary the award was promptly sent to NHPC who is neither a stake holder / right holder nor concerned with the proposed park in any lawful manner. The act of the collector to conceal the award from the right holders seems to aimed at avoiding any hue and cry over the extinguishment of resource use rights of thousands of people and excluding portions of park by the dependent population as well as conservationists.

The award was on expected lines and only a formal declaration of what has already been described in the preceding paras of this chapter.

- (a) The award excludes large portions (more than 10.5 sq.km.) of a distinct valley of the proposed park having very rich bio-diversity and habitats of rare and endangered wildlife species, which is home to a host of critically endangered plants and animals like the Serow, the Himalayan tahr, the Cheer Pheasant, The Musk Deer and the Western Tragopan [listed in the red data book of the International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN)]. This park is the only National Park in the world that supports Western Tragopan barring perhaps one in Pakistan, on the following grounds ;

“ The consent of the Chief wildlife warden (CCF wildlife) Shimla was obtained during the meeting held on 5.1.99 at Sainj who has stated that the area falling in an around villages Kundar and Majhan which measure 10.6 Sq. Kms. is not significant from ecological, faunal, floral, Geomorphological or Zoological point of view, hence this area is excluded from the proposed GHNP limits under the provisions contained in section 19(a) of the act which is identified as follows :-

North: Kasol Dhar and Dharashar Dhar

South: Land alongwith banks of Jiwa Nala

East: Nallah between jubkatan Thatch and Apgrain Thach

West: Gati Dhar”

See Annexure - 4 last para on page 4 of the award

The ground cited above for the exclusion of the said areas from the park are totally untenable because

According to section 19 of the wildlife protection act when an area is notified to be declared as an National Park under section 35.1-2 than the collector shall inquire and determine the existence, nature and extent of the rights of any person on or in that land / area.

According to this section the collector has no authority or jurisdiction to suo-motto judge the wisdom of the Govt. to notify the area as a proposed park under section 35.1 or suo-motto judge the suitability of the area so notified by the Govt. either by taking the opinion of Chief wildlife warden or any other person whosoever at least unless any right holder has contested for it. According to chapter 4 sections 19 to 25 and 35, collector's only duty and responsibility is to settle rights which existed in the land proposed to be constituted as National park. Neither the Chief Wildlife Warden is empowered by Section 19 – 25 of the Act to amend the boundaries of the area proposed by the Government to be constituted as a National Park nor to cause it to be amended by the collector. Moreover Inquiries could not find any material to support the opinion of the Chief Wildlife Warden. On the contrary, a number of research studies have reaffirmed the rich bio-diversity of the area excluded in the award. Any area from the proposed park can only be excluded under Section 24 of the Act and not under Section 19 as mentioned in the award. Further, the relevant sections only allow the exclusion in case some private person has contested for it. The section does not permit the change of boundaries on the ground that Chief Wildlife Warden or the collector do not view the area as a potential national park.

b) The award extinguishes the resource use rights of several thousand villagers saying ;

"It would not be possible and in the interest of public to acquire the rights grazing, timber distribution, extracting timber for agricultural implements, grasses and branches of trees etc. Hence forest department is requested to propose alternative forests where the affected people may be awarded these rights. Alternative forests alongwith future planing and relocation and improvement has been proposed by the park director in consultation with the forest department (list placed on file) ." (last two lines of para 3 and first 7 lines on page No.4 of the award, Annexure - 4)



The award admits resource use rights of more than 500 villages (see Table on page 9 of the award Annexure - 4), but gives marginal compensation to only 16 villages in lieu of rights to collect medicinal plants, that too only for 5 years and extinguishes all other rights of more than 500 villages by entering into an agreement with Park Director that he shall be given Rs.7.5 Crore for providing the various forest resources to thousands of right holders (page 10 of the award).

It is an open secret that neither it is lawful to extinguish rights of the dependent population by way of an agreement between the two Govt. officials without even informing the dependent population/right holders nor scientifically possible to immediately grow a large variety of forest produce out of its natural habitat. Moreover, it may take from 5 to 100 years to grow various forest resources required by the people for their domestic, and animal husbandry, agricultural requirements. The award does not spell how the livestock and people shall survive in the meantime. It also denies access to more than 150 pastures of the park but did not mention even a single pasture as alternative and leaves everything on the forest department to be done in future according to their convenience.

It has already been mentioned at several places of this report particularly in para 11 that there are no sufficient forests available in the vicinity of affected villages where these rights of the resident people may be transferred. That seems to be precisely the reason that the collector could not settle these rights even on the paper which is clear from the award which does not mention neither the names / descriptions of so called alternative pastures nor other areas for granting various resource use rights of the affected people.

It can be asked that if acquirement of these rights was not possible and in the interest of public than according to legal provisions, the collector should have excluded the areas having the above said rights from the boundaries of the proposed park. If for the sake of only 20 hectares of uncultivated land he can exclude more than 10 Sq. Kms. of proposed park areas then what was the problem in excluding other areas having the above said rights therein for the sake of subsistence and survival of more than 500 villages. It only indicates towards some hidden interests of the authorities in the former case and their fear of inviting the wrath of environmentalists / conservationists in the later who were already making hue and cry over the decision of authorities to hand over certain park areas to the said hydel power project.

It is submitted that the award has failed to settle the various resource use rights either by agreement or acquirement as well as on account of providing alternative pastures to more than 500 villages and as such can not be held proper/lawful because as per the relevant sections 19-25 of wildlife protection act he must have settled their rights for once and all.

- 19). On 28.5.1999, within a week of the pronouncement of the award by the collector, the Govt. / Governor accepted the said award in toto without any modification etc. vide its notification no dated 28.5.1999 under section 35.4 of the Wildlife Protection Act. A notification under section 35.4 of the said act can only be made;
- (a) If the Govt. has declared its intention to declare the area as a National park under section 35.1&2 of the said act.
 - (b) Proclamation under section 21 of the said act has been made, time for receiving claims etc. had expired and all the claims had been disposed off by the Govt. and
 - (c) All the rights over the lands to be included in the proposed park have been vested in the state.

A close scrutiny of the data/information secondary as well as primary shows that the above notification of the Government falls short of fulfilling the above mentioned three requirements because;

- ◆ The notification of the Govt. under section 35.1&2 of the said act has been tempered with by the Collector and the Chief wildlife warden as described in para 7 & 18 A. The award admits by implication that no private person/right holder contested the right and wisdom of the Government to constitute the area as National Park. Therefore, the exclusion/de-notification amounts to unlawfully amending the park boundaries by the functionaries of the state in violation of Section 35. 1 & 2 of the Act.
- ◆ Proclamation under section 21 was not published according to the law and claims etc. were not invited by the collector as per the provisions laid down for this purpose. Whatsoever claims were received or rights admitted by the Collector under section 22 of the said act were neither heard nor disposed of by the Collector as mentioned in para 17 of this chapter as well as in para 2 on page 5 of the award. The award admits that more than 500 villages have highly valuable resource use rights in



the proposed park. It also admits that despite two proclamations under Section 21 of the Wildlife Protection Act which requires intimation/ proclamations in every village and town inside or adjacent to the National Park inviting people to ask for compensation in lieu of denial to their livelihoods, not even a single person came forward and prayed/ demanded/claimed any sort of compensation (para 3 on page 2 of the award Annexure - 4). This fact coupled with the results of inquiries only indicates that there must have been any lacuna in the implementation of the due process of proclaiming Section 21 of the Act. It certainly points out towards a communication gap between the Authorities and right holders. In short, the above incidents prove that Section 21 of the Act could not be implemented.

