

CAUSES AND CONSEQUENCIES OF INTERNAL MIGRATION

A Case Study of Anarmuni VDC

Anarmuni VDC, Jhapa

Submitted By:

DIPAK PRASAI

T.U. Registration No. 27653-94

Roll no: 230

059/061

Submitted to:

Central Department of Rural Development

Faculty of Humanities and Social science

T. U. Kirtipur, Kathmandu

RECOMMENDATION

It is with great pleasure that I recommend the approval of the project report entitled **"CAUSES AND CONSEQUENCIES OF INTERNAL MIGRATION (A Case Study of Anarmuni VDC, Jhapa)"** under my supervision for the fulfillment of requirements of Master of Arts in Rural Development. Therefore this project report is recommended for its evaluation.

.....
(Prof. Dr. Uma Kanta Siluwal)
Supervisor

APPROVAL LETTER

This is to certify that the project work submitted by Dipak Prasai entitled "**CAUSES AND CONSEQUENCIES OF INTERNAL MIGRATION (A Case Study of Anarmuni VDC, Jhapa)**" has been approved by the department as partial fulfillment at the required for Master Degree of Arts in Rural Development.

Evaluation Committee:

Prof. Dr. Pradeep K. Khadka
Head of the Department
Central Department of Rural Development

External

(Prof. Dr. Uma Kanta Siluwal)
Supervisor
Central Department of Rural Development

Date

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

This project report is prepared for the partial fulfillment of the requirements of Masters' Degree in Rural Development. The main objective of the study is to analyze about the Causes and Consequences of Internal Migration in Anarmuni VDC of Jhapa district.

First and foremost I would like to express my sincere thanks and deep gratitude to Prof. Dr. Pradeep Kumar Khadka, Head of Rural Development, Department of Tribhuvan University, for his Invaluable suggestions and encouragement during the process of study.

I want to express my thanks to Prof. Dr. Uma Kanta Silwal for his constant supervision, and valuable suggestion for the study. I am very much thankful to the people of Anarmuni VDC for their help during field survey.

I cannot forget to mention Valuable suggestion and help of my uncle Mr. Mahendra Prasai who helped and shared his experience with me at the time of this study and overall report generation.

At last, I would like to express my thanks to my parents who helped me financially and emotionally to carry out the research work.

Dipak Prasai

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The study "Causes and Consequences of internal migration" is based on both primary and secondary data. Study on causes and consequences of internal migration have been evaluated from the primary data and the comprehensive study has been done with secondary data sources.

The project work was performed in 2007. The project study was conducted in Anarmuni VDC of Jhapa district. Since, the population is a dynamic aspect, so the data may differ little bit. But is hoped that it will depict the necessary information for the study in the focused area.

Based on this study, it is found that migration is being influenced by various socio-economic, demographic components. Migration does not only bring change in size, distribution and composition of population but also the socio economic, cultural composition of any areas. It is greatly affected by the pull and push factors in place of origin and the place of destination respectively.

All most all the respondents were taken from the migrated household only in Anarmuni V DC . Most of migrated households were migrated from the hilly districts of Ilam, Panchathar Taplejung, Terhathum and other hilly and Terai regions of the country. From the observation it is found that migration has played prominent role on the overall development of the people of Anarmuni VDC. On the another hand it has also created some social and economic problems on the study area.

TABLE OF CONTENT

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

1.1	Background	1
1.2	Introduction to the study Area:	3
1.3	Statement of the Problem	4
1.4	Objectives of the Study	5
1.4.1	General objectives	5
1.4.2	Specific objectives	5
1.5	Limitations of the study	5
1.6	Rational of the Study	5

CHAPTER II

2.1	Literature Review	6
-----	-------------------	---

CHAPTER III

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1	Selection of Study area	15
3.2	Method of Data collection	15
3.3	Research Design	15
3.4	Sample design and sample size	16
3.5	Method of Data Processing	16
3.6	Interview schedule for household survey	16
3.6.1	Observation	16
3.6.2	Key information's Interview	16
3.6.3	Households Survey	16
3.7	Secondary Data	17
3.8	Data Analysis	17

CHAPTER IV

4.1	Forest Management Practices in Nepal	18
4.1.1	History of Forest Management	18
4.1.2	The forestry Master Plan 1988	20
4.1.3	The Forest Act 1993	22
4.1.4	Evaluation of Community Forest in Nepal	23
4.2	People's Participation in Community Forest	25
4.3	Status of Community Forestry in Nepal	25

CHAPTER V

DATA ANALYSIS AND PRESENTATION

5.1	Socio-economic status.	27
5.1.1	Cast composition	27
5.1.2	Age Composition	27
5.1.3	Sex composition	28
5.1.4	Family Size	28
5.1.5	Occupational Status	29
5.1.6	Educational Status	29
5.5	Utilization of community forest in different purposed by the user households	29
5.5.1	Firewood	29
5.5.2	Grass collections.	30
5.5.3	Timber collections.	30
5.5.4	Availability of forest and forest products	30
5.5.5	Availability of firewood for fuel.	30
5.6	Impact of Community forest	31
5.7	Utilization of timber	31
5.7.1	Perception of respondents towards using the timber before and after C.F.	31
5.7.2	Availability of leaf and bedding materials.	32
5.7.3	Availability of wild life	32
5.7.4	Live stock searing after community forest.	33

5.8	Prices of forest products.	33
5.9	Forest based occupation and Income generating activities conducted by the CFUG	34
5.9.1	Cardamom Production	34
5.10	Forest based occupation	34
5.11	Local Community Development from Community Forestry	35
5.11.1	Social Benefits	35
5.11.2	Increased the status of FUG, women and poor	35
5.11.3	Increased Level of Awareness	36
5.11.4	Increased people's Participation	37
5.11.5	Increased community Development Activities	37
5.11.6	Economic Benefits	37
5.11.7	Income Generation	38
5.11.8	Environment Management	38
5.11.9	Employment Generation	38
5.11.10	Availability of Forest Production	39
5.11.11	Successful Regeneration	39
5.11.12	Forest Resources	40
5.11.13	Forest Management	40

CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

6.1	Summary:	42
6.2	Conclusion	43
6.3	Recommendation	44

CHAPTER -I

INTRODUCTION

1.1. Background

Nepal is an agricultural country. The majority of the farmers in the Hill and Terai in Nepal consider forest as an integral part of their farming system. The majority of farmers do not have large farmland. They depend on agriculture and there is not enough fertile land. Therefore people seek to use forest as agricultural land. The people depend on forest resources for fuel wood, fodder, timber, herbs and many other items. Timber is widely used for house construction, food for animals, agricultural tools, furniture and other purposes. Forest has been providing additional lands for agricultural expansion to meet the increasing demand for food by ever increasing population.

