

**IMPACT (KNOWLEDGE – ATTITUDE – PRACTICE)
OF STAFF TRAINING IN HARYANA COMMUNITY
FORESTRY PROJECT**

Status Report

**Haryana Community Forestry Project
Panchkula, Haryana**

O. N. Kaul

**Institute for Sustainable Development
New Delhi**

December 2004

CONTENTS

Abbreviations

| | | |
|------------|--|-----------|
| 1.0 | Background | 1 |
| 2.0 | Introduction | 3 |
| 3.0 | Project Environment | 5 |
| 3.1 | Land Use | 5 |
| 3.2 | Climate | 5 |
| 3.3 | Agro-ecological Zones | 6 |
| 3.4 | Human Resources | 6 |
| 3.5 | Forest Resource | 7 |
| 3.6 | Energy Consumption | 8 |
| 3.7 | Livestock and Grazing | 8 |
| 3.8 | Land Degradation | 9 |
| 4.0 | Past Efforts | 10 |
| 4.1 | History of Past Management | 10 |
| 4.2 | Evolution of Participatory Management | 11 |
| 4.3 | Hill Resource Management Societies | 12 |
| 4.4 | Joint Forest Management Policy | 12 |
| 4.5 | Joint Forest Management Programme | 13 |
| 4.6 | JFM Support Programme | 14 |
| 4.7 | Social Forestry Project | 15 |
| 5.0 | The Project | 16 |
| 5.1 | Operational Areas | 16 |
| 5.2 | Objectives | 17 |
| 5.3 | Project Stakeholders | 17 |
| 5.4 | Project Components | 18 |
| 5.4.1 | <i>Village woodlot</i> | 18 |
| 5.4.2 | <i>Sand Dune Fixation</i> | 19 |
| 5.4.3 | <i>Tree Groves</i> | 19 |
| 5.4.4 | <i>Water Harvesting Dams</i> | 19 |
| 5.4.5 | <i>Farm Forestry</i> | 19 |
| 5.4.6 | <i>Poplar Planting</i> | 19 |
| 5.4.7 | <i>Kitchen Gardens/Homestead Plots</i> | 20 |
| 5.4.8 | <i>Community Development</i> | 20 |
| 5.5 | Major Achievements | 22 |

| | | |
|------------|---|-----------|
| 6.0 | Organisation and Management | 24 |
| 6.1 | Overall Structure | 24 |
| 6.2 | Project Management Unit | 24 |
| 7.0 | Community Forestry Training | 25 |
| 7.1 | Training Package | 25 |
| 7.2 | Objective of Study | 25 |
| 7.3 | Assessment Criteria | 27 |
| 7.4 | The Respondents | 28 |
| 7.5 | Sampling Methodology | 29 |
| 8.0 | Discussions and Conclusions | 32 |
| 8.1 | The Approach | 32 |
| 8.2 | Age | 33 |
| 8.3 | Qualifications | 35 |
| 8.4 | Training Assessment | 37 |
| | 8.4.1 Forest Guards | 38 |
| | 8.4.2 Foresters | 38 |
| | 8.4.3 Sub Divisional Forest Officers | 41 |
| 8.5 | Village Resource Management Committees | 44 |
| 8.6 | Sample Villages | 49 |
| 8.7 | Control Officials | 50 |
| 8.8 | Issues and Concerns | 52 |
| | Bibliography | 54 |
| | ANNEXURES | |
| 1 | Sample Forest Guards | 56 |
| 2 | Sample Foresters | 60 |
| 3 | Sub Divisional Forest Officers | 61 |
| 4 | Divisional Forest Officers/Assistant Conservator of Forests | 62 |
| 5 | Conservator of Forests | 63 |
| 6 | Control Officials (Not Trained in JFM) | 64 |
| 7 | Sample Project Villages | 65 |
| 8 | Forester/Forest Guards (OP) | 66 |
| 9 A | Forester/Forest Guards (ITC) | 75 |
| 9 B | Forester/Forest Guards (PME) | 76 |
| 10 | SDO (SDFO)/(OP, ITC, PME) | 77 |
| 11 | DFO/ACF (OP, ITC, PME) | 85 |

| | | |
|----|---|-----|
| 12 | Conservator of Forests | 91 |
| 13 | Control Officials | 97 |
| 14 | Training Assessment of Sample Forest Guards | 99 |
| 15 | Training Assessment of Sample Foresters | 102 |
| 16 | Training Assessment of Sub Divisional Forest Officers | 103 |
| 17 | Resolution by the <i>Panchayat</i> | 104 |
| 18 | Agreement between <i>Panchayat</i> village Resource Management Committees/Society and the Haryana Community Forestry Project for Raising Community Woodlots/Tree Groves/Sand Dune Fixing trees on village <i>Panchayat</i> land | 107 |

ABBREVIATIONS

| | | |
|---------|---|---|
| ACF | - | Assistant Conservator of Forests |
| AFC | - | Agriculture Finance Corporation |
| BDO | - | Block Development Officer |
| CDB | - | Community Development Blocks |
| CF | - | Conservator of Forests |
| CIFOR | - | Center for International Forestry Research |
| CPR | - | Common Property Resource |
| CSWCRTI | - | Central Soil and Water Conservation Research and Training Institute |
| DFO | - | Divisional Forest Officer |
| DR | - | Deputy Ranger |
| EC | - | European Commission |
| EPA | - | Entry Point Activities |
| FA | - | Financing Agreement |
| FEW | - | Fuelwood Equivalent |
| FFA | - | Farm Forestry Association |
| FG | - | Forest Guard |
| GOH | - | Government of Haryana |
| GOI | - | Government of India |
| GS | - | Gender Sensitization |
| HCFP | - | Haryana Community Forestry Project |
| HFD | - | Haryana Forest Department |
| HRMS | - | Hill Resource Management Society |
| IFAD | - | International Fund for Agricultural Development |
| IGA | - | Income Generating Activities |
| ILO | - | International Labour Organization |
| ITC | - | Information, Training and Communication |
| J/PFM | - | Joint/Participatory Forest Management |
| JFM | - | Joint Forest Management |
| KAP | - | Knowledge, Attitude and Practice |
| M&E | - | Monitoring and Evaluation |
| MBA | - | Master of Business Administration |
| MC | - | Management Committee |
| MFP | - | Minor Forest Produce |
| MMF | - | Microplanning and Microproject Formulation |
| NGO | - | Non-Timber Government Organisation |
| NTFP | - | Non-Timber Forest Products |
| PA | - | Participatory Assessment |
| PFM | - | Participatory Forest Management |
| PI | - | Project Introduction |
| PME | - | Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation |
| PMU | - | Project Management Unit |
| PRM | - | Participatory Resource Management |

| | | |
|----------|---|---------------------------------------|
| RMF | - | Resource Management Fund |
| SDO/SDFO | - | Sub-Divisional Forest Officer |
| SFD | - | State Forest Department |
| SHG | - | Self-Help Group |
| TA | - | Technical Assistance |
| TERI | - | The Energy and Resources Institute |
| TOR | - | Terms of Reference |
| VE | - | Village Entry |
| VRMC | - | Village Resource Management Committee |
| WUA | - | Water Users Association |

1.0 BACKGROUND

In the context of present day depletion of India's forests, causing serious economic, environmental and social repercussions, putting forestry on a sustainable footing is as complex an undertaking as it is vital to our very existence. Community efforts have a considerable role in the sustainable development and management of forest resources and striking successes have been achieved in the regeneration of degraded forests through Participatory Forest Management (PFM) involving the Forest Departments and the local communities.

Nearly 240 million rural people live in or near tropical forests, where wild game and fish (much of it is harvested), provides over 20% of protein in 62 low-income countries. Nearly two billion people use biomass (mostly fuel wood and charcoal) as their main source of energy for cooking and heating their homes, and much of this comes from tropical forests. Low-income farmers living in or around forests, earn a major portion of their income by collecting and selling Non-Timber Forest Products (NTFP). The processing of forest products into finished goods provides significant employment and income in many places. Indeed, a large proportion of the world's poorest depend on forests, either wholly or in part, for their sustenance.

The timber industry makes up a large part of the rural economy in many tropical countries. It supplies a range of products, from saw logs to charcoal and round logs to pulpwood. It generates significant revenues for the private and public sector, and frequently constitutes an important source of foreign exchange. According to the International Labour Organisation (ILO), nearly 7.5 million people are employed in formal wood-related industries around the world and many more are found in informal wood-based activities.

Tropical forests are biologically the most diverse of all ecosystems. Although they cover less than 7% of the earth's land surface, they are believed to contain over half of the world's known species. These species often have more than intrinsic value alone in that trade in drugs that contain active ingredients extracted from forest plants and animals is now worth over US \$100 billion a year. Tropical forests also provide important environmental services in that they help to protect soils against the erosive action of wind and rain, and in some situations, play an important role in recycling and distributing freshwater and keeping it clean. They also help to lock up significant quantities of carbon dioxide, one of the principle gases contributing to global warming. Forests are, therefore, essential both for people and wildlife, yet they are being cleared at an alarming rate. During 1990s, approximately 12 million ha of tropical forests were lost each year, the major causes of deforestation varying from one part of the world to another, i.e. for expansion of agriculture, forest clearance by small holders, logging for timber, pulp and paper and palm oil companies. If present trends continue the world will continue to lose an area of tropical forest equivalent to the size of Greece each year.

Fortunately, there is some hope to this gloomy picture. The last decade was a watershed in terms of the action taken to solve the various environmental crises. In

1992, the Earth Summit in Rio de Janeiro addressed the problems of both environmental degradation and poverty. The summit spawned major international conventions on Climate Change and Biological Diversity. Over 100 world leaders signed up the 'Agenda 21' (a plan to achieve sustainable development in the twenty first century), and endorsed the "Forest Principles", which recognised the need to manage and conserve forests in a manner that takes into account their multiple uses.

Since the Earth Summit we have witnessed significant changes in the way in which governments perceive and manage their forests. The realisation that local people should be more involved in resource management, have encouraged many national Governments to relinquish some of their decision-making powers to local governments, District Councils and sometimes, to the Communities themselves. At least 60 countries have now decentralised some aspects of natural resource management to local governments. At the same time, local communities have become progressively more involved in forest management and sometimes ownership as well.

Almost every developing country has introduced devolution policies for their natural resources, by transferring authority of most forest resources to local communities for management. By doing so the Central Governments aim to cut costs. Local involvement should mean that the forests are better managed, as they are being looked after by people who are close to resources and have a strong vested interest in their rational management.

In practice, however, devolution has often failed to deliver what is needed, as a three-year study in Asia, coordinated by Centre for International Forestry Research (CIFOR) and commissioned by the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD), has revealed. One of the key findings is that when Forest Departments promote devolution they promote their own interests in timber production and forest conservation, often to the detriment of local communities.

An analysis of the impact of devolution in China, India and the Philippines indicates that community control, and access to forest products, increased most in China, where devolution led to an increase in forest area, and Forest Departments were found to be generally sympathetic to villagers' needs, although little attention was given to the unequal impacts of devolutionary policies.

A very different picture emerged from India where the reality of devolution has not matched the meteoric promoting it. It was found that in some states Forest Departments have actually used Joint Forest Management (JFM) – one of the instruments of devolution – to gain greater control of the forests (Orissa). Over many decades, local communities have responded to forest degradation by setting up their own community forest management mechanisms. These have often been very effective, and helped to restore degraded forests, although their existence has generally been ignored by the State authorities. Devolution policies promoted through Forest Departments are ultimately limited by the Departments' bureaucratic structures and mandates.

2.0 INTRODUCTION

India has a highly innovative afforestation programme underway since the early 1970s. Such innovation has resulted in learning by doing and increased understanding of the range of issues. These include: the role of traditional mixed forest systems on which the poor depend *vis-à-vis* the role of exotic species that meet the urban demand for timber, the productivity of the private farm forestry sector *vis-à-vis* public plantations, and the management implications of the conflicts posed by the Forest Department's need to raise revenues *vis-à-vis* the need of the rural people to meet their requirements.

Several of the lessons learnt have changed the design and implementation of forest interventions. Among other things, emphasis in policy has changed to involve the local communities in the protection, regeneration and development of forest resources including degraded forests. The policy document envisages, as one of the essentials of forest management, that forest communities should be motivated to identify themselves with the development and protection of forests from which they derive benefits. It is further emphasised that an industry-farmer nexus be developed for meeting the raw material needs of the forest-based industries; to promote farm and agro-forestry for meeting the local needs of fuel, fodder and timber; and creating a massive people's movement, with the involvement of women, for achieving the various objectives of the forest policy and to minimise pressure on existing forests.

Thus the new forest policy signals a fundamentally different approach. Among other things it places emphasis on the participation of poorer communities living in and around forests in their management. This approach of Joint/Participatory Forest Management (J/PFM) attempts to achieve a better balance between the needs of nearly 100 million rural poor who derive their income from forest products and the demand of the remaining 750 million or so other inhabitants, including particularly the nearly 300 million in the urban industrial sector. The JFM approach has been adopted in 23 states and is expected to spread to the remaining states in the near future. This participatory approach is intended to allow communities to extract NTFPs in a sustainable manner and also share with them the sale proceeds of various forest products. By so increasing the stake of rural communities in forest resources and vesting them with a greater control of the management of these resources, JFM is expected to rationalise the distribution of benefits as well as help improve land productivity on sustainable basis.

A number of workshops were held over the years by various organisations regarding Participatory Management. These workshops affirmed the crucial role of the participatory approach in leading India to turn a corner in the forestry sector.

But many questions about JFM still remain unanswered. First, the JFM approach is confined to limited areas. Well-documented information on the implementation experience or the distribution of the benefits between the communities and the Government is limited. Much of the focus of experimentation, monitoring and evaluation to date has been at the micro/village or the district levels. The scope for rapid and effective adaptation of the approach on a significant scale is not yet known, including

particularly their implications for a legal and institutional framework, although successes have been cited in several states (West Bengal, Haryana etc) with JFM rapidly spreading to other states with diverse climatic conditions, vegetation types and socio-economic structures. How does the JFM experience vary among these highly diverse eco-socio-political circumstances and what generalisable lessons, if any, can be drawn in terms of productivity, sustainability or equity of JFM approach?

These issues need to be addressed systematically and empirically to draw firm conclusions for further strategies. It is necessary to determine the likely impact and the role of JFM in India's forest sector in the short and the long run including a precise identification of the monetary and other benefits and the nature of beneficiaries. If the turn-around associated with JFM is sustained in the long run, it will indeed be a significant development in India's forest sector.

India has been losing its forest cover rather rapidly. While 23.38% of the total geographical area of nearly 329 million ha (or about 67.5 million ha) has been recorded as forest, the actual forest cover is of the order of 63.92 million ha. Equally significant is the fact that the quality of natural forests is widely accepted to have deteriorated. Of the recorded forest area, nearly 40 million ha, is severely degraded, over 0.15 million ha (or about 0.2%) is estimated to be deforested annually. There has been a decline in biodiversity over the years and the problems of soil and nutrient erosion are extensive in several areas.

The likely impact of JFM, as indeed the impact of other innovations such as community, social, farm-forestry or agro-forestry needs also to be better understood in a well documented, quantitative and comparative terms as also their effect on forest productivity, distribution of benefits and implications for institutional, legal, organisational and market policies. This will help assess the likely impact of these various strategies on the overall supply of, and the demand for forest products, their composition, and correspondingly the composition of their beneficiaries (i.e. rural, urban, low and other income households) at the broader (regional, state and to the extent possible, the national) level. As the nature of beneficiaries is closely related to the nature of interventions, it could then provide an important input into the development of several different approaches than relying on a comprehensive forest sector strategy.

This study has been undertaken to assess the impact of various training programmes on Participatory Resource (Forest) Management/People's Participation (PFM) organised by Haryana Community Forestry Project (HCFP) since its inception in 1992, for its various categories of officials.

3.0 PROJECT ENVIRONMENT

The State of Haryana, with a total geographical area of 43,910 sq. km and a population of over 21 million (2001 census), is one of the smallest states of the Indian Union. It is bounded by severely eroded Siwalik Hills and Aravalli ranges in the north and south respectively; the Rajasthan Desert in the west and southwest, and river Yamuna in the east.

3.1 Land Use

Of the total land area of 43,910 sq. km, over 3.622 million ha (82%) are under agriculture; 0.170 million ha (3.9%) under forest, over 0.599 million ha (13%) under other land uses (**Table 1**). Nearly 0.3039 million ha constitute *Panchayat* land, of which 0.62 million ha are under sand dunes while nearly 0.45 million ha are affected by salinity and alkalinity.

Table 1: Land Utilisation in Haryana

| Land Use | Area (Million ha) | % of the Total |
|-----------------------------|-------------------|----------------|
| Agricultural (Net are sown) | 3.622 | 82.5 |
| Forests | 0.170 | 3.9 |
| Other lands | 0.599 | 13.6 |
| Total | 4.391 | 100.0 |

The cultivable area consists of 1.34 million operational holding with an average size of 2.7 ha, 22% of which are below 0.4 ha. Nearly 2.2 million ha are under irrigation (over 60% of the cropped area), irrigation water being available from two main canal systems and about 360,000 tubewells. Land varies in quality from prime cropland to highly degraded saline/alkali soils and moving sand dunes resulting from deforestation and poor land management.

3.2 Climate

The climate of the state is subtropical with distinct winter, summer and monsoon seasons. Normally the months from November to February are cold, whereas the hot weather is pronounced from March to the advent of the monsoon in June or early July. The average annual rainfall varies from year to year (so do the number of rainy days, being on an average as 55) with a low of 217 mm in Bhiwani District to a high of 1,097 mm in Ambala District, maximum rainfall being received in the months of July and August. Monsoon showers may continue until September-October after which, there is usually very little rain until the winter months caused by western disturbances. Intense cloudbursts may occur during July to September, causing high run-off. These high velocity discharges lead to the formation of gullies and multiple ravines along the slopes. The southern half of the State receives less rainfall spread over few days in a year. There is normally a five-month dry season (December to April) and 60 to 70% of the total rainfall occurs from June to August. In general, 65% of the area of the State is

characterised by arid and semi-arid climate and drought is a recurring feature. Frost is common in drier areas during winter and hailstorms occur in March-April. Temperatures vary from 47° C in summer to 0° C in winter with high diurnal variation.

3.3 Agro-ecological Zones

There are four main agro-ecological Zones in the State, each with its own peculiar potentialities for use and problems of utilization. These are:

- **Siwalik Hills** in the northeast, which are steep and comprise of friable sandstone and conglomerates. The hill slopes represent a severely eroded landscape, which has resulted in *Chos* (seasonal rivers) formation in the plains below, mainly due to removal of vegetation through excessive grazing and indiscriminate exploitation of woody biomass.
- **Central Plains** wherein as a result of cultivation on marginal lands and increase in irrigated cropping, large areas have been affected by soil erosion, water-logging, soil salinity and lowering of groundwater.
- **The Desert** comprising numerous low stabilised and shifting sand dunes in the southwest and characterised by recurrent overgrazing and droughts with consequent degradation of vegetation, soil erosion and inducement of livestock migration.
- **Aravalli Hills** traversing through the plains in the southwest. Super-imposed on this physical pattern is the rainfall pattern, which declines from north to south. Denudation of tree cover, uncontrolled grazing and quarrying are accentuating desertification conditions in this zone.

3.4 Human Resources

The total population of Haryana, according to 2001 census, is over 21 million with a population density of about 477 people per sq. km, which is above the all India average of 324. Nearly 75% of the population is rural and 20% of the total population belong to scheduled caste. The literacy rate in the State was 55.33% as of 1991 (69% for men and 41% for women), while the gender ratio is 933 females to 1,000 males.

The State has the third highest per capita income (1995-96) in the country (Rs. 13,518/- per year), mainly because of its proximity to Delhi and extensive use of irrigation facilities. However, this wealth is unevenly distributed, both within individual communities as well as across the State. About 28% of the rural population were below the poverty line in 1996.

The tract is inhabited mainly by communities like *Gujjars* (both Muslims and Hindus), *Labanas*, *Jats* and *Harijans*. Agriculture livestock rearing and daily wage jobs are their major occupations. Goats are generally reared by landless *Gujjars*, (particularly Muslim

Gujjars) and *Harijans*. Land holdings are small and agriculture is mostly rainfed. There is acute water scarcity in the entire tract but wherever earthen dams have been constructed and water is made available for irrigation, agricultural production has increased two to three fold, boosting the economy of the concerned villages considerably.

3.5 Forest Resource

Forests in the State occupy an area of 0.170 million ha, constituting 3.9% of its total geographical area. Social and Farm Forestry plantations in the last two Five Year Plans have helped in extending tree cover to over 8%. Natural forests, however, cover 40,000 ha, two-thirds of which are degraded and the remaining one-third has a density of over 40%.

The Siwalik Hills support vegetation corresponding to Northern Dry Mixed Deciduous Forest Type. Forest cover is sparse on the western side as the area has been heavily grazed and over-exploited. Excessive grazing and frequent fires have resulted in bushy growth and coarse and unpalatable grasses. *Acacia catechu* (*Khair*), *Acacia nilotica* (*Kikar*) *Dalbergia sissoo* (*Shisham*) and *Anogeissus latifolia* (*Chhal*) are the dominant tree species. Co-dominant and associate tree species found in the region are *Lannea coromandelica* (*Jhingan*), *Acacia leucophloea* (*Reru*), *Dyospyros Spp.* (*Tendu*), *Ehretia laevis* (*Chamror*), *Bauhinia variegata* (*Kachnar*) and *Butea monosperma* (*Dhak*). The clayey forest tracts, where moisture regimes are better, support *Shorea robusta* (*Sal*), *Terminalia tomentosa* (*Sain*), *Ougeinia oojeinensis* (*Sandan*) and *Syzygium cumini* (*Jamun*). At higher reaches, sporadic trees of *Pinus roxburghii* (*Chir*) are met with.

Among the shrubs, *Carissa spinarum* (*Karaunda*), *Adhatoda vasica* (*Basuta*) *Dodonaea viscosa* (*Mendar*), *Nyctanthes arbortristis* (*Kuri*) and *Lantana camara* (*Booti*) are common. Other major species are *Flacourtia ramontchi* (*Kangi*) *Capparis horrida* (*Hins*). *Zizyphus Spp.* (*Ber*) and *Murraya keoengii* (*Gandhela*). In shady depressions. *Phoenix Spp.* also occur

Dendrocalamus strictus (Bamboo), *Eulaliopsis binata* (*Bhabbar*) and *Chrysopogon fulvus* (*Daulu*) *Saccharum munja* (*Sarkanda*), *S. spontanium* and *Heteropogon contortus* (*Sarala*) are the common grasses found in the area. Among climbers, *Bauhinia vahlii* (*Maljhan*) is of importance.

The per capita forest area in the State is 0.01 ha; far below the Indian average of 0.11 ha, and world average of 1.04 ha. The Haryana Forest Department (HFD) plans to extend tree cover to over 25% of the land area over a 20 years period; the potential areas for which are the common lands, mainly owned by *Panchayats*, institutional land, river banks, privately owned sand dunes in western parts, salt affected and waterlogged areas in the central and southern plains and degraded hills in the north and the south. In addition 350,000 ha of farm bunds may also be available for tree plantation.

3.6 Energy Consumption

Haryana's domestic energy requirement is primarily met through the use of wood, charcoal, agricultural wastes and dung cake. Given that per capita income in the State is somewhat higher than in other states of the country and all villages have been electrified, only about 4.1% of the energy requirements are met from non-renewable energy sources. The high cost of electric power, as well as of cooking gas, coal and kerosene, precludes their use as a source of domestic fuel especially for the rural poor and disadvantaged groups.

Based on an average daily household consumption of 20 kg of fuelwood, the State's domestic energy requirement is around 12 million tonnes of Fuelwood Equivalent (FEW) per year as follows.

- Fuelwood, charcoal and agricultural waste - 8.0 million tonnes (66.6%)
- Dung cake (73% of the total dung production) - 3.5 million tonnes (29.3%)
- Non-renewable sources - 0.5 million tonnes (4.1%)

It is estimated that tree cover in Haryana would have to be increased 10 times to meet its fuelwood requirement. There is thus a clear need to increase fuelwood production to permit more dung to be used as manure, agriculture waste as fodder, and to reduce pressure on natural forests and other vegetation.

