



**Forest Governance Learning Group (FGLG) – India
- enabling practical, just and sustainable forest use**

WORKPLAN

for the period February 2006 to July 2007

(Final draft 1 June 06)

1. Background to the project

The Indian Forest Governance Learning Group is part of a wider international project, with activities being carried out in parallel in seven countries in Africa, as well as in India, Indonesia and Vietnam in Asia. It aims for improved governance of forest resources in these ten countries. Four main outputs are expected over the project period:

- Output 1: Poverty reduction strategies, national forest programmes, decentralisation programmes and related processes enable improved forest governance
- Output 2: Illegal and corrupt forestry that degrades livelihoods is reduced through the adoption and spread of practical approaches to improve forest governance
- Output 3: Forestry enterprise initiatives and private sector associations comply with the law and spread practical approaches to improve forest governance
- Output 4: Ownership, access rights, policy and management frameworks are improved to support local control and benefit from forestry

The project will also support regional exchange of emerging lessons between the Asian FGLGs. The London-based International Institute for Environment and Development (IIED) coordinates the international project and the Bangkok-based Regional Community Forestry Training Centre (RECOFTC) is a partner in implementing the Asian component. The project is funded by the European Commission and the Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs. The international project is taking place over four years, February 2005 to January 2009, and the Asian component over the final three years, commencing in February 2006.

This project aims, through national and international collaboration and exchange of experience, to:

- spread learning about workable approaches to good forest governance
- make measurable progress in improving sustainable local returns to livelihoods from law enforcement, private sector responsibility and enhanced local ownership and access rights and
- build long-term capacity to spread these improvements.

This work plan was developed following several rounds of consultation and feedback from a range of actors in the Indian forest sector starting in October 2005.

The FGLG in India will have two 18 month phases. This work plan is concerned with the first 18 month period. The geographic area, theme and convenor for the second 18 month period will be decided towards the end of this first phase. This will enable the Group to change its thematic and geographic focus should developments in India's forest sector warrant a change of direction. Alternatively the

Group, IIED and RECOFTC may decide that the most useful role the Group can play for the second phase is to continue and extend activities developed in the first phase.

2. FGLG's regional and thematic focus in India

For the first 18 month phase, the Forest Governance Learning Group in India will work principally in the states of Andhra Pradesh, Orissa and Madhya Pradesh, with links to national level issues. Dr. D. Suryakumari of the Centre for People's Forestry, based in Secunderabad, will act as convenor for this period. The Group will address the theme of '**Governance tactics for forestry enterprise**'.

All four project's outputs were deemed to be relevant and important in India (though very few people suggested that output 2 be addressed overtly as a project objective). It was decided that the main focus of attention for the first 18 month period should be on a combination of Outputs 1 and 3. Of particular relevance to output 1 is the decentralisation of forest management responsibility through the Joint Forest Management programme and latterly the Forest Development Agency initiative, and decentralisation of administrative responsibility through Panchayati Raj. The potential role of the forest sector in poverty alleviation is also a key component of Output 1. Output 3 will form the core of the Group's work in India, focusing on the role of forestry enterprise initiatives in improving forest governance. Outputs 2 and 4 will be addressed during the second 18 month period; issues of illegality, corruption, access and rights are contentious and work on these issues will be more effective once the Group is better established and rapport built through the activities outlined in this work plan.

The focus during the first 18 month period will be on reviewing the literature, experience, policy and implementation with respect to selected non-timber forest products which are important to both the livelihoods of tribal and other marginalised communities, and to the forest ecosystem of the central Indian states. The Group will take the work forward from the existing level of debate, by intervening appropriately through filling the gaps in implementation, addressing policy issues, etc. Activities used to achieve this are described in subsequent sections. Plans for the second 18 month period will be refined towards the end of the first 18 month phase but may, for example, focus on the progress of the Scheduled Tribal (Recognition of Forest Rights) Bill, depending on the stage it has reached at that point. If it has been passed and the rules for implementation are in place, the Group may work on effective implementation; whereas if the policy and legislative process is still not complete, then the Group may focus on expediting its progress.

Andhra Pradesh, Orissa and Madhya Pradesh have been selected as focal states as they all have: large forest areas, large tribal areas, significant populations living in poverty, great dependence on NTFPs, conflicts over natural resources, and yet much potential for poverty reduction from improved governance of forest resources. Furthermore, promising approaches are being developed in all three states, and the Group will endeavour to exchange learning between these initiatives.