- All the rights over the lands to be included in the said park have not vested in the state. As mentioned in the award, resource use rights of thousands of right holders admitted by the Collector have neither been acquired nor taken by the state through agreement with the right holders as required by law. Neither any alternative pastures in lieu of more than 160 best quality pastures in the said park over which more than 500 villages graze their cattle / livestock were allocated. Strangely the impugned award admits the rights of several thousand villagers but remains short of settling them. Can an agreement between the collector and Park Director that the former shall grant the later Rs.7 crore and the later shall use this money in growing various forest resources may amount to extinguishment of resource use rights of thousands of people.

Further the Govt. has admitted vide order No. 565/R-ADM dated 1.9.1999 issued by the Distt. Collector/Collector GHNP stating that the resource use rights of several thousand families have not been settled so far and that these people have every right to go inside the park and exercise their resource use rights in the said park until their rights are settled.

In short, the following rights remains unsettled in the Award:

- Grazing rights:** The award only reveals that the collector requested and procured a list of alternative forests for transferring grazing rights existing in more than one hundred sixty best quality alpine pastures (Thatches) of GHNP(Annexure 2) but in the award he neither transferred these rights in the so called alternative pastures nor disclosed the names/description & location etc.of alternative pastures nor acquired them but only mentioned that a proposal from Director GHNP has been put on files. It shall not be out of place here to mention that in lieu of more than 160 alpine pastures not even a single pasture is allotted to any of the right holders because there are only a few alpine pastures



outside GHNP and which too are already in lawful possession of other villagers. Hence not even a single grazer's right is settled or transferred but rights of all the grazers are confiscated.

- b) **Rights to collect non timber forest produce:** A number of villages have legal rights to collect a variety of resources in the park such as various grasses, branches of trees, timber, right of way etc. These rights are admitted in the award (see table on page 9 of the award Annexure). These rights are not acquired in the award but a promise has been made that later on forest department shall settle them in other areas. As per the provisions of wildlife protection act/land acquisition act, such a promise can not vest these rights in the state nor does it amount to the extinguishment of rights in any other way.
- c) **Agricultural lands:** Acquisition of agricultural lands has been left pending in this award. While the collector has acquired some of the private lands in the park area he has left some others unattended and unsettled. For example in respect of private agricultural lands in the core area of Park he has asked the Director GHNP whether these lands should be excluded from the Park or acquired by giving the land holders alternative lands. However the award doesn't go beyond this inquiry and it neither excludes the lands in question from the Park nor acquires them. (para 2 first 9 lines on page 4 of the award).
- d) **Religious rights, other customary rights to resource use:** It doesn't make any alternative provision/ compensation in lieu of denying peoples' access to various park resources lawfully hold by them since centuries such as taking various woods for agriculture implements and household utensils, a variety of plants species for their traditional health care system, a variety of branches of trees, grasses necessary for maintaining the sustainability of agriculture and animal husbandry besides the unrestricted right to visit religious places in the park and to take their Devatas (local deities) to their places of worship in GHNP.

The facts mentioned in sub-para a, b, c & d clearly demonstrate that in this settlement a number of rights have been left unsettled. Therefore it shouldn't be considered as final award.

In the light of above mentioned facts it is submitted that the notification of the Governor bearing No. FFE -B - F (3) - 2/99 dated 28.5.1999 under section 34.4 can not be held lawful/proper.

- 20). The award of the Collector alongwith the order of the park director dated 23.03.99 shall have the following effects/impacts ;



- (a) It shall directly and adversely affect and destroy the precious and endangered wildlife and bio-diversity of the area excluded from the park due to extensive movement of men and material for the work of said hydle power project which shall also include blasting etc. of the hills / wild life habitats.
- (b) The work on the hydle project in this area is also likely to greatly disturb and inviolate core area of the park due to heavy blasting and construction work just inside the proposed park.
- (c) It shall deprived near about 1500 families residing on the immediate periphery of the proposed park of their livelihoods. The park management have always been admitting their total dependence on the park areas for survival and also have been implementing a COB project for reducing their dependence on the medicinal plants from inside the park. The award has not admitted their rights and hence deprived them of any sort of compensation.
- (d) Grazing in this area is not an isolate activity rather it has important links with the agriculture, domestic and forestry sectors. By simply stopping grazing the award has ignored its significance in the prevailing subsistence based agro – pastoral Eco system. Sheep, Goats and Cattle are the backbone of the farming system of the area involved. Sheep and Goats are kept for fibre, meat and manure. Cattle are kept for manure, dairy and plowing. Therefore the award has inflicted heavy setback / loss to the existing subsistence agriculture, animal husbandry and related sectors.
- (e) Poor, SCs, Landless, females and other weaker sections are the worst hit segments by the award.
 - (i) They were not considered for any kind of compensation on the grounds that they did not own agriculture lands. The collector had taken a strange stance saying that the forest rights shall be admitted only for those who owned land at the time of revenue settlement of 1911-12. Although it is contrary to law and these people are the most dependent on forest resources for their survival.
 - (ii) Females whose only source of income was collection and sale of Mushroom, Mehandi and Dry fuelwoods etc. have been totally deprived of their incomes by this award specially in the absence of any sort of compensation, causing them un-measurable hardships.
 - (iii) Female usually work more than 14 hours a day in these remote villages to sustain their family and economy. They have to walk several Kms., several times a day, right in the morning to collect fuelwood, then for

7.0 CONCLUSION

The basic objectives of conservation of biodiversity project in GHNP were to reduce the resource pressure from the park by developing sustainable resource use harvesting practices and providing alternative on- farm as well as off- farm employment opportunities and profitability to the dependent population. Programmes aimed at achieving these objectives were to be developed and implemented jointly by the resident/dependent communities and the park management through eco-development approach which revolves around the involvement of village communities in the preparation and implementation of microplans using participatory techniques. In the initial stages of implementation, the project had to face certain difficulties such as lack of participation by the local villagers, unsuitability of microplans, conflicts between the villagers and the park management etc. Due to lack of proper communication and traditional mistrust between the villagers and the forest department, certain quarters were able to successfully convince a large section of local population that if they shall participate in the eco-development activities then their rights to resource use in the park shall be curtailed. In short, the lack of detailed guidance/training to the staff and lack of awareness among the people about the project prior to implementation severely affected the project activities. Moreover, the effectiveness of microplanning process was significantly hindered by the absence of local NGOs and by the fact that authorities ignored other existing traditional local institutions.