In recent years, deforestation has become one of the major environmental crises in Nepal. It is said to occur at an annual rate of 4.1 percent during 1981-1985. Which is the highest among all countries surveyed (World Resources Institute, 1991). Serious concern is being expressed by many donor agencies that are now extending their activities in community forestry programmes in Nepal deal with this crisis. This crisis has led to the formulation of the Himalayan Environmental Degradation theory i.e. that population pressure in rural areas; insufficient landholdings and poverty are linked to massive deforestation.

In 1970, the community forest development programmes introduced the concept of Panchayat forest and Panchayat protected forest with the purpose of handing back the protection and management of the forest to the local people (Chhetri and Pandey, 1992).

In 1988, Government of Nepal prepared a master plan for the development of forestry programmes in Nepal. The main strategy was to promote people's participation in forest resource development and to develop community forest user groups (FUGs) as one of the important alternatives for the forestry sector in Nepal. The community forestry user group programme is supported strongly by many donor agencies such as the Nepal-UK forestry project, the Nepal-Australia forestry project, the World Bank and others.

The Forest Act 1993 categorises the forest into two broad classes, private forest and National forest. Private forest is a fully or partially tree-covered area and both the tree and the land belong to an individual. National forest is land owned by

the government. The national forest is further categorized into the following ownership types.

-) Community forest
-) Leasehold forest
-) Religious forest
-) Protected forest
-) Government forest

The study will be about the community forest. Community forest has been developed in 73 districts with out Rolpa and Mustang in Nepal. (GON Nepal, 2059)

However, the development of community forest in many areas is very limited and in the absence of detailed study, the performance of community forest, which are developed and handed over to the local community, is poorly assessed and analyzed. It is necessary to understand the causes of the success and failure of community forest program in order to develop an effective forest management strategy. It is in this context this study attempted to the community forest development management utilization benefit sharing and conservation practices of Sakranti VDC in Terhathum district.

The forest Act has defined the community forest as the jungle handed over the user group from the status jungle for the welfare of people with the responsibilities of its protection, a forestation and growth (GON, 1993)

When we defined the community forest it means the certain part of forest of the national forest which has been directly handed over to the community forest user group by formatting management communities to with the responsibility of management, protection and its betterment. The right investment, profit as well as implementation of programs depend on forest user group. The forest having all these characteristics is known as community's forest.

Community forestry also know as "social" or "village" forestry is practiced in various combination of scattered tree, clustered trees in rows monoculture woodlots and in the forms of multiple cropping in both private and communal lands. These multiple land use systems aim at designing ecologically sound, economically viable, socially and culturally acceptable and need oriented production of food, animal food, wood and other products on the same tract of land either simultaneously or sequentially. (Kayasta, Baban Prasad 1991)

Community forestry program that involves local people has had some success to reverse the trend of deforestation. Legislation enabled communities to hand over community forest (I. P. Neupane 1987)

Mainly, the community's forest means the forest on which each activity is directly programmed by the local people participation. In India, community forest is managed or protected forest with combined participation of government and people. In Thailand forest, which is an uncultivated barren land and managed by a group is known as community's forest. In United State of America community forest means the forest, which is planted, managed and protected on the both sides of road and park is known as community's forest. (Khadk, Dhruva, 2000)

1.2 Introduction to the study Area:

Forest resources play an immense role in the development of human society. Forests are closely interrelated with daily livelihood as well as with religion and culture.

This study will attempt to explore the forest development, management, utilization, benefit sharing and participation for conservation practices of Sakranti Bazar V.D.C.

The forest of this district occupies 23 thousand 9 hundred and 87 hector area out of them 47 percent forest has transformed to the community. The total number of registered community forests are 293 and 1,20,813 peoples of 22859 households are benefited directly and indirectly form the community forest. (Gorkhapatra, 4 Sawan 2061) Phagetar Community Forestry is one of the community forests of them.

Phagetar Community Forest is situated in Sakranti Bazaar VDC, Terhathum, Koshi Zone at the altitude of 2100 to 2500 meter from the see level. The forestry has cover 10.31:32 hector area. People of Sakranti Bazar VDC ward no 6 and 8 have been using the forest for the daily lives. This forestry has been transformed to the community user group at Magh 2049. Since the date of transferring the total authority of consuming the forest products has been utilizing by the households of Sakranti Bazar VDC. (District Forest Office, Terhathum)

Phagetar community Forest plays a vital role to the consumer of the household of Sankranti Bazar V.D.C. . It is not only important for environmental establishing but also for dominant source of energy. Fodders for animals and construction materials, it has also a great contribution in agricultural production. The rapid increase in human and livestock population over the last three decades create

heavy pressures on forest through expansion of agriculture and grazing lands and cutting down of more trees to meet fuel, fodder and timber requirements. As consequence, soil erosion, down stream floods, siltation and loss of soil fertility have threatened the farming system and the environment. Therefore the excessive use of the forest resources has created several environmental problems. The problems are increasing due to demand for the growing population. If the population can't be properly managed, we will inevitable lose of valuable resources.

1.3 Statement of the Problem

The forest resource of Phagetar Community forest has been the source of fodder for animal. It is also essential for composing dung to produce manure, fuel wood and timber for heating cooking and so on. The poor people of the village do not have any alternative source of energy. Electricity is available only for the lighting purpose. That's why they have to depend entirely only on wood as a main source of fuel.

In the past the rapid growth of population had heavy pressure on the available farmland that was not sufficient to face the need of growing population. Because of growing population, more forestland has been cleared for crop production. One the other hand the government and other agencies were less successful for the protection, management and sustainable use of the forest resources.

The concept of community forest is highly based on the principle of people's participation. In other words, it is thought that forest can be managed under the responsibility of the local people rather than government control.