These three states are also part of a group of central Indian states which share a contiguous rich forest patch (which runs from eastern Maharashtra to western Orissa) and whose large populations of forest-dependent poor are facing very similar challenges. Whilst local and state initiatives to address forest governance may differ, there is much scope for exchanging learning and building on attempts to develop regional policy interventions¹. Thus there is a possibility that the issues considered by the FGLG in the three selected states will be relevant and useful to a broader area of central India. The Group will spread learning by looking beyond the focal states and making links to the national level and it will consider how the most promising initiatives might be scaled up and adapted to a wider area.

¹ In 2005 RCDC hosted multi-stakeholder consultations on policy prescriptions for sustainable management of NTFPs in central Indian states.

Andhra Pradesh has made considerable progress with respect to the themes contained in outputs 1, 2 and 4 over the past 12 years, largely because of the implementation of the World Bank aided project, which played a catalytic role triggering debates and discussions. During this time, a strong NGO movement was built through the efforts of all concerned, and NGOs contributed a lot to the process of policy formulation with respect to community forestry and its implementation in the field. Although opinion on the World Bank's role was divided, the project did incorporate significant comments made by NGOs. In AP, JFM was state-initiated; NGOs and communities participated in it and contributed to its progression into community forest management (CFM). Some work has also been carried out with respect to forest enterprises, but this needs to be further strengthened and taken forward – which the Group aims to do. Key governance questions in AP include:

- Is the GCC² a potential model for transformation? Taking this as an example of a 'flexible monopoly', what are the lessons learnt, pros and cons?
- NTFP trade and management – a strategic partnership started to develop following a civil society consultation – are there opportunities to build on this?
- Given that many of the 'rights' issues have been resolved in AP, does this open up space for an increased focus on enterprise development?
- Other issues of note include: biomass-based power generation, usufruct rights to timber, illegal timber felling

In *Orissa*, community-initiated forest protection groups had been in place for more than a century before the state initiated JFM, due to an earlier policy of the Government of Orissa. When the JFM guidelines were issued in 1990 by the (central) Ministry of Environment and Forests (MOEF), the Orissa state government did not take the earlier CFM groups into consideration and attempted to form new groups under JFM. This led to major conflict between the communities, NGOs and the state, represented by the Forest Department. Since then, NGOs in Orissa have been trying to convince the state government/ Forest Department to recognise the existing CFM groups and confer rights over the forest to those groups wherever they exist, instead of applying JFM which undermines the community initiative. The debate is still continuing and needs to be sorted out, if the communities are to get benefits (timber, bamboo) out of the forests they have been protecting. All tribal/ forest-dependent/ forest-dwelling people have rights over NTFP items. The ownership of 68 items has been transferred to Gram Panchayats, which means the Gram Panchayats can issue transit permits for the NTFPs sold by the collectors. The Gram Panchayats were not equipped to handle the situation, nor did the state invest in capacity-building of the Panchayat institutions, to enable them to take up their new responsibilities. Thus the NTFP collectors, being mostly illiterate and often unorganised, have been subjected to exploitation by traders and middlemen. A few NGOs have initiated the process of organising the NTFP collectors into cooperatives, around one or two products in one or two mandals/ districts, but given the scale of operations required to see that the 15 million tribal population across the state gets remunerative prices for the produce collected by them, state intervention is necessary. What kind of intervention and which government agency should be entrusted with such responsibility need to be identified and advocated. Key governance questions in Orissa include:

- There are many small initiatives but how can these be scaled up? There is a need for policy recognition and intervention to support marketing.
- What has been the impact of the Forest Development Agency initiative? Are FDA institutions working and how can they learn from local institutional initiatives?
- How can documentation of best practice in community forest management (already undertaken by RCDC) be effectively communicated to the state government?
- What have been the impacts of lifting of green felling ban? What lessons can be exchanged with other states which have had, or still have, felling bans?

² The Girijan Cooperative Corporation (GCC) was established in 1956 to protect marginalized forest-dependent poor from private traders. It procures NTFPs and supplies essential commodities to villages.