Under these circumstances, the management had to resort to traditional semi – top down approaches to project implementation. A number of trust and confidence building activities were initiated in almost all the villages of eco-development area. The management not only launched public awareness campaigns but also organised several workshops, seminars etc. to train the frontline staff. A special team for microplanning was constituted which visited the villages, convinced some of the villagers in each village, constituted VEDCs and prepared microplans. By the end of second year of project implementation VEDCs in almost all the clusters of hamlets were in place and microplans for almost all of them were being made and implemented. However, in most of the microplans linkages between development investments and conservation actions were lacking. A substantial proportion of money was planned to be spent on civil works or Turco activities such as stone soling of village street, construction of water tanks, rain shelters and temples etc. and only a marginal sum on developing on farm as well as off farm employment avenues and increasing the availability of biomass in the vicinity of villages. The microplanning process and implementation remained confined to a few influential people and forest department. There remained lack of collaboration among various stakeholders and despite agreements to the effect, sound resource use practices could not be developed. VEDCs though did not represent all social groups in the villages, severely lacked in various capacities required for the successful implementation of the project particularly in areas such as conflict management, financial capacities and accountability,



community assets and their maintenance, microplanning etc. Most of the employment opportunities created through eco-development activities remained centered to temporary labour work in civil works and fell short of fulfilling the project objective of providing sustainable alternative employment to the dependent population. Rather, in most cases it turned out to be the provision of additional employment to a better off section of villagers and most dependent sections could get only a few employment opportunities due to their lack of participation in decision making and functioning of the VEDCs.

At the end of 3rd year of project implementation, these shortcomings became clearly visible and the management initiated remedial steps/alternative course to readjust project components. A review of the functionality of VEDCs, adequacy of microplans and capacities of VEDCs and frontline staff was made in several meetings, seminars and workshops. Major changes in the microplans were affected to replace the civil works with works aimed at increasing the availability of biomass and providing training and loans to the most dependent sections of village community. Till this time, in the name of local/village institutions only the executive committees of a few persons representing several villages/hamlets were working but now efforts were made to strengthen the general house representing at least one male and one female member from each household. VEDCs were devolved more powers to handle the financial transactions, taking decision about the project investment and choose beneficiaries. These initiatives though undertaken belatedly were largely accepted by the villagers. It also improved project functioning considerably. A number of nurseries were developed and plantations near the villages were taken up in most of the ecodevelopment units. After some agreements/collaboration among the major project stakeholders were made, activities aimed at institution building and employment generation got momentum and more than hundred self help groups primarily of females were formed within short span of time. The initiatives taken to strengthen the VEDCs successfully increased the participation of vulnerable sections in the decision making. However still their remains need to increase trust among the stakeholders and increase institutional learning. VEDCs also decided to regulate the resource use from inside the park and participate in enforcement initiatives.

Suddenly the Govt. of Himachal Pradesh decided to settle/extinguish the resource use rights of resident people in GHNP and quickly proceeded to do so. As it has been described in the preceding chapter, the final award extinguished all types of resource use rights inside the park in a record time of 5 months and also did not make any provision of compensation or viable alternatives to the affected population.

The award has totally restricted grazing inside the park without considering the fact that centrality of livestock points to the continuity between the household, the farm, the grazing field and the forest (and the market) in the local economy. Maintaining this continuity is crucial for the successful management of each of these elements. Any change in people's access to one set of resources with necessarily bring about changes in the other sets of resources. For

instance, if access to pastures laying inside GHNP is curtailed, it will not only affect people's ability to keep livestock, but also affect soil fertility on the farm, access to nutrition in the household, and commercial relationships with the world outside the village (Amita Baviskar, 1998).

Secondly, in most Indian villages, access to the commons plays a critical role in the survival strategies of the poor. Scheduled caste families depend heavily on collection of medicinal plants from the forest. If access to medicinal plants is curtailed, it will entail serious hardship for the poorest section of the village. The dependence on cash earnings from the sale of medicinal plants is crucial also for remote villages like Lapah which do not have access to other sources of monetary income. For those households in Lapah which are landless or have small or marginal land holdings, the collection of medicinal plants is economically much more important than agriculture (Amita Bavaskar 1998).

Taking into consideration the above mentioned facts and the likely impacts of the settlement/ extinguishment of rights as described in the preceding chapter in detail, there is an urgent need to cancel/suspend or keep the final award in abeyance at least for time being unless any alternative arrangements for the affected population are made. It is more so because experiences have made it amply clear that illegal/de-facto resource use practices are more harmful than de-jure practices because the former can be regulated & transformed into sustainable ones while the later are beyond any agreements or control. In this particular case where no viable alternatives are provided, denying access to park resources shall in all probability increase de-facto practices.

The successful management of protected areas therefore depends on the cooperation and support of the local people. Therefore, the required approach is of participatory management involving local communities. There is a need to make programs by involving people to promote sustainable land use practices as well as income generating activities. It is suggested that generation of alternative resource management systems based on the existing customs have more chances of successful incorporation by rural societies. Successful implementation of resource conservation projects as well as their maintenance over time depends on the identification of local population with them. This in turn depends in great part on their perceived compatibility with local goals and customs. There is an urgent need to identify and strengthen the existing traditional institutions and organizations such as *Devata committees*, *Mahila Mandals*, *Traditional Panchayats* and Youth clubs etc. and provide them training for formulating and implementing eco-development plans. Moreover, the possibilities of joint forest management by the staff and local population is expected to facilitate the successful management of the national park and conservation of forest resources. It is further suggested that as far as farming system is concerned, though there are many profitable and climatically suitable crops for this region, research and policy support for improvement in their yield and marketing are greatly lacking which require urgent attention. Government subsidy and credit



along with technical know how should be increased.

Any potential and viable employment schemes must be launched which should first be sustainable with minimum inputs and secondly socially acceptable. It shall restrain the villagers from longer stay in the forest/park/WLS along with decreasing economic dependence on forest produce. Along with it, local/indigenous technology, particularly non-conventional source of energy should be improved and encouraged besides development of traditional varieties of crops coupled with development of traditional household industry such as handicrafts, bee keeping, weaving etc. At the same time improvement in the quality of livestock/cattle is imperative. It is expected to reduce their number while increasing the quality and quantity of the product. As only the right holders are supposed to be allowed to collect certain herbs and mushrooms, it is easier to form cooperative to regulate their sale, pricing and profit mechanism of these commodities. However, the management should make sure their sustainable harvesting by involving the members. It can reduce the quantities to be extracted while keeping the monetary returns constant or even high.

Infrastructural facilities and availability of basic amenities in the area are greatly lacking which needs proper attention. Due to lack of transportation, people of remote areas are not able to earn cash incomes by selling their farm produce particularly fruits and vegetables (perishable goods) and have to depend on medicinal plants etc. (nonperishable goods) for cash income.

Indigenous/resident people have the power to make decisions concerning the sustainable use and management of natural resources which is governed and managed by village institutions such as traditional panchayats, Dewata committees etc. Such institutions must be strengthened by providing adequate training and technical assistance to adapt their more traditional land use systems to modern economic conditions. Besides, there is a strong need to inform the people about the aims, objectives and consequences of national park.

Most of the villagers complain of damage to crops and livestock by wild animals and lack of proper compensation by the authorities. It is therefore strongly recommended that in case of damage to crop and livestock by wild animals, quick relief should be given to villagers and possible arrangements should be made to protect their crop and livestock.