Fuelwood deficits also point to the need for more efficient energy saving devices – smokeless *chulhas* (cooking ovens) etc., which to date have not made any perceptible impact to ease the situation.

3.7 Livestock and Grazing

Animal husbandry is an integral part of the livelihood system of the people of Haryana, both poor and the elite. It is estimated that a rural household on an average keeps five heads of livestock to meet their milk, draught power, manure and energy (dung cake) requirements. Increasing demand for milk and animal products from urban centres is a major incentive for people to rear livestock. The provision of dairy cattle under credit-linked anti-poverty programme has made livestock rearing a major source of sustenance to the poor.

With a livestock population of over 9.9 million (1992), the pressure of grazing both on forest and common lands is very high. There are areas with (i) high livestock pressure (Ambala, Kurukshetra, Districts), (ii) moderate livestock pressure (foothills of the Siwaliks), and (iii) low livestock pressure (Bhiwani, Rewari, Districts), where sheep and goats predominate.

A large proportion of livestock throughout the State is uneconomic and their unfettered grazing in public, community and even in private lands is, no doubt, a cause of environmental degradation. Evolving appropriate Silvi-pastoral systems, need-specific breeding policy, encouragement of stall-feeding and establishment of *Gaushalas* (homes for stray cattle) are necessary for the success of any tree-planting programme.

3.8 Land Degradation

Almost a quarter of the total land area (44,000 sq. km) in the State is degraded, with mobile sand dunes in the southwest (about 0.62 million ha are affected by active sand dunes), saline and alkali soils in the Central Plains (estimated variously to be between 0.42 and 0.626 million ha) and severely eroded hills (Aravalli and Siwalik ranges) in the south and the north.

This degradation is caused by over cutting and overgrazing of vegetation on public, community and even private lands, poor management of irrigation water in the Central Plain; increasing population pressure and uneven distribution of wealth in the rural communities. Landless scheduled castes and other disadvantaged groups in a poverty spiral have no alternatives of income and depend on access to grazing, fodder and fuelwood on common and public lands.

The resulting pressures on these areas have depleted vegetation, caused soil erosion and diminished the yield of grass and fuelwood. Rural poverty is commonplace with women, scheduled castes and the landless being among the most disadvantaged groups. Afforestation is one way to reverse this degradation.

4.0 PAST EFFORTS

Up to the end of the eighteenth century, Siwalik Hills were well protected with a luxuriant cover of both broadleaved and coniferous species when forests belonged to the local *Rajas* and *Jagirdars*. Some of these forests, however, came under the British administration at the beginning of the nineteenth century, when in 1806 the first attempt at administration of forests in India was aimed at with their exploitation to meet the large size timber requirement of the royal navy. Later in 1822, land settlement was carried out with the sole purpose of ensuring that lands were rapidly brought under plough. Revenue officers were authorised to grant leases and the hillsides were divided among villages located in the hills. Brushwood and forest produce were declared to be village common property.

4.1 History of Past Management

During the period 1815 to 1860 the State had practically no control over most of the forests when during 1861 to 1876 they were brought under the control of the Revenue Department and in the process large areas were clear-felled for meeting the firewood requirements of cantonments and civil hill stations. Management of forests was transferred to the Forest Department in 1879. Demarcation of forests was taken up in 1890 by Mr. Minniken.

As forests provided excellent grazing areas and agriculture was labour intensive, difficult, and un-remunerative, large herds were reared by the people. With increasing population, more and more land was cultivated and an increasing number of animals grazed in the forests; the number of animals *grazed* being far in excess of their carrying capacity. By this time rapid denudation of the Siwaliks had taken place, resulting in the destruction of much of the agricultural lands in the plains below, by hill torrents commonly known as *Chos*. This necessitated adoption of special protection measures and a special legislation known as “The Punjab Land Preservation (*Chos*) Act” (commonly referred to as *Chos* Act) was enacted in 1900, which extinguished pasture and wood cutting rights as well as rights to break up new land for cultivation in the forest areas. However, the pressure of population on forests remained very heavy and the demand for forest produce was also very large. As the local population was mainly of *Gujjars*, who followed a semi-pastoral occupation, the pressure of grazing also remained very high. Sir Patrick Fagan in October 1916 described the condition of the Siwaliks as follows.

“All vegetation mould has been washed away from the slopes of hills and only survives in pockets on the rarely occurring flat terraces; the slopes themselves are at present as barren as the mountains of moon..... The sudden and violent character of floods is a sure indication of complete denudation of the catchment areas”.

During the period 1914 to 1916, sheep and goats were evicted by the Government after payment of compensation, but in large areas of low foothills, nomadic sheep and goats

used to crowd in the open forests during winter (November to February) causing much damage. In 1931, a special Committee of Legislative Assembly was convened under the Chairmanship of Sir Miles Irving, Financial Commissioner, which found that the basic cause of erosion was the disappearance of forests. The unofficial members of a Forest Commission, appointed in 1937 to enquire into the grievances of the public, realised the serious menace of soil erosion and recommended creation of a special Soil Conservation Circle. In 1939, a special branch of the Forest Department was created to undertake soil conservation measures in forests, pastures and the cultivated lands throughout the northern districts of the then Punjab Province. In the same year, a Soil Conservation Division was created at Ambala. The areas closed to sheep and goat grazing under section 4 of the *Chos Act*, were effectively protected. Many villagers applied for voluntary closure to cattle grazing. However, by 1942, the progress slowed down and the Government decided to compulsorily close these areas under section 5 of the above Act.

From 1939 onwards the Cooperative Department of the Government organised Cooperative *Chos* Reclamation Societies for reclamation of *Cho* areas. Extensive soil conservation works like gully plugging, terracing, construction of earthen dams and bunds in small *nallahs* (streams), planting of *Saccharum munja*, *Eulaliopsis binata*, *Khair* and *Sisoo* etc. was taken up to stabilize gullies, ravines as well as slips and slides. It was realised that appreciation and cooperation of the general public for the various soil and water conservation and land reclamation measures was a must to have their strong support, as complete closure of at least 50% of each forest area was essential. Therefore, the Government followed the policy of persuasion for people volunteering for closure of forest areas. A special Publicity Officer was appointed who toured the state, gave lectures and exhibited slides etc. Simultaneously, large-scale demonstration of correct methods of terracing, embanking and drainage etc, were taken up. Pamphlets written in simple local languages were widely distributed and many articles were supplied to the press to bring about general awakening about the seriousness of the problem among the masses. All the affected areas were put under Protection Working Circle in various working plans, prescribing afforestation, soil and water conservation measures and strict closure to grazing. After independence, with the advent of the Five Year Plans, such measures were taken up on a more extensive scale but areas could not be closed effectively. Increasing human and livestock populations put tremendous pressure on natural resources, resulting in deforestation and degradation of many areas.

4.2 Evolution of Participatory Management

The seriousness of the problem of soil erosion in the Siwaliks came into sharp focus in mid-seventies when deforestation in the catchment (Siwaliks) of Sukhna Lake (source of water supply for Chandigarh city) was causing serious problems of siltation of the lake. Various engineering and vegetative measures became ineffective in the wake of lack of people's cooperation in maintaining these measures. This led to the evolution of participatory approach to forest management by enlisting people's participation in the protection and management of forests jointly with the HFD. This experimental

programme started by the Chandigarh Centre of Central Soil and Water Conservation Research, Demonstration and Training Institute (CSWCRTI), Dehra Dun, and the HFD in Sukhomajri and Nada watersheds, was designed to achieve increased productivity and effective resource conservation. The strategy adopted for obtaining the willing cooperation of the local people was the construction of water harvesting structures to provide irrigation water to rainfed agriculture, which increased yield two to three times and proved a great incentive in soliciting cooperation of the local communities. This strategy captured the attention of the farmers and gave a new direction to the concept of watershed rehabilitation. Communities gained confidence as the economic returns from this new management approach began to materialize.

4.3 Hill Resource Management Societies

Local communities after observing improvement in the condition of pilot watersheds and other benefits like increased agricultural production and availability of more fodder, etc. became more cooperative in the management of these forest watersheds. Open grazing was replaced by stall-feeding, goats were replaced by high milk yielding buffaloes and illicit felling was given up in favour of removing dead and fallen wood. The villagers were convinced that various restrictions were in their own interest as otherwise the dams would get silted up.

With the growing number of dams the field staff of the Forest Department got overstretched and could not evolve an effective management system. It was also necessary to pass on the benefits of social fencing to the people for their deeper involvement. It was therefore, decided to hand over the management of this Programme to the villagers and for this purpose a Water Users Association (WUA) was formed in the year 1981, which was later renamed as Hill Resource Management Society (HRMS), a village body registered under the Registration of Societies Act, 1860, with responsibilities of: (i) protection of forests against grazing and illicit felling, (ii) distribution of irrigation water, (iii) fixing of rates for water, grass, etc., (iv) maintenance of dams and conveyance system, (v) maintenance of accounts, and (vi) cooperation and interaction with the staff of the Forest Department. All adults of all families in the village were free to become members of the Society, thereby sharing equal rights and responsibilities.

Each society had a duly elected Management Committee (MC) of 7-13 members including two or more women members. The Committee was required to meet every month to discuss various priorities and attended by outside resource persons from Tata Energy Research Training (TERI) and officials of the State Forest Department (SFD).

4.4 Joint Forest Management Policy

The revised National Forest Policy of 1988 envisages, as one of the essentials of forest management, that forest communities should be motivated to identify themselves with the programmes of protection, management, development, and conservation of forests. The basic philosophy underlying the proposed policy being to link the economic

interests of the rural communities living in and around forests with sustainable management of these areas.

June 1, 1990 was indeed a watershed in the history of India's forest management when, inspired by the success stories of PFM, Government of India, Ministry of Environment and Forests issued policy instruction, consistent with the National Forest Policy of 1988, to all the state governments supporting greater participation of village communities and Non-Governmental Organisations (NGOs) in the regeneration, management and protection of degraded forests. The implications of this document are far-reaching and assertive in support of PFM strategy.

Based on various field tests involving beat profiling, explaining the programme to the community, meetings with individual communities in which resource problems were discussed, assisting communities to form groups and also to get a feedback regarding programme policy proposal, drawing of micro-plans and creating of HRMS, a policy document on JFM was prepared and the same was approved by the Government of Haryana (GOH) on June, 13th 1990 (GOH, Forest Department, Memo No. 3373-Ft-I-90/15610 dated 13-06-1990 and Notification No. 3799-Ft-I-98/13358 dated 29-06-1998). The enunciation of this policy was a landmark in the evolution of JFM in Haryana.

The policy document contains the rights and responsibilities of the SFD and the village societies and discusses the details of sharing increased protection. In order to lay down the procedure for implementing the JFM policy, rules were formulated and approved by GOH in 1998. These rules besides dealing with leases and sharing of income from increased forest produce from a management area also allows the members of HRMS collect dead, dry and fallen wood and other NTFP for their bona fide domestic use. Surplus if any, may be sold in an open auction. However, previously existing rights of members or non-members are not to be interfered with.

4.5 Joint Forest Management Programme

Based on the experience gained, the HFD adopted the PFM approach for the management of degraded forests in the Siwalik Hills in 1989. Although HFD built dams with improved construction efficiency, it was observed that the forest staff lacked the capacity to support the development of the local HRMS, as they were not trained in the operational procedures of the Programme. The cooperation between the forest staff and the village communities was not as effective as it was in the pilot village of Sukhomajri. The problems of dam breaches, institution building, villager's commitment to protection and regeneration of forests, poor distribution of resources etc. emerged and it was getting difficult for the forest staff to keep pace with the new challenges.

It was, therefore, felt that unless the Department overcomes these limitation and the communities form management societies, JFM Programme will not be implemented and the watersheds will not rehabilitate. These problems were discussed in 1989 with

outside resource persons and it was decided that the capacity of the SFD needs to be strengthened so that their liaison with the village communities gets streamlined.

4.6 JFM Support Programme

In response to the problems of implementing a JFM Programme, TERI undertook a JFM Support Programme in Haryana Siwaliks in July 1990 in collaboration with HFD, with financial support from the Ford Foundation. The Programme sought to facilitate the development of sustainable PFM systems through various institutional, training, research, policy and legal mechanisms with peoples' (including women) association and participation in the management and sustainable development of forest resources of the State jointly with the SFD. The primary objective of the Programme was to devise mechanisms and evolve plans that enable systematic integration of PFM within the policies, programmes, procedures and operations of the HFD and at the same time secure willing participation of the local communities to protect and manage these forests for their sustainable development, increased biomass production, maintenance of biological diversity and conservation of the environment.

The main strategies and mechanisms adopted to elicit community participation and sustainable forest management included:

- Construction of soil conservation-cum-water harvesting systems by HFD through erection of series of small dams in the upper hilly catchments and construction of earthen water harvesting dams at suitable sites to provide irrigation to villagers for enhancing their agricultural productivity;
- Leasing out of forest areas to village community forest management societies (HRMS referred to earlier) for extraction of *Bhabbar* and other fodder grasses for economic betterment of the local communities;
- Supply of bamboo to *Bhanjda* community (basket makers) at concessional rates to provide them income and employment;
- Organising exclusive and inter-active informal training workshops/meetings/field training for the officials of HFD, office bearers of HRMS and village communities including women groups to sensitise, motivate and orient these target groups to PFM and to bring attitudinal changes in them;
- Ensuring effective participation of women in the Programme through their primary as well as managerial roles;
- Ensuring active involvement of local people in Micro-planning for the management and development of catchments/command areas.
- Community participation in the choice of species to be planted under different development programmes and raising of plantations on community lands;

- Regular documentation of institutional process and periodic analysis and assessment of the working of different PFM models:
- Regular training of (i) field staff and senior officers of the HFD, (ii) members of the MC of the HRMS (iii) Farmers Training Camps and development of training packages for these target groups.
- Undertaking research through case studies on different aspect of PFM to evolve pragmatic strategies, mechanisms and buffers to promote community participation for sustainable forest development;
- Publication and dissemination of publicity and extension material regarding the Programme like lectures, films and use of other audio-visual aids.

While the Programme sought to facilitate the development of sustainable PFM systems through various institutional, training, policy and legal strategies and mechanisms with people's association and participation (including women), constant research and case studies were undertaken on various aspects of JFM. A critical assessment of the impacts of various strategies and mechanisms adopted, on sustainable production, regeneration and ecology of the area and to evolve the most suitable management options to promote community participation, was made in 1994.

4.7 Social Forestry Project

It was in the above background that a social Forestry Project funded by the World Bank was implemented by the HFD from 1982-1990, with some useful results.

5.0 THE PROJECT

With the experience gained by the Department in the earlier projects and given the potential of raising plantations on village common lands, a new community based "Haryana Community Forestry Project" (HCFP) was finalised following a series of meetings regarding its technical and administrative provisions. A Financing Agreement (FA) between the European Commission (EC) and Government of India (GOI) was signed on January 24, 1997.

The total cost of the Project is estimated at EURO 30.10 million (Rs. 1,414.7 million), EC having committed a grant of EURO 23.30 million, with the financial commitment of the GOH being EURO 6.80 million. Using an exchange rate of one EURO = Rs. 47.00, the respective contributions of EC and GoH stand at Rs. 1,095.1 million and Rs. 319.6 million respectively.

The project became officially operational on November 30, 1998 and would be implemented through June 30, 2008.

5.1 Operational Areas

The project is being implemented in 300 villages of 43 rural Community Development Blocks (CDB) in 10 districts, targeting an estimated population of 606,000 (1999 estimates based on 2.5% growth). The districts included are: Panchkula, Ambala, Yamunanagar and Kurukshetra in the north; Sirsa, Fatehabad and Hisar in the west and Bhiwani (Siwani, Loharu and Bhiwani Community Development Blocks (CDBs), Mahendragarh (Kanina CDB), and Rewari (Jatusana and Nahar CDBs) in the southwest and south. The project intervention zone excludes the area covered under the Aravalli Project and districts with sodic and salt affected areas.

The project area comprise three of the four agro-climatic zones of the State, i.e. the Siwalik Hills and foothills in the north; Central Plain; and Arid Sandy Plains (Desert) in the west, southwest and the south; the zone excluded being the Aravalli Hills. Desertified areas abound in parts of Sirsa, Fatehabad, Hisar and the selected blocks of Bhiwani, Mahendragarh and Rewari districts.

The selected agro-climatic zones have sizeable blocks of common land owned either by the village *Panchayat* or groups of families in villages to whom tenurial rights are inheritable (*Shamlat* land), and administratively controlled by the Revenue Department/Block Development Officer (BDO).

The total area of common land in the project is about 125,000 ha, of which 39,000 ha is cultivable and the balance is uncultivable. It is only the uncultivable land that is available for tree plantation and some of this area has already been planted by the SFD under the Social Forestry Programme or by the State Government through the centrally sponsored scheme of *Jawahar Rozgar Yojana*.

Good proportions of *Shamlat* lands have restricted access for obvious reasons, while *Panchayat* land, on the other hand, is the common property of the entire village, on whose behalf it is held in trust by the elected *Panchayat*. Cultivable lands are generally leased out to private individuals on an annual basis in public auction presided over by the BDO. Lease rent is directly proportional to land capability and prime land may fetch as much as Rs. 10,000/- to Rs. 12,000/- per acre.

Panchayat lands unfit for cultivation are either used as pastures or for stacking cow-dung, though a major portion of this land is under encroachment.

5.2 Objectives

The overall objectives of the project are to build up the capacity of rural communities to improve the natural environment and maintain land fertility through sustainable management of natural resources undertaken in a participatory manner, with the expected results of increased wood production, improved productivity of common and private lands and greater involvement of project stakeholders, including women, in planning and management of Common Property Resources (CPRs). The project purposes (immediate objectives) are:

- Improved capabilities of village communities to undertake a process of self-directed community development, especially through greater involvement and empowerment of disadvantaged groups in village decision-making;
- Improved and sustainable management of CPRs that have previously been degraded by loss of biomass and topsoil and/or by moving sand;
- Increase in the number of sustainable forestry and agro-forestry interventions in farming systems;
- Increase in the number of market-led, environmentally friendly and energy efficient technologies introduced into villages.

5.3 Project Stakeholders

The project stakeholders at the community level are:

- Women in general and women heads of households in particular who have a stake in biomass production for fuel and fodder;
- Scheduled castes who generally are landless and depend on traditionally low paid occupation;
- Households dependent on degraded lands and sand dune areas;

- Cultivators who are willing to take up poplar plantations, preference being given to marginal and small farmers;
- All potential and actual resident users of common lands;
- Communities living in degraded and drought prone areas bordering and within Siwalik Hills.

Though the local community as a whole is the primary stakeholder, special attention would be paid to the needs and perspectives of the disadvantaged groups within the communities, namely, women, scheduled castes, landless and resource poor farmers.

5.4 Project Components

The various project components that are aimed at reversing the process of degradation through restoring vegetal cover will focus on the needs of the community for fuel, fodder, timber, fruit and other minor products on a sustainable basis. The Project will keep in view that the species planted are suitable to the site and meet the diverse needs of the people as identified during Participatory Assessments (PA) and micro-planning stages.

The Project interventions will mainly focus on degraded wastelands, village common lands, farmlands, homestead plots, institutional lands, riverbanks and areas unsuited for agriculture including private lands. With specific emphasis on plantations and their management, the project will deal holistically with the inter-related elements of land, water, trees, crops, livestock and livelihood systems of people. The various project components with their physical targets are shown as under:

5.4.1 Village woodlots: Establishment of Village Woodlots over 7,400 ha of *Panchayat* lands, village common lands (jointly owned by several villagers), institutional lands and riverbanks.

Plantations established by the Project will be handed over to the community for further management after three years of planting. **An incentive amount of Rs. 300 and Rs. 400, during the second and third year** after planting, is envisaged for village woodlots, to ensure effective cooperation of the villagers in protecting these plantations and obtaining higher survival rates. Incentive amounts will be paid only when the **survival rate is 80% or more**. The amounts will also be utilised by Village Resource Management Committee(s) (VRMCs) for further protection and management of plantations after the same have been handed over to them.

5.4.2 Sand Dune Fixation: Planting of 9,300 ha of moving Sand Dunes (Sand Dune Fixation), both on common and private lands.

The project will maintain these plantations up to three years of planting after which they would be handed over to the community/private owners as the case may be. While the trees planted on private lands would be the property of the owners of the land, *Panchayat* land plantations would revert to the community.

5.4.3 Tree Groves: Establishment of 200 ha of Tree Groves at 2,500 sites.

A total of 2,500 Tree Groves each extending over an area of 200 ha would be established.

5.4.4 Water Harvesting Dams: Development of micro-watersheds through construction of 18 Water Harvesting Dams.

The project, after the construction of dams and demonstrating their use to the village society, will hand over these functional dams to the villagers for their further maintenance, with certain conditions (to be drawn up in conjunction with the village communities), to ensure equitable distribution of water, and protection and management of the catchment.

5.4.5 Farm Forestry: Farm Forestry plantations over 5,300 ha of private farmland belonging to small and marginal farmers.

It is envisaged to cover a net area of 5,300 ha with trees on the premise that a farmer will not be willing to give up more than 20% of his land area for trees. As a guide 1,039 plants will be considered to cover one ha of plantation. The project will pay to the farmers an **incentive of Rs. 2 and Rs. 4 per surviving plant in second and third year** after planting. This will ensure their continued interest in protecting the plants, besides providing additional income.

5.4.6 Poplar Planting: Planting of Poplar on 5,000 ha of prime agricultural land in four north-eastern districts.

Improved clones of poplar for raising plantations on prime agricultural lands will be provided to the farmers. These plantations are envisaged to cover 5,000 ha on larger farms in the four north-eastern project districts of Panchkula, Ambala, Kurukshetra and Yamunanagar. Each ha will have an initial stocking of 500 plants at a spacing of 5 x 4m to allow for inter-cropping. Technical assistance will be provided for raising and maintaining these plantations during training sessions.

5.4.7 Kitchen Gardens/Homestead Plots: Establishment of 36,000 Kitchen Gardens over an approximate area of 180 ha.

The approach will be to provide five tall plants of grafted fruit trees per homestead and some good vegetable seed. Homesteads (36,000) covering an area of approximately 180 ha are targeted for this component.

Each area to be taken up for plantation will be surveyed, demarcated and mapped to help the villagers as well as the Monitoring and Evaluation (M & E) teams in assessing the assets created. In case of village Woodlots and Sand Dune Fixation, plantations will be established in blocks of not less than five ha and preferably above 10 ha, though planting of 20 ha blocks as envisaged in FA is not possible due to non-availability of land.

Nurseries of suitable species will be raised starting from the first year of the project to provide seedlings required for various plantation models. At least one permanent nursery will be set up in a cluster of 3 to 4 villages (100 nurseries in total). The project will encourage establishing decentralised nurseries to be managed by women, for which they will be trained.

In addition, 10 units of modern nurseries will be established, as well as two specialised nurseries for poplar plantations. Over 31 million seedlings would be produced from these nurseries during the currency of the project.

5.4.8 Community Development: including Income Generating Activities (IGA) and promotion of energy efficient technologies.

The community Development process aims at building up/strengthening the capacity of the community to plan and undertake participatory development activities. Community capacity building will be achieved through PA, formation of VRMC/HRMS/ Farm Forestry Association (FFA) and Micro-planning.

Community Capacity Building

Entry Point Activities (EPA): During the year prior to the models agreed to by the communities being implemented, and prior to the development of IGAs, the project will work with the community on EPA in order to keep up the momentum and interest of the communities. These activities will mainly be self-help activities with some limited support from the project; **up to Rs. 15,000 per village to enable these activities to be started during the first year**, while PA and microplanning exercises are taking place.

Chetna Kendras: It is proposed to establish one *Chetna Kendra* (Awareness Centre), in each of the project villages and this could be one of the micro-projects. These *Kendras* could be the venue for public discussion related to community forestry and other projects and activities, training, awareness

generation, literacy classes and IGAs. It will be the meeting place of VRMC/HRMS and provide a physical focal point for the community, facilitating the development of a sustainable resource management institution.

While the project will fund the construction of these *Kendras*, the community will have to supervise their construction, contribute labour and provide other amenities. The community will also have to generate funds and assume responsibility for their upkeep and maintenance in the long run.