In *Madhya Pradesh (MP)*, the state has nationalised four items (tendu leaf, harra, gums, and sal seed) while all other NTFPs can be gathered and traded freely. The Minor Forest Produce (MFP) Federation of Madhya Pradesh, the state owned corporation, trades these nationalised products^[11]. In MP (and Chhattisgarh) there is recognition of community rights as they are entitled to “Nistar rights”. Government designates few patches of forest and depot for the distribution of timber, poles and boles to the local people free of cost under Nistar.

NTFP distribution is as per PRI (PESA) amendment, 1996 (whereby 100 per cent rights of minor forest produce is reserved for the Panchayat). Under this act, since ownership rights are with the PRI, all the benefit must go to the communities. Thus, in case of tendu, the distribution is 50 per cent of the net profit to the collectors, 30 per cent to the primary co-operative society and 20 per cent for regeneration of the forest (by the Forest Department). But if one looks carefully, the Forest Department is straightaway taking 50 per cent, in the name of forest regeneration and the primary co-operative societies, which are Forest Department governed bodies. The actual distribution to the collectors, which is given as bonus, is just 10 per cent. The co-operatives have now initiated provision of insurance to the collectors.

Madhya Pradesh has formed the Madhya Pradesh Minor Forest Produce (Trading and Development) Co-operative Federation, managed by the state Forest Department. The Federation co-ordinates the collection and processing of nationalised and other important non-nationalised NTFPs through primary co-operative societies, and organises marketing of these products. It has a three tier system: the primary society is at the base, then divisional union and state federation. At the state level it has established a minor forest produce processing and research centre and marketing agency, called “Sanjeevni”. This has its own brand called “Vindhya Herbals”. The state MFP Federation and the Forest Department have initiated many programmes (like PPA, Vanaspati Van) for the conservation, cultivation, value addition and proliferation of medicinal plants and their market.

Key governance questions with regard to community forestry and NTFPs in MP are:

- What is the status of JFM committees and how they are operating currently?
- How has the trade in non-nationalised NTFPs been taking place?
- What are the similarities and differences between the trade of tendu leaf and other nationalised and non-nationalised NTFPs?
- Is the three tier structure of the MFP Co-operative Federation the most suitable one?

Within the overall theme of governance of NTFPs and NTFP enterprises, the Group will focus initially on five specific NTFPs: mahua, tamarind, bamboo, tendu leaf (also known as kendu) and sal seed. The present status of regulation of trade with respect to these selected NTFPs in the three states is summarised below:

Present status of regulation of trade with respect to selected NTFPs in the three focal states

<i>Present status of regulation with respect to selected NTFPs</i>	<i>Andhra Pradesh</i>	<i>Orissa</i>	<i>Madhya Pradesh</i>
NTFP extraction and trade regulation	Bamboo – Forest Department KL (Kendu Leaf/ beedi leaf) – APFDC (AP Forest	Bamboo – Forest Department KL - OFDC	Bamboo – Forest Department KL – MP MFP Federation

	<p>Development Corporation)</p> <p>tamarind, mahua - Girijan Cooperative Corporation (GCC), along with 23 other products such as – gums, siali leaves, amla, honey etc.</p> <p>Tamarind mostly from reserve forest, now being planted in degraded VSS forests.</p> <p>Sal Seed – Not available</p>	<p>Panchayats are vested with rights and responsibility.</p> <p>Tamarind mostly from revenue forests</p> <p>Sal Seed - Earlier TDCC; recently denationalised</p>	<p>Free trade, many products. Herbal medicine – collected through primary societies for MPMFP Federation</p> <p>Sal Seed – Free trade</p>
Price fixation by	<p>GCC for items in its list through a clearly defined “procurement policy” which takes into account the time collectors invest in collecting the produce;</p> <p>APFDC/APFD for beedi leaf</p> <p>APFD for bamboo for industry based on market terms</p> <p>APFD (bamboo for basket makers’ societies on subsidised prices)</p>	<p>Forest Department and OFDC for bamboo and Beedi leaf;</p> <p>Panchayats for other products</p>	<p>MFP controlled minimum price fixation. Federation approved traders collected at the governed rates for nationalised products. For others it is free trading</p>

Note: - TDCC – Tribal Development Cooperative Corporation.

