

Community Forestry and Non-timber  
Forest Products  
Policy research workshop  
*July 28-30, 2004*

**Workshop Proceedings**

(ANSAB) Asia Network for Sustainable  
Agriculture and Bioresources  
New Baneshwor

**P.O. Box 11035, Kathmandu, NEPAL**

# Contents

	<b>Page no.</b>
<b>Abbreviations</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Executive Summary</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Section 1      Introduction, Objectives and Process/Methods</b>	<b>5-6</b>
1.1      Introduction	
1.2      Objective	
1.3      Process/Methods	
<b>Section 2      Highlights of the Workshop</b>	<b>7-13</b>
2.1      Introductory session	
2.2      Presentations and discussions	
2.3      Identification of policy issues and constraints	
2.4      Group work and Group Presentations	
2.5      Closing	
<b>Section 3      Recommendations and Conclusion</b>	<b>14-15</b>
<b>Annexes</b>	
1.      Workshop program	
2.      Participants list	
3.      An overview of policy research rationale, framework and methodology	
4.      Decentralized forest management in Nepal: synergy of economic development governance a local capacity building	
5.      Complimentarities and contradictions between conservations and livelihoods	
6.      Integrated watershed approach and policy outcomes in relation to community forestry and NTFPs management in Nepal	
7.      Creating champions, planting ideas, connecting adversaries: IDRC's experiences in policy influencing	
8.      Group work and group presentations	

## Abbreviations

ANSAB	Asia Network for Sustainable Agriculture and Bioresources
NTFP	Non-timber Forest Products
DPR	Department of Plant Resources
MFSC	Ministry of Forests and Soil Conservation
IDRC	International Development Research Center
NGO	Non Governmental Organization
INGO	International Non Governmental Organization
NRM/CF	Natural Resources Management/Community Forest
NTFPCC	Non timber Forest Products Coordination Committee
FECOFUN	Federation of Community Forest Users, Nepal
DoF	Department of Forest
MoFSC	Ministry of Forest and Soil Conservation
CFD	Community Forest Department
NARMSAP	Natural Resource Management Sector Assistant Program
HJSS	Himali Jadibuti Sarokar Samuha
NEFEJ	Nepal Environmental Federation of Journalists
SNV	The Netherlands Development Organization
MAPPA	Medicinal and Aromatic Plants Program in Asia
BDS-MaPS	Business Development Services-Market and Production Services

## Executive Summary

ANSAB (Asia Network for Sustainable Agriculture and Bioresources) organized an Community Forestry and NTFP policy research workshop on July 28-30, 2004 at Godavari congregating high level government representatives from DPR, DoF, MFSC; donor organization, IDRC; representatives from grassroots community, private sector organizations, and participants from relevant NGOs and INGOs.

The objective of the workshop is to carry out a participatory action research on policy formulation process of the decisions made in the past digging into the reflection, impact experimentations, experiences and outcomes. To come up with the objectives there were efforts made on how the processes carried out in the past have helped in formulating policy. And then, the workshop tried to get to the strategies and to go on participatory action research.

The first day of the workshop initiated with a warm welcome that Mr. Bhishma P. Subedi offered along with a presentation on overview of policy research rationale, framework and methodology. Mr. Subedi articulated presenting a research framework, in the research action we will enter into from the decision, what the factors are influencing upon the decision, the basis of it; tools, environment, how it was implemented and what are the outcomes. Dr. Udaya Raj Sharma, Dr. Keshav Kanel, Mr. Bhola Bhattarai, Mr. Lal Kumar KC and other participants also addressed the workshop along with their expectation and suggestions in the session.

After the introductory session, Dr. Madhav Karki, Dr. Udaya Raj Sharma, Dr. Keshav Kanel and Dr. Mohan Wagle made presentations amassing the policy process related issues.

In the group work session the participants individually identified current policy issues, mutually prioritized them and selected issues for further analysis. Participants were divided into three groups and the groups made presentations on royalty, taxation, ban, restriction and lifting, inventory and institutional structure.

The major recommendations made in the meeting were implementation of policy issues that would address conservation and livelihood together and their balance in implementation, convincement and encouragement to the politicians for the appropriate policy imposition, development of moral enhancement and operation of constraints to make effective policy decisions and avoidance of policy implementation without consultation.