Resource Management Fund: While the community is to be encouraged to assume responsibility for the management of plantations, **initial seed money of Rs. 30, 000/-** would be given by the project to each VRMC/HRMS for creation of a **Resource Management Fund (RMF)** to be managed by them.

The RMF may be augmented by mobilising local resources in the form of **annual subscriptions** from user groups, an agreed percentage of benefits accruing from the various micro-projects, service charges, etc. In fact, seed money from the project would only be released if the community agrees to a mechanism for future community contribution to the fund. This is necessary for bringing about a sense of belonging in the community, as well as ensuring availability of adequate funds for future maintenance and sustainability, besides supporting IGAs.

Promotion of Self-Employment through Micro-Enterprises

Income Generating Activities through Micro-Enterprises: HCFP, adopting a holistic approach, will encourage the development of non-farm activities in project villages, by availing the services of existing institutions and programmes. Stress will be given in microplans to appropriate natural resource based IGAs for the landless and resource poor farmers, who normally rely on day labour/piece rate employment.

Institutional resources will be mobilised and incorporated into the micro-enterprise development projects under HCFP. Market intelligence and feasibility studies to enquire on these aspects would be commissioned. **There is a provision for providing a Revolving Fund to VRMCs for supporting IGAs.**

The fund could be utilised to provide critical support like training, skill development and backward and forward linkages including market intelligence to the small entrepreneurs. It could also be utilized to provide credit support to income generating micro-enterprises of women disadvantaged groups formed into Self-Help Groups (SHGs). The credit amount could be linked to the savings mobilised by the SHGs and supplemented through institutional credit. The micro-credit movement has found ready acceptance of institutional finance agencies in India.

Energy Efficient Technologies

Improved Cooking Technologies: The project aims at reducing the consumption of fuelwood and cow dung cakes in communities by introducing improved domestic cooking stoves. Improved indoor *Chulhas* can reduce fuel consumption by 30-50% under controlled conditions, compared to traditional stoves and can reduce the smoky environment in the house, resulting in health benefits to the family. Experience has, however, shown that the actual impact of improved technologies has been at best marginal. The project will, therefore, first carry out a study of improved cooking technologies in order to ascertain the options available in the market, the real needs of village households, the feasibility of introduction into different socio-economic groups, the possibility of further design improvements with participation of villagers and the potential for establishing income generating microprojects based on production of improved *Chulhas* by disadvantaged groups within the target villages.

Improved Crematoria: A survey of crematoria in the main towns within the project targets districts will be carried out, in order to assess the demand for fuelwood, the suppliers of fuelwood, the technologies used, the possibilities for introducing more fuelwood efficient systems, and the possibilities for using alternative energy sources.

Other Alternative Energy Sources: In conjunction with the Department of Non-Conventional Energy Sources, Government of India, a review will be carried out of other alternative energy sources that are likely to be of interest to communities within the 300 target villages, with a view to pilot some of the more promising technologies.

5.5 Major Achievements

The Project has by now (end of year 5) (March 2004) covered 288 villages (though a few of them may have to be eventually rejected) through VE, PA, VRMC formation and Micro-planning. The Planning Phase has been completed in new villages, with remaining work, in particular Microproject formulation to be completed at the beginning of Year 6.

Capability assessments of 234 VRMCs have been carried out. Repeated assessments show a trend of steady improvement, but with weakness still to redress through intensified efforts and further training. VRMC workshops (12 in number with 2,308 members attending) as well as special workshops for SHGs, have been arranged to gear up village institution building and stakeholder involvement.

Plantations have been established in 237 project villages during the year. Achievement against the year's targets for new plantations is 97% for village woodlots, 105% for multi-species farm forestry, 96% for poplar plantation, 136% for kitchen gardens, 123% for circular tree groves, 68.5% for linear tree groves, and 72% for sand dune fixation.

Survival rates for plantations raised in the years 2, 3 and 4 (after three, two and one year) remain satisfactory for village woodlots (81, 87, and 88% respectively), tree groves (89, 96 and 99%) and sand dune fixation (62, 81 and 74%) and have improved for Farm Forestry (32, 34 and 66%). Poplar survival is declining (45, 50 and 33%) due to a slump in the market. Kitchen garden survival remains at a low of 19, 21, and 23%. Linear tree groves have a satisfactory (80%) survival after one year. Farm forestry survival after one year has continued to improve in Hisar Circle – up from 11% two years back to 23% a year ago to this year's 28% (versus 60% in Ambala Circle).

Against a target of six water-harvesting dams, seven have been constructed, (4 in Panchkula District and 3 in Yamunagar District). Construction has been completed at six sites with the seventh dam to be completed shortly.

An impact assessment of two water harvesting dams previously constructed shows a dramatic increase in the potential for agriculture. Net return from crop production in the command area has increased four times since last year. With access to year-round irrigation, many farmers are changing over to higher paying crops like vegetable seeds. Also traditional crops give better yield – one village has recorded a 15-fold net profit increase from wheat cultivation. Milk yield per animal has also improved due to availability of high-quality fodder, by 23% for cows and 43% for buffaloes over a period of 2½ years. Besides irrigation, the dams also give benefits like improved moisture regime in forest vegetation, ground water recharge, water for wildlife and possibilities of rearing fish, etc.

A total of 158 SHGs in 93 villages have been established. 114 groups formed are now involved in IGAs, mostly vermi-composting. Five NGOs have assisted the Project in promotion of SHGs. Installation of 1, 250 energy efficient cooking stoves in 24 project villages was implemented, and two improved crematoria have been constructed.

Nearly all planned training of project beneficiaries has been conducted. VRMC office bearers and Link Workers have been trained in Microplanning, VRMC management, money management, leadership and communication skills and participatory monitoring and evaluation. Need-based refresher training of VRMCs, and link workers of previous village batches was given to them to boost their capabilities, has commenced. SHG members were trained in vermi composting and other IGA related skills and have also received literacy training.

Out of 80 planned, 66 Chetna Kendras (Village Training Centres), have been constructed. Planned field office construction could not be implemented due to non-availability of land.

Deployment of project staff remains almost constant. Of 557 posts sanctioned, 413 (74%) are filled. Amongst management and implementation staff, 87% of the positions are filled.

6.0 ORGANISATION AND MANAGEMENT

Government of Haryana has the overall responsibility for the Project and has nominated HFD with its headquarters at Panchkula as the responsible authority for the implementation of the Project. The State Government has also appointed a Steering Committee to co-ordinate the development of the project and to provide guidance on policy issues, besides approving the financial statements and auditor's reports, progress reports, work plan and budget.

6.1 Overall Structure

HFD has established a functionally autonomous Project Management Unit (PMU) located at Panchkula. In order to ensure proper co-ordination between the project and other line departments and state agencies/programmes, a state level Policy Review Committee and District Level Implementation Committees have been constituted to meet at least once and twice a year, respectively. For co-ordination at the local level, the project will work out mechanism for enlisting cooperation of BDOs, Village Extension Workers, etc.

6.2 Project Management Unit

The PMU has been delegated financial, administrative and technical responsibilities for implementation of the project once the overall and Annual Work Plans have been approved by the Steering Committee and the EC.

The unit is headed by a National Project Director, supported by an expatriate Technical Assistance (TA) Project Manager (Team Leader of the TA Team). The Project Director is assisted by three Conservators of Forests (CF), one responsible for monitoring and evaluation, training, publicity and extension and the other two for carrying out field operations. Each Conservator will be supported by specialist Divisional Forest Officers, (DFOs) Sub-Divisional Forest Officers (SDOs) and field staff who will implement the Project in 300 target villages (10% of all villages in the Project area) with active community participation in all phases from appraisal, Micro-planning and Micro-project formulation to planting, implementation and maintenance.

The project is adequately staffed with 557 personnel provided by the GOH to handle all its technical, administrative, and financial duties. For smooth implementation of the Project, the PMU will also directly contract local consultants, supplementary staff and NGOs on a short-term basis as required. Technical Assistance is provided by the consultancy firm Agriconsulting (Italy), in association with Agrisystems (UK) and Agriculture Finance Corporation (AFC) (India).

7.0 COMMUNITY FORESTRY TRAINING

The Project is a pioneer experience to promote forestry as an integral part of the process of participatory development with a view to ensure self sustaining efforts of the local people to preserve the environment and enhance economic advancement. The Project has the distinction of empowering people with the capabilities of planning for executing their development programmes, aiming at ecological soundness and economic growth through fruitful participation of Government agencies. The Project being a model of meaningful partnership between the people and the Government is to demonstrate the success of development based on joint efforts of the two sides and envisages the desirable changes, that need to be brought about in **Knowledge, Attitudes, and Practice** of the personnel of the HDF as also the people at large. It is in this context that **training** is extremely important in the overall success of the Project.

HCFP, which became operational on November 30, 1998, aims at building up the capacity of rural communities to improve the natural environment and increase productivity of various production systems, through sustainable management and development of their natural and CPRs, undertaken in a participatory manner. It is an embodiment of participatory approach to resource management, and is a marked deviation from the traditional systems of forest management. Its implementation requires a completely different set of skills on the part of its functionaries (HFD) to be able to effectively discharge their responsibilities. There is thus, an urgent need for *capacity building*, to enable HFD staff to take control of the process of planning, implementation and subsequent monitoring and evaluation. Community Capacity Building to sustain project interventions and undertake natural resource and community development are extremely important for the Project, **training** being a vital component of the Capacity Building process.

The sustainability of approach and its success is, however, largely governed by the institutions and processes that the Project leaves behind, after withdrawal of external assistance. *Governance* and *institution building* are thus, other important aspect of Participatory Resource Management (PRM) and forms a part of the capacity building component of the Project.

Encompassing the appropriate and effective execution of the varied tasks and activities are *social development and community mobilisation skills*, which capacity building measures impart to the project staff. There are also certain more general and short-term training capsules on *managerial and administrative aspects of teamwork*, especially as the HCFP professes a participatory approach.

7.1 Training Package

In view of the above background, HCFP developed a training package for introduction training in community forestry for its project staff, which consists of the courses shown in **Table 2**. These training courses have been organised by the Project since 1999-2000 for its various categories of staff.

Table 2: Training Package

| S. No | Training Courses | Period |
|--------------|--|----------------|
| 1. | Project Induction (PI) | Two (2) days |
| 2. | Village Entry (VE) | Three (3) days |
| 3. | Participatory Assessment (PA) | Five (5) days |
| 4. | Microplanning and Microproject Formulation (MMF) | Five (5) days |
| 5. | Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation (PME) | Five (5) days |
| 6. | Gender Sensitisation (GS) | Two (2) days |

The staff training package above has been devised to give full orientation on all the participatory methods and approaches adopted by the Project. As these approaches are different from practices in HFD at large, it has been recognised that de-learning practices previously applied are an equally important aspect of training, for trainees to internalise the new knowledge and to bring about a real change in their attitudes and practices.

Most of the Project's implementation and management staff [Forest Guards (FGs), Foresters/Deputy Rangers (DRs), SDOs, DFOs, CFs] have received such training during the course of first three years of the Project. For those who joined the Project late, only a crash course has been given to make them familiar with the various participatory methods and approaches followed in the Project. While data on pre-training knowledge at the start of each course and post-training knowledge at the end of each course, are available for each participant, no further evaluation of the effectiveness and impact of this staff training has been carried out so far and hence this Study.

7.2 Objective of Study

The key purpose of the Study is to assess the impact of training imparted to various categories of staff in the Project, in different courses of the training package (**Table 2**) developed by HCFP. The impact will be demonstrated in terms of **Knowledge, Attitude, and Practice (KAP)** for a sample staff who have attended the full training programme.

The tasks, therefore, according to Terms of Reference (TOR) are:

- To develop an assessment methodology, including questionnaires and checklists, related to issues covered in training manuals related to courses mentioned in **Table 2**.
- To interview a random sample of 50 FGs, Foresters/ DRs, besides all SDOs, DFOs and CFs who attended the full training programme;

- To present and analyse data collected in a study report;
- To draw conclusions and make recommendations for future staff training activities.

7.3 Assessment Criteria

PRM Programme seeks to facilitate the development of sustainable systems through various training, institutional, planning and implementation with subsequent M&E, research, policy and legal processes, with people's participation (including women and underprivileged and marginal communities) in the management and sustainable development of natural resources jointly with HFD. The primary objective of the Programme is to devise mechanisms and evolve plans that enable systematic integration of PRM within the policies, programmes, proceedings and operations of HFD and at the same time secure the willing cooperation and participation of the local communities to protect and manage these resources for their sustainable development, increased productivity and conservation of the environment. All staff training efforts are to be directed to this central theme.

This study will accordingly, assess the impact and effectiveness of different training courses provided to Project's management and implementation staff, since 1999-2000, in the context of issues covered in respective training manuals. The impact as suggested in the TOR, will be demonstrated in terms of **KAP** for a sample of randomly selected staff drawn from various categories who have attended all the training courses.

Four criteria, namely, **KNOWLEDGE, ATTITUDE, PRACTICE** and **PARTICIPATION (KAPP)** were, therefore, used for this impact assessment as mentioned below.

- **Knowledge:** Extent of knowledge acquired about Concept, Process and Programme of PRM as a result of attending the said training courses.
- **Attitude:** Has the staff of the Project been sensitised, motivated and oriented towards PRM. Is there any attitudinal change; if so, what is the change?
- **Practice:** How much of what the officials have learnt in these training courses is being practised by them to elicit peoples' participation and have a participatory approach? How sympathetic are they to community participation/ PRM Programme?
- **Participation:** How much do the officials trained, involve/participate personally in various activities/programmes of HCFP?

As a large number of officials (especially at the field level) trained by the HCFP are towards the latter half of their official career (some of them towards the fag end of their career), the assessment methodology has necessarily to be simple, direct, flexible, and not very sophisticated. The study was conducted through a sample of officials trained by

the HCFP in its various training programmes. The details of trainees are given under Para 7.4.

7.4 The Respondents

The total authorised executive staff strength sanctioned for the Project is 313 persons in various categories ranging from Forest Guards to the Director of the Project (**Table 3**), besides other supporting staff.

Table 3: Authorised Sanctioned Strength of Executive Staff of HCFP

| Designation | No. Sanctioned | No. in Position |
|--|----------------|-----------------|
| Chief Conservator of Forests (Project Director) | 01 | 01 |
| Conservator of Forests | 03 | 03 |
| Divisional Forest Officers / Assistant Conservator Forests | 11 | 08 |
| Sub Divisional Forest Officers | 17 | 17 |
| Deputy Ranger/ Forester | 47 | 51 |
| Forest Guard | 235 | 185 |
| | 314 | 265 |

Against the sanctioned strength of 314 personnel only approximately 84% (265 persons) are currently in position, the heaviest casualties being in Forest Guards (who are the main executive staff in the Project), with nearly 22% of the posts lying vacant.

The study was conducted on a sample of officials (44 FGs, 06 Foresters, 17 SDOs, 8 DFOs/ACF and 3 CFs) who have attended all the courses of the training package developed by HCFP (**Table 2**). The sample consists of officials as detailed in **Annexures 1,2,3,4, and 5**. **Annexure 6** lists the two untrained (in JFM) officials of HFD while **Annexure 7** gives the names of villages/VRMCs, for obtaining a feedback on the work in the villages and the officials. Summary details are given below and in **Table 4**.

- Forest Guards (44 Nos) (Annexure 1)
- Foresters/Deputy Rangers (6 Nos) (Annexure 2)
- All Sub Divisional Forest Officers (17 Nos) (Annexure 3)
- All Divisional Forest Officers/Assistant Conservator of Forests (8 Nos) (Annexure 4)
- All Conservators of Forests (3 Nos) (Annexure 5).

- Two untrained (in JFM) officials of HFD to serve as **Control** (Annexure 6).
- Project villages/VRMCs for obtaining a feedback on the work of the sample officials (Annexure 7).

Table 4: Summary Details of Respondents

| S No | | Forest Guard | Forester/ DR | SDO | DFO/ ACF | CF | Total |
|------|----------------------------|----------------------------|--------------|-----------|----------|----------|-----------|
| 1. | Operational | 30 | 5 | 13 | 5 | 2 | 55 |
| 2. | ITC | 7 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 12 |
| 3. | M & E | 7 | - | 2 | 1 | | 11 |
| | Total | 44 | 6 | 17 | 8 | 3 | 78 |
| 4. | Control (Untrained) | - | 2 | - | - | - | |
| 5. | Field observation | VRMC/villagers in villages | | | | | |
| 6. | VRMC/Villagers for opinion | Discussions | | | | | |

7.5 Sampling and Methodology

Having identified the training courses for this study, initial discussions were held with the Project Director and the Project Manager with a view to seek their suggestions with regard to sampling of officials, approval of various formats to be used for the study and the procedure to be followed.

- The assignment started with a review of relevant documents including data on pre-training and post-training knowledge of participants who attended various training courses;
- A review of training manuals prepared for different stages of community development, by HCFP, to list the issues covered in these manuals related to the courses mentioned earlier;
- Random selection of 50 Foresters, and FGs from the list of trained officials available with HCFP. No sampling was necessary in case of SDOs, DFOs, and CFs as all of them are included in the Study.
- Structured formats showing particulars of randomly selected officials who attended the training were designed. **(Annexure 1 to 5)**.
- Two officials of the Department who were not trained in JFM were selected at random as Control. **(Annexure 6)**

- Two villages (**Annexure 7**) where these sample officials had worked were selected at random to get a feed back from these villages (their VRMCs/ villagers) regarding the work done in these villages and the concerned officials (Knowledge/Attitudinal Changes/Practice/ Participation).
- This was followed by structured questionnaires drawn up for various categories of sample staff to be filled by them (**Annexure 8 to 13**).
- Making logistics arrangements for field tasks (meetings, interviews etc) in consultation with HCFP authorities. The concerned officials, Villages/VRMCs were informed about these meetings and interviews.

The next phase of assessment was concerned with field tasks (discussions, meetings, interviews etc). The following assessment tasks were undertaken during this period.

- All sample officials were requested to give a brief presentation on the courses attended by them with their views/comments in the context of:
 - **Knowledge** gained - what did they learn and unlearn?
 - **Attitudinal** changes that may have come about in them - have they been sensitised, motivated and oriented towards PRM?
 - The extent to which learning in the classroom is being **practised** in the field to elicit community participation and have a participatory approach.
 - Their personal **participation** in various activities of the Programme – how has this training affected them personally?
 - How **effective** has the training been in their task of eliciting people's participation and make the Programme a success?
- After their presentations all sample officials were interviewed in detail through structured formats and checklists referred to earlier (**Annexure 8 to 12**) to assess their depth of knowledge about PRM, attitudinal changes that have come about in them, their practising what they have learnt, their personal participation and effectiveness of training.
- Sample officials were observed in the field, both individually and collectively, while they are undertaking different activities like, VE, PA, Microplanning, etc. to get a feedback of their knowledge about PRM, attitudinal changes, practice, personal participation and the process.

- Two sample villages included in the Project were visited to get a feed back from their VRMCs/villagers regarding the work done in the villages with regard to PRM Programme and the work of the officials having worked there **(Knowledge/Attitudinal Changes/Practice/ Participation)**.
- Discussions were held with **two Control officials** (not trained in JFM) **(Annexure 13)** mainly to know the difference between trained and untrained officials. Would these officials like to be trained and how would it help them in the discharge of their duties.

8.0 DISCUSSIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

It has already been mentioned earlier that training has a significant place in the overall framework of the Project and envisages that necessary changes be brought about in **Knowledge, Attitude, and Practice** of the personnel of the Project staff as also the villagers. Various training programmes have helped to improve the knowledge, awareness and skill of the respondents in general, though there are differences in the way in which the respondents have gained from these training programmes based on their age, educational background, interest, frequent transfers, changes in community Forestry staff and position in the hierarchy of the Department. There are, however, substantial differences between those who have been trained in Community Forestry and those who have not.

8.1 The Approach

HCFP, being based on an entirely different approach to the management of land-based resources (both forest and non-forest) requires its personnel to not only perform a different set of tasks, but also to even think and act differently. *This reorientation is not possible without an understanding and appreciation of the philosophy and principles of PRM. Capacity building* measures to be undertaken as part of the Project have, therefore, to aim at developing an understanding of *sociological and institutional issues in forestry and allied disciplines* in the realm of *rural development*, across abroad. This will form the foundation of the learning process for the staff and thereby also govern Project sustainability.

Community capacity building to sustain project interventions and undertake natural resource as well as community development is a cornerstone for the HCFP, in line with its objective to develop *community capacity* and *capability*. A variety of programmes are organised by the project, including formation of community institutions such as VRMC; training of community members; exposure visits; participatory planning, implementation and monitoring etc.

Different capability areas for the community have been identified under the project to prepare the local institution to take over the responsibility of natural resource management and maintenance and management of assets developed under the project. The focus of various programmes including training is to develop these capabilities. The community/VRMC capability is annually evaluated under the Project and could also be taken as an indirect indicator of the effectiveness of the processes adopted for strengthening the capabilities.

8.2 Age

The age of sample Forests Guards (44 Nos) varies from 25 to 53 years on the operational side, 37 to 44 years for ITC and 31 to 55 years for M&E. The following age groups have, therefore, been recognised.

1. 20 – 25 years
2. 26 – 30 years
3. 31 – 35 years
4. 36 – 40 years
5. 41 – 45 years
6. 46 – 50 years
7. 51 – 55 years

The bulk (82.27%) of the sample Forest Guards (23 Nos) are in the age group of 41 to 50 years with 25% (12 Nos) being between 41 to 45 years and 27.27% in 46 to 50 years. This is followed by age group 31 to 40 years (29.54%) which includes 13 Forest Guards (**Table 5**).

Table 5: Age Groups of Forest Guards

| S. No | Age Group (years) | No. of Forest Guards | Percentage (%) |
|-------|-------------------|----------------------|----------------|
| 1. | 50 and above | 5 | 11.36 |
| 2. | 46 to 50 | 12 | 27.27 |
| 3. | 41 to 45 | 11 | 25.00 |
| 4. | 36 to 40 | 9 | 20.45 |
| 5. | 31 to 35 | 4 | 9.09 |
| 6. | 26 to 30 | 2 | 4.54 |
| 7. | 20 to 25 | 1 | 2.27 |
| | | 44 | |

There are five (11.36%) Forest Guards in age group 50 years and above and 6.81% (3) between 20 to 30 years.

The youngest Forest Guard (25 years) is working in the operational area of the Project. There are two Forest Guards, 55 and 53 years working on M&E and operations of the Project.

Of the total number of sample Forest Guards there are six Forest Guards below the age of 35 years and 16 below the age of 40 years. The majority of sample Forest Guards (30 Nos.) in the operational side of the Project are in the age group of 25 to 53 years. There are only six (6) Forest Guards below the age of 35 years and two Forest Guards of 53 and 55 years of age. Seven Forest Guards each, of ITC and M&E, are in the age group of 37 to 44 years and 31 – 55 years respectively.

Of the six Foresters/Deputy Rangers (**Table 6**) included in the sample, four (66.66%) are 50 years and above in age while two (33.32%) are between 41 to 50 years. The age of these Foresters/Deputy Rangers varied between 45 to 55 years. There are only two Foresters in their forties with 45 (OP) and 47 years (ITC) age.

Table 6: Age Groups of Foresters

| S. No | Age Group (years) | No. of Foresters | Percentage (%) |
|-------|-------------------|------------------|----------------|
| 1. | 50 and above | 4 | 66.66 |
| 2. | 46 to 50 | 1 | 16.66 |
| 3. | 41 to 45 | 1 | 16.66 |
| | | 6 | |

There are 17 SDOs in the Project; their ages varying from 43 to 55 years on the operational side, 48 to 54 years for M&E and two SDOs of ITC are in the age group of 50 years and above (**Table 7**).

Table 7: Age Groups of Sub-Divisional Forest Officers (SDOs).

| S. No | Age Group (years) | No. of SDOs | Percentage (%) |
|-------|-------------------|-------------|----------------|
| 1. | 50 and above | 9 | 57.14 |
| 2. | 46 to 50 | 6 | 35.71 |
| 3. | 41 to 45 | 2 | 7.15 |
| | | 17 | |

The majority of SDOs (8 Nos) (57.14%) are above the age of 50 years while five (35.71%) are in the age group of 46 to 50 years. There is only one SDO aged 44 years. Both the SDOs in ITC are in the age group of 50 years and above, while the two SDOs in M&E are 48 and 54 years of age.