- For bamboo and beedi leaf also there are clear policies and guidelines to finalise the price for the year under consideration

Each of these NTFPs is commonly collected or harvested by marginalised groups in most parts of central India, and they represent a substantial proportion of the trade in NTFPs. Each has specific issues and constraints which affect its trade. For example:

- Mahua is subject to conflicting legislation and hence the governance of this resource is confused. Mahua is part of tribal culture and in some areas the tree is worshipped; its sacred status means it is never felled in tribal areas. Mahua has multiple uses. The flower is eaten directly; oil extracted from the seed is edible and is used locally as a cooking medium as well as a constituent in the Dalda (hydrogenated vegetable oil) industry. Mahua is also brewed to make liquor, which is relished by both men and women, who are in the habit of taking it from childhood. This liquor, known locally as “Vippa sara”, is consumed in all tribal festivals and ceremonies at household or community level.
- Tamarind is a high production item and marginalised groups are extremely dependent on it. It is used both in the domestic market and for export, yet there is a high degree of market fluctuation

which brings risks and uncertain income to the collectors. There is much scope for local value addition and tamarind is starting to be cultivated in degraded VSS³ forests in Andhra Pradesh

- Bamboo was originally cultivated for use in the paper industry but now, in Orissa for example, raw material for paper production is obtained from fast-growing clonal plantations of eucalyptus. The drop in the market for bamboo is affecting the livelihoods of around 1 million people. There is an urgent need to consider alternative uses of bamboo beyond paper production, and different varieties of bamboo have different uses. There are already large numbers of poor people depending on artisanal use of bamboo such as mat and basket making. Bamboo has a very specific market channel, different to other NTFPs. Policies concerning bamboo are also unclear: bamboo is generally considered as a timber and its extraction has to comply with a working plan – yet in some situations it is considered an NTFP. Its definition has major implications for the share of the harvest that is returned to VSSs.
- Tendu leaf collection and processing into bidis occupies huge numbers of poor people and there is a very high level of dependence. However as in other countries, the market for bidis/cigarettes is falling and there is a need for policy to focus on alternative livelihoods for tendu leaf collectors and processors. There is scope for the trees to be used for fruit and timber, but this requires different management practices. To date there has been little attention given to the fate of collectors and processors in the changing market.
- Sal seed is a crucial livelihood resource and raw material for various industries in the central Indian States of Jharkhand, Orissa, Chhattisgarh, and Madhya Pradesh. About 11 million forest dwellers, especially tribals, eke out a living from Sal seed in this area, and Sal seed collection is often the only employment for tribal people during the hot summer months. The oil from Sal seed has long been extracted for use in lamps and cooking; in remote areas tribal people use Sal seed flour for food during lean periods; and about a hundred big and small processing industries like chocolate, soap, confectionary, Vanaspati oil, and cosmetics depend on it as end users. State procurement policies over a period of time have played a major role in influencing both domestic and international trade. In some states, state control has succeeded in giving better prices; in others, it has failed. But in all cases mostly the price has stagnated for years, forcing sal seed collectors into other more remunerative professions. Low collection prices and the inefficiency of the procurement agencies are the two main reasons for reduced procurement of kernels and subsequent reduction in the production of fats. Very recently, Orissa denationalised the Sal seed trade and put it into the purview of the Gram Panchayats. This should not be misinterpreted as an initiative to raise prices or to adhere to PESA specifications; rather it is due to the State Government's unwillingness to suffer loss and support to non-performing state marketing agencies. In such states, it is being suggested that Sal seed is losing both domestic and international demand; and that that is why the state should withdraw from the business and allow markets to determine the price and fate of collectors who are no more the responsibility of State.

The Group will use a focus on these five specific NTFPs as a means of examining governance issues with particular attention given to enterprises for NTFP production, processing and trade.

3. Activities

The Group aims to study and develop 'Governance tactics for forestry enterprise', focusing on the central Indian states of Andhra Pradesh, Orissa and Madhya Pradesh. Activities will be developed in a stepwise fashion; with review and assessment of needs at the end of each step.

