Role of State in NRM

State has certain functions to perform wrt NRM:

- Legislate on water/forests/lands etc.
- Protect natural resources and systems
- Promote resource conservation
- Ensure fairness and social justice
- Regulate the use of resources from diverse sources
- Provide appropriate infrastructure
- Prevent and resolve conflicts
- Oversee quality
- Enter into agreements and treaties across territories

Tunnel vision (State)

James Scott

- Certain forms of knowledge and control require a narrowing of vision – limited aspects of complex realities
- E.g scientific forestry – fiscal lens of revenue needs
- Habitat aspects of forests ignored and it is considered only as an economic resource
- Utilitarian state
- Naturalists perspective
- Anthropologist perspective

Role of State in NRM

Two major views:

1. State owns natural resources
2. State does not own

The role of the state is defined by law:

It claims eminent domain which is close to ownership and this is negated by many

4 R's Framework (Dubois, 1998)

4R's	State Approaches	Drawbacks
Rights	Forests, wastelands, water and common lands	Lack of accountability
Responsibilities	Infras. Dev. on common lands, forestry and water mngmt, technical and other inputs rest with the state	Inefficiency, corruption, political interefence
Relationships	Top-down, expert driven agenda, hierarchical and rigid management structure	No feedback from beneficiaries and their views and knowledge ignored

4 R's Framework

4R's	State Approaches	**Drawbacks/Problems**
Resources •Financial	Controlled by the Central and state govts or their agents	Constraints due to paucity of funds & additional resources cannot be mobilised
•Natural	Sustainability of NR base is seen as role of govt. agencies	Cannot sustain due to complex problems

Reforms within the State

1) **Decentralisation**
- *Devolution*
- *Deconcentration*

2) **Privatisation**

3) **Deregulation**

Goals for Reform

- ***Effectiveness*** – ability to meet objectives

- ***Efficiency*** – way the goals are met (optimal cost) without compromising on effectiveness

- ***Accountability*** – is institutionalised responsiveness to those who are affected by one's actions

Forest Management and Policies

- In India forests have been managed and regulated by customary law since long
- During the British rule, in the name of scientific management, forests were divided into wards –

  Forest Acts of 1865 and 1878

- Classification of forests into reserve, protected and village forests
- Several restrictions imposed on people's rights
- Duty was levied on timber – thus encouraging revenue generation

Continued

1894 – Forest Policy Resolution

- Policy emphasised the need for state control over forests and need to exploit them for state revenue

1927 – Indian Forest Act

- To replace the 1878 Act and was a consolidated and the state control over forests were tightened – clearly emphasising the revenue yielding aspects of forests

Continued

1952 – Indian Forest Policy

- This forest policy resolution emphasised that the forest policy should be oriented to meet the paramount national needs – commercial exploitation of forests

1976 – National Commission on Agriculture

- Ushered in social forestry

1980 – Forest Conservation Act

Continued

1988 – National Forest Policy

- Significant departure from earlier policies
- First time mention about the communities dependent on forests for their livelihoods
- Focus shifted from commerce and investment to maintaining the ecology and satisfying the minimum needs of the people – fuelwood and other NTFP, strengthening the tribal-forest linkages

1990 – Joint Forest Management

Three Phases in Forest Policy

Period	Main Focus
1952-1976	Forests for timber, neglect of the village commons
1976-1988	Commercial forestry on forest lands, but more funds for social and farm forestry on private and other lands
1988 onwards	Joint Forest Management and Integrated Forestry (Institutionalising participatory approaches in NRM and development)

Joint Forest Management (Devolution)

Background –

- increasing prominence of environmental concerns, human and resource rights of forest dependent communities from the 1970s – led to major reversals during the 1980s
- Earlier focus on maximising revenue & promoting forest-based industry in the national interest, 1988 forest policy articulated the twin objectives of :

  - ecological stability
  - social justice

Joint Forest Management (Devolution)

1990 GOI issued a circular to all states – involvement of village communities and voluntary agencies in the regeneration of degraded forests – ***partnership approach***

As of Oct 2001 – 27 out of 28 states have adopted JFM – 14.25 million hectares of forest land (18% of total forest area) protected by 62,890 village level organisations

Joint Forest Management (Devolution)

- Feb 2000 – MOEF revised guidelines for JFM – permitted extension of JFM to well-stocked instead of degraded lands only – specified women's representation by 33% in the executive committee and 50% in the general body
- All village organisations should be registered for a separate legal identity
- Dovetailing of JFM micro-plans and technical working plans of the Forest Department
- Differences however seen in the nature of lands on which JFM has been implemented and the organisational structure adopted in different states

Bureaucracy-Community Interface in JFM

JFM – two major players – bureaucracy and the local community

Bureaucratic responses in JFM

1) Participatory mode
2) Incremental mode
3) Manipulative mode
4) Anti-participatory

Classification of community types (JFM)

1) Homogeneous and cooperative (HC)
2) Homogeneous and non-cooperative (HNC)
3) Heterogeneous (mixed) and non-cooperative (MNC)
4) Heterogeneous (mixed) cooperative communities with egalitarian access rules (MCE)
5) Heterogeneous (mixed) cooperative communities with inegalitarian access arrangements (MCI)

A Matrix of Participatory Outcomes

Outcome	HC	HNC	MNC	MCE	MCI
Anti-participatory	X	X	X	X	X
Manipulative	1	X	X	2	3
Incremental	4	X	X	5	6
Participatory	7	X	X	8	9

Forest Rights Bill (2005)

- Vest forest rights and occupation in forest land to Scheduled tribes whose rights have not been recorded
- Framework for recording the rights
- Right to cultivate 2.5 ha of land per nuclear family
- Cut off point of 25 Oct 1980
- No right to sell only (rights conferred for use only)

Forest Rights Bill (2005)

Criticism

- Demand for a transparent system to award forest rights to inhabitants
- Amendment in the cut-off date to get habitation rights
- Change in law that calls for mass displacement of tribals
- Inclusion of non-tribal residents as stakeholders of forests