The park management has been successful to a large extent in involving the people in development activities but the degree of participation is less than what is needed in such type of programs. Also there is no agreement or realization in the eco. development committees that these activities are in consideration for the reduction in income from expletive activities in the forests. Secondly, as the activities required for such projects generally fall into two categories viz. activities directly contributing towards mitigation of pressures on park resources and activities aimed at trust building/infrastructure building or indirectly affecting the use of Park resources. There should be an appropriate mix of the two in which the degree of former should dominate. Although the investments made so far, does not reflect this idea, it is quite



natural because most of the investments in initial phases of the project go in trust/infrastructure building. But as soon as this objective is achieved, there should be a sharp shift of investments from trust/infrastructure building activities to sustainable employment generation activities.

The first and foremost job ahead is to take advantage of the momentum made by activities done so far and translate it into concrete long term employment generating mechanisms at institutional level. It requires coordination among all the concerned departments/agencies in the area and bringing together all the government plans/subsidiary activities as well as development activities under one platform and carefully choose suitable long term employment generation activities which are feasible and acceptable in the present social setup. In addition, it is very important to organize and improve household industry by giving sufficient inputs such as improvement in indigenous technology and availability of raw material. Sustainable use of minor forest produce and agricultural and horticultural products can lead to potential development in household industry and reduce pressure from other targeted species. However in order to generate practical long term employment in the aforesaid manner, following three structural bottlenecks have to be taken care of by the management:

1. Banking/Finance: Park management should be instrumental in getting the finance/subsidies to households.
2. Marketing: Intervention for marketing the finished goods by park management is also desirable.
3. Training: Training in various vocational activities should be provided to the local people

There is an urgent need for making Eco-Development Committees self-sufficient by way of registering them either under Societies Registration Act or any other provisions. It shall help in maintaining the conservation efforts in long term specially after the completion of COB project. At the same time public awareness campaign through print and audio-visual media is essential for taking the full benefit of the activities and initiatives and to keep in constant touch with the public. Public awareness campaign should be undertaken keeping in view the seasonal calendar of local activities, fairs and festivals etc.

Effective Enforcement of rules and regulations is very important for the success of all management and conservation programs. It not only helps in direct conservation of various forest produce and wildlife but also in indirect conservation of bio-diversity by enforcing discipline and sincerity among the local population. At the same time it gives confidence to the frontline staff and local population. In this effort full cooperation of people should be taken and if possible joint management committees be formed. Enforcement has to be done on two fronts viz.

1. **Unauthorized users and prohibited articles** : Strict enforcement through more frontline staff and by giving them more facilities, equipment and moral and material support. By



giving incentives to people and staff and by involving right holders in conservation activities by forming joint enforcement/surveillance committees is also highly desirable. Monetary allowance can be given to committee members from the fine collected from offenders.

2. **With regard to right holder in respect of time, quality and place of extraction :** In this work, people's cooperation and active participation is very essential. In fact it is a joint management of those forest produce which are being used/harvested un-sustainably particularly mushrooms and herbs. The committees should ensure that right holders do not collect more than fixed quantities, from fixed places and at fixed times only. It can be a very good step if these committees can evolve guidelines for more useful and sustainable use of, at least, some desired forest resources.

However the enforcement activities should only be taken after obtaining full confidence and participation of the user population. An casual approach can give rise to conflict and mistrust due to intervention and wrong propaganda from unwanted quarters.

Here, given the considerable success of Eco-development/trust building activities and degree of interaction between management and people, this task does not seem to be very difficult. Successful implementation of this task shall be a direct input to the bio-diversity conservation program.

Due to various reasons there are many intra-village as well as inter-village conflicts in respect of decision making and implementation of micro-plans. There are reports of various development activities coming to a halt after such conflicts cropped up in eco-development committees particularly in cases involving selection of sites for development activities, surrender of land for bridle path etc. and civil works. Therefore it is important to resolve conflicts by employing proper mechanism during and prior to decision making in order to save the time and money at implementation stage. In addition, local people and forest department do not trust each other in respect of various issues. Taking these facts in consideration efforts should be made at trust and institution building.

It has been noted that in the preparation and implementation of micro-plans, participation of SCs and females is negligible. Due to their weaker socio-economic conditions, they are not in a position to bargain a better or at least workable deal in development activities and have little role in decision making. Therefore there is an urgent need to take appropriate steps for their empowerment. Management should under the project, pay more attention to the employment and income generation of the weaker sections of society who are comparatively more dependent on the use and sale of minor forest produce. They are also likely to be most affected by increase in enforcement practices. Training programmes should be organised ~~where the potential of these sections, who are good in handicraft, weaving and other small~~ household industry, can be increased to better wages/employment.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Aggarwal, K.L. 1949, Fourth Working Plan for the Kullu and Seraj Forest, (Lahore: Government Press).
- Anderson, Alexander 1886, Report on the Demarcation and Settlement of the Kullu Forests (Lahore: Government Press).
- Archibugi, F. 1989 "Comprehensive social assessment: an essential instrument for environmental policy making" in Archibugi, F. and Nijkamp P (ed.) Economy and ecology : Towards sustainable development. Kluwer Academic Publishers. Dordrecht. Boston, London.
- Bajaj, Manjul 1997, Medicinal Plants and Other Non-Timber Forest Products in Himachal Pradesh New Delhi: British Overseas Development Administration.
- Baviskar, Amita 1997 "Claims to knowledge, claims to control: Environmental conflict in Great Himalayan National Park". Unpublished.
- Baviskar, Amita 1997 "Participating in ecodevelopment: The case of Great Himalayan National Park, Himachal Pradesh". Unpublished.
- Bavaska, Amita (1998):Intensive Micro Study to assess the Social Context and Socioeconomic Conditions of People using GHNP & WLS. Wildlife Institute of India Dehradun.
- Bonner, R. 1993, At the Hand of Man: Peril and Hope for Africa's Wildlife. Simon and Schuster, London.
- Boserup, E. 1965. The Conditions of Agricultural Growth: The Economics of Agrarian Change under Population Pressure. London : Allen and Unwin. World Commission on Environment & Development, Oxford University Press, p. 283.
- Brandon, K. & Wells M. 1992. People and parks : linking protected area management with local communities. World Bank. WWF, USAID Washington D.C.
- Brown, M. and Wyckoff-Baird, B. 1992. Designing Integrated Conservation and Development Projects. PVO-NGO/NRMS Project. WWF, Nature Conservancy, World Resources Institute, Washington DC.
- Chetwode, Penelope 1972, Kullu: The End of the Habitable World (Bombay: Allied).
- Cleghorn, H. 1964, The Forests of Punjab (Roorkee: Engineering College Press).
- Conservation of Biodiversity Project (India) 1995 "Staff Appraisal Report"
- Daly, H.E. 1990, Onward Some Operational Principles of Sustainable Development. Ecological Economics, Vol.2, 1-6