3.1 Activities for the first 18 month phase

The overall issue being addressed by the Group during its first 18 months is 'governance tactics for forestry enterprise'. The Group will consider what good practice for governing forest enterprise looks

³ VSS are Van Samakya Samiti, the 'JFM groups' of Andhra Pradesh

like, and what is needed to spread such good governance. During the first 18 month phase the Group will work on the following activities:

Synthesis of existing information and gap analysis: In the first six or seven months the Group will synthesise existing information on these five NTFPs in the states of AP, Orissa and MP. The Group will use a framework for analysis that gives particular attention to governance issues; this framework for analysis will be developed by the Group and IIED (see indicative questions in the box below). The Group will draw upon information relating particularly to types of enterprise or institution through which trade takes place, as well as looking at the opportunities and constraints created by policies and legislation with respect to NTFPs. Policies and legislation will be considered not just in terms of their content, but particularly their implementation, identifying barriers and blockages. The synthesis of information will include a 'gap analysis' – identifying gaps in policy and legislative provisions, in knowledge/ literature, and in implementation. One Group member from each state will carry out the synthesis and gap analysis for that state.

Synthesis of existing information: outline framework for analysis

The framework for analysis of the initial five NTFPs in AP, Orissa and MP will be developed by the Group members and IIED. Broadly, this will include analysis of the following issues:

- Collection, production and management of NTFPs: how can local control and benefit be emphasised as end uses and management systems change?
- NTFP enterprises: what are the external governance issues? What kinds of institutions work best at enterprise level? How can examples of good enterprise governance be scaled up?
- Implementation of policies and legislation: how can implementation of policies designed to favour the poor be improved?

A more detailed framework for analysis will be developed by the Group and IIED as one of the early activities of the Group

Production of combined synthesis: This synthesis and gap analysis will be produced in the form of one combined document and a set of briefing papers (exact format to be decided later). The final documents will look at inter-state issues and differences and well as considering each NTFP in the three states. The combined synthesis will be prepared by a Group member from one of the three focal states, or an independent person under the guidance of the Group. (Later work by the Group may include consideration of the outcomes of the synthesis with respect to other central Indian states).

National level workshop: Following completion of the combined synthesis and gap analysis, the Group will host a national level workshop to present and discuss the findings. It is envisaged that this workshop may discuss and facilitate the creation of a regional board concerned with NTFPs in central India. The Group will be in a position to make informed suggestions on the work programme of the proposed board, as well as making inputs to the governance of the board itself. This will build on past discussions concerning the creation of a regional board consisting of federations of central Indian states concerning policies for NTFPs – discussions which were promising but which then lost momentum. These discussions were facilitated and have been documented by RCDC.

Next steps: filling the gaps: Depending on the findings of the initial synthesis and the outcome of the workshop, the Group will design a further programme of work according to identified needs. This may include research if there are gaps in knowledge, advocacy if policy and legislative change are required, and design of tools and tactics to improve implementation if barriers to implementation are identified. Hence at the end of seven months, the Group will be in a position to decide upon the specific activities and appropriate mode of working for the period up to the end of the first 18 months (up to July 2007). This stepwise approach will enable the Group to tackle current concerns in a flexible way, without being locked into a programme of work that cannot respond to emerging issues.

3.2 Indicative activities for the second phase

Towards the end of the first 18 month phase, the Group and IIED will meet to review progress to date, to re-assess priorities, and to develop a work plan for the second 18 month phase. The second 18 month phase provides an opportunity for greater focus on 'outputs 2 and 4' – on illegality and corruption, access and rights – although ways of approaching those outputs have yet to be debated.

Whilst it is premature to predict what topics, inputs and modalities will be appropriate in July 2007, activities may be drawn from the following indicative list:

- continuation of focus on NTFPs in central India, working on specific issues identified in first phase
- support to proposed regional NTFP board
- extension of focus to other NTFPs and/or to timber
- extension of focus to other states
- increased links with national level concerns
- response to current issues of concern in the forestry sector (for example, should the Tribal Rights Bill be passed there may be opportunities to monitor and comment on its implementation).

4. Modalities/ ways of working

In all their activities the Group members will follow some guiding principles. These are:

- to stand back from what may be their conventional approaches
- to take an objective view
- to consider other tactics and methods of influencing those charged with implementation, and
- to learn from each other's experience and from experience elsewhere.