The significance of the workshop is that the attempt of policy research itself was an initiative and a new step in the community forestry and NTFP sub-sector. Participants from high level government body, donor organizations, NGOs/INGOs and relevant stakeholders appreciated the initiative with an expectation that the research outcome would create easier environment for government to further make and implement policy decisions and others to learn the lessons. The another productive substance is that some representatives on behalf of their organizations gave hands to completely support working towards the policy research model while others appreciated and encouraged to step on further strides. The positive responses from the government bodies and happiness towards it from the grassroots representative were other enabling ambiances the workshop created.

The workshop went fruitful drawing out clear ways and making findings of some cases of policy decisions made in the past. Initiative in the policy research work and wise discussion among grassroots to the national level participants were the major aspects of workshop appreciated by all the participants.

# Section 1 Introduction, Objective and Process/Method

## 1.1 Introduction

Forestry sector of Nepal had come across several ups and downs and it has made a long story in a short history. There are stories that policy reached failure and policy reached success. Policies were formulated, amended and imposed, despite justifiable policy research was never get done.

In this context, ANSAB organized a two days long community forest and NTFP research workshop (*Please see annex 1 for program detail*) congregating representatives from MFSC, DoF, HBTL, BDS-MaPS, FECOFUN, HJSS, NEFEJ, IDRC, SNV, DPR, NARMSAP, MAPPA-Nepal, New Era and ANSAB. (*Please see annex 2 for list of participants*).

The research project has been designed to reflect back, analyze, synthesize and document the experiential learning of different actors and stakeholders in the evolution of community forestry and NTFP oriented policy formulation at local to national levels in Nepal. More specifically the study will:

- reflect back, assess and share the methods and processes of formulating policies in the areas of community forestry and NTFP sub-sectors in Nepal;
- examine how research and grassroots experiences influenced the forest policy making and shaping process in Nepal;
- assess the effectiveness of the specific tools, experiences and insights in formulating forest policies targeting the gender and marginalized communities;
- develop national strategies for future policy reforms in forestry and related NRM sectors;
- recommend different policy influencing options for appropriate policy reforms in community forestry and NTFP sub-sectors; and
- disseminate the policy research outcomes to the key stakeholders.

This study will primarily diagnose how NRM research and development experiences including IDRC sponsored initiatives at grassroots in Nepal influence and or contribute policy development process by looking closely into and making analysis of various cases. The proposed study will therefore be more qualitative and exploratory, and rely on the primary and secondary sources of information. The techniques inherent in PRA such as sampling, checklists, field observations, interviews and triangulation, review meetings and workshops, review of past works and relevant literatures will be employed extensively. The collected data will be analyzed and interpreted logically and inferred to reach to a valid conclusion and recommendation.

5 districts including Darchula have been selected one from each Development Region for data collection and understanding grassroots perspectives. FECOFUN (district chapters), HJSS district branches, DFOs, local NTFPs traders, FUG members and other relevant stakeholders will be involved at this stage. Moreover, a national level workshop will be organized comprising of high ranking officials from line agencies of HMG/Nepal, national planning commission, centre FECOFUN, NNN members and other pertinent stakeholders.

## **1.2 Objectives**

The objective of the workshop is to carry out a participatory action research on the policy formulation process of the policy decisions made in the past digging into the reflection, impact experimentations, experiences and outcomes. Besides, the major objectives of the workshop were,

- Manifest, review and share the methods and processes of formulating policies in the areas of community forestry and NTFP sub-sector in Nepal;
- Identify and prepare issues and cases on policy process from grass-roots, district and national level experiences;
- Interact in an informal setting among the concerned stakeholders like high level government bodies, grassroots level community people, federations, private organizations, NGOs and INGOs; institute them to cooperate in the initiative; and bring out recommendations for the appropriate policy reforms;
- To find ways how to make the policy planning process effective;

## **1.3 Process and Method**

The process of the workshop included:

- Introduction
- Presentations and discussions
- Plenary identification of policy issues and constraints
- Selection of issues for further analysis, group works and sharing
- Brainstorming on options and strategies

## Section 2      Highlights of the Workshop

### 2.1 Introductory Session

The workshop set about in an informal setting, a cozy and agreeable environment. Welcoming all the participants, Mr. Bhishma P. Subedi, Executive Director at ANSAB called on all to take an easy way in communication that wouldn't halt what the spirit of everyone wants to spell out.