There are in all seven Divisional Forest Officers and one Assistant Conservator of Forests (Ext) in the Project and their ages range from 41 to 55 years (**Table 8**) on the operational side, with two DFOs aged 33 years and 54 years for M&E and ITC. The youngest DFO is 33 years old posted in M&E.

Table 8: Age Groups of Divisional Forest Officers (DFOs).

| S. No | Age Group (years) | No. of SDOs | Percentage (%) |
|-------|-------------------|--------------|----------------|
| 1. | 50 and above | 2 | 25.0 |
| 2. | 46 to 50 | -- | -- |
| 3. | 41 to 45 | 3 | 37.5 |
| 4. | 36 to 40 | 2 | 25.0 |
| 5. | 31 to 35 | 1 | 12.5 |
| | | 8 Nos | |

The bulk of DFOs (62.5%) are in the age group of 36 to 45 years with two DFOs (25%) 50 years and above.

8.3 Qualifications

The position with regard to the educational background of Forest Guards is given in **(Table 9)**. Bulk of the Forest Guards, (29 constituting 65.9%) are Matriculates, four (9.1%) are graduates with one Forest Guard having a B.Ed. degree. There are 3 post-graduates (6.8%) with one having a B.Ed degree. Three (6.8%) Forest Guards have passed 10+2; one is an intermediate and one pre-engineering. The balance of three (6.8%), have studied up to B.A. First year (1) or Second year (2).

Table 9: Educational Qualification of Forest Guards

| S. No | Educational Qualification | No. of Forest Guards | Percentage (%) |
|-------|----------------------------|----------------------|----------------|
| 1. | Matriculation | 29 | 65.9 |
| 2. | 10+2 | 3 | 6.8 |
| 3. | Intermediate | 1 | 2.3 |
| 4. | Pre-Engineering | 1 | 2.3 |
| 5. | B.A | 3 | 6.8 |
| 6. | B.A., B.Ed | 1 | 2.3 |
| 7. | M.A | 2 | 4.5 |
| 8. | M.A, B.Ed | 1 | 2.3 |
| 9. | B.A (1 st year) | 1 | 2.3 |
| 10. | B.A (2 nd year) | 2 | 4.5 |
| | | 44 Nos | |

As regards Foresters **(Table 10)**, of the total six, three (50%) are Matriculates one is an intermediate, one has studied up to B.A (1st year) and one is a Middle pass.

Table 10: Educational Qualification of Foresters

| S. No | Educational Qualification | No. of Foresters | Percentage (%) |
|-------|----------------------------|------------------|----------------|
| 1. | Middle Pass | 1 | 16.6 |
| 2. | Matric | 3 | 50.0 |
| 3. | Intermediate | 1 | 16.6 |
| 4. | B.A (1 st year) | 1 | 16.6 |
| | | 6 | |

Of the 17 SDOs, a large majority (82.33%) are either science (7) or arts graduates (4) with three post-graduates (17.64%). There are three matriculates (17.64%) among the existing SDOs **(Table 11)**. One of the science graduates has also a degree in education.

Table 11: Educational Qualifications of Sub Divisional Forest Officers

| S. No | Educational Qualification | No. of SDOs | Percentage (%) |
|-------|---------------------------|-------------|----------------|
| 1. | Matriculation | 3 | 17.64 |
| 2. | B.A. | 4 | 23.52 |
| 3. | B.Sc | 6 | 35.29 |
| 4. | B.Sc, B.Ed. | 1 | 5.88 |
| 5. | M.Sc | 3 | 17.64 |
| | | 17 | |

Amongst the Divisional Forest Officer (8 Nos) four are postgraduates (50%) with one of them holding a Masters Degree in Business Administration (MBA). There are three persons (37.5%) who hold a Science degree (B.Sc) and one Officer (12.5%) has a Master of Engineering degree (**Table 12**).

Table 12: Educational Qualifications of Divisional Forest Officers

| S. No | Educational Qualification | No. of DFOs | Percentage (%) |
|-------|---------------------------|-------------|----------------|
| 1. | B.Sc | 3 | 37.5 |
| 2. | M.Sc | 3 | 37.5 |
| 3. | M.Sc, MBA | 1 | 12.5 |
| 4. | B.E, M.E | 1 | 12.5 |
| | | 8 | |

All the Forest Guards engaged in the HCFP are professionally trained having undergone six months' training course for Forest Guards conducted regularly by the Department. The same is the case with Foresters/Deputy Rangers who are trained in a nine months training course after their recruitment. Out of the 6 sample Foresters four are trained as Foresters while two are trained as Forest Guards.

All Sub-Divisional Forest Officers are promoted Range Officers, they being trained at of the Rangers' Colleges in the country for a period of two years.

Deputy Conservator of Forests/Divisional Forest Officers are either directly recruited as Assistant Conservator of Forests in the Indian Forest Service or promoted from Range Officers. After recruitment the direct recruits are trained at the Indian Forest Academy, Dehra Dun for a period of 3 years after which they are allotted to different states.

All the implementation staff has been trained in Joint Forest Management in batches, to facilitate their working in the Project.

8.4 Training Assessment

Training assessment of the respondents was started by requesting all of them to give a brief presentation on the courses attended by them with their views/comments in the context of **knowledge** gained, **attitudinal changes** that have come about in them as a result of training, how much of classroom training is being, **practised** by them in the field and what is their personal **participation** in various activities of the Programme. This was followed by interviewing each official in detail through structured formats, referred to earlier, to assess their depth of Knowledge about PRM, attitudinal changes that may have come about in them, their practising what they have learnt, their personal participation and effectiveness of the training.

Thereafter the respondents were observed in the field while they were undertaking various activities like VE, PA, Microplanning etc to get a feedback about their **knowledge, attitude and practice**. In the process two randomly selected villages were visited to get a feedback from their VRMCs/villagers regarding the work done in the villages and the work of the respondents who had worked there. Finally meetings/discussions were held with two officials of the HFD (Control Officials), who were not trained in JFM mainly to know the difference between trained and untrained officials.

With a view to assign a rank to a respondent, the officials were graded from 1 to 10 with regard to **knowledge, attitude, practice** and **participation** on the basis of their presentations. No such distinction was made with regard to grading for interviews, fieldwork and VRMCs. Finally each participant was allotted an overall grade as a result total efforts made put in by him.

The above method of assessment was followed in case of all sample FGs, Foresters and Sub-Divisional Forest Officers, as they are the main operational staff the Project.

The results of this exercise are given in Annexure **14** (FGs), **15** (Foresters) and **16** (SDOs) for individual officials and a summary is presented in **Tables 13** (FGs), **14** (Foresters) and **15** (SDOs). The scores from 1 to 10 mentioned above have the meaning assigned to them, as follows.

| | | |
|-----|---|---------------|
| 10 | - | Excellent |
| 8,9 | - | Very good |
| 6,7 | - | Good |
| 5 | - | Average |
| 4 | - | Below Average |

Some of the salient features of the inferences drawn (as indicated in **Tables 13, 14 and 15**) are as follows.

8.4.1 Forest Guards

Most of the FG trainees (25 or 56.81%) are average as far as their **knowledge** gained is concerned though 22.71% are good and 18.17% (8) are very good. There is only one FG who is below average, with regard to extent of knowledge acquired about concept, process and programme of PRM as a result of attending the said training courses (**Table 13**). The position is somewhat similar with regard to **attitudinal** changes that may have come about in respondents - they have been sensitised, motivated and oriented towards PRM.

The results for **Practice** are almost the same as far knowledge in that a large proportion of trainees practice what they have learnt in the training courses to elicit people's cooperation and have a participatory approach. They are very sympathetic and cooperative to community participation and PRM Programme. With regard to **Participation** the results are the same as for Practice. The respondents involve themselves/ participate personally in various activities/Programmes of HCFP.

There were nine respondents (18.17%) who did very well (very good) in the **interview**, followed by 8 trainees (20.45%) who were good. They had good depth of knowledge and some attitudinal changes have come in them. Bulk of the FG (56.81%) were average and 2 respondents (4.34%) were rather poor (below average) in interview.

A good proportion of FGs (18.18%) were very good in **field work**, followed by 10 trainees (22.72%) who were good in the field. The bulk of the trainees (52.27%), however, were average in their field duties. Three trainers (6.81%) were below the mark in the field.

With regard to **VRMCs**, eight respondents (18.17%) were very good to see that the VRMC functions and become self reliant with financial sustainability. This was followed by 13 FGs (29.54%) who were good in their work as far as VRMCs are concerned. Bulk of the FGs (22 or 50%) were average in their work while one (2.27%) was below average. More details for VRMCs are given in **Para 8.5**.

As regards assigning an overall grade based on the total work of the FGs, 8 persons (18.17%) were rated as very good, 13 as good (29.54%) and the bulk of trainees (50%) as average, while one (2.27%) was below average.

8.4.2 Foresters

Among the Foresters, two trainees each, (**Table 14**) (33.33%) were good and below average as far as the extent of **knowledge** acquired about concept, process and programme of PRM were concerned. One respondent, each, were average and very good. As regards **attitudinal changes** that have come about in the respondents, they have been sensitised, motivated and oriented towards PRM. Of the trainees three (50%) are below average, while two (33.33%) are good and one (16.66%) is very good.

Table 13: Training Assessment of Forest Guards

| Presentation | | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------|-----------|-----------------------|---------------------|-----------|-----------------------|---------------------|-----------|-----------------------|---------------------------|-----------|-----------------------|
| Knowledge (K) | | | Attitude (A) | | | Practice (P) | | | Participation (PT) | | |
| Grade | No | Percentage (%) | Grade | No | Percentage (%) | Grade | No | Percentage (%) | Grade | No | Percentage (%) |
| 4 | 1 | 2.27 | 4 | 1 | 2.27 | 4 | 1 | 2.27 | 4 | 1 | 2.27 |
| 5 | 25 | 56.81 | 5 | 25 | 56.81 | 5 | 25 | 56.81 | 5 | 25 | 56.81 |
| 6 | 7 | 15.90 | 6 | 7 | 15.90 | 6 | 7 | 15.90 | 6 | 7 | 15.90 |
| 7 | 3 | 6.81 | 7 | 3 | 6.81 | 7 | 3 | 6.81 | 7 | 3 | 6.81 |
| 8 | 7 | 15.90 | 8 | 7 | 15.90 | 8 | 7 | 15.90 | 8 | 7 | 15.90 |
| 9 | 1 | 2.27 | 9 | 1 | 2.27 | 9 | 1 | 2.27 | 9 | 1 | 2.27 |
| Total | 44 | 99.96 | Total | 44 | 99.96 | Total | 44 | 99.96 | Total | 44 | 99.96 |
| Interview | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Interview | | | Field work | | | VRMC | | | Overall | | |
| Grade | No | Percentage (%) | Grade | No | Percentage (%) | Grade | No | Percentage (%) | Grade | No | Percentage (%) |
| 4 | 2 | 4.54 | 4 | 3 | 6.81 | 4 | 1 | 2.27 | 4 | 1 | 2.27 |
| 5 | 25 | 56.81 | 5 | 23 | 52.27 | 5 | 22 | 50.00 | 5 | 22 | 50.00 |
| 6 | 5 | 11.36 | 6 | 8 | 18.18 | 6 | 9 | 20.45 | 6 | 9 | 20.45 |
| 7 | 4 | 9.09 | 7 | 2 | 4.54 | 7 | 4 | 9.09 | 7 | 4 | 9.09 |
| 8 | 7 | 15.90 | 8 | 8 | 18.18 | 8 | 7 | 15.90 | 8 | 7 | 15.90 |
| 9 | 1 | 2.27 | | | | 9 | 1 | 2.27 | 9 | 1 | 2.27 |
| Total | 44 | 99.97 | Total | 44 | 99.98 | Total | 44 | 99.98 | Total | 44 | 99.98 |

Grades:

- 10 - Excellent
- 8,9 - Very good
- 6,7 - Good
- 5 - Average
- 4 - Below Average

Table 14: Training Assessment of Foresters

| Presentation | | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------|-----------|-----------------------|---------------------|-----------|-----------------------|---------------------|-----------|-----------------------|---------------------------|-----------|-----------------------|
| Knowledge (K) | | | Attitude (A) | | | Practice (P) | | | Participation (PT) | | |
| Grade | No | Percentage (%) | Grade | No | Percentage (%) | Grade | No | Percentage (%) | Grade | No | Percentage (%) |
| 4 | 2 | 33.33 | 4 | 3 | 50.0 | 4 | 3 | 50.0 | 4 | 3 | 50.0 |
| 5 | 1 | 16.66 | 6 | 2 | 33.33 | 6 | 2 | 33.33 | 6 | 2 | 33.33 |
| 6 | 2 | 33.33 | 8 | 1 | 16.66 | 8 | 1 | 16.66 | 8 | 1 | 16.66 |
| 8 | 1 | 16.66 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Total | 6 | 99.96 | Total | 6 | 99.99 | Total | 6 | 99.99 | Total | 6 | 99.99 |
| Interview | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Interview | | | Field work | | | VRMC | | | Overall | | |
| Grade | No | Percentage (%) | Grade | No | Percentage (%) | Grade | No | Percentage (%) | Grade | No | Percentage (%) |
| 4 | 1 | 16.66 | 4 | 1 | 16.66 | 4 | 1 | 16.66 | 4 | 2 | 33.33 |
| 5 | 2 | 33.33 | 5 | 2 | 33.33 | 5 | 2 | 33.33 | 5 | 1 | 16.66 |
| 6 | 2 | 33.33 | 6 | 2 | 33.33 | 6 | 2 | 33.33 | 6 | 2 | 33.33 |
| 8 | 1 | 16.66 | 8 | 1 | 16.66 | 8 | 1 | 16.66 | 9 | 1 | 16.66 |
| Total | 6 | 99.98 | Total | 6 | 99.98 | Total | 6 | 99.98 | Total | 6 | 99.98 |

Grades:

- 10 - Excellent
- 8,9 - Very good
- 6,7 - Good
- 5 - Average
- 4 - Below Average

The results of **Practice** and **Participation** are somewhat similar to attitude. Three trainees (50%) are below average, 2 (33.33%) good and one trainee (16.66%) is very good. The training has affected the trainees personally in that they participate in the various activities of the Programme. The learning in the classroom is being practised in the field to have a participatory approach and get community participation.

The sample officials after their presentation were **interviewed** in detail through structured formats to assess their depth of knowledge about PRM and the attitudinal changes that may have come about, their personal participation, their practising what they have learnt and effectiveness of training. Of the six respondents two each (33.33%) were good and average, while one each (16.66%) was very good and below average.

The results of the **fieldwork** were somewhat similar to that of personal interview.

With regard to **VRMC**, two respondents each (33.33%) were good and average while one was very good, to see that the VRMC could be self reliant with financial stability. One of the trainees (16.66%) was below average while the other one was very good. More details about VRMC are given in **Para 8.5**.

The overall grade assigned to the trainees based on their total work was: Two persons each, (33.33%) were rated as good and below average, and one each, (16.66%) was rated as very good and average.

8.4.3 Sub Divisional Forest Officers

Most of the respondents (62.50%) among the SDOs (**Table 15**) were good to very good with regard to **knowledge** acquired about concept, process and programme of PRM by attending the said courses. There were 5 (31.25%) SDOs who were average, while one (6.25%), was below average. The same results were obtained with regard to **attitude** with nine candidates as good, one as very good, five (31.25%) as average and one below average. The staff in general was sensitised, motivated and oriented towards PRM along with attitudinal changes in favour of the community.

As far as **practising** in the field is concerned, what all was learnt in the classroom to elicit community participation and have a participatory approach, majority of the respondents (8) were good (50.0%) while five (31.25%) were average. There was one trainee each (6.25%) rated as very good, good and below average.

The personal **participation** of majority SDOs (9) (56.25%) in various activities of the programme was good, while one (6.25%) was very good. Five respondents were average (31.25%), while one (6.25%) was below average.

Table 15: Training Assessment of Sub Divisional Forest Officers

| Presentation | | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------|-----------|-----------------------|---------------------|-----------|-----------------------|---------------------|-----------|-----------------------|---------------------------|-----------|-----------------------|
| Knowledge (K) | | | Attitude (A) | | | Practice (P) | | | Participation (PT) | | |
| Grade | No | Percentage (%) | Grade | No | Percentage (%) | Grade | No | Percentage (%) | Grade | No | Percentage (%) |
| 4 | 1 | 6.25 | 4 | 1 | 6.25 | 4 | 1 | 6.25 | 4 | 1 | 6.25 |
| 5 | 5 | 31.25 | 5 | 5 | 31.25 | 5 | 5 | 31.25 | 5 | 5 | 31.25 |
| 6 | 7 | 43.75 | 6 | 7 | 43.75 | 6 | 8 | 50.0 | 6 | 7 | 43.75 |
| 7 | 2 | 12.50 | 7 | 2 | 12.50 | 7 | 1 | 6.25 | 7 | 2 | 12.50 |
| 8 | 1 | 6.25 | 8 | 1 | 6.25 | 8 | 1 | 6.25 | 8 | 1 | 6.25 |
| Total | 16 | | Total | 16 | | Total | 16 | | Total | 16 | |
| Interview | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Interview | | | Field work | | | VRMC | | | Overall | | |
| Grade | No | Percentage (%) | Grade | No | Percentage (%) | Grade | No | Percentage (%) | Grade | No | Percentage (%) |
| 4 | 1 | 6.25 | 4 | 1 | 6.25 | 4 | 1 | 6.25 | 4 | 1 | 6.25 |
| 5 | 4 | 25.0 | 5 | 5 | 31.25 | 5 | 5 | 31.25 | 5 | 5 | 31.25 |
| 6 | 7 | 43.75 | 6 | 7 | 43.75 | 6 | 7 | 43.75 | 6 | 8 | 50.0 |
| 7 | 2 | 12.50 | 7 | 2 | 12.50 | 7 | 2 | 12.50 | 7 | 1 | 6.25 |
| 8 | 1 | 6.25 | 8 | 1 | 6.25 | 8 | 1 | 6.25 | 8 | 1 | 6.25 |
| Total | 16 | | Total | 16 | | Total | 16 | | Total | 16 | |

Grades:

- 10 - Excellent
- 8, 9 - Very good
- 6, 7 - Good
- 5 - Average
- 4 - Below Average

In order to assess their depth of knowledge about PRM and the changes that may have come in their attitude, their personal participation, their practising what has been learnt and the effectiveness of the training courses, all the sixteen SDOs were **interviewed**. The results indicate that nine respondents (56.25%) were good, one (6.25%) was very good, while 4 (25.0%) were average, and one was below average.

The results of the **fieldwork** show that nearly all the officers are good to very good in the field except for one officer who is below average. One of the officers was very good.

The results of **VRMC** indicate that nearly 15 officers were average to very good to see that the VRMC functions and becomes self reliant with financial sustainability. Ten officers were rated good to very good in their VRMC work, though five of them were average (31.25%). One person (8.25%) was below average. More details about the VRMCs are given in **Para 8.5**.

In order to assign an overall grade based on the work of the SDOs in totality, 9 persons (56.25%) are rated as good, one person as very good and five persons (31.25%) as average. There was only one person (6.25%) below average.

During the interview, the respondents (mostly Foresters and Forest Guards) have made certain suggestions, which the Project may look into. Some of these are really useful and should be adopted.

1. A large majority of the respondents from Foresters and Forest Guards (80%) have suggested that the Project should make arrangements for refresher courses at regular intervals. These courses are necessary because of their age.
2. There is need for more fieldwork and practical training in the courses.
3. VRMCs need guidance and help (both financial and otherwise) after the project is over. There should be help given to VRMCs even after the Project closes, otherwise the whole effort will be lost.
4. The time period of the training should be increased, because nothing much can be achieved in such a short time as one week.
5. Some audio-visual aids (like video cassettes etc) should be used during teaching. They would be very useful.
6. Foresters and Forest Guards should change places between operations, ITC and M&E Branches. In fact this should be applicable at higher levels as well.
7. The respondents should be given a briefing about community Forestry/HCFP so that they know what exactly they are supposed to do which is different from the regular forestry operations. They are to promote forestry as an integral part of the process of participatory development of the village communities with a view to ensure self sustaining efforts of the local people to preserve environmental heritage and enhance economic advancement. The project has the distinctive feature of empowering villagers with the capacity and capabilities of planning and executing their development programmes aiming at ecological soundness and economic strength through a fruitful participation of the government agencies.

8.5 Village Resource Management Committees

A Village Resource Management Committee (VRMC) is constituted and promoted under the HCFP of HFD and registered as a Sub-Committee of the village *Panchayat* which is responsible for managing common lands vested in it and for promoting social and farm forestry, minor forest produce (MFP), and fuel and fodder plantations of the village. The *Panchayat* appoints a Sub-Committee namely the Village Resource Management Committee (VRMC) under Section 22(V) of the Haryana Panchayati Raj Act, 1994, for planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of forestry and other associated village development activities. The details of a VRMC are given in **Annexures 17 and 18**.

The total number of VRMCs operating in the Project area is 288 (Batches 1 to 5 villages; up to March 2004), which are operational to different degrees though some of them are doing well as is evident from the activities in some of the villages, as follows.

Mehuwala Village

The VRMC persuaded an encroacher to vacate the land, so that a *Chetna Kendra* could be constructed. The Committee arranged for a ladies toilet and a boundary wall to be built. The VRMC is cleaning the village streets, engaging youth, giving awards to the best students and getting a tree planted by any officer visiting the village.

Kheri (Panchkula) Village

The *Chetna Kendra* is used as a clinic for weekly free medical check-ups, and for training of women in stitching and tailoring. The VRMC has arranged for a boundary wall to be constructed around the building.

Bodla Village

The VRMC has contributed Rs. 120,000 for land levelling, construction of a boundary wall around the *Chetna Kendra*, and construction of a veranda.

Matersham Village

A villager, who had destroyed 20 trees, was fined by VRMC ordering him to water at least 100 seedlings, which he readily accepted.

Dhingsara Village

Pisciculture was initiated by VRMC in the *Johad* rehabilitated by the Project, with all rules and regulations in place.

Garwa Village

The VRMC, along with a SHG, arranged a cleanliness drive in the village.

Kheri (Jatusana) Village

Initially, the animal owning community resisted all plantations, fearing that animals would have no place to graze. VRMC was able to convince the community and has now given graziers first priority to collect fodder from the woodlot.

Bhauratwala Village

Twigs and branches from thinning and pruning in the woodlot were collected by the VRMC and a collective decision was taken to give these to needy families of the *Harijan* community.

Bhattuwala Village

The VRMC has established one ha orchard inside the woodlot; teachers and students sharing responsibility for its protection. Salary of the woodlot watchmen is paid by the VRMC and a local contractor. The VRMC has also arranged for training in stitching for 25 women in *Chetna Kendra*.

Tarkanwali Village

Two years survival incentive money received by farmers has unanimously been given to the VRMC, to be utilised for village development.

Mandoli Khurd Village

Value of grass collected from the woodlot, managed by the VRMC, amounts to around Rs. one million (Rs. 1,000,000/-) during 2003.

Shahzadwala Village

The VRMC convinced the farmers to contribute their survival bonuse, as matching grant, towards a Rs. 1,000,000/- budget grant for the construction of a drinking water tubewell.

Ganganpur Village

The VRMC is involved in digging of a *Johad* to be used for fish culture. The *Johad* is excavated on community wasteland. VRMC is managing as well as funding this Project.

Binjalpur Village

VRMC persuaded the *Panchayat* to give one acre of land to the three SHGs in the village, for cultivation of medicinal herbs.

Lisan Village

The villagers and the *Panchayat* contributed labour and money for construction of a road to the school. At the instance of the VRMC, all villagers contributed their survival bonus to build the main gate to the school.

Kaimbwala Village

The VRMC has, within a year, collected membership fees three times and now has a fund of Rs. 31,000/-. The *Chetna Kendra* is extensively used, and the VRMC persuaded the *Panchayat* to add a veranda to it.

Chaharwala Village

A poor man was caught grazing his goats in the woodlot. As a fine he was told to water the plantation for seven days and plant a tree, which he complied with.

Dhanunda Village

The VRMC sent a copy of the village microplan to the Development Commissioner in Chandigarh, and received grants for development of the *Johad*. In the village.