Community forest is not a new concept of Nepal. Before the nationalization of forest in 1957, local people used to manage most of the forest, particularly in the hill and mountains by themselves. Some are very successful some are not. It is necessary to understand that what are the main factors responsible for the success and failure. So this study will attempt of the following aspects.

-) Utilization, management & protection of community forest
-) Participation and decision making
-) Cost benefit sharing
-) Equity and conservation practice of the study area.

1.4 Objectives of the Study

1.4.1 General objectives

The general objective of this case study is to identify the present conditions of the Phagetar Community forest of Sankranti VDC.

1.4.2 Specific objectives

The specific objectives of the case study are following:

1. To evaluate participation of local people in community forest.
2. To evaluate use and management practices of community forest.
3. To observe the socio economic Impact of community forestry to the local people.

1.5 Limitations of the study

1. Every research has its own nature and limitation the study will be concentrated to the Phagetar community forest of Sakranti Bazar VDC and the consumer of the forest of the same VDC.
2. The study covers only the limited area
3. Information will be collected form the head of the household or knowledgeable member of the household so there may not achieve the actual information in some households
4. The study will be tried to bind within the time, area and other limitation. So the thesis will be limited and it will be of course for certain purpose that cannot be used for other purposes.

1.6 Rational of the Study

Community forest is one of the most appreciated programs in Nepal. Active involvement of the local people is the backbone of the community forestry program. The study deals with the micro level study of community forest in regards to people's participation.

The perception of the local people as well as the relationship between user group and local people is highly related on the community forest. It's also helpful for government for developing and implementing policies for projects of community forest in the village.

The status of forest also affects ecology and economic sustainable development. The study deals with the improvement in forest condition that leads to sustainable environment and economic improvement. Forest condition can be improved if community forest program is made effective. This study provides basis for the development of effective management strategies, policies and programs.

CHAPTER II

2.1 Literature Review

There are many scholars and researchers who have devoted their time on forestry issues of Nepal. Their efforts to find out the forestry problem and solution are considered valuable contributions. However, here an attempt has been made to review the publications by some scholars related directly to community forestry management system.

Community forestry is a social process, concerned with the management of forest and tree resources by complex and dynamic social institutions and organizations (Gilmour and Fisher, 1991). In addition, the community forestry approach puts the community at the centre rather than the forest. Therefore, it is called "People Centered forestry". Community forestry is an activity in which forest is managed, protected, and utilized by groups of local people on a sustained yield basis and works towards developing their own capability for self reliance. FAO in 1989 restates that ideally community forestry activities are those that recognize the intimate relationship of women, men and the trees the surround them.

The concept of CF crystallized some what is the late 1970, with the release of the landmark FAO publication foresting for Local Community Development (FAO, 1978) In this community forestry was defined as "... any situation which intimately involves local people in a forestry activity" (FAO, 1978) According to FAO, community forestry departed radically from all previous conception of what forestry was about in that is centered on the idea of peoples participation getting local population to plan and execute their own projects on a self help basis. This meant providing them with the advice and inputs needed to grow seedlings to plant, manage and protect their own forest resource and to extract the maximum benefit from these resources. Community forestry is dedicated to the idea of increasing the direct benefit of the forest resources to the rural poor (FAO, 1983). Community forestry is the control and management of forest resource by the rural people, who use them especially for domestic purpose and as an integral part of their farming system (Gilmour et al, 1991)

Community forestry program begin in Nepal as a problem solving strategy in the late 1970s. The problems to be addressed were of two major types. First,

deforestation and deteriorating condition of the forest in the country were believed to be critical community forestry program was identified as a strategy to combat such problems. Community plantations and handing over the authority for the protection and management of local forests to the communities (called forest user Groups) have been the means of achieving this goal. Second, people were alienated from forestry due to the Private Forest Nationalization of 1957 and it was realized that this could pose problems for any conservation efforts in the country (Chhetri 1999)

In the 1970s, the community forestry development program introduced the concepts of Panchayet forest (PF) and Panchayet protected forest (PPF) with the purpose of handing that the protection and the management of the forest to the people. In the 1980s decentralization regulations were introduced in the forestry sector to further establish and foster local peoples and local organizations participation in the management and development of PF and PPF. In 1990, the end of Nepal's Panchayet system of government brought a change in the status of PF and PPF. Today, the term community forestry is used to refer any forest under user group protection and management (Chhetri, 1992)

In the very beginning community forest emerged in response partly to the failure of the forest industry development model to lead the socio-economic development and partly to the increasing rate of deforestation and forest land degradation in the third world. Indeed, it was recognize that these problems were interrelated and actually exacerbate by traditional approaches to forestry where little attention was given to relationship between the foresters and rural poor (Gilmour and Fisher, 1991). But now a day it is taken as an integral part of development process.

Forest form an integral part of the farming system for the majority of the farmers in the hills of Nepal. Life becomes unsustainable with out tree and forest products like leaf litter, grass and leaf fodder for their animals, firewood for cooking and timber for agricultural implements as well as construction work. Except for timber, other forest and tree products mentioned about are required by an average farming household on regular basis (Chhetri 1992).Forestry for local Community development is a new people oriented policy whose objectives are to raise the standard of living of rural people and involve them in decision making, so it is about rural people for the rural people (FAO 1978)

Community Forestry has been defined as 'small scale, village level forestry practices where decisions and actions are made on a collective basis and where the rural population participate in planning, establishment, management and harvesting of forest crops and receive a major proportion of the socio-economic and ecological benefits from the forest. Community Forest is a process of socio-economic change that requires continuous participation of the community in planning, implementing and problem solving. And it is a bundle of activities which generate a supplementary flow of income to the community by utilizing either unutilized or ill utilized land' (Kayastha, 1991). Similarly, community forestry has been defined as 'the control and management of forest by the people who use them (Gilmour/and Fisher, 1991). The Forest Act 1993 defines community forest as any part of national forest which is handed over by a DFO to 'a users group in the form of community forest as prescribed entitling to develop, conserve, use and manage the forest, and sell and distribute the forest products independently by fixing their prices according to the work plan' (GON 1993).