- Diack, A.H. 1897, *Gazetter of the Kangra District, Part II to IV: Kulu, Lahul and Spiti/Reprint*, New Delhi: Indus Publishing Company, 1994).
- Diack, A.H. 1898, *Final Report on the Revised Settlement of Kulu Sub-Division* (Lahore Government Printing Press).
- FAO 1993. *Management & Conservation of Closed Forests in tropical Africa*. FAO Forestry paper p. 101.
- Frank Vanclay and Daniel A. 1995 "Environmental and Social Impact Assessment" John Willy & Sons. Chichester. New York. Brisbane. Toronto. Singapore.
- Garson, P.J. 1983, "Comments on a Prospective National Park in Kullu District, Himachal Pradesh," typescript.
- Gaston, A.J., and P.J. Garson (1992), *A Re-appraisal of the Great Himalayan National Park (Himachal Wildlife Project - III)*, typescript.
- Gradstaff, S. Gradstaff, T. and Lovelace, G. 1987, *Proceedings of the 1985 International conference on Rapid Rural Appraisal*. Khon Kaen University, Khon Kaen, Thailand.
- Great Himalayan National Park, Himachal Pradesh: *A Report on the Human Nature Interactions in and Around the Park* (New Delhi: Indian Institute of Public Administration, Revd. Ed., 1996).
- Harcourt, A.F. P. 1982, *The Himalayan Districts of Kooloo Lahul and Spiti. Selections from the Records of the Government of the Punjab*, Reprint, Delhi: Vivek.
- John Lenihan, William W. Fletcher 1997 "Economics of the environment" BLACKIE Glasgo & London.
- John & Kerr, Dinesh K. Marothia, Kartar Singh, C. Ramasamy, William R. Bentley 1997 "Natural resource economics: Theory and application in India" Oxford and IBH Publishing Com. Pvt. Ltd., New Delhi, Calcutta.
- Judd, C.M. ,& Kenny , D. A. (1981): *Estimating the effects of Social interventions*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- K. Finsterbusch & C.P. Wolf (ed.) *Methodology of Social Impact Assessment* :Str oudsburg , PA :Hutchinson Ross.
- Kapoor, D.P. 1973, *Fifth Working Plan for the Kullu and Seraj Forests* (Simla: Government Press).
- Kershad, K.A. 1973. *Quantitative & dynamic plant Ecology* p. 308.
- Kothari, A., Pande, P., Singh, S., and Variava D. 1989. *Management of National Park and Sanctuaries in India: A Status Report*. Indian Institute of Public Administration, New

Delhi.

Kurt Finsterbusch, Jasper Ingersoll & Lynn Llewellyn (1990) : *Methods for Social Analysis in Developing Countries*. Westview Press Boulder, San Francisco, & Oxford.

Kurt Finsterbusch, Lynn G. Llewellyn, C.P. Wolf (ed.) 1983 : *Social Impact Assessment Methods*. Sage Pub. Beverly Hills / London/ N. Delhi.

Lawrence B. Mohr (1995): *Impact Analysis for Program Evaluation*. Sage Publication. Thousand Oaks London, New Delhi.

Lyll, J.B. 1874, *Report of the Land Revenue Settlement of the Kangra District, Punjab, 1865-72* (Lahore: Government Press).

McNeely, J.A., K.R. Miller, W.V. Reid, R.A. Mittermeier and T.B. Werner. 1990. *Conserving the World's Biological Diversity*. IUCN, Gland, Switzerland; WRI, CI, WWF-US, and the World Bank, Washington D.C.

Mehta A., Mehta R., Palhan S., Sankaran V., Singh S., Uppal V., Vania F. 1993. *Biodiversity Conservation through Ecodevelopment. A Preliminary, Indicative Plan for Great Himalayan National Park, Himachal Pradesh and Kalakad Mundanthurai. Tiger Reserve, Tamil Nadu*. Indian Institute of Public Administration, New Delhi, India.

Misra, R. 1973, *Ecology workbook*, Oxford IBH Publication, New Delhi, p.244.

MoEF, 1994. *Conservation of Biological Diversity in India. An Approach*. Ministry of Environment and Forests, Government of India, New Delhi.

Negi S.S. 1993. *Biodiversity and its conservation in India*. Indus Publishing Co. New Delhi.

Pandey, Sanjeeva & Michael P. Wells 1997 "Ecodevelopment Planning at India's Great Himalayan National Park for biodiversity conservation and participatory rural development". *Biodiversity and Conservation*.

Panwar, H.S. 1992. *Ecodevelopment. An Integrated Approach to Sustainable Development for People and Protected Areas in India*. Paper presented in the IV World Congress on National Parks and Protected Areas. Caracas, Venezuela. 10-21 February, 1992.

Patrick, C West and Stevens, R. Brechin (ed). 1991. *Resident Peoples and National Parks*. The University of Arizona Press, Tuscon. 14-17.

Parmar, B.S. 1959, *Report on the Grazing Problems and Policy of Himachal Pradesh* (Simla: Government Press).

Pathak, Akhileshwar, and Vikash N. Pandey 1996, *Forest Laws in Mandi and Kullu Districts, Himachal Pradesh* (Anand, Gujarat: Institute of Rural Management).

Punjab District Gazetteer, Kullu and Seraj, Vol. Xxx A, Part II (Lahore: Government Press,



1918).

- Ramakrishnan P.S. Purohit A.N. , Saxena K.G. & Rao K.S. (1994) Himalayan Environment & Sustainable Development Indian National Science Academy Bahadurshah Zafar Marg, New Delhi - 110002.
- Richard, Camille (1999):Grazing in the Great Himalayan National Park; A Riew of Research and Recommends for Ecodevelopment Activities.
- Richard Tucker 1997:The Historical Development of Human Impacts on the Great Himalayan National Park. Winrock International Institute for Agricultural Development.
- Sharma, R.C. 1987. Management Plan of the Great Himalayan National Park. Department of Forest Farming and Conservation, Government of Himachal Pradesh, Shimla.
- Soule, M.E. 1991, Conservation: Tactics for a constant crisis. Science 253.
- Susam Braatz 1992. Conserving biological diversity: A strategy for protected areas in the Asia Pacific Region. The World Bank, Washington D.C.
- Sawarkar V.B. & V.K. Uniyal (1992_ Landscape Diversity, Satpura hills India, International Seminar on Biodiversity in Managed Landscapes, Sacramento, California, U.S.A.
- Sawarkar, U.B. 1992, Managed Forest Approach to Support protected Arab for conserving Biodiversity, IV world congress on National Parks & protected areas, Caracas Venezuelas.
- Shabab, Dilaram 1996, Kullu: Himalayan Abode of the Divine (New Delhi: Indus).
- Singh, Iqbal 1997, "Study of Grazing Management System and Status of Herb Collection," Draft Report.
- The Wildlife (Protection) Act, 1972, as amended upto 1991 (Dehra Dun: Natraj, 1994).
- Tucker, Richard P. 1986, " The Evolution of Transhumant Grazing in the Punjab Himalaya," Mountain Research and Development 6: 2, pp. 17-28.
- WCED 1987, our common future (The Brundtland Report), Oxford.
- West P. and Brechin S.R. (ed.) 1991, Resident People and Resident Parks: Social Dilemmas Land Strategies in International Conservation. University of Arizona Press.
- Whose Eden? An Overview of Community Approaches to Wildlife Management, International Institute for Environment and Development July 1994.
- Wilkhison, R.G. (1973), Poverty & Progress and Ecological Model of Economic Development, London Methuen & Co.
- Wilson E.O. (ed.) 1988, Biodiversity, National Academy Press, Washington D.C.
- ~~Woodland, R. Daly, H, Serafy, S.E. & Drosk, B.van (1991). Environmentally Sustainable Economic Development. Building on Brundtland UNESCO, France p.100.~~