Baldhan Kalan Village

The VRMC has been involved in maintenance of the village pond, construction of four *dharamshalas*, etc.

Makho Sorani Village

The VRMC is enforcing strictly rules for protection of plantation and has collected Rs. 12,000 as fine for the damage caused, using the money to construct a common meeting place. The VRMC also assists the *Panchayat* in development activities.

Bhattuwala Village

VRMC members decided to take active part in the anti-polio campaign, personally bringing children to the polio camp at the *Chetna Kendra*.

Jhanjhara Toda/Sheoran Village

The VRMC has taken initiatives to level the school yard, to enforce banning of liquor and hunting, to arrange water for common land, to arrange dairy loans, etc.

Basra Village

Unable to get assistance from the canal authorities, every household in the village provided labour to dig a drain from the canal to the *Johad*.

Nahrana Village

The VRMC plays an active mediation role in village conflicts.

Shekhupur Dharauli Village

Four general microprojects of the microplan have been implemented through VRMC initiative; cleaning street drainage channels, digging two ponds, maintaining the animal creation ground and construction of common toilets for women.

Gawar Village

The VRMC has taken the initiative to get a village doctor, to fill teacher vacancies and has supervised construction of a village drain.

Dhigawa Shamvan Village

The VRMC has been involved in cleaning of paths, provision of drinking water for school children, a tubewell on common land and has collected Rs. 26,000/- for construction of a common meeting place.

Sambhalkha Village

VRMC has taken the initiative to implement six general microprojects of the microplan – a school boundary wall, *dharamshala* repair, upgrading village streets, drinking water taps, a crematorium and a veterinary dispensary. The VRMC is trying hard to remove common land encroachments. The female Link Worker has started literacy training of illiterate women.

Capability assessments of 234 VRMCs of the first four batches of villages (few from the fifth batch as well) have been carried out by Project Staff with the help of Consultants and the TA Team. This exercise includes self-evaluation by VRMCs assessed. Peer evaluation of VRMC capabilities by Link Workers or by members of other VRMCs was also introduced in 24 villages on a pilot basis. For this purpose, nine key Capacity Indicators were assessed, namely: (1) Managing Village Information (2) Village Resource Planning (3) Conflict Resolution (4) VRMC Management (5) Resource

Mobilisation (6) Community Resource Monitoring (7) Natural Resource Protection and Rehabilitation (8) Supporting Disadvantaged (9) Knowledge and skill sharing. The results show that there is a trend of continued steady improvement in the VRMCs capabilities over the years though many weaknesses remain to be redressed, through intensified efforts and more training. It is also indicated that VRMCs of the first three batches of villages moved from “weak” to “moderate” to “good” for each indicator over a year. Combining the nine indicators to an Overall Capacity Index shows that 60% of these VRMCs are moderate or good with 40% still weak.

A major weakness of the VRMCs is their lack of financial sustainability. The Project will have to consider an augmented contribution to RMF in addition to the present standard of Rs. 30,000/- per VRMC, for villages with larger plantations on common lands, to ensure proper management of these resources after they are handed over to the community. In fact, the Project has during the current financial year paid augmented contribution to the RMF at Rs. 500/- per ha of woodlots greater than 10 ha besides the fixed amount of Rs. 30,000/- per VRMC. Further, RMF has been paid to 59 new VRMCs this year in addition to 138 villages during the previous three years.

Putting together, the three assessment exercises, it is indicated that five out of nine Key Capacity Indicators need special attention, if the VRMCs are to become sustainable within the Village institutional matrix of Haryana in the long term. These indicators are: (1) Ability to access or mobilise financial resources, (2) Ability to plan village resources management unassisted, (3) Ability to support disadvantaged groups in the village, (4) Ability to manage village information, and (5) Ability to share knowledge and skills amongst the community at large. VRMC Capabilities need to be further strengthened through intensified efforts of Project staff, refresher training courses, workshops, study tours etc.

It is therefore, suggested that:

- Refresher training of VRMCs, Link Workers, and MMT (PME) teams should continue until VRMCs are considered mature enough to operate independently. This period may (and will) extend beyond the Project period.
- This refresher training would also include the operational staff needed to rectify the weak VRMC Capabilities suggested in the Capacity Assessments.
- There has to be a policy on benefit sharing of income from harvested woodlots or any other income between *Panchayat* and VRMC which should be notarised to all concerned.

There is a great need to prepare a State Policy Paper related to VRMCs and their ability to access funds from the harvest of woodlots in villages, for them to become self-sufficient financially and to enable them to carry out protection and management activities in all woodlots in their village. The Project should also work for an apex institution for VRMCs.

8.6 Sample Villages

Two sample villages namely Tabar and Hangola, of community Forestry Division Ambala, were selected randomly for a visit to get a feed back from their VRMCs/villagers regarding the work of the officials having worked there (knowledge /Attitudinal changes/Practice/Participation) and the work done in the village. The two villages were visited on November 09, 2004 with prior intimation to all the villagers and VRMC members, for discussions, with the following results.

Village Tabar

Eight people had assembled for the meeting, which included the Pradhan of VRMC, one (women) Panch, one Ex-Panch, one VRMC member, three villagers and one Forest Guard, HCFP.

The Committee had a bank balance of **Rs. 52,368/-** (as of date). The account was opened on **January 23, 2001** and started with **Rs. 1,400/-** (all incentive money). There are 46 ha of plantations in the village and they still have to get **Rs 23,000/-** as incentive money for these plantations (**Rs. 500 x 46 = 23,000/-**). The membership fee of **Rs 10/-** per family has been collected only once at the beginning but never again.

The Committee (VRMC) has introduced improved *Chulhas* as they feel that they have a future. The villagers do not allow their cattle to graze in plantations, but allow grass cutting. They also do not allow burning of village plantations.

The village doctor has been changed as he went abroad.

VRMC holds a meeting every month. It is suggested that the date of the meeting be fixed once and the meeting should generally be held on that date in the evening. Women are attending the VRMC meetings.

The Committee is very active and is doing well. They do not allow any grazing but allow grass cutting and give money for planting material to the villagers.

The VRMC has spent some money on office furniture. They propose to sell grass and intend investing the money on fixing an idol in the temple. While these expenses may be justified, expenditure should be made on developmental works of the village for public good.

Village Hangola

Ten people had assembled for the meeting, which included the Pradhan of VRMC, one woman Vice President, three VRMC members (one female), four villagers and one Forest Guard, HCFP.

The Committee had a Post Office balance of **Rs. 1,36,568/-** (as of date) (all woodlot money). There has been no expenditure out of these funds. The account was opened

on **March 13, 2001** and started with **Rs. 1,100/-** (membership fees). The membership fee of **Rs. 10/-** per family has been collected only once at the beginning but never again. Nobody is interested in paying this membership fee.

The Committee has introduced improved *Chulhas* and IGAs, mostly vermi composting.

VRMC is holding meetings of the Committee at different times. It is suggested that the date of the meeting be fixed once and the meetings generally held on that date in the evening. Women should also attend the VRMC meeting.

The VRMC has distributed farm forestry money to the farmers twice; **Rs. 16,000/-** and **Rs 34,000/-** respectively. There is a general feeling among the villagers that VRMC should be independent of the *Panchayat*, because they have some land. This needs to be investigated.

The village has a doctor. The position of the *Chetna Kendra* is very bad, and it is being misused. This needs to be looked into. The VRMC is in bad shape. Members of the VRMC do not seem to attend the meetings. Basically the VRMC has too many members. Not much poplar is being planted in this area because of sandy soil.

8.7 Control Officials

A meeting was held on November 09, 2004 with two officials of the Haryana Forest Department, no trained in JFM, (Control Officials), mainly to know the difference between officials trained in JFM and untrained officials of the Project. It was also held to ascertain if these officials would like to get trained in Community Forestry (participatory approach to natural resource management) and how it would help them in the discharge of their duties of officials maintained by the HFD. A structured format (**Annexure 13**) was drafted for these control officials, which they filled at the time of interview. The particulars of these officials and the results of the discussions with them are given hereafter:

1. Rohtas Birthal

Name : Rohtas Birthal

Designation : Range Officer, Raipur Rani Range, Morni Division.

Age : 34 years

Education : B.Sc

Professional Qualification : Ranger training from Northern Forest Rangers College (NFRC), Dehra Dun

Date of Joining HFD: 1996

This official has not undergone any other in-service training besides the two years at NFRC, Dehra Dun.

He does not seem to know much about community Forestry Project, Haryana except for what he has heard from others in the Department in that some plantations are being raised in the Project on private and Common lands and construction of some earthen dams. To a specific question as to whether he would like the HFD to follow a participatory approach to natural resource management, he said to “*some extent*” though he was not sure. He was aware of some community Forestry terms like VE, EPA, PA, Microplanning and Microproject formulation, though he did not actually know how these are conducted. He had learnt about these from other colleagues in the Department.

He would himself like to get trained in Community Forestry/participatory approach to natural resource management. He would also like to work in the Project as he feels that participatory approach is the only way to make forestry sustainable in Haryana.

2. Rakesh Kumar

Name : Rakesh Kumar

Designation : Forester, Pinjore Range, Morni Pinjore Division

Age : 39 years

Education : B.A (II year)

Professional Qualification : Foresters training from Foresters School Pinjore

Date of Joining HFD: June 1983

The official had no other in-service training after passing out of the Forest School, Pinjore, except a three days workshop on Dams in 1995-96. He was posted in HCFP at Raipur Rani for a period of four months in 1999. Consequently he knew a little about the Project - about making societies and their work. He also had some idea about participatory approach to natural resource management, in that the concerned people are consulted and their suggestions are taken into account. He feels that the participatory approach followed in the Project should be followed in HFD as a matter of policy. He was aware of some stages of community development like VE, EPA, PA, Microplanning and Microproject formulation, though he actually is not able to do these things.

He would himself like to join the Project and get trained in community Forestry/participatory approach to natural resource management. He would also like to

work in the Project, as he is of the opinion that the only way to make forestry sustainable in Haryana, participation of the people is a must. VRMCs have a big role in this.

8.8 Issues and Concerns

Some of the major issues and concerns that have arisen during the currency of the Project and need to be remedied, are as follows.

While all the Project staff are making efforts to make the Project a success, there is lack of the needed interest and motivation in majority of staff in participatory approach for community forestry development, as is evident from Table 13, 14 and 15 on training assessment, where nearly 60% of FGs, 33% of Foresters and 25-30% of SDOs have been assigned an Average grade. As a result, there is slow progress all round the Project.

The slow progress towards the establishment of self-reliant and sustainable VRMCs is an issue of constant concern. This would mean that once the Project comes to an end, the VRMC in a village will cease to function as an effective village institution. It would further mean that after harvesting the plantations, the VRMCs will not be able to replant areas without outside funding and assistance, leading to lower tree cover in common lands causing an overall decline of tree cover in the State.

It is also doubtful, while the Project is moving forward at present, whether the current Project activities would be carried forward, post-Project.

The new SHGs remain fragile and there is need for constant guidance and support if they are to become sustainable enterprise entities after the Project is over.

There is poor quality of field reporting from some divisions in terms of tardiness, incomplete data and inaccuracy.

There is need for refresher courses for Project trainers under ITC and operational staff in order to help weak VRMCs to develop their capabilities. In fact, refresher training of VRMCs, Link workers and other should continue till they are considered "mature".

The policy on benefit sharing of income from harvested woodlots between *Panchayats* and VRMCs needs to be institutionalised and notarised to all *Panchayats*

Refresher training courses are needed for field staff (Forest Guard to SDO) in PA and Microplan for writing such reports.

There is low survival for multi-species farm forestry (MSFF) and kitchen gardens in most villages and most farmers especially in arid and semi-arid zones. The bonus system for MSFF has now been restructured to emphasise the benefits of good initial pitting and planting.

There is shortage of common land for new village woodlots (Kurukshetra Division). The number of Project villages has to be increased above 300 (targeted) to achieve the area target.

Senior Officers in the Project should exercise a better check on the work of their subordinates; see that all records are properly kept and that they correlate with their own records with regard to Project inputs and outputs. They should accept the need for more decision-making at village level in order to further motivate FGs and Foresters, as well as VRMCs and other village stakeholders.

Assistance by short-term consultants to aid adoption of participatory processes, e.g. PA/Microplanning and the annual VRMC capacity assessments, to be continued.

Finally, there is an urgent need for the creation of a WING on community Forestry, within the Forest Department in Haryana to deal with all *Panchayat*, common and community lands etc, which are otherwise lying barren but could be used for raising forest crops to make them economically viable and environmentally useful. This is particularly important in states, which have a small area under forest cover like Haryana (3.51%), Punjab (6.07%), Bihar (6.45%), Delhi (5.73%) etc. Community forestry assumes great importance both economically and environmentally, in such forest deficient states. The officials in the Forest Department cannot attend to these lands, as it requires personnel to not only perform a different set of tasks, but also even to think and act differently. This reorientation is not possible without an understanding of the principles of PRM. The personnel in Community Forestry have to develop an understanding of sociological and institutional issues in forestry and allied disciplines in the realm of rural development, across board, in line with the objectives of developing community capacity and capability.

It is, therefore, time that the HCFP should work out the details of such a proposal in this regard and put up to Government of Haryana for approval.

Bibliography

1. Anonymous (1994). Indian's initiatives in implementation of the forest principles. Ministry of Environment and Forests, Government of India. New Delhi
2. Anonymous (1999). Haryana Community Forestry Project – An Overview – Haryana Forest Department, Panchkula.
3. Anonymous (1999a). Principles and criteria for forest management – Pocket Guide. Forest Stewardship Council U.S., Washington DC, USA.
4. Anonymous (2000) Microplanning and Micro-project Formulation, Community Forestry Working Paper 4. Haryana Community Forestry Project, Haryana Forest Department, Panchkula.

5. Anonymous (2000a) Participatory Assessment. Community Forestry Working Paper 3. Haryana Community Forestry Project, Haryana Forest Department, Panchkula.
6. Anonymous (2000b) Village Entry, Community Forestry Working Paper 2. Haryana Community Forestry Project, Haryana Forest Department, Panchkula.
7. Anonymous (2002). State of Forest Report 2001. Forest Survey of India, Dehra Dun.
8. Anonymous (2003). Haryana Community Forestry Project. Annual Progress Report – Project Year 4 (April 2002 to March 2003). HCFP, Panchkula.
9. Anonymous (2004). Haryana Community Forestry Project. Annual Progress Report – Project Year 5 (April 2003 – March 2004). HCFP, Panchkula
10. Banthia, J K (2001) census of India 2001, services – 1, India Provisional population totals, Paper – I of 2001. Registrar General and Census Commissioner, India.
11. Billing David (2001). Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation. Haryana Community Forestry Project, Haryana Forest Department, Panchkula.
12. CIFOR (Centre for International Forestry Research) (2003). Forests and people – Research that makes a difference. CIFOR, Jakarta, Indonesia.
13. CIFOR (2004). Science for Forests and people – CIFOR Annual Report 2003. CIFOR, Jakarta, Indonesia.
14. Grewal. S.S. and S.K. Dhar (2004) Community participation in water resources management (under preparation).
15. Kaul, O. N. (2003). Evaluation of afforestation project undertaken by Forest Development Agency, Budgam, during 2000 – 2003 under SGVSY. National Afforestation and Eco-Development Board, Ministry of Environment and Forests, Government of India, New Delhi
16. Kaul, O. N., B. N. Dwivedi, Rajshree Kantkar and Vishwanath Shah (1994). Promoting community participation for forestry development in Haryana – Final Report (1992 – 93). Submitted to FAO of UN. Tata Energy Research Institute. New Delhi.
17. Kumar, Nalini, Naresh Saxena, Yogindar Alagh and Kinsuk Mitra (2000). India – Alleviating poverty through forest development. The World Bank, Washington DC.

18. Lynch, Owner J. and Kirk Talbott (1995). Balancing acts: Community based forest management and national law in Asia and the Pacific. World Resources Institute, Washington. DC. USA.
19. Passi, Santosh (2003). Impact of the training on Knowledge Attitude and Practices – An assessment report prepared for HCFP. SAMVAYA, New Delhi.
20. Ray, Savitri, (2000). Training manual on Gender Sensitisation, Haryana Community Forestry Project, Haryana Forest Department, Panchkula.
21. Rawat, J.K. and Rajnesh (2000). Participatory approach in Indian forestry in historical perspective. Indian Forester, **126 (5)**.

SAMPLE FOREST GUARDS

| S. No | Name | Division | Age (Years) | Educational Qualifications | Professional Qualifications | JFM Training (No. of Courses attended) | Date of Joining HFD | Date of Joining HCFP | Remarks |
|-------|-----------------|-----------------|-------------|----------------------------|-----------------------------|--|---------------------|----------------------|---------|
| 1 | Gordhan Lal | Ambala (OP) | 50 | Matric | Trained as Forest Guard | All the 6 courses attended | July, 1991 | December 1999 | |
| 2 | Surender Shukla | | 48 | B.A, B.Ed | Trained as Forest Guard | All the 6 courses attended | 1985-86 | June 2000 | |
| 3 | Shashi Pal | | 38 | Matric | Trained as Forest Guard | All the 6 courses attended | July, 1985 | January 2000 | |
| 4 | Jagir Singh | | 53 | 10+2 | Trained as Forest Guard | All the 6 courses attended | December 04, 1978 | 1999 | |
| 5 | Hans Raj | | 40 | B.A (II year) | Trained as Forest Guard | All the 6 courses attended | May 1991 | November 1999 | |
| 6 | Nirmal Singh | | 45 | 10 th (Prep) | Trained as Forest Guard | All the 6 courses attended | April 01, 1977 | 1999 | |
| 7 | Desh Raj | Kurushetra (OP) | 49 | Matric | Trained as Forest Guard | All the 6 courses attended | February 23, 1979 | July 1999 | |
| 8 | Sarwan Kumar | | 48 | Matric | Trained as Forest Guard | All the 6 courses attended | May 30, 1978 | August 1999 | |
| 9 | Ashok Kumar | | 48 | Matric | Trained as Forest Guard | All the 6 courses attended | December 1981 | August 2000 | |
| 10 | Pritam Singh | | 48 | Matric | Trained as Forest Guard | All the 6 courses attended | January 21, 1977 | July 1999 | |
| 11 | Bushan Kumar | Hisar (OP) | 46 | Matric | Trained as Forest Guard | All the 6 courses attended | December 17, 1976 | July 2000 | |
| 12 | Jai Singh | | 49 | Matric | Trained as Forest Guard | All the 6 courses attended | July 07, 1991 | June 2000 | |
| 13 | Sita Ram | | 41 | Matric | Trained as Forest Guard | All the 6 courses attended | January 26, 1980 | July 2000 | |
| 14 | Baljeet Singh | | 34 | Matric | Trained as Forest Guard | All the 6 courses attended | August 01, 1984 | August 2000 | |

| S. No | Name | Division | Age (Yeas) | Educational Qualifications | Professional Qualifications | JFM Training (No. of Courses attended) | Date of joining HFD | Date of Joining HCFP | Remarks |
|-------|----------------|---------------|------------|----------------------------|-----------------------------|--|---------------------|----------------------|---------|
| 15 | Wazir Singh | Hisar (OP) | 47 | B.A | Trained as Forest Guard | All the 6 courses attended | April 03, 1978 | January 17, 2000 | |
| 16 | Om Prakash | | 49 | M.A | Trained as Forest Guard | All the 6 courses attended | November 18, 1978 | 2000 | |
| 17 | Mahabir Prasad | | 43 | B.A., Part- I | Trained as Forest Guard | All the 6 courses attended | August 1980 | 2001-02 | |
| 18 | Inder Singh | | 36 | Pre-Engineering | Trained as Forest Guard | All the 6 courses attended | November 14, 1984 | July 2000 | |
| 19 | Bansi Lal | | 25 | 10+2 | Trained as Forest Guard | All the 6 courses attended | April 30, 1993 | April 1999 | |
| 20 | Ram Ji Lal | | 50 | Matric | Trained as Forest Guard | All the 6 courses attended | September 06, 1978 | December 1999 | |
| 21 | Baljeet Singh | Bhiwani (OP) | 37 | M.A, B. Ed | Trained as Forest Guard | All the 6 courses attended | September 17, 1991 | May 1999 | |
| 22 | Shri Niwas | | 51 | Matric | Trained as Forest Guard | All the 6 courses attended | July 1979 | August 2001 | |
| 23 | Rajesh Kumar | | 29 | Matric | Trained as Forest Guard | All the 6 courses attended | May 15, 1996 | Aug 1999 | |
| 24 | Bijander Singh | | 39 | Matric | Trained as Forest Guard | All the 6 courses attended | December 05, 1983 | August 01, 2002 | |
| 25 | Dilbag Singh | | 46 | Matric | Trained as Forest Guard | All the 6 courses attended | December 14, 1981 | August 2001 | |
| 26 | Lal Singh – I | Jatusana (OP) | 45 | Matric | Trained as Forest Guard | All the 6 courses attended | May 27, 1977 | April 21, 1999 | |
| 27 | Somvir Singh | | 33 | 10+2 | Trained as Forest Guard | All the 6 courses attended | July 17, 1985 | August 1999 | |
| 28 | Ishwar Singh | | 28 | B.A., Part – II | Trained as Forest Guard | All the 6 courses attended | December 03, 1993 | October 1999 | |
| 29 | Dalip Singh | | 31 | Intermediate | Trained as Forest Guard | All the 6 courses attended | December 1993 | 1999 | |

| S. No | Name | Division | Age (Yeas) | Educational Qualifications | Professional Qualification | JFM Training (No. of Courses attended) | Date of joining HFD | Date of Joining HC FP | Remarks |
|-------|------------------|---------------|------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|--|---------------------|-----------------------|---------|
| 30 | Jaswant Singh | Jatusana (OP) | 48 | M.A | Trained as Forest Guard | All the 6 courses attended | January 11, 1979 | October 1999 | |
| 31 | Bhag Chand | Hissar (ITC) | 44 | Matric | Trained as Forest Guard | All the 6 courses attended | October 10, 1978 | October 2000 | |
| 32 | Chandan Singh | | 37 | Matric | Trained as Forest Guard | All the 6 courses attended | April 29, 1983 | 1999 | |
| 33 | Surjeet Singh | | 44 | Matric | Trained as Forest Guard | All the 6 courses attended | October 25, 1978 | July 1999 | |
| 34 | Ved Prakash | | 43 | Matric | Trained as Forest Guard | All the 6 courses attended | June 24, 1994 | April 2000 | |
| 35 | Satish Kumar | | 39 | Matric | Trained as Forest Guard | All the 6 courses attended | July 30, 1982 | 2000 | |
| 36 | Umed Singh Saini | | 49 | Matric | Trained as Forest Guard | All the 6 courses attended | May 02, 1978 | October 10, 2000 | |
| 37 | Jagbir Singh | Ambala (M&E) | 41 | B.A | Trained as Forest Guard | All the 6 courses attended | October 25, 1997 | 1998 | |
| 38 | Sajjan Singh | | 39 | Matric | Trained as Forest Guard | All the 6 courses attended | April 18, 1981 | 1999 | |
| 39 | Chander Bhan | | 31 | Matric | Trained as Forest Guard | All the 6 courses attended | December 1993 | July 2001 | |
| 40 | Naresh Kumar | | 37 | Matric | Trained as Forest Guard | All the 6 courses attended | March 01, 1993 | July 2001 | |
| 41 | Ravider Kumar | | 41 | B.A | Trained as Forest Guard | All the 6 courses attended | December 06, 1982 | October 2000 | |

| S. No | Name | Division | Age (Yeas) | Educational Qualifications | Professional Qualifications | JFM Training (No. of Courses attended) | Date of joining HFD | Date of Joining HCFP | Remarks |
|-------|----------------|--------------|------------|----------------------------|-----------------------------|--|---------------------|----------------------|---------|
| 42 | Ved Prakash | Ambala (M&E) | 44 | Matric | Trained as Forest Guard | All the 6 courses attended | June 19, 1991 | May 08, 2001 | |
| 43 | Chet Ram | | 55 | Matric | Trained as Forest Guard | All the 6 courses attended | March 1977 | 2001 (?) | |
| 44 | Rajinder Singh | Hissar (ITC) | 44 | Matric | Trained as Forest Guard | All the 6 courses attended | June 20, 1991 | May 20, 2001 | |