When Mr. Indu Bikal Sapkota, NRM/CF manager at ANSAB opened up forum for participants to bring together expectations on what the workshop would come up with, expectations from the participants emerged cohesive and correlated

Making a fresh start, Mr. Bhishma P. Subedi, presented an overview of policy research rationale, framework and methodology. (*Please see annex 3 for details*) The specific objective will be how the processes carried out in the past have helped in formulating policy and now, we want to get to the strategies and to go on participatory action research, said Mr. Subedi. Detailing the rationale of the site selection criteria for the policy research, he articulated, in the research action, we will enter into from the decision, what are the factors influencing upon the decision, the basis of it, tool, environment, how it was implemented and what is the outcome.

Dr. Udaya Raj Sharma said policy makes big impact. Policy eases and hardens the process of NTFP management and marketing. Citing an example of *Cordyceps sinensis* he said, though we know that the royalty rate should be cut down, we don't know how much royalty should be imposed. If royalty rate is curtailed and keep up with 7 or 8 thousand, we assume that the royalty will boost up. The way of conclusion in this regard should be explored and made. I am happy to say that the reduction is under process.

In a query, are we being specific Mr. Subedi responded, our limitation is community forestry and NTFP sub-sector which are so much inter-related. This is a very good approach, said Dr. Bishnu Hari Pandit. Mr. A.L. Joshi also went along with it. Mr. Joshi further reasoned, this is good approach because this is the process oriented study. Mulling over the initiatives taken in the policy research works, Mr. Subedi said it's not possible to do everything all at once. It is a time consuming process. Despite it, we are thinking of studying the past and go on accordingly. But it is a fact that we can't stop our works because of the security issues.

Responses came from the forum that we should not get feared of the sensitive security situation in bringing voices of community people to come up with the policy research process. Stronger voices will come from the people suffered by the insurgency.

While bringing out the voices of the community people we should not say them that the policy will be formulated in respect with the government's interest. If the community people are convinced that the government will not turn its deaf ears to their voices we can congregate their support, said Mr. Bhola Bhattarai.

Mr. Bhim Prasad Shrestha said, equity issues, past initiatives in the policy, lessons learned and prediction in the policy perspective require to be thought over. He added, the research on policy process should oblige us to change our way of thinking.

Many positive changes in policy making process are bringing into practice these days, said Mr. Lal Kumar K.C. We are doing practical exercise whenever ANSAB organizes such policy forums. We are happy that our recommendations have been included in the upcoming policy reforms. Still, we want all our recommendations would come into the policy reforms.

Exploring some instances of the policy research issues, Mr. Bhishma P. Subedi notified, why ownership of the policy decisions was not taken or why the implementation process is incomplete? We want to select some cases.



## **2.2 Presentations and Discussions**

*Decentralized forest management in Nepal: synergy of economic development governance a local capacity building – By Dr. Keshav Kanel*

Dr. Kanel started from what the policy is with empirical statements, policy should be very practical. He further explained about the policy making process and changes. He said policy is always dynamic. Though coordination is important, in some cases, the coordination is so much difficult. And so, he reasoned, there are some world wide challenges in the environmental management.

Referring to the present context, he said, policies are made but implementation has been weakened. Yet, implementation capacity is the world's problem. To come up with the concrete result, we should equally convince and encourage the politicians, which have been difficult for us of late. Another challenging issue is that weather forest should be under community ownership or of the state.

Neither do we have big level stock nor have money problem, said Dr. Kanel. Social capital is important for development where binding and breezing is crucial. Society itself should take over the development responsibility. Unless and until we understand the complexity of policy issues, we can not be successful. This indeed is a socio-political process not a physical issue, agreed the meet.

In a query of Mr. Bhola Bhattarai if autonomy is not there, great problem may be created, Dr. Kanel responded, autonomy should be in place of the social context, I said it should be building and breezing. First we should be independent and later we should be interdependent, added Mr. Bhishma P. Subedi. ***(Please see annex 4 for paper and presentation)***

### **Speech of Dr. Madhav Karki**

Dr. Karki expressed happiness when he found himself among the discussion of wise people. When the discussion went intensive, Dr. Karki said every state is managing the contradiction between the livelihood and conservation. We usually ask for balance of conservation and livelihood in developing products. When the resource does not mount up, the development will be failed. In the case of development process, he said not only decentralization but also devolution is required uniformly. Digging into the policy research perspective, excellent policy expert is as crucial as the good research, good analysis and good policy.