Tropical forests and other wood lands are fundamental to the economic and social livelihoods of millions of rural people. Forests supply energy need and it provides fodder for livestock which in turn produce for agriculture. Rural people also use forests for water supply, materials for house construction and for products like bamboo and medical herbs. For poor rural people trees can be of direct and immediate use, a source of cash when required a form of saving or a longer-term asset. So the forest and its products are critical to the livelihoods of millions (Oakley, 1991).

Community forest is for the benefit of local people, the primary user of the forest specially these who are dependent on forest products to meet subsistence needs. The majority of rural people in Nepal depend on forest to support their agricultural and livestock system forest provide fuel wood for cooking and heating, timber for building, furniture, fodder and bedding for livestock and leaf litter for compost and a range of other non-timber products. After the implementation of community forestry these products are equally distributed to all the members and people have started getting different training opportunities as well as they come in contract with different NGO and INGOs. This contact helps them in planning for poverty alleviation, through income generation (Goutam, 2001).

Not only has the sustainable management of the forest resource, CF program have been able to change the CFUG status. Pokharel (2004) examine that CF has

become has become instrumental in increasing natural, social, human, financial and to some extent physical capital (Quoted in Bhandari 2004, The Katmandu Post).

The implicit assumption originally made about a community of beneficiaries are now questioned, and have led to new initiatives focused on the participation of the forest users in the management of their forest resources. However, the degree to which users actually participate in decision making varies according to ideology of the organization. For some organizations community forestry means the empowerment of poor men and women through giving them control over access to the forest and decision making. Governments of both developed and developing countries should lend support to institutionalizing self-reliant mechanisms by which forestry activities will be increasingly based in endogenous decision making and the full participation of the rural poor (FAO, 1980, P. 7 cited in Hobley, 1991).

Community forestry is a strategy of rural development. Its aim is to improve the socio-economic condition of the people and help to poverty alleviation and rural development through forest resource management/utilization, Chhetri and Jackson (1994) include that community forestry is a viable strategy for rural development in Nepal. Similarly Chhetri (1994) explain that the community forestry program being implemented in Nepal is essentially a strategy adopted to bring about socio-economic change and development in rural societies through interventions in regard to the management of forests.

Kayastha (1991) has pointed out community forestry as one of the most effective and appropriate approaches taken by the people to preserve the forest in Nepal. Community forestry is in essence a participatory approach in which the local people are involved in the planning implementation development, production and protection of forest resources.

Kishor 1988 has mentioned in his research report that the economically well off, literate and upper class people of the village participate relatively more than poor and illiterate people in the community forest

Inserra (1998) has mentioned that the community forestry refers to management of forest by local villagers who depend on them to use fuel wood, fodder and raw materials for domestic purpose she has further described that the forest should be managed and protected by user groups.

Pradhan (1998) has tried to find out the present condition of community forest management program and socio-economic condition of user groups in

particular area. She has also found that role of community forest is important to the protection and management of forest resources.

At present, sources of income in community forestry are largely dependent upon income from government funding and the sale of timber and non-timber forest products, some environmental services are also becoming a source of income where forest condition has improved and wildlife viewing is possible (Rijal, 1997) various products and services can be extracted from forest for human use and provide tangible benefits (Appendix 2)

However, various tangible and intangible benefits from the community forestry can be realized. The environmental services and the agro-ecological stability due to the forest is quite difficult to quantify within the scope of this study, Tangible benefit that is timber, fuel wood, fodder etc, has been considered as the source of income that would be otherwise purchased from other sources. The sale of such products and the subsidies from the government and management sector are the chief source for the community forestry income.

NTFPs may be as important as cultivated crops for rural people (FAO, 1982). This is because during crucial periods and famine years, these products constitute the source of basic foods for peasants. Many people directly and indirectly depend upon forest for daily needs. Some are highly involved in collection and selling of forest products for their consumption and household income. This practice has been carried out since the last century for subsistence needs as well as for income generation. For example, a study in a rural village of west Bengal, India estimated that 38% of total income of tribal villagers comes from forest product sales, two thirds of which comes from fuel and fodder (Upadhyaya, 1989)

Forest products are sold as well as consumed and become a major contributor to monthly supplementary income during the agricultural off-season (Kant, 1997), It is estimated that 200-300 million people worldwide earn much of their subsistence supplementary income from forest products either through collecting them, or through simple processing activities such as handicrafts, furniture making or food processing (Byron, 1996)

Singh (1998) studied community Forestry in Nepal. In his study it is found that many Forest Users Groups (FUGs) after gratifying the basic forestry needs (Fuel wood, fodder, leaf litter and timber) have earned a significant amount of money in their group funds from the management of community forest and other viable source. Forest User Groups have been free to sale the surplus forest products

elsewhere in the competitive markets within the country in better price. However, government of Nepal since 1980 has banned export of round log and sawn timber. The only surplus forest product (such as fuel wood, timber of any FUGs should be sold within the district. Non timber forest products if not used by the FUG could be directly sold to the outsiders. It is found that most of the forest user groups have developed consolidated institutional capacity and adopted locally suitable forest management system. This has enabled them not only to fulfill their basic forestry need but also to accrue a considerable amount of money in their FUGs fund.

Malla (1993) studied that there has been the rapid socio-economic changes in Nepal and the development of domestic markets. These changes have been placed new demands on resources, including forest and open resources. In area with access too motor able to the markets, agricultural and livestock production has been become market oriented. In addition, more rural people have been involved in off-farm employment, which has been played a key role in rural household economy. These results have been changed the economic and resource management strategies of the rural people. In some rural areas these changes has been rapidly down the traditional agricultural system.

The study of community forest income distribution in Nepal has not been initiated. A limited number of studies in the past dealt only with the Government rules and regulations related to forestland property distribution. These studies were closely related to the charge of administration and politic in Nepal. Some related studies regarding income distribution of community forestry have been done in different parts of Nepal Mahat (1985), in an interview of people in Sindhupalchok District found that they have been wanted free of charges like the products grasses, herbaceous fodder, dead woods, leaf litters, etc. He also stated that people wanted thinning and pruning materials at lower rate than the government royalty.

The multidisciplinary team mentioned the existence of communal rules which state that felling of trees for construction timber requires permission of the headman of the territory-holding of local clan with the payment, Deadwood and reed bamboo can be collected by any member of the clan as needed (PAC 1988). Nettle, from which fibers for clothing are made, can also be collected according to the clan's rules.