Annexure I : List of Various Revenue Villages and Major Hamlets falling in the Eco-Development Project Area of GHNP

1	2	3	4		5	6	7
Tehsil & Waziri	Kothi, Revenue estate	Phanti/Revenue Village	Name of Hamlets	(i)	Number of House Holds	Total Population	Eco Dev Unit
Banjar, Inner Seraj (Sub Teh. Sainj)	Shaughar	1 Shangarh		(i)	5	43	6
			Birashangar	(ii)	7	58	
			Chamarda	(iii)	14	82	
			Dharali	(iv)	22	84	
			Dagahra	(v)	4	31	
			Goshti	(vi)	7	78	
			Dhara	(vii)	8	24	
			Kulwali	(viii)	8	65	
			Madana	(ix)	5	62	
			Kahna	(x)	6	53	
			Kotlu	(xi)	7	25	
			Shengcha	(xii)	6	44	
			Lot	(xiii)	5	23	
			Sundarnagar	(xiv)	7	22	
		Total		14	111	694	
Banjar, Inner Seraj (Sub Teh. Sainj)	Shunghar	2 Lapah	Lapah	(i)	15	113	3
			Barshangar	(ii)	14	55	Village Bar
			Titri	(iii)	8	51	Shanghur and Titri
			Dhara	(iv)	8	24	has been included
					Total		4
Banjar, Inner Seraj (Sub Teh. Sainj)	Banogi	3 Shehan	Nanwali	(i)			
			Pupna	(ii)	5	14	9
			Ropa	(iii)	11	61	
			Suchen	(iv)	21	108	
			Shigaira	(v)	5	28	
			Thachan	(vi)	10	44	
		Total		5	52	255	



Banjar, Inner Seraj	Tung	4 Chipni	Chipni	(i)	35	329	13 & 14
			Banogi	(ii)	8	65	Thari & Manwani
			Thari	(iii)	5	25	included in Unit
			Tung	(iv)	6	35	14 alongwith
			Mulwani	(v)	11	114	Farwari.
			Farwari	(vi)	22	208	
		Total		6	87	776	
Banjar, Inner Seraj	Tung	5 Mashiyar	Mashiyar	(i)	11	110	5
			Manjaili	(ii)	20	170	
			Kamera	(iii)	15	164	
			Gulingcha	(iv)	22	205	
			Thanegad	(v)	14	70	
			Ghaliyed	(vi)	40	200	
			Gadingcha	(vii)	8	48	
			Bathad	(viii)	18	178	
		Total		8	138	1145	
Banjar, Inner Seraj	Nohanda	6 Pekhri	Duran	(i)	5	50	I
			Ghat	(ii)	6	45	Nadhar has been
			Kuthi	(iii)	25	120	included in Unit 13
			Loharda	(iv)	3	23	
			Lagcha	(v)	12	120	
			Nadahar	(vi)	5	30	
			Nahin	(vii)	45	400	
			Pekhri	(viii)	80	500	
			Talinga	(ix)	5	35	
			Shungcha	(x)	8	102	
			Shalinga	(xi)	12	115	
			Byte	(xii)	30	250	



			Ludhar	(xiii)	3	18	
			Burnga	(xiv)	5	32	
			Gaded	(xv)	7	40	
			Manahar	(xvi)	10	90	
		Total		16	261	1540	
Banjara, Inner Seraj	Nohanda	7 Tinder	Dingcha	(i)	11	105	11
			Gushaini	(ii)	12	160	Gushani included
			Karongcha	(iii)	3	30	in Unit 14.
			Tinder	(iv)	40	380	
			Ropa	(v)	10	60	
			Lajhari	(vi)	5	30	
		Total		6	81	765	
Banjar, Inner Seraj	Plach	8 Shri Kot	Huri	(i)	4	20	15
			Kanon	(ii)	103	944	
			Khatheri	(iii)	8	40	
			Nah	(iv)	5	45	
			Ragut	(v)	7	35	
			Shirachi	(vi)	90	450	
			Shanar	(vii)	5	25	
		Total		7	222	1559	
Banjar, Inner Seraj	Sharchi	9 Shilhi	Guruli	(i)	25	320	12
			Parwali	(ii)	17	120	
			Shil	(iii)	21	260	
			Shurangar	(iv)	22	220	
		Total		4	85	920	
Banjar, Rupi	Shansher	10 Shansher	Pathara	(i)	10	58	50% villages, in
			Bhagi - Kashari	(ii)	15	69	Unit 7 rest 50%



			Chinari	(iii)	25	95	villages in units 16,
			Darmera	(iv)	11	71	10 & 4 respectively.
			Dhartha	(v)	4	42	
			Damiari	(vi)	6	30	
			Guhri	(vii)	13	65	
			Julahro	(viii)	4	30	
			Jangler	(ix)	9	33	
			Karehla	(x)	8	26	
			Khainth	(xi)	8	33	
			Khain	(xii)	36	161	
			Manahra	(xiii)	28	198	
			Mail	(xiv)	17	108	
			Nadohra	(xv)	7	32	
			Niharni	(xvi)	3	16	
			Pathara	(xvii)	7	43	
			Pachari	(xviii)	4	30	
			Riari	(xix)	7	38	
			Sumbha	(xx)	17	95	
			Siri	(xxi)	9	40	
			Sumbho	(xxii)	4	18	
			Tiali	(xxiii)	5	35	
			Telehra	(xxiv)	4	19	
			Tung	(xxv)	29	187	
			Gaul	(xxvi)	6	24	
			Namuribahli	(xxvii)	3	20	
			Satesh	(xxviii)	14	64	
			Bhaludwar	(xxix)	3	11	
		Total		29	321	1641	
Banjur (Rupi)	Shansher	11 Garaparli	Baretha-Sanyer	(i)	15	106	10 and 4 Neuli



			Banaugi	(ii)	9	48	included in Unit 16.
			Bah	(iii)	7	35	
			Munjhan	(iv)	26	205	
			Neoli	(v)	13	30	
			Sohan	(vi)	1	9	
			Chenga	(vii)	3	15	
		Total		7	74	448	
Kullu, Rupi	Balahan	12 Rala	Bupan	(i)	11	59	2 and 8
			Dhatidhar	(ii)	4	25	
			Dalhiyar	(iii)	4	26	
			Ghatsiri	(iv)	7	60	
			Ghat	(v)	10	67	
			Gorunsari	(vi)	3	16	
			Kharangcha	(vii)	7	50	
			Khanyari	(viii)	1	5	
			Kathiyari	(ix)	3	26	
			Majharna	(x)	7	47	
			Majhgran	(xi)	4	21	
			Pashi	(xii)	13	111	
			Sharan	(xiii)	11	64	
			Shaindhar	(xiv)	5	27	
			Sharoh	(xv)	8	47	
			Setitol	(xvi)	1	16	
			Shikari	(xvii)	8	65	
			Jiwa	(xviii)	16	89	
			Sharan	(xix)	42	247	
		Total		19	165	1068	
Banjar, Inner Seraj	Plach	13 Kalwari	Nadahar	(i)	7	32	Both have been
			Thunach	(ii)	7	30	included in Unit 15
		Total		2	14	62	with Seri Kot.