In a concern about livelihood and conservation, he said, only one model does not work everywhere. Conservation and livelihood both are the outcome. He also consented that community forest and NTFP sector can not only work for the poverty reductions. Participatory outcome monitoring mechanism should be developed. All types of

resources, financial resource, human resource, technical resource, and natural resource should be available to get expected outcome in this regard. We should be informed and learn the lessons from others but should not replicate.

There are also situations that we are happy in policy implementation, said Dr. Bishnu Hari Pandit. Adding on it, Dr. Sharma said the policy decisions made so far were not made through perfect policy making process or through the wider consultation. Until and unless moral enhancement and operation of constraints are not cultivated, nothing can be done, further added Dr. Sharma, we should realize the weaknesses and make the policy well, we will not lack human resources. And the policy should be multi-sectoral. We should also bring out ways how to avoid culture of policy imposition without consultation.

### **Presentation of Dr. Udaya Raj Sharma**

*Complimentarities and contradictions between conservations and livelihoods*

The objective of this workshop is how to make the policy planning process effective, said Dr. Sharma. NTFPCC has actively worked out for a year in preparing draft of NTFP policy bringing out the wide range of grassroots consultations.

Sometimes wrong policy may come. Despite the fact that Kutki is banned for import, still illegal trade of Kutki is rampant. In this context, there appeared the policy is not functioning well and it egged on the illegal trade. From this standpoint, government would better to carry out research in this issue and make appropriate provision, said Dr. Sharma.

Dr. Keshav Kanel said governance is the driving force which should be autonomous as well as interdependent. Along with it, conservation and livelihood should be stepped forward together. To come up with the conservation and livelihood results, investment should also go to the se-phoksundo and others, exemplified Dr. Sharma. He further questioned, is the objective of community forest at present is only the conservation? Dr. Sharma suggested, we should be obvious where to head towards, either towards commercialization or conservation or capitalization, whereas we are working only one or two sides. Unique local opportunity should be capitalized, argued Dr. Sharma. This is not hard and fast but understanding of priority and bringing it into mind is crucial, emphasized Dr. Sharma. *(Please see annex 5 for paper and presentation)*

*Integrated watershed approach and policy outcomes in relation to community forestry and NTFPs management in Nepal by Dr. Mohan Wagle*

According to the presentation of Dr. Wagle, more than 50 % of world's population depends directly on these watersheds for water to grow food, generate energy and to drink. Watersheds are vital for the ecological health of a country. Watershed shelters immense flora and fauna and provide important sources of forest products including major forest products and Non-timber Forest Products (NTFPs). For the sustainable water shade management, inevitable factors like forest, agriculture, soil, biodiversity, water,

social economic culture, human resources, local resources and NTFPs should be integrated. The major points Dr. Wagle highlighted were critical role and concern of watershed, threats to NTFPs from watershed degradation and awareness issues, increasing awareness of NTFPs in watershed, sectoral policies including NTFPs. *(Please see annex 6 for paper and presentation)*

### **Presentation of Dr. Madhav Karki**

*Creating Champions, Planting Ideas, Connecting Adversaries: IDRC's Experiences in Policy Influencing.*

Policy champions should be encouraged and they are more important than issues in government agencies, according to Dr. Madhav Karki, Regional Program Coordinator at MAPPA, IDRC, Canada. Revealing some issues in the community forestry and NTFP policy sector, he presented some restraining factors in policy including politics and bureaucracy. He also shared the IDRC's experience in the policy sector, policy linkages and lessons learned. *(Please see annex 7 for presentation)*

## **2.3 Identification of policy issues and constraints**

The participants individually identified the current policy issues, mutually prioritized them and selected issues for further analysis.

In the process of identifying policy issues, Mr. Bhim Prasad Shrestha said, what can be the factor that affects implementation and why the policy could not be effective in implementation? There may be tiny but important things beyond it.

Mr. Bhairab Risal said, it would be better to sort out the recommended issues in the policy research process, follow up with what are taken or what are not taken. I am ready to help what is delivered or what is not. We'd better to analyze what's going on.

Mr. Bhattarai presented a chronological ebb and flow of the policy formulation events in the past. The trend, as he presented, shows that the policy impact went well after a long drawn out experiences and again now the process is heading towards decreasing wave.