Upadhyaya (1989), has been made another studies. The purpose of the study are as to assess the perception, role, view on distribution of Common Property Forest (CPF) to determine the factors influencing respondents' view on CPF

products distribution and distribution equity and fact that the distribution of forest product like fodder, grasses, timber, poles, pies, sal leaves, etc. should be distribute according to their contribution in Community Forestry (CF) management in order to make them full benefits of their involvement. With regards to equitable distribution, respondents showed that CPF product should be equitable distributed to the people in the area regardless of their involvement in CPF management and distribution scheme so that long-term stability can be maintained. He has also revealed that the socioeconomic factors like age, income, caste and education of the household heads, education and age of women of income and education of local leaders are significantly affected their perception of CPF management and product distribution.

Shrestha (1996) studied the benefit sharing and level of participation of user in community forestry. Community forests handed over to user groups are being used only for fodder, fuel wood and so on the most visible form of participation is protection work. In many community forestry, the users decide that protection work should be carried out in turns.

Community forestry has evolved to establish a suitable management of forests at local level. Rural communities have had significant achievements in meeting their forestry needs, generating and utilizing funds for community welfare, and conserving the forests as well. However, the management of community forestry will be at risk in the existing institutional arrangements within the user groups are not improved and user groups do not strive to attain a suitable security for subsistence before migrated market economy (Karki and Tiwari 1999)

Despite many successes in community forestry, there are some challenges ahead in the path of community forest management and development. There are three types of conflicts namely among users, between users and between user group and VDC member (Sharma, 1999). The conflicts are related to decision making and people's participation based on political ideology and different interest groups.

Poffenberger (2000) found that tendency for community forestry to be viewed from several narrow perspectives. A commonly held view arises from the development sector and assumes that community involvement in forest management is dependent on subsidies provided by governments and external donor agencies, while a second perspectives views community forestry as rather static traditional practiced by isolated peoples. The latter perspective provides a romantic, respective vision of a world that often no longer exists. The former paradigm has been empowered by vast sums of financial resources that build dependencies of rural

people upon government and outside agencies, creating paternalistic relationships. This approach can underling community initiative by assuming external financing is a pre-requisite to action, imposing outside structures and procedures.

Acharya (2001) found that the original envision of community forestry was to protect soil erosion, prevent environmental degradation and provide basic needs of forestry products to the rural people. In the present context community forestry management is a complex situation after meeting conflicting objectives and dynamic process than traditional forest management system. As recently been reported, Landowners and wealthier households are interested in long-term of intermediate produces while landless and poor families are interested for cash income produces gaining experiences and learning process will greatly help to develop the system. However, effective learning to shift protection-oriented forest management approach of the CFUGs to active approach have not been seen in the past. To maximize the benefits and to make successful community forestry program there is an urgent need to shift for active forest management. To address the livelihoods issues in community forestry, there is a need of leasing part of CF area to poorer section of community so that forest area will be used for more productivity and poorer will get more benefits from CF.

Shrestha (2002) claimed that he community forestry approach developed in Nepal has become one of the best models for managing the forests in the mid hill region. However in relation to management of forest in the Terai, there are some deficiencies. In a partnership approach to forest management, responsibilities and rights of all stakeholders must be clear and mutually agreed. He proposes a model where responsibilities and rights of all principal stakeholders are clearly defined. Such clarity is one of the main elements necessary for the collaborative model to be acceptable to all stakeholders. It is a strong basis for active participation by stakeholders, also tackles the issue of equitable benefit sharing. The benefit-sharing mechanism is based on proportionality with levels of investment. These practical provisions make the proposed mode unique and innovative. They create a strong tool for managing Terai forests and provide income and employment to local people, the proposed model benefits all stakeholders from families, user groups, local government, the DOF to the national as a whole. It tries to improve local livelihoods, forestry development and local development. In this way, the precious Terai Forest can be managed.

Upreti (2000) stated that the community forestry have positive impact on gender, equity, poverty, biodiversity and forest management which are significantly contributing to social change. The poverty reduction aspect is relatively weak as compared to the achievement made on gender and equity. The level of awareness is increased whereby quantity and quality of participation of user (poor, women, untouchable) etc. is improved.

According to Pokherel (2001) it is possible from community forestry to reduce poverty by securing resource for the poor, increasing the availability of resources and providing potential for income generating activities. Community forestry contributes to improve people's livelihoods. It has contributed significantly in building social capital.

New ERA (1998) explained that the people of Nepal have traditionally depended on forests for the supply of fuel wood, fodder, timber and non wood forest products. The greatest value of forest in the livelihood of the people is as providers of essential inputs in to the farming system. Tree fodder makes up a higher proportion of animal feed. Leaf litter collected from forests is used as bedding material in animal stalls and mixed with dung to make compost manure which is the major fertilizer for farmland.

Most of the users of community forest area perceive that the community forest belong to all the users and equal rights to forest products as well as responsibilities towards their forest. In general, the users make equitable contribution towards the protection and management of their community forest. The entire product is distributed to the users who are registered in a particular community Forest. Forest products such as firewood, timber, leaf litter, grass etc. are collected and distributed among them. The effectiveness of the management system depends on how the forest product has been distributed equally.

While summing up the literature, it can be concluded that there has been no formal research on income distribution pattern. Available information and literature indicated that the community forests product should be equally distributed to the users according to their involvement in forest management. However, there is no study about income source of community forest and distribution procedure of forest income. Therefore, this study is essential to identify income sources and distribution procedure. So the pattern of income distribution can be judge. This will be the best parameter to judge the equitable income distribution of community forest, which ultimately determines the sustainability of community forest.

CHAPTER III

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Selection of Study area

Phagetar Community Forest is situated in Sakranti Bazaar VDC, Terhathum, Koshi Zone at the altitude of 2100 to 2500 meter from the sea level. The forestry has cover 10.31:32 hector area. People of Sakranti Bazar VDC ward no 6 and 8 have been using the forest for the daily lives. This VDC was selected for the study because no such type of study was made in the past and the researcher is familiar with the areas also.