ANNEXURE II : Various Eco-Development Activities and Their Likely Impact

Watershed/Revenue Village	Name of Hamlet	Activity Undertaken	Likely impacts
SAINJ SHANGHAR	Dhara	a) Levelling of village ground. a) Bawdi (Water source) b) Donation of Rs.50,000/- for the renovation of village Devata's temple.	Trust building Increased people's confidence in park management.
	Patara	1. Bawdi (water source) 2. Levelling of temple ground.	People are annoyed. They say the old Bawari was better and they have destroyed it. People say they suggested other things but department did not pay any attention.
	Dharali	1. Bawdi (water source) 2. Water tank 3. Bridle Path	Trust building activity. Availability of relatively clean drinking water. Transportation avenues increased.
	Katwali	1. Stone Soling 2. Bawdi (water source)	Started two years back but due to conflicts could not be completed till date. People are angry that the department has destroyed the previous Bawdi which was better.
	Birashangar	1. Bawdi 2. Bridle Path 3. Temple is being reconstructed	Still incomplete. Only half is constructed. People and management shall come closer.
	Kotlu Kanha	Nothing is done. Nothing is done.	People have become anti park for they think they have been discriminated against.
	Dagara	1. Bawdi (incomplete). 2. Stone Soleng.	Trust building.



	Goshti	1. Stone Soleng (incomplete)	
	Dharapatra	Nothing is done.	People are against the management because they think they are being discriminated against.
SAINJ SUCHEN	Dharla	1. Chakkatalai (Stone Soling) 2. Compost Pit	Trust building, appreciated by the villagers. Provided to only one household. No criteria. Conflict among members who should take it.
	Shiravgi	1. Chakkatalai	Increased confidence between villagers and management
	Ropa	1. Levelling of Devta ground 2. Khor (Pots for serving fodder to cattle). 3. Bridle Path (from Ropa to Schean).	Trust building activity. Successful, also residents got some labour work. Given to only two households, conflicts regarding selection of beneficiaries.
	Tungru/Narwali	Levelling of School playground.	Increase in transportation avenues. Confidence building measure.
	Mashla	Bawdi	Confidence building measure.
	Other works	a. Vaccination among livestock. b. Plantation.	If protected, shall increase availability of bio-mass.
SAINJ LAPAH	Birshangar	1. Repair/levelling of school ground. 2. Construction of water tank. 3. Vaccination among livestock and distribution of free medicines (once).	Increased trust and confidence between management and villagers. Protect wild animals from contacting diseases from domestic livestock.



THIRTHAN MASHIYAR	Ghadingcha	1. Chakkatalai (Stone soling)	People/labours complain that they have not paid wages so far.
	Kamera	2. Bawri 1. Bawri	People say it is defective.
	Galnigcha	1. Mule Path 2. Chakkatalai (stone soling) 3. Bawdi	Likely to increase transportation and provide better drinking water.
	Other Hamlets	Nothing is done.	
THIRTHAN TINDER	Tinder	1. Chakkatalai 2. Bawdi 3. Grain storage Tank (one piece only).	Increased confidence between management and villagers.
	Ropa	1. Chakkatalai 2. Bawdi 3. Grain storage Tank distributed 4. Mule path in Progress	Increased confidence between management and villagers. Likely to increased transportation facilities.
	Jhanyar	1. Chakkatalai 2. Mule path in progress	Likely to increased transportation facilities.
	Brencha	1. Chakkatalai	



THIRTHAN/ PEKHRI	Gushani	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Levelling of school ground.2. Toilet construction in school.	Confidence building activity. Helped in bringing people close to park management.
	Pekhri	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Chakkatalai (300 meter length).2. Repair of Temple (Guru Lomash Rishi) Spend Rs.12,500.3. Water Tank.	Confidence building activity. Helped in bringing people close to park management. As tap water is available in most of the villages, construction of water Tanks and Bawari are not required.
	Lagcha	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Chakkatalai2. Bawdi (water source)	Confidence building activity. Helped in bringing people close to park management.
	Nahi	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Chakkatalai2. Bawdi	Confidence building activity. Helped in bringing people close to park management.
	Manhar	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Chakkatalai	Confidence building activity. Helped in bringing people close to park management.
	Ghat	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Chakkatalai	Only inside the village, no effect on transportation. Confidence building activity. Helped in bringing people close to park management.
	Shalingcha	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Chakkatalai2. Bawdi	Confidence building activity. Helped in bringing people close to park management.



	Talinga	<p>1. Bawdi 2. Water Tank</p> <p>3. One bridle path from Gushani to Shrnnga (6 km length).</p>	<p>Confidence building activity. Helped in bringing people close to park management.</p> <p>Transportation of village products made easy. It will indirectly help in reducing pressure from park.</p>
	Other works done in Pekhri Phanti	<p>1. Distribution of subsidised cookers to some households</p> <p>2. Distribution of grain storage tanks to some of the households.</p>	<p>These are said to be distributed on first come first basis. Villagers complain that these were given to some influential persons only and not to poor households. This perception can result in people disbelieving the management.</p> <p>It can help in fuelwood saving, though a little fuelwood is required for cooking purposes.</p> <p>Only one tank each in Pekhri and Talinga and three in Shilinga were distributed. No criteria was followed.</p> <p>People allege that these were given to forest guard's and eco. dev. Committee president's near and dears only.</p> <p>It can discourage people's participation in eco. dev. activities.</p>



		<p>3. Plantation of Broad leaves tree at some places.</p> <p>4. Vaccination of livestock and cattle and distribution of some medicines.</p>	<p>Shall increase fodder availability in areas peripheral to the villages. Reduce pressure on Protected Areas in long run.</p> <p>It was part of livestock improvement programmes and shall also help saving wild animals from contracting diseases from domestic animals.</p>
THIRTHAN	Shurugar	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Chakkatalai2. Bawdi3. MPD-Diyskoria (3 hector.)4. 5 hectre area fenced for future plantation5. Apple tree distribution (Eight households only)6. One household was given subsidized grain container.	<p>Most of the activities are of confidence building nature. People complain that grain container were not distributed to all and that no criteria was adopted. Similarly they allege that apple tree were also not given to all. Forest Department says that they had already intimated the people and distributed the trees on first come first basis, and they cannot be held responsible if some people did not come at the place fixed for distribution.</p>



SHILHI	Shilhi	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Chakkatalai (630 metre) 2. Bawdi a) Plantation (broad leaves) 5 hectre 4. Distribution of plant graftings 5. Only one grain container distributed in the area. 	<p>Confidence Building</p> <p>Confidence Building</p> <p>Reducing fodder/fuelwood pressure in long run.</p> <p>Horticulture development aimed at diverting pressure from herb economy. However it shall result in decrease in land under traditional fodder crops and result in increase in pressure on forest resources.</p> <p>Shall increase conflicts among villager on the one hand and villagers and Forest Department on the other.</p>
	Guruli	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Chakkatalai. 2. Plant distribution (Grafting etc.). 3. Distribution of three grain containers. 	<p>Confidence building measure.</p> <p>This small quantity shall not reduce use of wood for household utensils rather it shall encourage conflict.</p>
	Farwari	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Chakkatalai (400 Meter). 2. Plant distribution/ grafting. 3. Grain container to one family. <p><u>Important :</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) A bridge called Shilhi Gad constructed for the benefits of 34 hamlets. b) 2 bridle paths (2 kms.) still incomplete. 	<p>Increased confidence between management and villagers.</p> <p>Shall increase transport and communication opportunities. Shall develop local economy by making marketing of rural products easy.</p>