Expressing views on the complicated aspect of the policy making process, Mr. Bhairab Risal put forward a potential phenomenon that may arise to discourage people in participation. He said, in the progression of policy forming, initially draft is made amassing enormous endeavor. When act is formulated an extent of satisfaction came across. Yet much effort is required to make the act a regulation and moreover sub-regulation is necessitated in some cases. In such long winded process, people may loose encouragement. We should not let our feeling and spirit lost on the way of progression.

Mr. Bhishma P. Subedi said we look different issues differently. In the social aspect, we think very differently from the spontaneous flow. We asked all to include whatever left over issues time and again. NTFPCC has already passed the policy. The policy draft

underwent a long process. We are usually bringing the lessons learned into practice.  
*(Please see annex 7 for identified policy issues)*

## **2.4 Group Work and Group Presentations**

Mr. Indu Bikal Sapkota and Mr. Surya B. Binayee facilitated the session. The participants were divided into two groups and asked for work using the research framework. The major suggested details were who are the stakeholders called on for accumulating suggestion for policy, where the data came from, what are the outcomes, was the process participatory or not, how were the outputs, did it go towards implementation or not, who did what, how the decision came.

The participants were also asked to find out ways that are not known and to take out the extent that is known about the policy issues. The groups firstly explored policy decisions; identified issues and challenges, policy formulation process and thereafter made out impacts and recommendations.

The group works were done on the following issues:

- Royalty, taxation, ban, restriction and lifting
- Resources assessment and inventory
- Institutions *(Please see annex 8 for group presentation)*

## **2.5 Closing**

Mr. Bhim Prasad Shrestha expressed belief that ANSAB has well coped to get recommendations from the government. I hope so much from the workshop that ANSAB does well in this sector. Dr. Nirmal Bhattarai said the workshop took in very good objective and the workshop went well. Let's work together to completely fulfill the spirit of the workout the workshop aspires in future in the next informal forum. Dr. Bhattarai also thanked ANSAB for organizing such workshop.

Mr. Bhola Bhattarai appreciated ANSAB saying it has set up commendable reputation in the community forest and NTFP sector. And it has done a lot to bring out voices of grassroots people which the government listens to. We have no ways to convey our voices to the government without ANSAB. I am very happy that I saw government people very positive in the workshop. But its important that how can we use their positive ness and our happiness, added Mr. Bhattarai. I think that the research model will work well moreover I wish the output of research would work towards guiding the process. In this regard, I am ready to contribute on behalf of FECOFUN.

Mr. Lal Kumar KC requested more workshops to be held of this kind. and added ANSAB is doing a lot in bringing out grassroots level voices for the policy reformation intent.

Mr. Shambhu Rai said it is the matter of happiness that the government people have stepped up a long stride in the social aspect. The workshop has been very good from the learning standpoint. He expressed happiness over the active participation of high ranking government people in the workshop.

Mr. Surya B. Binayee said I found the workshop different from others and more interesting. I expect that the research model would help to uplift the effective policy implementation process. He thanked all the participants for the energetic and output oriented involvement.

Mr. Bhishma P. Subedi said we got the perception of the government. We learnt from them. We also thought of to bring their views in this respect, from this point of view, we have been successful. We should present it in a credible way. We have just stepped into an initiative and there are lots to do ahead, added Mr. Bhishma P. Subedi.

## **Section 3: Recommendations and Conclusion**

### ***Recommendations***

- It would be better to look upon conservation and livelihood issues in order to step up them together and how they have been addressed in the policy implementation process
- We should be obvious where to head towards, either towards commercialization or conservation or capitalization.
- To come up with the concrete result, we should equally convince and encourage the politicians, which have been difficult for us of late
- Bring out ways how to avoid culture of policy imposition without consultation
- Moral enhancement and operation of constraints should be cultured to bring out effective policy decisions
- The research would better also to look over how the issues and voices of the community people have been included and neglected in the policy making process
- Research should oblige us to change our way of thinking
- Security sensitive issues should be brought into mind while implementing the research model. Limitation may be fruitful to be discussed at length in terms of the security sensitive situation in bringing out the voices of the people i.e. how to take in the voices of the people of the areas made vulnerable by security issues
- Cases from Terai region would have been better to consist of in the selection criteria in the research model. District selection and ANSAB's area would better be considered more
- Conservation should not only be the slogan

## ***Conclusion***

The community forest and NTFP policy research workshop held on July 28-30 on Godavari come to an end with tangible findings, a concrete result of participatory action research as an initiative in the community forest and NTFP sub-sector of Nepal.