Note: OP - Operational
M&E - Monitoring and Evaluation
ITC - Information, Training and communication

JFM Courses:

1. Project Induction
2. Village Entry
3. Participatory Assessment
4. Microplanning and Microproject Formulation
5. Participatory Monitoring & Evaluation
6. Gender Sensitisation

SAMPLE FORESTERS

| S. No | Name | Division | Age (Years) | Educational Qualifications | Professional Qualifications | JFM Training (No. of Courses attended) | Date of joining HFD | Date of Joining HCFP | Remarks |
|-------|-----------------------|------------------|-------------|----------------------------|---|---|---------------------|----------------------|---------|
| 1 | Surender Kumar | Ambala (OP) | 50 | B.A. Part I | Trained Forest Guard and Trained Forester | All the 6 courses attended Gender sensitisation Course attended twice | November 02, 1977 | August 04, 1999 | |
| 2 | Raghubir Singh | Kurukshetra (OP) | 55 | Matric | Trained Forester | 5 courses attended not attended PME Course | August 27, 1970 | October 2000 | |
| 3 | Ram Kumar Jangra | Hissar (OP) | 45 | Matric | Trained Forester (1984-85) | All the 6 courses attended | November 20, 1979 | September 04, 2000 | |
| 4 | Om Prakash Malik | Bhiwani (OP) | 55 | F.A. | Trained Forest Guard | 5 courses attended PA Course not attended. | November 21, 1971 | August 2001 | |
| 5 | Ram Kumar | Jatusana (OP) | 55 | Middle Pass | Trained Forest Guard | 5 courses attended not attended PME Course | August 11, 1971 | September 2000 | |
| 6 | Jagdish Chander Saini | Hissar (ITC) | 47 | Matric | Trained Forester | All the courses attended | January 20, 1983 | September 2000 | |

Note: OP - Operational
ITC - Information, Training and communication

JFM Courses:

1. Project Induction
2. Village Entry
3. Participatory Assessment
4. Microplanning and Microproject Formulation
5. Participatory Monitoring & Evaluation
6. Gender Sensitisation

SUB DIVISIONAL FOREST OFFICERS

| S. No | Name | Circle | Age (Years) | Educational Qualifications | Professional Qualifications | JFM Training (No. of Courses attended) | Date of joining HFD | Date of Joining HCFP | Remarks |
|-------|-------------------------------|-------------------|-------------|----------------------------|-----------------------------|--|---------------------|------------------------------|---------|
| 1 | Sh. Ram Sawroop, HFS | Hissar (ITC) | 54 | Graduate | DDR | All Six Courses | 03-03-76 | 23-10-02 | |
| 2 | Sh. I.P. Singh, HFS | Kurukshetra (ITC) | 52 | B.SC | DDR Refresher Course | Three Courses | 05-03-74 | 18-10-03 | |
| 3 | Sh. Hari Krishen Phaugat, HFS | Kurukshetra (M&E) | 48 | B.A | ? | One Course | 26-06-79 | 21-10-03 | |
| 4 | Sh. Radhey Shyam, HFS | Fatehabad (OP) | 52 | B.SC | DDR | Four Courses | 01-04-82 | 22-12-99 | |
| 5 | Sh. Parma Nand, HFS | Hissar (OP) | 50 | B.A | Dy. Ranger | Five Courses | 26-02-79 | Aug. 2001 | |
| 6 | Sh. Jagjit Singh, HFS | Nahar (OP) | 55 | Matric | Dy. Ranger | All Courses | 07-12-73 | 16-07-99 | |
| 7 | Sh. O.P. Kajla, HFS | Siwani (OP) | 46 | B.SC | One year (NFRC) | All Courses | April, 1981 | Aug. 1999 | |
| 8 | Sh. R.K. Chug, HFS | Sirsa (OP) | 44 | B.SC | DDR | Four Courses | 01-06-82 | 21-11-99 | |
| 9 | Sh. S.K. Wasan, HFS | Kanina (OP) | 51 | Matric | Forester Course | All Six Courses | 19-11-76 | 16-07-99 | |
| 10 | Sh. Uma Shankar, HFS | Bhiwani (OP) | 49 | B.A | 2 Yrs Forester Course | One Course | 24-04-77 | 24-02-02 | |
| 11 | Sh. Bhagwan Singh, HFS | Jatusana (OP) | 51 | B.SC, B.Ed | DDR | One Course | 01-03-75 | Nov. 2002 | |
| 12 | Sh. Jagpal Singh | Ambala (OP) | 52 | Matric | Forester trained | One Course | 23-10-69 | 05-07-04 | |
| 13 | Sh. Satbir Singh Kadiyan, HFS | Panchkula (OP) | 48 | B.SC | ? | Four Courses | 01-04-82 | June 2002 | |
| 14 | Sh. Naresh Kumar Malik | Yamuna Nagar (OP) | 46 | M.SC | DDR | Two Courses | 02-07-84 | 25-11-99 | |
| 15 | Sh. Satbir Singh Sheorau | Loharu (OP) | 47 | B.Sc | DDR | All Courses | 07-04-1984 | Aug. 1999 | |
| 16 | Sh. O.P. Dalal HFS | Bhiwani (M&E) | 54 | M.Sc | DDR | All Courses | 1976 | Nov. 1999 to Aug. 2000 | |
| 17 | Sh. Raj Kumar Jangra | Kurukshetra (OP) | 43 | M.Sc (Agri) | DDR | All Courses | 01-06-1984 | Feb. 2004 | |

Note: HCFP - Haryana Community Forestry Project
 OP - Operational
 M&E - Monitoring and Evaluation
 ITC - Information Training and communication

JFM Courses:

1. Project Induction
2. Village Entry
3. Participatory Assessment
4. Microplanning and Microproject Formulation
5. Participatory Monitoring & Evaluation
6. Gender Sensitisation

DIVISIONAL FOREST OFFICERS / ASSISTANT CONSERVATOR OF FORESTS

| S. No | Name | Circle | Age (Years) | Educational Qualifications | Professional Qualifications | JFM Training (No. of Courses attended) | Date of joining HFD | Date of Joining HCFP | Remarks |
|-------|----------------------------|------------------|-------------|----------------------------|-----------------------------|--|---------------------|----------------------|---------|
| 1 | Sh. Rajesh Gulia, HFS | Ambala (OP) | 45 | B.SC (AG) | DDR | All the six courses | April 1981 | July 2000 | |
| 2 | Sh. S.K. Goyal, IFS | Kurukshetra (OP) | 55 | B.SC | DDR | One course (Gender) | 04-04-1973 | 14-07-2000 | |
| 3 | Sh. Jagdish Chander, IFS | Hissar (OP) | 38 | M.SC | AIFC | None | 15-07-1990 | 01-08-2002 | |
| 4 | Sh. M.S. Malik, IFS | Bhiwani (OP) | 39 | M.SC, MBA | AIFC | One course (Gender) | April 1986 | August 2001 | |
| 5 | Sh. V.S. Tanwar, IFS | Jatusana (OP) | 41 | BE, ME | AIFC | All the six courses | 06-07-1987 | 29-07-2001 | |
| 6 | Sh. T.C. Sihag, HFS | Hisar (ITC) | 54 | B.SC | DDR | None | 01-03-1975 | 18-11-1999 | |
| 7 | Sh. S. Narayana, IFS | Ambala (M& E) | 33 | M.SC | AIFC | None | 02-06-1999 | 01-06-2000 | |
| 8 | Sh. R.K. Sharma, HFS (ACF) | Panchkula (Ext) | 42 | M.SC | DDR | All the six courses | 02-03-1981 | July 1999 | |

Note:

| | | | | | |
|------|---|---|------|---|--|
| HCFP | - | Haryana Community Forestry Project | AIFC | - | Associate of the Indian Forest College |
| AIFC | - | Associate of the Indian Forest Collage | DDR | - | Forest Rangers training from Ranger College, Dehra Dun |
| OP | - | Operational | IFS | - | Indian Forest Service |
| M&E | - | Monitoring and Evaluation | HFS | - | Haryana Forest Service |
| ITC | - | Information, Training and communication | | | |

JFM Courses:

1. Project Induction
2. Village Entry
3. Participatory Assessment
4. Microplanning and Microproject Formulation
5. Participatory Monitoring & Evaluation
6. Gender Sensitisation

CONSERVATORS OF FORESTS

| S. No | Name | Circle | Age (Years) | Educational Qualifications | Professional Qualifications | Date of joining HFD | Date of Joining HCFP | Remarks |
|-------|-------------------------|---------------------|-------------|----------------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------|--|---|
| 1 | Sh. K.S. Chauhan, IFS | Panchkula (ITC/M&E) | 48 | M.SC | AIFC | 16-05-1983 | 25-02-99 | |
| 2. | Sh. Rupinder Singh, IFS | Ambala (OP) | 47 | M.SC | AIFC | 21-05-1984 | 03- 05-1999 To 24-05-1999 24-07- 2000 To 27-08- 2001 14-01-2002 to date | |
| 3. | Sh. R.P. Balwan, IFS | Hissar (OP) | 47 | M.SC | AIFC | 21-05-1984 | 1999 | Transferred recently to Hissar Territorial Circle |
| | | | | | | | | |

Note: IFS - Indian Forest Service
HCFP - Haryana Community Forestry Project
AIFC - Associate of the Indian Forest Collage
OP - Operational
M&E - Monitoring and Evaluation
ITC - Information, Training and communication
HFD - Haryana Forest Department

JFM Courses:

1. Project Induction
2. Village Entry
3. Participatory Assessment
4. Microplanning and Microproject Formulation
5. Participatory Monitoring & Evaluation
6. Gender Sensitisation

Annexure 6**CONTROL OFFICIALS (Not trained in JFM)**

| S. No | Name | Division | Age (Years) | Educational Qualifications | Professional Qualifications | Present appointment | Date of joining the HFD | Remarks |
|-------|----------------|---------------|-------------|----------------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------|-------------------------|---------|
| 1 | Rohtas Birthal | Morni-Pinjore | 34 | B.Sc | DDR | Ranger Officer | 1996 | |
| 2 | Rakesh Kumar | Morni-Pinjor | 39 | B.A (II Yearar) | Forester Trained | Forester | 1983 | |

Note: HFD - Haryana Forest Department
DDR - Forest Ranger trained from Northern Forest Rangers College, Dehra Dun

SAMPLE PROJECT VILLAGES

| S. No | Name of villages | Circle | Remarks |
|-------|------------------|-----------------|---------|
| 1. | TABAR | Ambala Division | |
| 2. | HANGOLA | Ambala Division | |

Annexure 8
FORESTER/FOREST GUARD (OP)

IMPACT ASSESSMENT OF STAFF TRAINING PROGRAMMES UNDER HARYANA COMMUNITY FORESTRY PROJECT (HCFP)

(A) PERSONAL PROFILE

1. Name: _____
2. Designation: (*Forester/Forest Guard*) _____
3. Division: _____
4. Sub Division: _____
5. Age: (*Years*) _____
6. Educational qualifications: _____
7. Date of Joining the Haryana Forest Department (HFD): _____
8. Are you a trained (*Forester/Forest Guard*)? (YES/NO)
If Yes:
 - From where did you have this training: _____
 - Indicate the period of training: _____
9. Date of Joining Haryana Community Forestry Project (HCFP): _____
10. Where have you been posted in HCFP after your joining the Project?

11. Which villages have you worked in the Project and how long in each village?

12. Which village/s are you working at present? _____
13. What was/is the exact nature of your job/jobs you have been doing?

14. Do you live in the village of your posting? (YES/NO)
15. During your tenure with the HCFP, did you undergo any training courses organised by the Project. If yes, name those courses.
 1. _____
 2. _____
 3. _____
 4. _____
 5. _____
 6. _____

16. Which of the following training courses organised by the HCFP have you attended? Tick (√) the courses attended.

- | | |
|---|--------------------------|
| 1. Project Induction | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 2. Village Entry | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 3. Participatory Assessment | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 4. Microplanning and Microproject Formulation | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 5. Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 6. Gender Sensitisation | <input type="checkbox"/> |

17. Training attended according to HCFP records:

- | | |
|---|--------------------------|
| 1. Project Induction | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 2. Village Entry | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 3. Participatory Assessment | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 4. Microplanning and Microproject Formulation | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 5. Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 6. Gender Sensitisation | <input type="checkbox"/> |

18. Have you undergone any other training, (other than those mentioned at S. No. 8, 15, and 16)? (YES/NO)

If yes, please indicate the following:

- Name of training: _____
- Dates/duration of training: _____
- Subject of training: _____

(B) TRAINING (GENERAL)

19. Give a brief resume of HCFP training courses attended by you. Comment on the training in general and give your assessment of the training as:

- | | | | |
|-----------|--------------------------|-----------|--------------------------|
| Excellent | <input type="checkbox"/> | Poor | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Good | <input type="checkbox"/> | Very poor | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Average | <input type="checkbox"/> | | |

20. Have these training courses been helpful to you in your work in HCFP? Tick (√) one of the following

- | | | | |
|-------------------|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|
| Extremely helpful | <input type="checkbox"/> | Partly helpful | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Very helpful | <input type="checkbox"/> | Not at all helpful | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Helpful | <input type="checkbox"/> | | |

21. Do you think that HCFP training you received will be of use to you in the discharge of your duties after you go back to the Department? Tick (√) one of the following

- | | | | |
|------------------|--------------------------|-------------------|--------------------------|
| Extremely useful | <input type="checkbox"/> | Partly useful | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Very useful | <input type="checkbox"/> | Not at all useful | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Useful | <input type="checkbox"/> | | |

22. Would you like to continue working in HCFP? (YES/NO)

23. Of all the HCFP training programmes that you attended, which one did you like the most and why?

24. Name three important things you have learnt from these training courses.

25. What did you like about these training programmes?

26. What did you not like about these training programmes?

27. Do you have any suggestions to improve the training courses and make them more useful and objective with regard to:
- | | |
|---------------------|--------------------------|
| 1. Content | 4. Training material |
| 2. Trainers | 5. Training arrangements |
| 3. Training methods | 6. Others |

(C) PROJECT INDUCTION

28. What is the participatory approach to natural resource management?

29. What are the main objectives of HCFP? _____

30. Who is funding this Project? _____

31. Who are the main stakeholders at the community level in the Project? Tick (√) the correct answer

- Women in general/Schedule Castes and Marginal
- Big farmers
- HFD
- HCFP

32. There are eight components of HCFP. Name these components in order of importance to the Project as perceived by you.

- | | |
|----------|----------|
| 1. _____ | 2. _____ |
| 3. _____ | 4. _____ |
| 5. _____ | 6. _____ |
| 7. _____ | 8. _____ |

33. Do you think that participatory approach adopted in the Project should also be followed in HFD as a matter of policy? (YES/NO)
 If yes, Tick (√) one of the following.
 The participatory approach will help:

- To stop further destruction of forests
- To meet the requirement of large wood based industries
- To promote agro-forestry
- To improve rural Development in the State

(D) VILLAGE ENTRY (VE)

34. Name any two stages of Community Development. _____

35. What is Village Entry (VE)? _____

36. What is the primary objective of VE? _____

37. How do you start conducting VE? _____

38. Is there a Team Leader in VE? (YES/NO)

39. What are Base Maps and Village Resource and Tenure Maps? Why are they made?

40. What is an Entry Point Activity (EPA)? How does it facilitate Village Entry?

41. What EPAs did you assist in implementing in the villages you have worked in? Name the activities.

42. How long should it take to carry out an effective VE exercise in one village?

43. Which of the following statements regarding VE, is correct?
Tick (✓) the correct one.

- Takes too long and should be shortened in length.
- Is not useful and we should go straight to planting trees from the nursery in the common lands.
- Is useful as it gives us good contact and better cooperation with villages in the future.

44. What is Paired – Ranking. What is it used for? _____

45. What would you do if you find that the during VE the villagers in a village are indifferent to your efforts? Tick (✓) one of the following.

- Quit the village for good.
- Wait for sometime and come back to the village after you have completed working in another village.
- Try to build a rapport with the village community along with project publicity and EPA identification and execution.

46. Indicate the following statements as TRUE (T) or FALSE (F)

- Acquisition and review of secondary data is necessary for preparation for VE.
- Having the right attitude to stakeholder participation is not necessary for VE.
- Meetings with key persons of the village are not necessary in VE.
- A village could be rejected for inclusion in HCFP due to non-availability of land for planting.

(E) VRMCs/LINK WORKERS

47. What is a Village Resource Management Committee (VRMC)?

48. Who can be members of VRMC in a village? _____

49. Is there a reservation for membership of VRMC for women, Scheduled Castes and other marginalized communities? (YES/NO).

50. Mention the Office bearers of VRMC by name and designation in the village/s allotted to you.

| <u>Designation</u> | <u>Name</u> |
|--------------------|-------------|
| 1. _____ | _____ |
| 2. _____ | _____ |
| 3. _____ | _____ |
| 4. _____ | _____ |
| 5. _____ | _____ |

51. Are VRMCs registered bodies? (YES/NO).

52. Do you attend the meetings of the VRMC of the village/s allotted to you? (YES/NO)

53. How often do you communicate with the VRMC members (Both General Body and Executive Committee)?

54. The VRMC will be formed at the beginning of the PA exercise. TRUE (T) or FALSE (F).

55. What is the difference between VRMC and VRMS? _____

56. Do you think that the VRMCs can function independently after Project comes to an end? (YES/NO)

57. Have the capabilities of the VRMC been developed to the extent that they can now function independently? (YES/NO)

58. Apart from HCFP plantations, what are the most important development milestones in the villages you are allotted during your tenure? _____

59. What is a tripartite agreement? _____

- Who signs the agreement? _____
- Name four items that should be included in the agreement.

1. _____ 3. _____
2. _____ 4. _____

60. What is Resource Management Fund? Who manages this fund?

61. Who selects a Link Worker and what are his/her duties?

62. Who selected the Link Worker in your village/s?

63. Does a Link Worker get a salary on a monthly basis? (YES/NO).
If yes who pays him? Tick (√) one of the following.

- VRMC
- HCFP
- HFD
- NGO
- *Panchayat*

| |
|--|
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |

64. Why are Link Workers paid so late?

(F) PARTICIPATORY ASSESSMENT (PA)

65. What is Participatory Assessment (PA)? Why is it necessary?

66. What are the pre-requisites for conducting PA?

67. Name any two steps in conducting PA.

68. PA exercises are used: Tick (√) one box.

- To collect data for HCFP
- To improve community participation so that they are more involved in Implementation.
- To train villagers in information gathering for *Panchayat*.
- To carry out research to produce text books.

69. Have you been involved in conducting PA in a village? (YES/NO).

70. How long should it take to complete field work for PA exercise in a village?

71. There are about 18 tools and techniques used for conducting PA. Name any three of them

1. _____ 2. _____
3. _____

72. Indicate the following as TRUE (T) or FALSE (F).

Village Meeting-cum-Discussion is necessary for conducting PA.

Village Historical Time Line as a tool is not used in PA but in Microplanning.

Transect Walk is necessary for conducting PA.

Gender Analysis identifies division of labour between men and women.

73. What do Trend lines as a tool in PA indicate? _____

74. What is a Seasonal Calendar? What does it show? _____

75. What is Problem Identification in PA? _____

76. It does not matter if PA is done before microplanning or microplanning is done before PA, as long as PA is done. (YES/NO)?

77. At the time of PA there is a disagreement in the village between members of the community (Men and Women) regarding planting fuelwood trees and fodder trees. What are your options to solve this indifference?

78. Who is supposed to write a PA report? _____

• Have you written a PA report? (YES/NO)

• Who are supposed to have copies of PA reports? _____

• Do you have a copy of PA report (YES/NO)

(G) MICROPLANNING

79. What is microplanning and what is a microplan? _____

80. Who is supposed to prepare a microplan? Tick (√) one of the following

- VRMC members
- VRMC office bearers
- HCFP Staff
- Whole village
- Others

81. Who actually prepares the microplan? Tick (√) one of the following:

- VRMC
- Link Worker
- Forest Guard
- DFO
- NGO
- Local Consultant

82. Have you ever participated in the preparation of a microplan?

Yes No

83. What shortcuts you have made to complete microplanning in time?

84. Who owns the microplan? _____

85. How much did your training in microplanning help you in participating in the microplanning process? Tick (√) the correct answer.

- Very helpful
- Helpful
- Not helpful

86. Who is supposed to approve the microplan? Tick (✓) the correct one.

Panchayat

VRMC

Gram Sabha

DFO

Project Director

NGO

87. Indicate if the following statements are TRUE (T) or FALSE (F)

- A microplan is a plan for village tree plantations only.
- Focus Group Discussion (FGD) is not a tool in microplanning
- Micro-plan is approved by *Gram Sabha* of VRMC
- Micro-planning is taken up before Participatory Assessment

88. Community development through sustainable management of natural resources is a process with different stages and takes time. Can there be a short cut? (YES/NO)

89. Have you resolved any conflicts in a village in your charge? (YES/NO)
If yes, give a brief account of the same.

(H) MICROPROJECT FORMULATION / IMPLEMENTATION

90. What is the difference between microplanning and microproject formulation?

91. What is the spacing of plantations in:

- Village Woodlots _____
- Sand Dune Fixation Areas _____
- Tree Groves _____
- No. of plants/ha under Farm Forestry _____

92. There is incentive money of Rs. 300/- and Rs. 400/- during the second and third year after planting under Village Woodlots. Who pays this money and to whom is the money paid?

93. What are *Chetna Kendras*? What is a *Chetna Kendra* used for in the village/s you are working in?

94. Is *Chetna Kendra* a microproject? (YES/NO)

(I) GENDER SENSITISATION

95. Who is the NGO supporting Self Help Groups (SHGS) in your village and Sub Division?

96. Are you aware of any Income Generating Activity (IGA) in your village/s? (YES/NO)
- Have you participated in any IGA? (YES/NO)
- If yes, name the IGA _____
97. Do you think women have a role in participatory natural resource management? (YES/NO)
- If so indicate the role they play _____
98. Indicate if the following statements are TRUE (T) or FALSE (F)
- Patriarchy system is an important reason for oppression of women _____
 - Women can do all jobs that men can do _____
 - Raising gender issues does not cause conflict between men and women in a village. _____
 - Men and women behave differently because they are biologically different. _____
99. Can rural men be motivated to change their attitude to women? (Yes / No) _____
- If yes, how can they be motivated? _____
100. Are rural women easy to motivate then rural men? (Yes/No) _____
101. How do rural men feel if you raise gender issues with them? Comment. _____

Annexure 9 A
FORESTER/FOREST GUARD (ITC)

(A) INFORMATION, TRAINING AND COMMUNICATION (ITC)

1. The following factors lead to ineffective communication. TRUE (T) or FALSE (F).

- Game and Group Discussions are mainly for Ice -breaking and do not contribute to learning
- We do not encourage others to talk
- Training messages are best imparted by the Lecture method
- Use vague, general and unfamiliar words
- We do not try to understand villager's perceptions

2. How many *Gram Sabha* / VRMC training programmes have you participated in and what was your role?

3. Which of the following media/methods have you used under the Project for communication (√) and for what purpose?

| <u>Media</u> | <u>Purpose</u> |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|
| 1. Verbal media | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 2. Written media | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 3. Audio-visual media | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 4. Audio media | <input type="checkbox"/> |

4. Name three important purposes of communication in HCFP.

1. _____ 2. _____
3. _____

5. How many of the following methods of training have you used in your training programmes? Tick (√) the ones used:

- | | | | |
|---------------------|--------------------------|---------------------|--------------------------|
| 1. Lecture | <input type="checkbox"/> | 3. Workshop methods | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 2. Group Discussion | <input type="checkbox"/> | 4. Field Trips | <input type="checkbox"/> |

6. What is Training of Trainers (TOT)? Is the Trainer (Resource Person) a key element in TOT? (YES/NO) _____

Annexure 9 B
FORESTER/FOREST GUARD (PME)

(B) PARTICIPATORY MONITORING AND EVALUATION (PME)

1. What is Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation (PME)? Why is it necessary?

2. What do you monitor in PME? _____

3. Have you participated in a PME exercise? (YES/NO)

If yes, give some details of what you did _____

4. How useful has your training in PME been in carrying out your work in the field? Tick (✓) one of the following:

| | | | |
|-------------|--------------------------|---------------|--------------------------|
| Very useful | <input type="checkbox"/> | Partly useful | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Useful | <input type="checkbox"/> | Not Useful | <input type="checkbox"/> |

5. Who are the members of the PME Team in the villages you are working?

6. Name three tools for carrying out PME:
1. _____ 3. _____
2. _____

7. What is a VRMC microproject Log Book? Indicate the headings of one of the logbook sheet.

8. Have you been involved in VRMC Capacity Assessments?
(Yes / No)
If so in how many villages _____

- Why is capacity self-assessment by VRMC members themselves important to community forestry? _____

IMPACT ASSESSMENT OF STAFF TRAINING PROGRAMMES UNDER HARYANA COMMUNITY FORESTRY PROJECT (HCFP)

(A) PERSONAL PROFILE

1. Name: _____
2. Designation: _____
3. Sub Division: _____
4. Division: _____
5. Place of posting: _____
6. Age: (Years) _____
7. Educational qualifications: _____
8. Professional qualification: _____
9. Date of Joining the Haryana Forest Department (HFD): _____
10. Date of Joining Haryana Community Forestry Project (HCFP): _____
11. What is the exact nature of your job?