JIWA SHANSHAR	Ralla	1. Stone Pitting	Increase trust and confidence between management and villagers.
	Nevli	1. Stone Pitting 2. Levelling of School Ground	Increase trust and confidence between management and villagers.
	Dmadhi	1. Stone Pitting	All of these trace activities failed to gain the confidence of local people.
	Tung	1. Stone Pitting	All of these trace activities failed to gain the confidence of local people.
	Bajora	1. Stone Pitting <u>Other Activities :</u> a. Bridle Path from Shina to Bagshari. b. Stadium at Manu Maharaj Temple. c. Plantation of Broad leaves trees in the area. d. Vaccination of livestock throughout the area. e. Distribution of fruit plants.	Transportation made easy, shall benefit the people economically. Likely to increase biomass. Protect wild animals from contracting diseases from domestic live stock. Only a few plant distributed. Marginal improvement in horticulture likey.



<p>JIWA RALLA</p>	<p>Pashi</p> <p>Jiwa</p> <p>Khadingcha</p> <p>Sharan</p> <p>Bhagidhar</p> <p>Majarana</p>	<p>1. Stone Soling 2. Bawdi 3. Compost Pit</p> <p>1. Stone Soling 2. Compost Pit</p> <p>3. Feeding Stalls</p> <p>1. Stone Soling 2. Compost Pit</p> <p>1. Stone Soling 2. Feeding stalls</p> <p>1 Stone Soling 2. Feeding Stalls</p> <p>1. Stone Soling 2. Repair of water source</p>	<p>TRUCO activity.</p> <p>Only one household benefitted.</p> <p>TRUCO activity. To only two households. No criteria was fixed, therefore people are angry that only influential people can get benefit.</p> <p>Only for 2/3 households without any criteria.</p> <p>TRUCO activity. Only one household benefitted</p> <p>TRUCO activity. Only few sleeted household benefitted.</p> <p>TRUCO activity. Only few household benefitted.</p> <p>TRUCO activity.</p>
	<p>Other Activities in Railla Phanti</p>	<p>1. Bridle Path (5 km) From Sharan to Majharana</p>	<p>Shall benefit the people of many villages. Inter village transportation made easy.</p>



		<p>2. Inspection Path (12 km)</p>	<p>It links many villages. Also it provides access to park areas and is likely to provide much input to management/staff which could not enter the park in bad whether due to bad path. It shall strengthen enforcement activities. Also it is likely to be misused by unwanted and unauthorised persons.</p>
		<p>3. A small check dam constructed</p>	<p>Provide irrigation facilities to near about 15 to 20 households. Shall improve agriculture and horticulture and is likely to divert pressure from park/forest produce.</p>
		<p>4. Distribution of fruit Plants in the area</p>	<p>Shall improve the economy of the area if carefully looked after . However people say that the quality was inferior and quantity insufficient (distributed on first come first basis).</p>
		<p>5. Vaccination in livestock and cattle</p>	<p>Protect wild animals from contacting diseases from domesitc livestock.</p>
		<p>6. Plantation (broad leaves) 10 hectre.</p>	<p>Shall provide fodder and fuelwood and decrease pressure from forest in the long term.</p>



ANNEXURE III : List of Alpine pastures in GHNP

1. DUNGA	2. MUNGRA DWARI	3. CHHADAR
4. MANDRACH	5. BAGARIS	6. JASU
7. NARAGI	8. MUNNI ROPA	9. BASLEO
10. RATA DABAR	11. KER	12. BHUJ
13. MANJNIKOT	14. BADI	15. CHHODAR
16. MUNDREUR	17. BASHEL	18. DETI
19. SHAGOT	20. KHORIL POLI	21. CHANONI
22. ASHURBAGH	23. SARI	24. PHUPHU
25. JHATHOLI	26. DHARACH	27. BHOGARA DUNGA
28. UMBLIDWARI	29. KHUKHARI	30. CHANNI
31. KHOL	32. BANDYOG	33. DEOBANI
34. SAKETI	35. THARTHADHAR	36. BHLUNDWARI
37. BATLIJANI	38. CHANG	39. BAKRETU
40. MANJHOUNI	41. CHAKRER	42. DWARIGARH
43. SHANKHA	44. RAKHALTI	45. BALU
46. HARA	47. NARA	48. KOBRI
49. BHARENGCHA	50. CHALOCHA	51. GHARANI
52. DULANGA	53. SHILT	54. PARDI
55. BHUJDWARI	56. GHUMTAROA	57. PATAL
58. MANONI	59. KOLCHI	60. PALNI
61. GURAT	62. SHILI DANSWARI	63. DOTLA
64. NIARI NAINA	65. NALA TAPRA	66. MATI NAINA
67. CHARKERA	68. KILI	69. KAMBA
70. TUNDA BHUJ	71. DUDLA	72. HUMKHARNI
73. MANJHAN GALU	74. DHEL	75. PITTA
76. HUNGCHA	77. UKKHAL	78. DUGGI
79. RAJ THATTI	80. SARAH	81. THATI
82. THINI	83. JAGNAHU	84. KHARU
85. MUNDA TAPRA	86. MANJ KA TAPRA	87. RATI DWARI
88. INDRA	89. RAL	90. JAOLA
91. PALTA	92. RAKTI TAPRA	93. GHUGHUMUA
94. JOARA (I)	95. RAHNI	96. JAUVIA
97. MAJHAUN	98. AVNI	99. RAKTIKHOL
100. PARKACHI	101. MATHAUN	102. JARAUN
103. JOARA (II)	104. RATI NARI	105. SALTU
106. KAILI	107. CHYAS	108. BARAMCHULI
109. KARCEHAR	110. THUMRI	111. GALU
112. GARWARI	113. DUDI CHAN	114. BAHLI
115. THELRU	116. SOCHA	117. MURLI
118. RAKTI SAR	119. DISHARI	120. PANIHARU
121. SILIRARI	122. KHUTAR KA BANI	123. DEUN
124. RADHAUNI	125. BAROHI	126. KANDI
127. KHUTAR KA BAN (II)	128. RANKA	129. RATICHHO
130. TALYAHARU	131. BAGRI	132. CHANGAR



133.	LAHLI BATI	134.	MILI DWAR	135.	DUARA
136.	UKHAL PATTHAR	137.	MAJHAN	138.	GARA DAURA
139.	SHILLILUARI	140.	RATI THATI	141.	ROHNI
142.	KHANERSU	143.	HARI	144.	ATHADUG
145.	BIRAGHMAR	146.	BIRA	147.	APGAIN
148.	JUBKUTAN	149.	BAKARCHUNA	150.	BECHA
151.	DWARA	152.	MORGAIN	153.	DRASHER
154.	LIGAN	155.	SHILPHAR	156.	BHAKHILCHIN
157.	CHHOGAD	158.	PHAGCHI	159.	KUNDARI
160.	DASHMANI	161.	RANGTHAR		