

## Concerns with Draft Forest Policy

### What is the issue?

\n\n

\n

- The MoEFCC recently released the draft National Forest Policy 2018. Click [here](#) to know more.

\n

- The shift in approach and various other provisions in the policy raise some serious ecological and social concerns.

\n

\n\n

### What does forest policy aim at?

\n\n

\n

- The multiple goods and services that forests offer, flowing to different beneficiaries, cannot be simultaneously maximised.

\n

- Forest policy, therefore, focusses primarily on which benefits and beneficiaries to prioritise.

\n

- Another focus area is to decide when and through what process to allow diversion of forest land for “non-forest” activities.

\n

\n\n

### What was the earlier policy approach?

\n\n

\n

- Forest policy in colonial India focussed on maximising products and revenues for the state.

\n

- The imperial forest department functioned as sole owner, protector and manager of the forest estate.

\n

- Unfortunately, post-Independence policy too continued this 'state-managed forestry' approach.  
\n
- Forests were seen as sources of raw material for industry.  
\n
- On the other hand, local communities were merely treated as labour.  
\n

\n\n

### How did 1988 forest policy address this?

\n\n

- \n
- In a paradigm shift, the 1988 Forest Policy recognised the multiple roles of forests.  
\n
- Significantly, it prioritised environmental stability over revenue maximisation.  
\n
- It acknowledged the rights of forest-dependent communities on forest produce.  
\n
- Also, the policy emphasised people's involvement in protecting and regenerating forests.  
\n
- It thus formally recognised the limitations of state-managed forestry.  
\n

\n\n

### What is the post-1988 experience?

\n\n

- \n
- **Devolution of control** - Joint forest management (JFM) was initiated in the 1990s to facilitate people's involvement.  
\n
- Foresters created thousands of village forest committees.  
\n
- But their autonomy and jurisdictions were severely limited.  
\n
- Donor money was spent on plantations but activities were stopped once funds ran out.  
\n
- "People's participation" by executive order was too weak.

- \n
- What was actually required was substantive devolution of control over forests
- \n
- **Community rights** - The Forest Rights Act (FRA) of 2006 created a historic opportunity for such devolution.
- \n
- Its community forest resource provisions gave communities rights to both access and manage forests.
- \n
- **Forest Diversion** - FRA also democratised the forest diversion process.
- \n
- It mandated community concurrence for forest diversion once community forest rights are recognised.
- \n
- E.g. the Adivasis of Niyamgiri in Odisha exercised this provision to prevent bauxite mining in their sacred hill tracts.
- \n

\n\n

## **What are the concerns with the new draft forest policy?**

\n\n

- \n
- **Production forestry** - In the past, production forestry has led to replacing
- \n

\n\n

- \n
- i. natural oak forests with pine monocultures in the Himalayas
- \n
- ii. natural sal forests with teak plantations in central India
- \n
- iii. wet evergreen forests with eucalyptus and acacia in the Western Ghats
- \n

\n\n

- \n
- All this had significantly affected forest diversity.
- \n
- It has dried up streams and undermined local livelihoods.
- \n
- **Ecology** - The stress on commercially important species like eucalyptus and poplar raises concerns for the ecology.
- \n

- These species are known to be water-demanding, with deep root systems that deplete groundwater.  
\n
- Also, poplar and eucalyptus have negative allelopathic properties i.e. they do not encourage vegetative growth under their cover.  
\n
- Non-indigenous plantation species to meet afforestation targets and timber requirements would be counterproductive to public investments in such initiatives.  
\n
- **Livelihoods** - There are about 1.3 lakh villages in and around India's forests.  
\n
- An estimated 350-400 million people depend directly on these forests for sustenance, involving in management and protection.  
\n
- The new policy fails to acknowledge this symbiotic relationship between the tribal people and forests.  
\n
- **Community Participation** - There is little about decentralised governance in the draft policy.  
\n
- Local communities would have challenged the production forestry model if they had had a say in forest governance.  
\n
- **PPP** - The 1988 policy clearly states that the requirements of the local communities should not be sacrificed for the sake of forest based industries.  
\n
- However, the PPPs in the new policy go against this and will entail more forest destruction.  
\n
- It is a way of granting the private sector access to public resources.  
\n
- The profits and benefits are also thus likely to end up in corporate hands.  
\n
- **Mechanism** - The draft policy talks of "ensuring synergy" between gram sabhas and JFM committees.  
\n
- But the actual need is to replace JFM committees with statutorily empowered gram sabhas.  
\n
- Harmonization with other laws like the FRA could certainly leave scope for concern in administrative jurisdictions.  
\n
- It may put environmentalists and bureaucracy at loggerheads as the former

may see it as an attempt to weaken the role of gram sabhas.

\n

- In all, the new Policy seems to be falling back to the practice of state-managed forestry of the 1950s as well as shifting focus from community and ecology to industry and raw materials.

\n

\n\n

\n\n

**Source: The Hindu**

\n\n

\n\n

\n

