

Compensatory Afforestation and Forest Governance

What is the issue?

\n\n

\n

- There were protests against the decision to fell more than 16,000 full-grown trees in Delhi recently. Click [here](#) to know more

\n

- This has brought attention to the issue of compensatory afforestation and the availability of land for it.

\n

\n\n

What are the larger concerns?

\n\n

\n

- In forested and tribal-dominated states large tracts of forests are being diverted for infrastructure projects.

\n

- This was however on the condition that afforestation will compensate for forest loss.

\n

- The user agencies will in turn pay money.

\n

- However, “polluters pay” model may not resolve environment- and land-related concerns.

\n

- **Compensation** - Forest Conservation Act, 1980 and Indian jurisprudence led to the Compensatory Afforestation (CA) concept.

\n

- In 1999, it was proposed that the “area” of forest lost be compensated by afforesting an “equal area” on non-forest land.

\n

- If non-forest land was not available, then degraded forest land that was “double the area of forests lost” had to be afforested.

\n

- Eventually, a price tag was put on forests and its loss was deemed to be compensated financially.

\n

- **Implementation** - Earlier the state forest departments were made responsible for afforestation.

\n

- But despite money being deposited by the user agency, CA was not taking place on the ground.

\n

- This led to the setting up of the Compensatory Afforestation Planning and Management Authority (CAMPA).

\n

- The money deposited thus came under the purview of the Centre.

\n

- CAMPA at national and state levels managed these funds.

\n

- A CAG audit report found that 11 out of India's 30 states could not use more than 50% of the funds released to them by the centre.

\n

- The report also added that it was difficult to procure land for compensatory afforestation.

\n

- This is because the state forest departments lacked planning and implementation capacity.

\n

- The situation is more worrisome for states with high tribal populations.

\n

- **Principle** - Later, in 2016, the Compensatory Afforestation Fund (CAF) Act was enacted.

\n

- The whole principle reduced a "forest" to a "commodity which acquires certain area on the ground".

\n

- The whole focus has shifted to spending money.

\n

- The ecology, biodiversity and ecosystem services of the forests lost relevance.

\n

- Data indicate that ecologically unviable but commercially popular species like Eucalyptus are promoted.

\n

- The need of the hour is to improve forest clearance processes, approvals and basic issues of forest governance.

\n

\n\n

\n\n

Source: Business Standard

\n