Participants expressed happiness that the government people came out very appreciative in the meeting and the government has stepped up a long stride in the social aspect. In the run that many positive changes are going to be brought into practice these days, grassroots representatives expressed pleasure over those forums where ANSAB has repeatedly been providing opportunities to exercise practically in order to contribute to the policy reformation process. The discussion on policy process went intensive among the prudent and wise arguments of policy champions and the real voices of the grassroots people.

The forum strove at getting reflection from the high level government representatives taking part in the meeting. Policy issues under the periphery of community forest were looked through in the workshop. Identification of policy issues and discussion over them at length in process was the major outline the meet made out.

The significance of the workshop is that the attempt of policy research itself was an initiative and a new step in the community forest and NTFP sub-sector. Participants from the high level government body, donor organizations, NGOs/INGOs and relevant stakeholders appreciated the initiative with an expectation that the research outcome would create easier environment for government to further make and implement policy decisions and others to learn the lessons. The another productive substance is that some representatives on behalf of their organizations gave hands to completely support working towards the policy research model while others appreciated and encouraged to step on further strides. The positive responses from the government bodies and happiness towards it from the grassroots representative were other enabling ambience the workshop created.

# Annexes

## 1. Workshop Program

<b>July 28, 2004: Arrival of the participants at Godavari Village Resort by 19:00</b>	
19:00-19:30: Registration of the participants	
<b>July 29, 2004</b>	
<b>Time</b>	<b>Topic/Sub-topics</b>
9:00-9:30	Welcome, introduction and workshop objectives
9:30-10:00	Overview of policy research rationale, framework and methodology- By Mr. Bhishma P. Subedi
10:00-10:20	Clarifications and discussion
<b>10:20-10:40</b>	<b>Tea Break</b>
10:40-11:00	Decentralized forest management in Nepal: synergy of economic development, governance and local capacity building-By Dr. Keshav Kanel
11:00-11:10	Clarifications and discussion
11:10-11:30	Role of research and information dissemination in policy analysis and formulation in Nepal-By Dr. Damodar Parajuli
11:30-11:40	Clarifications and discussion
11:40-12:00	Integrated watershed approach and policy outcomes in relation to community forestry and NTFPs management in Nepal-By Dr. Mohan Wagle
12:00-12:10	Clarifications and discussion
12:10-12:30	Complementarities and contradictions between livelihoods and conservation in Nepal: policy responses and practices: By Dr. Udaya Sharma
12:30-12:40	Clarifications and discussion
<b>12:40-14:00</b>	<b>Lunch</b>
14:00-15:30	Plenary brainstorming on identification of major policy issues and constraints
<b>15:30-15:50</b>	<b>Tea Break</b>
15:50-17:00	Plenary reflection upon the methods and processes of formulating policies in the areas of community forestry and NTFP sub-sectors in Nepal
17:00-17:30	Wrap up of the day's work
19:00-21:00	Yarsagumba video show and reception Dinner
<b>July 30, 2004</b>	
<b>Time</b>	<b>Topic/Sub-topics</b>
9:00-9:30	Recap of yesterday's works and clarifications
9:30-11:00	Plenary brainstorming and analysis of how research and grassroots experiences influenced the forest policy making and shaping process in Nepal
<b>11:00-11:20</b>	<b>Tea Break</b>
11:20-13:00	Continue brainstorming and analysis of how research and grassroots experiences influenced the forest policy making and shaping process in Nepal
<b>13:00-14:15</b>	<b>Lunch</b>
14:15-16:00	Group works on assessment of the effectiveness of the specific tools, experiences and insights in formulating forest policies targeting the gender and marginalized communities, and recommend different strategies and options for appropriate policy reforms in community forestry and NTFP sub-sectors (2-3 groups) <b>Tea at 15:30 included</b>
16:00-17:00	Presentation of Group works and discussion
17:00-17:30	Wrap up and closing of the workshop
<b>18:00</b>	<b>Departure</b>