The Group will operate informally and flexibly and will not develop a visible high-profile identity unless it becomes necessary in order to achieve its objectives. Rather, the Group members will use their current positions and experience to influence those with the power to make decisions that affect poor and marginalised people in central India. All the Group members have a substantial body of experience and networks on which to draw, and establishment of the Group will enable them to make better use of existing knowledge as well as generating and spreading new information. The Group will ensure that its own governance will meet the standards it advocates, through transparency, participatory decision-making and sharing of information.

During the course of the first 18 months, the Group will identify the most appropriate ways of working – these are likely to include:

- *Synthesis of existing information* with respect to governance issues
- *Case documentation* where local variation and specificity will add to the policy debate
- An *email discussion group* will be facilitated to interact with the FGLG members regularly. Initially this will be restricted to the Group, IIED and RECOFTC; extension to a wider network of contacts will be considered as the work proceeds.
- *Group meetings* are likely to take place every 3 or 6 months, though the Group members will take advantage of other opportunities to meet such as at conferences etc.
- Establishment of a *website* will also be considered; in the meantime project outputs will be placed on the CPF and IIED websites
- *Publications* on selected practices in the form of reports and briefing papers, and guidance/ training tools in local languages and in English will be considered for wider dissemination.

The most effective mode of working will be better identified following the initial synthesis and gap analysis. This may include detailed research and fieldwork; adaptation and development of tactics for advocating policy and legislative change, and design of tools, tactics and incentives to promote improved implementation of existing policies.

5. Group membership and implementation arrangements

For the first 18 month period (February 2006 to July 2007), the Group will be convened by Dr. D. Suryakumari, Director of the Centre for People's Forestry (CPF) in Secunderabad. The CPF will host the Group and provide support services.

Group membership may be expanded gradually as initial work informs and sets the direction for further work, and the specific skills and experience required can be better identified. 'Call-in' members may well be invited to join the Group for specific activities over short periods of time. The Group will be an informal group of individuals who are able to use their own positions, contacts and experience to represent the interests of the poor and marginalised, and to influence those who hold positions of power in terms of governance of forest resources.

Members of the Group join in their individual capacity rather than as representatives of their institutions. The following people have indicated their willingness to participate in the Group:

Participant	Criteria addressed and role in the Group
Dr. D. Suryakumari Director of the Centre for People's Forestry Secunderabad AP	Convenor. Association with J/CFM in Andhra Pradesh since 1999 and contributed substantially to the change process, both at policy and implementation levels. Keen to see that forest dependent communities get maximum benefits out of forest products. Instrumental in developing collaborative functional relationships among different stakeholders in the context of NTFP.
Mr. Ramesh G. Kalaghatgi CCF, CFM, APFD	Long association with CFM; instrumental in developing people centred policies/ implementation guidelines in Andhra Pradesh. Keen to develop a good model of forest-based community enterprise
Mr. Sanjoy Patnaik RCDC Bhubaneswar Orissa	Long experience in participatory processes in Orissa, advocate of community rights over forest resources and specializing in forest governance aspects especially of NTFP in Orissa and in central Indian states. Instrumental in initiating the process of regional consultation on NTFP.
Dr. A.K. Bansal Additional PCCF Orissa FD	To inform the group about Orissa situation from Orissa FD's perspective and to influence the process from within the department.
Mr. Sushil Saigal Winrock International India New Delhi	National perspective as well as bringing expertise on forest enterprises
Dr. Prodyut Bhattacharya Indian Institute of Forest Management Bhopal	Coordinates the International Centre for Community Forestry at IIFM and specialises in NTFP policy matters as well as on enterprise

MP	models.
Mr. Sanjay Kumar NAEB MOEF New Delhi	In charge of overall implementation of Forest Development Agencies at the MOEF. Keen to develop sustainable models on forest based community enterprises.
Mr.M.Satyanarayana Director India – Canada Environment Facility (ICEF) New Delhi	Belong to Orissa cadre IFS; Good experience in working with NGOs and Policy development; Keen to establish community based forest enterprises to benefit the poor forest dependent communities.
[others to be co-opted in due course]	[required expertise to be identified following initial activities]

Coordination and administration of the Group will be the responsibility of the Centre for People's Forestry under the direction of Dr. D. Suryakumari. IIED and CPF will agree a contract such that international funds are sent to CPF; Dr. Suryakumari will administer the budget and develop sub-contracts with Group members and resource persons as required. The initial state-level synthesis of information on five selected NTFPs will be carried out by Dr. Suryakumari (AP), Sanjoy Patnaik (Orissa) and Dr. Prodyut Bhattacharya (MP). Other Group members will be involved in the finalisation of study TORs, commenting on studies, using position of influence to spread learning, and in planning follow up activities.