3.2 Method of Data collection

Both the primary and secondary data are collected for this study. Primary data are collected through interview method. Information was sought through well designed questionnaires and different people are interviewed personally. Secondary data were collected from different sources like library visit, and other related published and unpublished documents.

The data and information were collected from the community forest users household. For that the researcher has conducted household survey for determining the sample size. Representation of 10 percent of its households has made the source of primary information.

The researcher directly involved for the process of data collection. The researcher directly met the household and took their views. Census method was used to collect the necessary information.

The research work is basically descriptive and exploratory. It is based on the analysis of available information from the field work.

Two parts questionnaire are used to collect the necessary information. The first part covers the household survey and the second part covers the information about community forestry.

3.3 Research Design

Since, the objective of the research requires both quantitative and qualitative information, method and tools of data collection in the present study. There are various aspects to understand the community forestry but the study is mainly based

on limited area with certain indicators such as socio-economic status, development activities and local environmental impact.

3.4 Sample design and sample size

The research is analytical and descriptive. Local people are the primary stakeholders of the local forestry resources. It is impossible for the appropriate forest management plan without their participation. Therefore, it is necessary to consider local people's needs, interests and perceptions while framing and management system of local resources. The reliable and accurate socio-economic data were collected only from actual representatives and stakeholders at household level.

3.5 Method of Data Processing

The crude data collected from the field survey are processed on microcomputer using the basic program. Required table and program are formed from the software. The complete questionnaire and information are checked seriously before entering into the computer then the data are edited in order to tap the entry errors to maintain data accuracy.

3.6 Interview schedule for household survey

In order to understand, the situation of the area a set of semi-structured and open-ended questionnaire were prepared and used to extract information from the samples. These techniques were useful to obtain qualitative data from the forest user groups. They were given information about their past and present income status, education, employment opportunities and their attitude towards community forestry.

3.6.1 Observation

This method was used to collect relevant information directly. This was useful to know what was currently happening in the research area. This helped to verify the statements made by the respondents in the questionnaire.

3.6.2 Key information's Interview

This was informal discussion which concerned with local leaders, social workers, educated people and disadvantaged and deprived people also, they had given valuable suggestive measures.

3.6.3 Households Survey

Households survey were included age/sex structure, education, occupation, participation, income from CF, saving funds, utilization of funds, equity/distribution, awareness, the demand and supply of forest product.

3.7 Secondary Data

The secondary data were collected from village profile, district profile, DFO documents, CBOs, NGO/INGOs documents, research report and other related publication and reports of FUGs and Nepal Government documents.

CFUGC questionnaire were made to achieve CFUGs development activities. From these, the following information were collected: road construction, school building and health post building, irrigation, community development activities, wooden bridge, forest types, management practices, forestation rates, saving method.

3.8 Data Analysis

Before entering the data in computer, responses were pre-coded and questionnaire were manually checked, so that, the errors could be minimized. The simple statistical tools and techniques were applied to analyze the data collected data were presented in tables, pie-chart by using SPSS/PC for one way and cross-tabulation.

CHAPTER IV

4.1 Forest Management Practices in Nepal

4.1.1 History of Forest Management

The history management in Nepal closely parallels the political history of country. Therefore, understanding the evolution of forest management in Nepal requires an understanding of Nepal's Political history.

The key historical periods are as follows:

Unification 1846

IN the virtual absence of any state control, local people themselves controlled the use of forest. The population was small, but the forest resources were abundant. Thus there was little need to regulate forest use. There were no rules and regulations for forest. Local people managed their own indigenous knowledge in using forest.

1846-1950

Nepal was ruled by the Ranas, with the shah kings as figureheads. the policy of the Rana government was to extend the area under cultivation in the Terai. Exploitation of forests was formalized though rules drawn up by the government. Period of Rana ruler in Nepal, the forest resources were the private property of them especially in terai. Terai had good commercial valuable forest so that Terai forest was totally under controlled of the Rana rulers. Most of the forestland was distributed as Brita land (Panchhai, 2001). This resulted in a massive removal of forest products, mostly timber to sale in India. A British forestry advisor J.V. Collier, was appointed from 1925 to 1930 to advise the government on the regulation of the Terai forests and to aid export of sale timber to India. Another British Forestry advisor E.A synthetics worked in Nepal from 1941 to 1947. He wrote several forest working plans, which unfortunately were not implemented. He was instrumental in starting a modern forest services in Nepal by setting up the forest Department in 1942, which was based on the model of the India Forest Service (Bhatia, 1999)

1950 -1960

Since 1950, king Tribhuvan was restored as a constitutional monarch. About one third of the total forests and cultivated land were under Birta tenure, and three fourths of that belonged to member of the Rana family before 1950 .Birta land was granted by that safe and was usually tax free and heritable . In order to remove this

feudal land tenure, the private Forest Nationalization Act was promulgated in 1957. The main intention of the Act was to *prevent the destruction of forest wealth and to ensure adequate protection maintenance, and utilization of privately owned forest* (Regmi, 1978). The 1957 Nationalization Act Undermined the customary right of communities to use forests and did not replace these rights with an alternative management system but helped the deforestation. Forests are an inseparable part of the farming systems due to farmer's dependence on the forest products such as timber, fuel wood, grass etc. to meet daily basic needs. Therefore, forests cannot be isolated from people in the Nepalese context (Thakur 2001)

1960 up to

In 1960, the king resumed full political control, political parties were banned and a party less Panchayet system was established. In 1961, the forest Act was in Nepal.

The Act divided forest into six categories: Panchayet Forest, Panchayet Protected Forest, Religious Forest, Leased Forest, Private Forest and Government Forest. A village Panchayet could own 125 has of degraded forest designated as Panchayet forest (PF) for plantation and protection. Similarly, 500 ha. of existing forest area could be designated as Panchayet Protected Forest (PPF) (Sitaula 2001).

The forest Act established Panchayet forests or plantation forests from which hundred percent of the income went to the Panchayet, and Panchayet Protected Forests i.e. standing forests from which 75 percent of this revenue went to the Panchayet and 25 percent to the government. The Forest Department began taking some control of forest management around this time. "Forest Protection Act 1967" gave the Forest Department (FD) more power (Shrestha, 1995)

In the late 1970s, the government realized that without the peoples' involvement, it was not possible to restore the balance between forest resources and the ever increasing demand for forestry products. This led to the development of a new forest management paradigm known as community forestry (Acharya, 2001). The original envision of community forest was to protect soil erosion, prevent environmental degradation and provide basic needs of forestry products to the rural people.