## 2. List of Participants

S/No.	Name	Designation	Organization
1.	Dr. Udaya Raj Sharma	Director General	DPR
2.	Dr. Madav Karki	Regional program coordinator	IDRC
3.	Dr. Keshav Raj Kanel	Deputy Director General	DoF
4.	Dr. Mohan Wagle	Chief Planning Division	MoFSC
5.	Mr. Bhola Bhattarai	General Secretary	FECOFUN
6.	Ms. Munni Gautam	Assistant Forest Officer	CFD/DoF
7.	Mr. A. L. Joshi	Technical Advisor	NARMSAP
8.	Mr. Lal Kumar K.C.	Treasurer	HJSS
9.	Mr. Bhairab Risal	Member	NEFEJ
10.	Mr. Bhim Pd. Shrestha	Chairperson	FECOFUN
11.	Mr. R.P. Lamsal	Deputy Regional Director/ Far-western Regional Forest Directorate	DoF, Dhanghadi
12.	Mr. Francisco Tolentino	Advisor	SNV-Nepal
13.	Dr. Nirmal Bhattarai	Coordinator	MAPPA-Nepal
14.	Dr. Bishnu Hari Pandit		NEW ERA
15.	Mr. Rajiv Pradhan	Deputy Team Leader	BDS-MaPS
16.	Mr. Shambhu Rai	Monitoring and Evaluation team leader	BDS-MaPS
17.	Mr. Bhishma P. Subedi	Executive Director	ANSAB
18.	Mr. Surya B. Binayee	Program/manager	ANSAB
19.	Mr. Indu B. Sapkota	CF/NRM manager	ANSAB
20.	Ms. Shova Adhikari	Information Officer	ANSAB

## **6. Group presentations**

### **Group 1**

#### **Royalty, taxation, ban, restriction and lifting**

##### **Forest regulation:1995**

- – Ban on collection (complete ban): Panchaule, Yarsagumba(1 piece – 500)
- Raw export ban (Sugandhakokila, Sugandhawal, Jatamansi, Sarpagandha, Jhyau, Silajit, Taxus)
- DFO given decision making power on punishment/fine except yarsagumba and Panchaule (according to the regulation)

##### **Process**

- Criteria for selection of species for ban and restriction: no explicit bases/logic, whatever basis taken, not communicate to concerned stakeholders
- Process of policy making did not recognize the need to consult stakeholders
- Involved were  
Comment: DG and DFO –secretary (MFSC), Minister (MFSC), MoF- cabinet ?  
MoTC ?  
(Investigation needed)

##### **Outcomes:**

- HMG royalty decreased to zero in case of Yarsagumba, Panchaule, significantly on others
- Over harvesting continued
- Illegal trade flourished (export)
- Collectors income decreased, poverty increased
- Support to corruption
- No evidence/perception of positive outcomes
- No effective monitoring and implementation

##### **Policy and decision-2057**

- Complete ban on bark of Okhar, Kutki, Panchaule (as it is), Withdrawn of yarsagumba
- Raw export: as it is, add on yarsagumba
- In the case of timber: complete ban on falling  
In community forest: Chap, Khayar, Sal, Satisal, Bijayasal, Simal, etc –three were added on later. Before it were 4

##### **Process:**

- No proven and concrete scientific reason to impose ban
- Little changes after wider protests arose from relevant organizations and stakeholders
- In imposition and withdrawal of the ban no consideration done towards the context of the neighboring countries and CITES.

- Those banned in Nepal are open according to CITES and those banned in CITES are opened in Nepal
- Ban on Chiraito without any study and again withdrawal of ban on chiraito without any study
- No consultation with stakeholders while imposing ban
- Under pressure from the stakeholders and civil society, minimum openness and amendment

#### **Outcomes:**

- Changes made in this regard could not help achieve the targeted results. (situation as it is)
- No provision was made for the monitoring and evaluation of implementation and impact of the policy and regulation.
- Royalty of Yarsagumba was raised in minimal extent though not as expected.
- Collectors able to get more money since they got market information of Yarsagumba.