12. Which of the following training courses organised by the HCFP have you attended? Tick (√) the courses attended.

- | | |
|---|--------------------------|
| 1. Project Induction | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 2. Village Entry | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 3. Participatory Assessment | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 4. Microplanning and Microproject Formulation | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 5. Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 6. Gender Sensitisation | <input type="checkbox"/> |

13. Have you undergone any other training, (other than those mentioned at S. No. 8, and 12)? (YES/NO)

If yes, please indicate the following:

| S. No. | <u>Name of training</u> | Dates/duration of training | Subject of training |
|--------|-------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------|
| 1. | | | |
| 2. | | | |
| 3. | | | |

(B) TRAINING (GENERAL)

14. Give a brief resume of HCFP training courses attended by you. Comment on the training in general and give your assessment of the training as: **Excellent, Good, Average, Poor, Very poor**
15. Have these training courses been helpful to you in your work in HCFP? Tick (√) one of the following

| | | | |
|-------------------|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|
| Extremely helpful | <input type="checkbox"/> | Partly helpful | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Very helpful | <input type="checkbox"/> | Not at all helpful | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Helpful | <input type="checkbox"/> | | |

16. Do you think that HCFP training you received will be of use to you in the discharge of your duties after you go back to other duties in the Department? Tick (✓) one of the following

| | | | |
|------------------|--------------------------|-------------------|--------------------------|
| Extremely useful | <input type="checkbox"/> | Partly useful | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Very useful | <input type="checkbox"/> | Not at all useful | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Useful | <input type="checkbox"/> | | |

17. Would you like to continue working in HCFP? (YES/NO)

18. Of all the HCFP training programmes that you attended, which one did you like the most and why?

19. Name three important things you have learnt from these training courses.

20. What did you like about these training programmes?

21. What did you not like about these training programmes?

22. Do you have any suggestions to improve the training courses and make them more useful and objective with regard to:

- | | |
|---------------------|--------------------------|
| 1. Content | 4. Training material |
| 2. Trainers | 5. Training arrangements |
| 3. Training methods | 6. Others |
- (Please give a detailed note on the subject at the back of this sheet)

(C) PROJECT INDUCTION

23. What is the participatory approach to natural resource management? Do you agree with the participatory approach (Yes/No). If so why.

24. What are the main objectives of HCFP?

25. Who are the main stakeholders at the community level in the Project? Explain.

26. There are eight components of HCFP. Name these components in order of importance to the Project as perceived by you.

- | | |
|----------|----------|
| 1. _____ | 2. _____ |
| 3. _____ | 4. _____ |
| 5. _____ | 6. _____ |
| 7. _____ | 8. _____ |

27. Do you think that participatory approach adopted in the Project should also be followed in HFD as a matter of policy?
(YES/NO)
If yes, give reasons.

(D) VILLAGE ENTRY (VE)

28. What is Village Entry (VE) and what is its primary objective?

29. How do you start conducting VE? _____

30. Who leads the VE Team? _____

31. Why are Base Maps and Village Resource and Tenure Maps made?

32. How does an Entry Point Activity (EPA) facilitate Village Entry?

33. What EPAs have you organized for implementation? Name the activities.

34. How long should it take to carry out an effective VE exercise in one village?

35. Which of the following statements regarding VE, is correct?
Tick (✓) the correct one.

- Takes too long and should be shortened in length.
- Is not useful and we should go straight to planting trees from the nursery in the common lands.
- Is useful as it gives us good contact and better cooperation with villages in the future.

36. What is Paired – Ranking. What is it used for? _____

37. What would you do if you find that the during VE the villagers in a village are indifferent to your efforts? Explain briefly

38. Indicate the following statements as TRUE (T) or FALSE (F)

- Acquisition and review of secondary data is necessary for preparation for VE.
- Having the right attitude to stakeholder participation is not necessary for VE.
- Meetings with key persons of the village are not necessary in VE.
- A village could be rejected for inclusion in HCFP due to non-availability of land for planting.

| |
|--|
| |
| |
| |
| |

39. Who prepares a VE Report? _____

(E) VRMCS/LINK WORKERS

40. **What is the extent of reservation for membership of VRMC for women, Scheduled Castes and other marginalized communities?**

41. Should VRMCs be registered societies under the Registration of Societies Act or a Sub-Committee of the Gram Panchayat? Why?

42. How often do you attend the meetings of the VRMC of the villages under you?

43. How often do you communicate with the VRMC members (Both General Body and Executive Committee)?

44. When should we constitute a VRMC? Before or after PA?

45. What is the difference between VRMC and VRMS?

46. Do you think that the VRMCs can function independently after Project comes to an end? (YES/NO). If the answer is No, why not?

47. Have the capabilities of the VRMC been developed to the extent that they can now function independently? (YES/NO) If the answer is No, Who not?

- How can the capabilities of the VRMC be developed to the extent that they can function independently?

48. Apart from HCFP plantations, what are the most important development milestones in the villages under you during your tenure? _____

49. What is a tripartite agreement?

- Who signs the agreement? _____
- Name four items that should be included in the agreement.

1. _____
2. _____
3. _____
4. _____

50. Who manages the Resource Management Fund (RMF)?

51. Who selects a Link Worker and what are his/her Terms of Reference (TOR)?

52. Why are Link Workers paid very late? _____

(F) PARTICIPATORY ASSESSMENT (PA)

53. Why is Participatory Assessment (PA) necessary?

54. Have you been involved in conducting PA in a village (YES/NO).
55. How long should it take to complete field work for PA exercise in a village?

56. There are about 18 tools and techniques used for conducting PA. Name any three of them
1. _____ 2. _____
3. _____

57. Indicate the following as TRUE (T) or FALSE (F).
- | | |
|--|--------------------------|
| Village Meeting-cum-Discussion is necessary for conducting PA. | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Village Historical Time Line as a tool is not used in PA but in Microplanning. | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Transect Walk is necessary for conducting PA. | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Gender Analysis identifies division of labour between men and women. | <input type="checkbox"/> |

58. What do Trend lines as a tool in PA indicate? _____
59. What is a Seasonal Calendar? What does it show?

60. What is Problem Identification in PA?

61. It does not matter if PA is done before microplanning or microplanning is done before PA, as long as PA is done. (YES/NO)?

62. At the time of PA there is a disagreement in the village between members of the community (Men and Women) regarding planting fuelwood trees and fodder trees. What are your options to resolve this difference of opinion?

63. Who is supposed to write a PA report? _____
- Have you written a PA report? (YES/NO)
 - Who are supposed to have copies of PA reports _____
 - Do you have a copy of PA report (YES/NO)

(G) MICROPLANNING

64. What is microplanning and what is a microplan?

65. Who is supposed to prepare a microplan?

66. Who actually prepares the microplan? _____

67. **How often have you participated in the preparation of a microplan?**

68. What short cuts have you made to complete microplanning in time?

69. Who owns the microplan? _____

70. How much did your training in microplanning help you in participating in the microplanning process?
Tick (✓) the correct answer.

Very helpful

Helpful

Not helpful

| |
|--|
| |
| |
| |

71. Who is supposed to approve the microplan?

72. Community development through sustainable management of natural resources is a process with different stages and takes time. Can there be a short cut? (YES/NO)

73. Have you resolved any conflicts in a village in your charge? (YES/NO)

If yes, give a brief account of the same. _____

(H) MICROPROJECT FORMULATION / IMPLEMENTATION

74. **What is the difference between microplanning and microproject formulation?**

75. Have you written any feasibility studies for microprojects? (YES/NO)

If so, what type of microprojects? (Example). _____

76. **There is Incentive money of Rs. 300/- and Rs. 400/- during the second and third year after planting under Village Woodlots. Has this helped in achieving the objectives of the project? Explain**

77. What are *Chetna Kendras*? What is a *Chetna Kendra* used for in the village/s you are working in?

(I) GENDER SENSITISATION

78. Who is the NGO supporting Self Help Groups (SHGs) in your Sub Division?

79. What Income Generating Activities (IGAs) are going on in the villages in your charge?

- Have you participated in assisting any IGA? (YES/NO)

If yes, name the IGA and the Self Help Group

80. Do you think women have a role in participatory natural resource management? (YES/NO)

If so indicate the role they play _____

(J) INFORMATION, TRAINING AND COMMUNICATION (ITC)

81. The following factors lead to ineffective communication. TRUE (T) or FALSE (F).

- Games and Group Discussions are mainly for ice-breaking and do not contribute to learning
- We do not encourage others to talk
- Training methods are best imported by the Lecture method
- Use vague, general and unfamiliar words
- We do not try to understand villager's perceptions

82. How many *Gram Sabha* meetings/ VRMC training programmes have you participated in and what was your role?

83. Which of the following media/methods have you used under the Project for communication (✓) and for what purpose?

| | <u>Media</u> | | Purpose |
|----|--------------------|--------------------------|---------|
| 1. | Verbal media | <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| 2. | Written media | <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| 3. | Audio-visual media | <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| 4. | Audio media | <input type="checkbox"/> | |

84. Name three important purposes of communication in HCFP.

1. _____ 2. _____
3. _____

85. How many of the following methods of training have you used in your training programmes? Tick (✓) the ones used:

- | | | | |
|---------------------|--------------------------|---------------------|--------------------------|
| 1. Lecture | <input type="checkbox"/> | 3. Workshop methods | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 2. Group Discussion | <input type="checkbox"/> | 4. Field Trips | <input type="checkbox"/> |

86. **What is Training of Trainers (TOT)? Is the Trainer (Resource Person) a key element in TOT? (YES/NO)**

(K) PARTICIPATORY MONITORING AND EVALUATION (PME)

87. What is Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation (PME)? Why is it necessary?

88. **What do you monitor in PME?**

89. Have you participated in a PME exercise? (YES/NO)

If yes, give some details of what you did

90. How useful has your training in PME been in carrying out your work in the field? Tick (✓) one of the following:

Very useful
Useful

Partly useful
Not Useful

91. Name three tools for carrying out PME:

1. _____ 3. _____
2. _____

92. If you agree to participatory approach to forest Management, please give a brief not as to how this can be achieved.

IMPACT ASSESSMENT OF STAFF TRAINING PROGRAMMES UNDER HARYANA COMMUNITY FORESTRY PROJECT (HCFP)

(A) PERSONAL PROFILE

1. Name: _____
2. Designation: _____
3. Division: _____
4. Place of posting: _____
5. Age: (Years) _____
6. Educational qualifications: _____
7. Professional qualification: _____
8. Date of Joining the Haryana Forest Department (HFD): _____
9. Date of Joining Haryana Community Forestry Project (HCFP): _____
10. What is the exact nature of your job?

11. Which of the following training courses organised by the HCFP have you attended? Tick (✓) the courses attended.

- | | |
|---|--|
| 1. Project Induction | |
| 2. Village Entry | |
| 3. Participatory Assessment | |
| 4. Microplanning and Microproject Formulation | |
| 5. Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation | |
| 6. Gender Sensitisation | |

12. Have you undergone any other training, (other than those mentioned at S. No. 7, and 11)? (YES/NO)
If yes, please indicate the following:

| S. No. | <u>Name of training</u> | Dates/duration of training | Subject of training |
|--------|-------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------|
| 1. | | | |
| 2. | | | |
| 3. | | | |

(B) TRAINING (GENERAL)

13. Give a brief resume of HCFP training courses attended by you. Comment on the training in general and give your assessment of the training as: **Excellent, Good, Average, Poor, Very poor**

14. Have these training courses been helpful to you in your work in HCFP? Tick (✓) one of the following

Extremely helpful
Very helpful
Helpful

| |
|--|
| |
| |
| |

Partly helpful
Not at all helpful

| |
|--|
| |
| |

15. Do you think that HCFP training you received will be of use to you in the discharge of your duties after you go back to other duties in the Department? Tick (✓) one of the following

Extremely useful
Very useful
Useful

| |
|--|
| |
| |
| |

Partly useful
Not at all useful

| |
|--|
| |
| |

16. Would you like to continue working in HCFP? (YES/NO)

| |
|--|
| |
|--|

17. Of all the HCFP training programmes that you attended, which one did you like the most and why?

18. Name three important things you have learnt from these training courses.

19. What did you like about these training programmes?

20. What did you not like about these training programmes?

21. Do you have any suggestions to improve the training courses and make them more useful and objective with regard to?

- | | |
|---------------------|--------------------------|
| 1. Content | 4. Training material |
| 2. Trainers | 5. Training arrangements |
| 3. Training methods | 6. Others |

(Please give a detailed note on the subject at the back of this sheet)

(C) THE PROCESS

22. Do you agree with participatory approach to natural resource management? (YES/NO)

If so, why?

| |
|--|
| |
|--|

23. What are the main objectives of HCFP?

24. Are you aware of the Logical Framework of the Project? Give some details

25. **Who are the main stakeholders at the community level in the Project? Explain.**

26. Do you think that participatory approach adopted in the Project should also be followed in HFD as a matter of policy? (YES/NO)
If yes, give reasons.

27. **Do you think that Village Entry (VE) is important in Community Forestry? Explain**

28. Does an Entry Point Activity (EPA) facilitate Village Entry? Explain how?

29. How long should it take to carry out an effective VE exercise in one village? Is the time suggested followed in your Division? Give reasons _____

30. Do you think that VE takes too long and should be shortened in length?

31. What are your suggestions if we find that during VE the villagers in a village are indifferent to our efforts? Explain briefly

32. Who is supposed to prepare a VE Report? _____

33. **What is the extent of reservation for membership of VRMC for women, Scheduled Castes and other marginalized communities? Do you think this is enough?**

34. Should VRMCs be registered societies under the Registration of Societies Act or a Sub-Committee of the Gram Panchayat. Why?

35. Do you attend the meetings of VRMCs of the villages in your Division? If so, how often?

36. Do you communicate with the VRMC members (Both General Body and Executive Committee)? If so, how often?

37. Do you think that the VRMCs can function independently after Project comes to an end? (YES/NO). If the answer is no, why not?

38. Have the capabilities of the VRMCs been developed to the extent that they can now function independently? (YES/NO) If the answer is No, why not?
- How can the capabilities of the VRMC be developed to the extent that they can function independently?
39. Apart from HCFP plantations, what are the most important development milestones in the villages in your Division during your tenure? _____

40. In how many VRMCs did you discuss benefit sharing in woodlots and in how many tripartite agreements was it included? _____

41. What are your options if the *Sarpanch* does not sign the tripartite agreement?

42. Why are Link Workers paid very late? _____

43. Why is Participatory Assessment (PA) necessary?

44. Do you do any spot-checking of the data collected for Demographic-cum-Socio-economic Matrix and Farm Information Matrix? (YES/NO).
45. How long in your opinion should it take to complete fieldwork for PA exercise in a village?
Is the time suggested by you followed in your Division? If not give reasons

46. At the time of PA there is a disagreement in the village between members of the community (Men and Women) regarding planting fuel wood trees and fodder trees. What are your suggestions to resolve this difference of opinion?

47. Who is supposed to write a PA report? _____
- Who are supposed to have copies of PA reports? _____
48. Do you read the microplans prepared for the villages in your Division? If yes, do you edit them?

49. Who is supposed to prepare a microplan in your Division?

50. Who actually prepares the microplan? _____
51. **Do you participate in the preparation of a microplan? How often?**

52. **Have any short cuts been made to complete microplanning in time in your Division? If so, what are the short cuts?**

53. What are your options if your Conservator of Forests (CF) disagrees with the targets in a microplan?

54. Who is supposed to approve the microplan?

55. Community development through sustainable management of natural resources is a process with different stages and takes time. Can there be a short cut? (YES/NO)

56. Have you resolved any conflicts in a village in your Division? (YES/NO)

If yes, give a brief account of the same. _____

57. How often do you visit farmers to see if they have adopted the Project models?

58. Have you written any feasibility studies for microprojects? (YES/NO)

If so, what type of microprojects (Example). _____

59. **There is incentive money of Rs. 300/- and Rs. 400/- during the second and third year after planting under Village Woodlots. Has this helped in achieving the objectives of the project? Explain**

60. Who is the NGO supporting Self Help Groups (SHGs) in your Division?

61. What Income Generating Activities (IGAs) are going on in the villages in your Division?

62. Do you think women have a role in participatory natural resource management? (YES/NO)

If so, indicate the role they play _____

63. Effective communication is very important for the success of HCFP. Explain

64. How many *Gram Sabha* meetings/ VRMC training programmes have you participated in and what was your role? _____

65. Which of the following media/methods have you used under the Project for communication (✓) and for what purpose?

- | | <u>Media</u> | | Purpose |
|----|--------------------|--------------------------|---------|
| 1. | Verbal media | <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| 2. | Written media | | |
| 3. | Audio-visual media | | |
| 4. | Audio media | | |

| |
|--|
| |
| |
| |
| |

66. How many of the following methods of training have you used in your training programmes? Tick (✓) the ones used:

- | | | | |
|---------------------|--------------------------|---------------------|--------------------------|
| 1. Lecture | <input type="checkbox"/> | 3. Workshop methods | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 2. Group Discussion | <input type="checkbox"/> | 4. Field Trips | <input type="checkbox"/> |

67. **What is Training of Trainers (TOT)? Is the Trainer (Resource Person) a key element in TOT?**

68. Do you think Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation (PME) are necessary? Why

69. What do you monitor in PME?

70. How do you make sure that Project activities are reported to PMU?

71. How do you ensure quality control in your work in your Division?

72. Is there sufficient checking to ensure quality control? Comment

73. Why is reporting of Project activities important? Explain

74. Do you think that reporting on Project Indicators is important? Why?

75. What indicators do you think are important to be reported upon?

76. Why is reporting weak in HCFP? Is it an attitudinal problem?

77. What are tracking sheets? What is their use in the various processes of HCFP?

78. If you agree to participatory approach to Forest Management, please give a brief not as to how this can be achieved.

IMPACT ASSESSMENT OF STAFF TRAINING PROGRAMMES UNDER HARYANA COMMUNITY FORESTRY PROJECT (HCFP)

(A) PERSONAL PROFILE

1. Name: _____
2. Designation: _____
3. Circle: _____
4. Place of posting: _____
5. Age: (Years) _____
6. Educational qualifications: _____
7. Professional qualification: _____
8. Date of Joining the Haryana Forest Department (HFD): _____
9. Date of Joining Haryana Community Forestry Project (HCFP): _____

10. What is the exact nature of your job?

11. Which of the following training courses organised by the HCFP have you attended. Tick (√) the courses attended.

| | |
|---|--------------------------|
| 1. Project Induction | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 2. Village Entry | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 3. Participatory Assessment | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 4. Microplanning and Microproject Formulation | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 5. Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 6. Gender Sensitisation | <input type="checkbox"/> |

12. Have you undergone any other training, (other than those mentioned at S. No. 7, and 11)? (YES/NO)

If yes, please indicate the following:

| S. No. | Name of training | Dates/duration of training | Subject of training |
|--------|------------------|----------------------------|---------------------|
| 1. | | | |
| 2. | | | |
| 3. | | | |

(B) TRAINING (GENERAL)

13. Give a brief resume of HCFP training courses attended by you. Comment on the training in general and give your assessment of the training as: **Excellent, Good, Average, Poor, Very poor**

14. Have these training courses been helpful to you in your work in HCFP? Tick (√) one of the following

Extremely helpful
Very helpful
Helpful

| |
|--|
| |
| |
| |

Partly helpful
Not at all helpful

| |
|--|
| |
| |

15. Do you think that HCFP training you received will be of use to you in the discharge of your duties after you go back to other duties in the Department? Tick (√) one of the following

Extremely useful
Very useful
Useful

| |
|--|
| |
| |
| |

Partly useful
Not at all useful

| |
|--|
| |
| |

16. Would you like to continue working in HCFP? (YES/NO)

| |
|--|
| |
|--|

17. Do you have any suggestions to improve the training courses and make them more useful and objective with regard to?

- | | |
|---------------------|--------------------------|
| 1. Content | 4. Training material |
| 2. Trainers | 5. Training arrangements |
| 3. Training methods | 6. Others |
- (Please give a detailed note on the subject at the back of this sheet)

(C) THE PROCESS

18. Do you agree with participatory approach to natural resource management? (YES/NO)
If so, why?

| |
|--|
| |
|--|

19. What are the main objectives of HCFP?

20. Give some details of the Logical Framework of the Project

21. Who are the main stakeholders at the community level in the Project? Comment

22. Do you think that participatory approach adopted in the Project should also be followed in HFD as a matter of policy?
(YES/NO)
If yes, give reasons, in detail.

| |
|--|
| |
|--|

23. Village Entry (VE) is important in Community Forestry? Comment

24. How does an Entry Point Activity (EPA) facilitate Village Entry?

25. How long should it take to carry out an effective VE exercise in one village? Is the time suggested followed in your Circle? If not, give reasons _____

26. **Do you think that VE takes too long and should be shortened in length?**

27. What are your suggestions if we find that during VE the villagers in a village are indifferent to our efforts? Comment.

28. Who is supposed to prepare a VE Report? _____

29. **What is the existing reservation for membership in VRMCs for women, Scheduled Castes and other marginalized communities? Do you think this is enough? If not, suggest the extent of reservation.**

30. Should VRMCs be registered societies under the Registration of Societies Act or a Sub-Committee of the *Gram Panchayat*? Give reasons.

31. Do you attend the meetings of VRMCs of the villages in your Circle? If so, how often?

32. Do you communicate with the VRMC members (Both General Body and Executive Committee)? If so, how often?

33. Do you think that the VRMCs can function independently after? Project comes to an end? (YES/NO) If the answer is No, why not?
34. Have the capabilities of the VRMCs been developed to the extent that they can now function independently? (YES/NO)
- How can the capabilities of the VRMC be developed to the extent that they can function independently?
35. Apart from HCFP plantations, what are the most important development milestones in the villages in your Circle?

36. What are your options if the *Sarpanch* does not sign the tripartite agreement?

37. Why are Link Workers paid very late? _____

38. Why is Participatory Assessment (PA) necessary?

39. How long in your opinion should it take to complete fieldwork for PA exercise in a village?
 _____ Is the time suggested by you followed in your Circle? If not give reasons

40. At the time of PA there is a disagreement in the village between members of the community (Men and Women) regarding planting fuel wood trees and fodder trees. What are your suggestions to resolve this difference of opinion?

41. Who is supposed to write a PA report? _____
 • Who are supposed to have copies of PA reports? _____
42. Do you read the microplans prepared for the villages in your Division? If yes, do you edit them?