7. Links to other initiatives

The Forest Governance Learning Group will strive to collaborate and share information with other initiatives in the three focal states where appropriate. These include:

- World Bank projects in AP: the AP Community Forest Management project is being implemented through the AP Forest Department since November 2002 (till 2008). This project is promoting a new institutional structure to promote community based forest enterprises. CPF has contributed to its formulation; there are opportunities for the FGLG to strengthen the process and to share experience from this elsewhere in India and internationally. Another WB project is "Indira Kranthi Patham" which is being implemented through the Rural Development and Tribal Welfare ministries of the Government of AP at the field level. At state level, SERP (the Society for the Elimination of Rural Poverty, a Government promoted registered society) is the coordination agency.
- Tribal Cooperative finance corporation (TRICOR) under the Ministry of Tribal Affairs is focusing on skill development, training and enterprise development for tribal communities. The Girijan Cooperative Corporation is also a part of the Ministry of Tribal Affairs.
- The DFID (Support to the forestry sector, 2006-2009) project in Orissa is under active consideration but not yet finalised.
- DFID Western Orissa Rural Livelihoods project - ongoing since 2004 (through the Government of Orissa, Rural Development Department), this is aimed at poverty reduction, focusing on livelihoods especially watershed and related ones being implemented in the KBK region (Kalhandi, Bolangir and Koraput districts).
- Orissa Tribal Empowerment and Livelihood programme (IFAD, DFID and WFP; through the Government of Orissa Tribal Welfare Department) is ongoing since 2004 and is being implemented in six districts.
- JBIC project in Orissa (2006-2011; through the Government of Orissa's Forest Department) aims to support the forestry sector activities especially afforestation and plantation activities as well as establishment of NTFP based enterprises
- Asia Forest Network (AFN): established in 1992, AFN is dedicated to supporting the role of communities in sustainable management and restoration of Asia's forests. It is a coalition of

planners, policymakers, scientists, researchers, government foresters and non-governmental organisations.

- India Community Forestry Alliance: this will be convened by CPF in the near future, as a multi-stakeholder platform for cross-learning. This will enable CPF to share its experience of building an effective functional relationship with the state Forest Department, and also to share the collaborative work of NGOs and APFD which contributed a great deal to the success of CFM in AP. NOVIB is supporting the preliminary work after which the network aims to raise further support.
- The stakeholders forum on JFM hosted by Winrock International India
- The International Centre for Community Forestry (ICCF), based at IIFM Bhopal, is coordinated by Dr. Prodyut Bhattacharya (an FGLG member) and aims to facilitate cross learning in community forestry within and outside India through trainings, meetings, workshops and publications. ICCF has intervened in the NTFP sector for sustainable harvesting, processing at community level with small investments, and microfinance to improve the returns from the sale of these products from the traders. Microfinance was given especially to the collectors so that the middleman does not bind them during the lean period for minimum price of their collection.
- Madhya Pradesh has also initiated the DFID funded MP Rural Livelihood Project, to create sustainable livelihoods in villages that are difficult to access – particularly forest dwellers in tribal areas.

8. Further information

Further information is available from:

Dr. D. Suryakumari
Centre for People's Forestry
12-13-445 Street 1
Tarnaka
Secunderabad 500 017
Andhra Pradesh
India.
Tel/fax +91 40 27016038
Email: sk@cpf.in

Elaine Morrison
International Institute for Environment and Development
3 Endsleigh Street
London WC1H 0DD
UK
Tel. +44 20 7388 2117
Fax. +44 20 7388 2826
Email: Elaine.Morrison@iied.org

Further information on the international project is available on IIED's website:
www.iied.org/NR/forestry/projects/forest.html

9. Budget and logical framework

The budget is given in Appendix 2. The logical framework is given in Appendix 3.

Page: 4

[11] Bamoo comes under timber produce in Madhya Pradesh and 30% sharing from bamboo felling is given to the communities either in cash or bamboo itself.