#### **Royalty and taxation**

##### **1995: Royalty rate mentioned in the regulation**

- Royalty rate was confirmed indifferently and roughly (Same rate of twelve types of Chiraito, royalty rate of Pakhanved is more than of its market price.
- Lack of knowledge in the authoritative body and no attempt was made towards fulfilling the lack.
- More than one name of the similar species and different royalty rates
- No attempts done from the government in the foreign export and more difficulties to be borne in India.
- Availability and sustainable development was not considered by DFO while giving collection permit (Technical knowledge and data)
- Two window system in the taxation

#### **Process**

- Lack of obvious reason
- No consultation with concerned stakeholders
- DG-----Secretary (MFSC)-----MoF---Cabinet
- Complex process required to be amended the once made regulation

#### **Outcome:**

Not remarkable reforms in royalty in the favor of users and NTFP management.

## **Group two**

### **Inventory**

- **Policy decision**

- Inventory should be done in hand over or renew of the community forest
- Guideline implemented for the need
- Stock, also of timber taken annually
- Silent about the NTFP (work only done to measure the plant 1m x 1m)
- More complicated and technical
- Not participatory
- Forest management not integrated while giving training to the field staff and users

### **Issues and challenges**

- Speed of community forest reduced
- Dependency over technicians increased
- Not objective oriented, limited only in formality
- Inventory should be done not only of the forest based NTFPs but also of the wetland products, tourism, wildlife and of other environmental services
- Falling of timber was promoted legally after the inventory was implemented
- In some of the community forests they have concept that timber should be chopped down according to the annual production (particularly in the mid hills)
- Useful tool for those who wants to do well

### **Adopted process**

- Initiation of the most primitive guidelines was started from a particular project through inadequate discussion and homework. Very limited technical persons were involved. (2056)
- When difficulty in implementation was realized by other programs and projects, ministry decided to apply own methods (2057) and amended the above mentioned guidelines was amended and translated into Nepali. (2058)
- Third times again? federation of community forest users group presented written recommendations after the amendment process set about
- Workshop organized to amend the guideline in 2059/60 (Phalgun 12). Users group on behalf of federation of community forest users Nepal took part. Recommendations called on from other stakeholders but the suggestions were not included in the guideline
- The condition of the guideline of late is unknown
- There is no ownership of other stakeholders in the guideline
- Only the work of government official (ranger) is validated

## **Recommendations**

- Community forest inventory and inventory of the NTFP should be integrated
- Community forest should be categorized into enterprise oriented and livelihood oriented and inventory should be done only in the enterprise oriented community forests
- Guideline should be made practical, simple, useful and users oriented
  - Consultation required from all the stakeholders
  - Technical words should be translated into understandable Nepali language
  - Focus should be given more to the process rather than in the content
  - Training in the local level and prepare focal person
  - The guideline should adopt flexibility considering the local necessities
  - Provision of regular technical service while implementing the guideline
  - Orientation to the technicians accordingly the guideline after it is prepared

## **Group 3**

### **Institutional structure**

1. Forest Development Master Plan – 2045
2. Forest Act-2049
3. Forest Regulation-2051
4. Community Forest Guideline-2058

### **Policy decisions, 2045; 2049**

- Community forest users group formation, registration and organization
- Community forest users group can set up enterprise
- Community forest users group can do collection, management, price fixation and sale of the forest products

### **Challenges appeared in the forest master plan**

Policy can not be implemented unless and until it becomes legal

### **Challenges of the forest act**

- Not obvious process of forest hand over and users group formation
- Demand of community forest increased from the community people

### **Challenges of the forest regulation**

- Not obvious hand over process
- Not obvious role of the concerned stakeholders
- Not obvious role and qualification of the facilitators

### **Environment conservation act/regulation-2053/54**

- Consideration of EIA and IEE while setting up an enterprise while community forest can not invest for the IEE and EIA

### **Community forest guideline – 2058**

- Facilitators of non governmental organization can facilitate for the formatin of community forest

### **Issue**

- Decision of the suers group can amend the operational plan of the community forest users group while 2 years to be waited for

Partnership Forest Guideline – 2060 (Secretary level decision without consultation)

- Involve all the stakeholder for the forest management

### **Issues**

- Prevent on hand over of the community forest users group
- Ownership confiscated from the users group
- Ruling of the tricky people in the benefits

Deforestation in Terai region is likely to happen which may egg on the hilly region also

**Decision/Impact**

- Formation and registration of community forest users group
- Community involvement in forest management increased
- Improvement in the capacity of the forest
- Enterprise establishment
- Formation and development of networks
- Groups of similar interest formed
- Increase in the women participation (In decision making and benefit sharing)