The forestry Master plan was prepared in 1986 to 1988. The community forestry process began to change in 1987 with the holding of the first community forestry seminar in Nepal. The Master Plan clearly recognized the importance of true people's participation and that a concentration of power could have negative

consequences. In 1990, Nepali restored the democratic system, then actual communities forestry program was launched quickly.

The Forest Act of 1993 and Forest Regulations of 1995 are the current forestry legislation. These follow the recommendation of the Master Plan. As a result, it is now possible to handover a particular forest of a Forest User Group (FUG) for management and use. The District Forest Officers (DFO) can now form and register FUGs and can handover management and use rights of a particular forest of the FUG. Now, the process of handling over forests to user groups is continued all over the country.

4.1.2 The forestry Master Plan 1988

The master plan for forestry was prepared by combined adventure of GON, the Donor Finish International Development Agency (IDA) and Asian Development Bank (ADB) in 1988. The master plan lays out the plans, policies and resources needs for investments to develop the forestry sector for the coming decades (1989-2010). It provided a policy and planning strategy; the first priority of which was to meet the basic forest a product-related need of local people through community forestry and private planning. Some strategies are following.

-) Phased handing over of all accessible hills forests of the communities, to the extent that they are wining and able to manage them.
-) The need for an extension approach, aimed at gaining the confidence of the woodcutters and others who actual make the daily decisions.
-) Community forestry became the primary program of the forestry sector emphasizing two major components.
-) Management of natural forests and enrichment planting of degraded forest as community forests (Known as Panchayet Protected Forests).
-) Establishment and management of community plantations (Know as Panchayet Forest) in open and degrade areas.

Present and future demand of forest products are calculated for fuel wood, animal fodder, construction wood, raw material for cottage industries. The resources needed to meet those demands are estimated and the policy is formulated around the development of that forest resource (Thakur, 2001)

The master plan set out the following long-term objectives for the forestry sector.

-)] To meet people's basic needs for fuel wood, timber, fodder and other forest products on a sustainable basis.
-)] To protect the forest against degradation by soil erosion, floods, landslides, desertification and other effects of ecological disturbances
-)] To conserve eco-system and genetic resources.
-)] To contribute to the growth of the local and the national economy by managing the first resources, developing forest based industries and creating opportunities for income generation and employment.

The master plan envisioned six major programs to fulfill the above objectives.

-)] The community and private Forestry Program

The aim of this program was to facilitate the development and management of forests through the individuals. It was accorded the highest priority by the plan.

-)] The National and Leasehold Forestry Program

This supported the management of production forests by government and of small wood lots (on lease) by groups of People, communities or institutions.

-)] The wood-Based Industry Program

This was directed towards the development and management of wood-based industries that would facilitate the conversion of wood into commodities needed by people

-)] The medicinal and Aromatic Plants and Other Non-timber Forest Product Development Program

This was intended to increase the supply of medicinal and aromatic plants and facilitate their conversion into useful commodities.

-)] The soil conservation and Watershed Management program

The aim of this program was to protect land from degradation, conserve soil and water resources, and encourage people's participation.

-)] The conservation of Eco-System and Genetic Resources' Program.

This focused on the protection of special areas for their ecosystem and genetic resources value and the promotion of in situ and ex situ conservation of plant and animal resources.

The largest of these are the community and private program with central policy to develop and manage forest resources through the active participation of individuals and communities to meet their basic needs (GON 1998)

4.1.3 The Forest Act 1993

The preamble of Act is whereas *it is expedient to meet the basic needs of the public in general, to attain social and economic development and to promote a health environment and to ensure the development and conservation of forest and the proper utilization of forest products and extend cooperation in the conservation and development of private forest by managing the national forest in the form of government managed forest, protected forest, community forest, household forest and religions forest (GON 1993).*

The Forest Act of 1993 is the latest forestry legislation, promulgated by the government of Nepal. The new acts follow the recommendations of the Master Plan of forest sector. Of which, the two most important are (i) community forests should have priority over other uses of government owned forests, and (ii) the protection and management of community forests should be entrusted to the actual users. Forests have been classified into two broad categories, private and national, depending on the ownership of the land on which the forest stands of upon whether the government owns the national forest land. The national forests are categorized into the following types.

- i. Community Forest: It is handed over to the user groups for its development conservation and utilization for collective benefit.
- ii. Leasehold Forest (Kabuliyat Ban): It is leased to any institution, industry based on forest products, or community established under the current law
- iii. Religious Forest: It is any forest handed over to religious body, group of community for its development, conservation and utilization.
- iv. Protected forest: It means a national forest declared by GON to be a protected forest considered to be a special environmental, scientific, or cultural significance.
- v. Government Management Forest: It means a national forest to be managed by GON

In keeping with the recommendations established in the master plan. The 1993 Forest Act clearly defined FUGs as an "autonomous and corporate bodies with perpetual succession." FUGs were defined as groups of households using or

dependent on forest resources. FUGs are identified by a District Forest Officer (DFO) based on household surveys to assess forest dependence. Once the group membership has been established, the members develop a constitution and five year management and protection plan, as which time the DFO formally transfers management authority to the FUG. Each FUG is supported to create an executive committee consisting of 10 to 15 members. The committee is elected during a general body meeting and handles routing management of the forest. The role of the Forest Department to facilitate the functioning of the FUGs and provide technical assistance if needed the FUG is a legal entity and posses the following rights and responsibilities;

-) Protect annual plans to manage the forest.
-) Acquire, use sell and transfer movable and immovable properties.
-) Set punishment for members who violate working plans.
-) Fund its own activities and receive grants from governments and outside sources.
-) Reinvest at least 25 percent of forest revenues on forestry, development, with the reminder spent on community activities.

The user's group found can be generated from the following

-) Grants received from GON
-) Grants, donations, or assistance received from any individual or institution
-) Amount received from the sale or distribution of forest products.
-) Amounts collected through fines.
-) Amounts received from others sources.