43. Who is supposed to prepare a microplan in your Circle?

44. Who actually prepares the microplan? _____

45. **Have any short cuts been made to complete microplanning in time in your Circle? If so, what are the short cuts?**

46. Who is supposed to approve the microplan? _____
47. Community development through sustainable management of natural resources is a process with different stages and takes time. Can there be a short cut? (YES/NO)
48. **How often do you visit farmers to see if they have adopted the Project models?**

49. **There is incentive money of Rs. 300/- and Rs. 400/- during the second and third year after planting under Village Woodlots. Has this helped in achieving the objectives of the project?**
Comment

50. Who is the NGO supporting Self Help Groups (SHGs) in your Circle?

51. **What Income Generating Activities (IGAs) are going on in the villages in your Circle?**

52. Do you think women have a role in participatory natural resource management? (YES/NO)

If so, indicate the role they play

53. Effective communication is very important for the success of HCFP. Comment

54. How many *Gram Sabha* meetings/ VRMC training programmes have you participated in and what was your role? _____

55. Which of the following media/methods have been used under the Project for communication (√) and for what purpose

| | <u>Media</u> | | <u>Purpose</u> |
|----|--------------------|--------------------------|----------------|
| 1. | Verbal media | <input type="checkbox"/> | _____ |
| 2. | Written media | <input type="checkbox"/> | _____ |
| 3. | Audio-visual media | <input type="checkbox"/> | _____ |
| 4. | Audio media | <input type="checkbox"/> | _____ |

56. How many of the following methods of training have been used in your training programmes? Tick (√) the ones used:

1. Lecture 3. Workshop methods

2. Group Discussion 4. Field Trips

57. **Do you think that the Trainer (Resource Person) is a key element in TOT (Training of Trainers)?**

58. Do you think Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation (PME) are necessary? Why _____

59. What do you monitor in PME? _____

60. How do you make sure that Project activities are reported to PMU?

61. **How do you ensure quality control of work in your Division?**

62. Is there sufficient checking to ensure quality control? Comment

63. Why is reporting of Project activities important? Comment.

64. **Do you think that reporting on Project Indicators is important? Why?**

65. **What indicators do you think are important to be reported upon?**

66. Why is reporting weak in HCFP. Is it an attitudinal problem?

67. Do you think that tracking sheets are useful in various processes of HCFP?

Comment _____

68. If you agree to participatory approach to Forest Management, please give a brief note as to how this can be achieved.

Annexure 13
(CONTROL OFFICIALS)

IMPACT ASSESSMENT OF STAFF TRAINING PROGRAMMES UNDER HARYANA COMMUNITY FORESTRY PROJECT (HCFP)

(A) PERSONAL PROFILE

1. Name: _____
2. Designation: _____
3. Sub Division: _____
4. Division: _____
5. Place of posting: _____
6. Age: (Years) _____
7. Educational qualifications: _____
8. Professional qualification: _____
9. Date of Joining the Haryana Forest Department (HFD): _____
10. What is the exact nature of your job?

11. Have you undergone any other training, (other than those mentioned at S. No. 8)? (YES/NO)
If yes, please indicate the following:

| S. No. | Name of training | Dates/duration of training | Subject of training |
|--------|------------------|----------------------------|---------------------|
| 1. | | | |
| 2. | | | |
| 3. | | | |

(B) THE PROJECT

12. What do you know about the Haryana Community Forestry Project (HCFP)? State briefly.

13. What is participatory approach to natural resource management? If you know anything about it, state briefly.

14. Are you aware of the activities of HCFP? (YES/NO)
If yes, mention some activities.
1. _____ 2. _____
3. _____ 4. _____

15. Is HCFP operating in Government forest lands, private lands, or community / common / *shamlat* lands?

16. Name two beneficiaries in HCFP.

1. _____ 2. _____

17. Would you like working in HCFP? (YES/NO)

18. Do you think that participatory approach adopted in the Project should also be followed in HFD as a matter of policy? (YES/NO)

If yes, Tick (✓) one of the following.
The participatory approach will help:

- To stop further destruction of forests
- To meet the requirement of large wood based industries
- To promote agro-forestry
- To improve rural Development in the State

| |
|--|
| |
| |
| |
| |

19. Do you know what is a Village Resource Management Committee (VRMC) under HCFP? (YES/NO)

20. What is a Hill Resource Management Committee (HRMC)? In what area of Haryana do you find them?

21. **Are you familiar with various stages of community development like Village Entry (VE) including Entry Point Activities (EPAs), Participatory Assessment (PA), Micro-planning and Micro-project formulation? (YES/NO)**

If yes, where did you come to know about them? _____

If yes, explain any one of these stages briefly _____

22. **Would you like to get trained in participatory approach to natural resource management? (YES/NO)**

23. Do you think women have a very important role to play in natural resource management? (YES/NO)

24. Can you suggest, from your experience in HFD, important steps to be taken to make forestry sustainable in Haryana? _____

Training Assessment of Sample Forest Guards

| S. No | Name | Age (Yrs) | Professional Qualifications | JFM training | Presentation | | | | Interview/ Attitude to PA | Field work | VRMC | Overall grade | Remarks |
|-------|-----------------|-----------|-----------------------------|----------------|--------------|-----|-----|-----|---------------------------|------------|------|---------------|---|
| | | | | | K | A | P | PT | | | | | |
| (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) | (7) | (8) | (9) | (10) | (11) | (12) | (13) | (14) |
| 1. | Gordhan Lal | 50 | Trained Forest Guard | Yes | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | -- |
| 2. | Surender Shukla | 48 | Trained Forest Guard | Yes | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | -- |
| 3. | Shashi Pal | 38 | Trained Forest Guard | Yes | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 6 | 6 | He wants to go back terroritly division |
| 4. | Jagir Singh | 53 | Trained Forest Guard | Yes | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 6 | 6 | -- |
| 5. | Hans Raj | 40 | Trained Forest Guard | Yes | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | -- |
| 6. | Nirmal Singh | 45 | Trained Forest Guard | Yes | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 6 | 6 | Study tours abroad |
| 7. | Desh Raj | 49 | Trained Forest Guard | No | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | -- |
| 8. | Sarwan Kumar | 48 | Trained Forest Guard | Yes | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | -- |
| 9. | Ashok Kumar | 48 | Trained Forest Guard | Yes | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | -- |
| 10. | Pritam Singh | 48 | Trained Forest Guard | Yes | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | -- |
| 11. | Bushan Kumar | 46 | Trained Forest Guard | Yes | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | He has been doing mostly office work |
| 12. | Jai Singh | 49 | Trained Forest Guard | Yes | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | |
| 13. | Sita Ram | 41 | Trained Forest Guard | Yes | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | |
| 14. | Baljeet Singh | 34 | Trained Forest Guard | (Four courses) | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 6 | 5 | 5 | |
| 15. | Wazir Singh | 47 | Trained Forest Guard | Yes | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | |
| 16. | Om Prakash | 49 | Trained Forest Guard | Yes | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | |

| S. No | Name | Age (Yrs) | Professional Qualifications | JFM training | Presentation | | | | Interview/ Attitude to PA | Field work | VRMC | Overall grade | Remarks |
|-------|----------------|-----------|-----------------------------|----------------|--------------|-----|-----|-----|---------------------------|------------|------|---------------|--|
| | | | | | K | A | P | PT | | | | | |
| (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) | (7) | (8) | (9) | (10) | (11) | (12) | (13) | (14) |
| 17 | Mahabir Prasad | 43 | Trained Forest Guard | Yes | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | Practical training needed |
| 18 | Inder Singh | 36 | Trained Forest Guard | Yes | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 6 | 8 | Refresher course |
| 19 | Bansi Lal | 25 | Trained Forest Guard | Yes | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 5 | 8 | Use of video cassette during teaching would be helpful |
| 20 | Ram Ji Lal | 50 | Trained Forest Guard | Yes | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 5 | |
| 21 | Baljeet Singh | 37 | Trained Forest Guard | Yes | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 8 | 9 | 9 | Refresher courses necessary |
| 22 | Shri Niwas | 51 | Trained Forest Guard | PME not done | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | Refresher course is necessary no field work done |
| 23 | Rajesh Kumar | 29 | Trained Forest Guard | Yes | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | |
| 24 | Bijander Singh | 39 | Trained Forest Guard | (Four courses) | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | Increase time period of the course |
| 25 | Dilbag Singh | 46 | Trained Forest Guard | Yes | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 6 | 6 | 6 | |
| 26 | Lal Singh – I | 45 | Trained Forest Guard | Yes | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 7 | 5 | VRMC need guidance after the project is over |
| 27 | Somvir Singh | 33 | Trained Forest Guard | Yes | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | |
| 28 | Ishwar Singh | 28 | Trained Forest Guard | Yes | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | |
| 29 | Dalip Singh | 31 | Trained Forest Guard | Yes | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 7 | 7 | |
| 30 | Jaswant Singh | 48 | Trained Forest Guard | Yes | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | The duration of training should be increased. |
| 31 | Bhag Chand | 44 | Trained Forest Guard | Yes | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | |

| S. No | Name | Age (Yrs) | Professional Qualifications | JFM training | Presentation | | | | Interview/ Attitude to PA | Field work | VRMC | Overall | Remarks |
|-------|------------------|-----------|-----------------------------|--------------|--------------|-----|-----|-----|---------------------------|------------|------|---------|--|
| | | | | | K | A | P | PT | | | | | |
| (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) | (7) | (8) | (9) | (10) | (11) | (12) | (13) | |
| 32 | Chandan Singh | 37 | Trained as Forest Guard | Yes | 6 | 6 | 7 | 6 | 7 | 6 | 8 | 7 | 1 Refresher coursed needed because of the age. 2 Forest Guard and Forester should be moved from operation division and Vice-versa |
| 33 | Surjeet Singh | 44 | Trained Forest Guard | Yes | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 8 | 5 | Refresher course needed |
| 34 | Ved Prakash | 43 | Trained Forest Guard | No | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | |
| 35 | Satish Kumar | 39 | Trained Forest Guard | Yes | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | People should be told about the project in detailed |
| 36 | Umed Singh Saini | 49 | Trained Forest Guard | Yes | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | |
| 37 | Jagbir Singh | 41 | Trained Forest Guard | Yes | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 1 There is need for more field work 2 Guidance in necessary after the project for sustainability |
| 38 | Sajjan Singh | 39 | Trained Forest Guard | Yes | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | |
| 39 | Chander Bhan | 31 | Trained Forest Guard | No | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | |
| 40 | Naresh Kumar | 37 | Trained Forest Guard | Yes | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | |
| 41 | Ravider Kumar | 41 | Trained Forest Guard | No | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | |
| 42 | Ved Prakash | 44 | Trained Forest Guard | No | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | |
| 43 | Chet Ram | 55 | Trained Forest Guard | No | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 1. He want strubed transferrered out of HCFCP 2. Refresher course |
| 44 | Rajinder Singh | 44 | Trained Forest Guard | No | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 7 | 5 | |

Note: K - Knowledge
P - Participation
A - Attitude
P - Practice
PA - Participatory Approach

Overall Grades: 10 - Excellent
8,9 - Very good
6,7 - Good
5 - Average
4 - Below average

Training Assessment of Sample Foresters

| S. No | Name | Age (Yrs) | Professional Qualifications | JFM training | Presentation | | | | Interview/ Attitude to PA | Field work | VRMC | Overall grade | Remarks |
|-------|-----------------------|-----------|-----------------------------------|--------------|--------------|-----|-----|-----|---------------------------|------------|------|---------------|--|
| | | | | | K | A | P | PT | | | | | |
| (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) | (7) | (8) | (9) | (10) | (11) | (12) | (13) | (14) |
| 1. | Surender Kumar | 50 | Trained Forest Guard and Forester | Yes | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 9 | Refresher course suggested as age is a factor |
| 2. | Raghubir Singh | 55 | Trained Forester | Yes | 5 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 6 | 4 | --- |
| 3. | Ram Kumar Jangra | 45 | Trained Forester | Yes | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 7 | 5 | 6 | There should be a study tour along with training |
| 4. | Om Prakash Malik | 55 | Trained Forest Guard | Yes | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 7 | 6 | 6 | --- |
| 5. | Ram Kumar | 55 | Trained Forest Guard | Yes | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 4 | --- |
| 6. | Jagdish Chander Saini | 47 | Trained Forester | Yes | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 5 | Refresher course suggestion |

Note: K - Knowledge
A - Attitude
P - Practice
P - Participation
PA - Participatory Approach

Overall Grades:

10 - Excellent
8, 9 - Very good
6, 7 - Good
5 - Average
4 - Below Average

Training Assessment of Sub-Divisional Forest Officers

| S. No | Name | Age (Yrs) | Professional Qualifications | JFM training | Presentation | | | | Interview/ Attitude to PA | Field work | VRMC | Oveall grades | Remarks |
|-------|----------------------|-----------|-----------------------------|-----------------|--------------|-----|-----|-----|---------------------------|------------|------|---------------|---------|
| | | | | | K | A | P | PT | | | | | |
| (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) | (7) | (8) | (9) | (10) | (11) | (12) | (13) | (14) |
| 1. | Ram Swroop | 54 | DDR | Yes | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | |
| 2. | I P Singh | 52 | DDR | Yes | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | |
| 3. | H K Phogat | 48 | -- | Yes | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | |
| 4. | Radhy Sham | 52 | DDR | Yes | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | |
| 5. | Parmanand | 50 | Trained Deputy Ranger | Yes (5 courses) | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | |
| 6. | Jagjit Singh Phogat | 55 | Trained Deputy Ranger | Yes | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 6 | 5 | 6 | 5 | |
| 7. | O P Kajla | 46 | DDR | Yes | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | |
| 8. | R K Chugh | 44 | DDR | Yes (4 courses) | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 7 | 7 | 7 | |
| 9. | S K Wasan | 51 | Forester Trained | Yes | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | |
| 10. | Uma Shankar | 49 | Forester Trained | - | 7 | 6 | 7 | 6 | 7 | 6 | 7 | 6 | |
| 11. | Bhagwan Singh | 51 | DDR | - | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | |
| 12. | Jagpal Singh | 52 | Forester Trained | Yes (1 course) | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | |
| 13. | Satvir Singh Kadiyan | 48 | | Yes (4 courses) | 6 | 7 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | |
| 14. | Naresh Kumar Malik | 46 | DDR | Yes (2 courses) | 7 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 7 | 6 | |
| 15. | Satbir Singh Sheoran | 47 | DDR | Yes | 6 | 7 | 6 | 7 | 7 | 6 | 7 | 6 | |
| 16. | O.P Dalal | 54 | DDR | Yes | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | |
| 17. | Raj Kumar Jangra | 43 | Forester Trained | Yes | 6 | 6 | 6 | 7 | 6 | 7 | 6 | 6 | |

Note: K - Knowledge
A - Attitud
P - Practice
P - Participation
PA - Participatory Approach

Overall Grades: 10 - Excellent
8,9 - Very Good
6,7 - Good
5 - Average
4 - Below Average

Annexure 17

Resolution to be passed by the *Panchayat*

This resolution, made this _____ day of _____ (month) of _____ year) by the *Panchayat* of _____ (village), hereinafter called the *Panchayat*, witnesses as follows:

1. That the *Panchayat* is aware that it is responsible for managing common lands vested in it and for promoting social and farm forestry, minor forest produce, fuel and fodder plantations in the Sabha area.
2. That it has received a report from the community on Participatory Assessment exercise, which shows that the community is desirous of inviting the Haryana Community Forestry Project (hereinafter called the Project) to initiate a Resource Management Project in the Sabha area.
3. That in pursuance of this desire, the *Panchayat* seeks the assistance of the Project in developing its community land as per the annexed schedule.
4. That the *Panchayat* will permit the Divisional Forest Officer _____(Forest Division) and his subordinates and collaborating institutions to survey and demarcate such land and set it apart for forestry purposes for a period equivalent to the rotation period of the Micro-projects to be prepared under the Project.
5. That the *Panchayat* appoints a subcommittee, named Village Resource Management Committee (VRMC), under section 22 (v) of the Haryana *Panchayati Raj Act*, 1994, for planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of forestry and other associated village development activities.
6. That the sub-committee shall consist of the following persons, as recommended in the PA report:

| S. No. | Name and Address | Position | Occupation | Sex | Social Group |
|---------------|-------------------------|-----------------|-------------------|------------|---------------------|
| 1 | | | | | |
| 2 | | | | | |
| 3 | | | | | |
| 4 | | | | | |
| 5 | | | | | |
| 6 | | | | | |
| 7 | | | | | |
| 8 | | | | | |
| 9 | | | | | |
| 10 | | | | | |
| 11 | | | | | |
| 12 | | | | | |
| 13 | | | | | |

7. That the powers and responsibilities of the Resource Management Committee shall be the following:
- (a) To organise the community to plan for the development of natural resources in the *Panchayat* area, including community land, degraded farm land, village ponds and tanks, village institutional land, other Govt. owned lands and river bank land;
 - (b) To survey and demarcate common land vested in the *Panchayat* under Punjab Common Land Act, 1961;
 - (c) To decide on the area that is to be brought under tree plantation under Community Forestry Project;
 - (d) To undertake village level planning, formulate Microprojects and manage the Microprojects which include forestry projects, as well as support of income generation and energy saving projects;
 - (e) To plant, protect and enrich tree plantations on common lands;
 - (f) To enter into an agreement with the Haryana Forest Department reserving specified areas of community land and public places for afforestation and eco-development activities for a period equivalent to the rotation period of Micro-projects to be prepared, the management of which shall be undertaken jointly with the Forest Department for the first three years and thereafter by the VRMC. The agreement shall also specify the management plan for the said period, arrangement for equitable sharing of benefits within the village community and reinvesting part of the benefits for future afforestation activities within the village;
 - (g) To accept financial support from the Forest Department;
 - (h) To open a separate VRMC bank account to be jointly operated by the Chairperson, Secretary, Cashier and SDO. For withdrawals from the account up to Rs. 1,000 only any two of the authorised signatories need to sign, i.e. the Chairman and Cashier or Secretary and Cashier, but for withdrawals above Rs. 1,000, the SDO has to sign additionally;
 - (i) To maintain separate books of accounts for the funds received from Haryana Forest Department under the Community Forestry Project, undertake internal audit thereof as well as facilitate external audit by the Project;
 - (j) To supply the *Panchayat* with copies of plans, projects and accounts for presentation in its *Sawani* and *Hari* meetings;
 - (k) To frame rules for managing and protecting areas planted under forests and levy fines from villagers violating such rules;
 - (l) To collect membership fees, donations and other contributions from households of the village for managing and protecting planted areas;
 - (m) To accept donations and other contributions from any other agency for augmenting resource management funds;

- (n) To harvest and distribute forest produce equitably as per the management plan prepared during Microplanning process;
- (o) To receive Resource Management Fund from the Forest Department after framing rules for its utilisation and replenishment (Attachment 5: Rules for Utilising Resource Management Fund);
- (p) To implement, monitor and evaluate the various village development projects formulated during Microplanning.

Annexure 18

AGREEMENT BETWEEN PANCHAYAT, VILLAGE RESOURCE MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE/SOCIETY AND THE HARYANA COMMUNITY FORESTRY PROJECT FOR RAISING COMMUNITY WOODLOTS/TREE GROVES/SANDUNE FIXING TREES ON VILLAGE PANCHAYAT LAND

This Agreement made this _____ day of year 2000 (two thousand) between the Divisional Forest Officer, _____ Haryana Community Forestry Project (on behalf of the Haryana Community Forestry Project, Government of Haryana) on the **First Part** and _____ (Village) *Panchayat* of _____ Community Development Block of _____ District on the **Second Part** and the _____ (Village) Resources Management Committee/Society (here-in-after called VRMC/VRMS) on the **third Part**, witnesses as follows:

1. That the VRMC/VRMS is authorised to Execute any works concerning establishing and maintaining the Community Woodlot/Tree Groves/Sand Dune Fixation microprojects on behalf of the _____ *Panchayat*, _____ Block, _____ District.
2. That the VRMC/VRMS and the Haryana Community Forestry Project confirm that the *Panchayat* has the absolute title to the land described in the attached schedule and map.
3. That specifically the *Panchayat* agrees to;
 - Release, within 15 days of signing this agreement, _____ hectares of Common land for village Woodlot, _____, hectares of Common land for Tree Groves and _____ hectares of Common land for Sand Dune Fixation models as per the Microproject proposals prepared by the VRMC and the schedule and map of the area, herewith attached.
 - Cooperate with the VRMC/VRMS and the DFO in implementing the Resource Development Micro-plan of the village prepared by the VRMC.
4. That the VRMC/VRMS shall specifically carry out the following:
 - Implement the micro-project proposals approved by the village Community and by the DFO in every respect, subject to modifications that may be necessitated in future, and ratified by the DFO.
 - Appoint a Community Monitoring team of the VRMC, to keep regular tracking of the implementation of the Microprojects.
 - Mobilize Resource Management Funds for the microprojects including membership fees, VRMC Management Fund from HCFP and Survival Bonuses from the HCFP, and donations and grants from other sources;
 - Open Bank Account for its money and keep proper accounts of the money and submit the accounts for audit by the HCFP.

- Make a Fixed Deposit of three years from the Resource Management Fund of **Rs. 30,000** to be received from the DFO and use the money for Genuine Resource Management needs after Microproject handover at the end of the establishment phase.
 - Maintain and manage the plantations during and after the establishment phase of three years.
 - Refrain from using the land for any other purposes than specified in the benefit sharing plant in the Microproject Proposal.
 - Execute the Forestry Extension advice rendered by the Forest Department with regard to protection, maintenance, management and harvesting of the plantations.
 - Allow landless Labourers and Marginal and Small Farmers to remove fruit, flowers, deadwood, leaf fodder and grass fodder for Bona Fide personal use. Provided the DFO or the VRMC may put periodic restrictions on such extractions in view of the health of the plantation.
 - Undertake thinning as per the Management Plan contained in Microproject Proposals and allow poor households to carry head loads of the thinning free of cost after recording in the logbook.
 - To undertake final felling at the rotation age as per Management Plan, subject to the advice of the DFO in the best interest of ecological balance of the village. The VRMC/VRMS shall sell the produce after assessment of its value by DFO (CFP). 30% of the proceeds will be deposited in the VRMC Fund for undertaking replanting of the same site and/or fresh planting of new sites. 70% of the proceeds will be allocated to the *Panchayat* to undertake general development activities indicated in the village microproject.
5. That the DFO, on behalf of the Haryana Community Forestry Project, shall carry out the following:
- Train the villagers, labourers and the VRMC, including the Community Monitoring Team, in techniques for raising and maintaining nurseries and plantations.
 - Raise the seedlings required for various plantation micro-projects either in a permanent central nursery or in a temporary cluster nursery.
 - Contributed Rs. 30, 000 to the VRMC/VRMS as Resource Management Fund, after 50% of the membership fee is collected by the VRMC from the households in the village.
 - Undertake, jointly with the VRMC/s, earthwork, planting, watering and other operations during the establishment phase of three years;
 - Monitor, along with the Community Monitoring Team, the seedling survival rate and make the seedling survival bonus to the VRMC in the Second and Third year of planting out, as per rates fixed by HCFP.

- Undertake periodic review of Microproject implementation to minimize factors that hinder the successful outcome of the microproject.
 - When Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation confirms that the community is fully capable of managing the Microprojects independently and establish conflict free benefit-sharing arrangements, turn over the microproject to the community through its VRMC/VRMS.
6. That the DFO (CFP) shall continue to issue directions and render technical advice and assistance to the VRMC/VRMS regarding maintenance, management and protection of plantation throughout the rotation and such directions shall be binding on the VRMC/VRMS.
 7. That if the VRMC/VRMS/*Panchayat* fails to carry out any of the directions issued by the DFO (CFP) under this agreement or any of its obligations which is bound to discharge, the DFO (CFP) shall carry out at his discretion any or all the works regarding protection, maintenance and management plantations at the cost of the VRMC/VRMS/*Panchayat*, provided a notice of 15 days is issued to the parties.
 8. That Project Director, Haryana Community Forestry Project shall arbitrate all disputes with regard to the operation of this agreement. His decision shall be binding on all the parties concerned.
 9. In witness whereof, the three parties to this agreement have set and subscribed their hand seal on the dates hereinafter mentioned respectively.

Signed, Sealed and Delivered by the said parties on the _____ Day of _____ (Month), _____ 2000 (year).

Divisional Forest Officer
Haryana Community Forestry Project
 _____ Division.

Sarpanch Gram Panchayat
 Village _____
 Block _____
 District _____

Chairperson VRMC/VRMS
 Village _____
 Block _____
 District _____

Annexure 1 Schedule of Land

| Name of <i>Panchayat</i> | Block | Tehsil | District | Khasra & Murabba Nos. |
|-------------------------------------|--------------|---------------|-----------------|--------------------------------------|
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |

Annexure 2: Map of Proposed Plantation Sites Annexure _____