The expenses incurred in the development of community forest are to be met by the above find and the balance may be used for public welfare activities (GON 1993)

4.1.4 Evaluation of Community Forest in Nepal

During the period of Rana ruler in Nepal, the resources were the private property of Rana's especially in Terai region, the accessible forest of Terai has good commercial value. So, the Terai forest was totally controlled under the Rana rulers. But in the case of Hills, the local farmers has practiced indigenous management of the local case of Hills, the local farmers had practiced indigenous management of the local forest on their own initiatives. These systems involved locally accepted

rules through which a clearly fixed group of beneficiaries regularized forest use and excluded outsiders.

The government was failed to manage the forest resources through bureaucratic machinery up to 1976. After that a remarkable event was taken place in the history of community forestry. The villagers have already started managing local forest on their own initiative. This system involved locally accepted rules and it fixed the group beneficiaries who were mainly know and respected in the society and excluded outsiders as users. Considering this fact, His Majesty's Government of Nepal (GON) implemented Community Forestry Development Program (CFDP) in 1987 to encourage initiatives of local people in the management of the forest resources. GON began CFDP's first phase in 1980 (Bhatia, 1999)

The Nepal Community Forestry Program was initiated with financial and technical assistance from the World Bank, United National Development Program (UNDP), Food Agricultural Organization (FAO) and other donors. CF has been defined as *small scale, village level forestry practices where decisions and actions are made on a collective basis and where the rural people participate in planning establishment, management and harvesting of forest crops and receive a major proportion of the socio-economic and ecological benefits from the forest (GON 1999)*

The Decentralization Act of 1987 introduced the concept of "User Groups" for local control of resource management and development. CF is a term used to describe a situation involving the participation of communities in the management and use of forest resources. The CF program build on local peoples' and technician', knowledge using the participatory approaches to improve the organizational structures and management of trees and forest resources (FAO, 1997)

The late Forest Act was lunched in 1993, Act 1993 defines CF as my part of national forest which is handed over by DFO to *users Groups in the form of CF as prescribed entitling to develop, conserve, use and manage the forest products independently by fixing their price according to the work plan (GON 1993)*

In 1993 a national FUG workshop was organized involving 40 different groups from districts. Only community representatives were allowed to attend and many issues surfaced regarding ways to streamline operations and address community concerns. The meeting laid the Foundation for the development of the national federation of community forest users of Nepal (FECOFUN) and also provide guidance for the 1993 Act. The 1993 Act was followed by forest

regulations. In 1995, that provides procedural guidelines for implementing the Act. By 1997, the FUGs were given total authority over the use of forest produce, complete autonomy of develop forest management plans, and total discretionary authority over their own fiscal allocations.

4.2 People's Participation in Community Forest

The common property has been misused all over the world. Common property is owned by nobody but it used by every body. Forests of Nepal are common property. Common in natural property is that poverty, which are used by the people living in the same area (Thakur, 2001)

CFPs are totally based on people's participation. Many national and international organizations have launched various programs over the last 10 to 15 years to halt the rapid degradation of resources of Nepal. Protection of remaining forest is very difficult without the co-operation of the local community. Villagers are likely to protect forests, when they are involved in forest management and receive significant proportion of benefits. They have information, which is crucial for planning a successful forestry program, including their goals, situation, knowledge, experience with technologies, extension system and of social structure of their society. They will be more motivated to co-operate in forestry program, if they have responsibility for it (Thakur, 2001)

Participatory development emphasizes women's position as an equal further in the mass of rural people. Women are seen as equal constitutes and partner of the rural people. Women in Nepal are major user of natural resources, including firewood, water and fodder. They are more responsible for findings, collecting and transporting for domestic use. Their involvement is necessary in CF to get success of conservation and resource management programs and to restoration of an overall ecological balance in Nepal (Thakur, 2001)

4.3 Status of Community Forestry in Nepal

The total area of forest is 6303500 ha (90%) of total land. The total community forest area is only 998169 ha. (15.8%) of forest area up to 2002. 12569 user groups were registered in CF. The potential CF land is 3551849 ha. (56.32%) of total forest area, 1402416 household (36.47%) are involved in CF of total household. Of this total of 12569 user groups, 11921 (94.84%) are established in the hill and mountains. The remaining 648(5.16%) user groups are only in the Terai (GON) 2003)

In the figure of above underline the fact that there is much more experiences in hill and mountains than the Terai. Among 20 districts of Terai. CFP is launched only in 5 districts by supporting projects. But CFP is launched in almost district of hill and mountain by supporting projects, like GTZ, EFEA/USA, NACRMP, NARMSAP (CFD).

An FUG is an autonomous and corporate body. The Act also has provision for an FUG fund, which can be generated from grants from GON or others, donations, assistance received from any individual or institution, amount received from the sale of forest products, amounts collected through fines and amounts received from other sources.

Surveys have been shown that literate and relatively well to do users are the ones who have some understanding of current community forestry policy. Experience has shown that many villagers, especially those belonging to disadvantaged groups, think that the community forests were handed over to the Forest User Group Communities (FUGC) members, who are often the village elite. They use that term *Samit ko ban* (committee's Forest) rather than *Samuha Ko ban* (Group's forest) (Bhatia, 1999)

CHAPTER V

DATA ANALYSIS AND PRESENTATION

5.1 Socio-economic status.

The total community forestry users' households of Sakranti VDC are 72. All the households were participated in the survey. Questions were asked to the head of households and the active member of house

5.1.1 Cast composition

Table No. 1: Caste composition of households in Phagetar Community forestry users in Ward No 6 and 8

Ward No	Brahmin	Chettari	Sherpa	Limbu	Dalit	others	Total
6	13	12	10	12	6	7	60
8	7	2	-	2	1	-	12

Source: field survey, 2007

The table shows the heterogeneous caste composition of community forestry users group. However the area is highly dominated by Brahmin cast. Out of the total households in ward no 6 13 households were belong to Brahmin caste , 12 from Chhetri , 10 from Sherpa. Likewise in ward no 6, 7 households were from Brahmin, 2 from Chhetri , 2 from Limbu , only 1 from Dalit community and no households were found from Sherpa community.

5.1.2 Age Composition

Table No. 2: Age composition of respondent households

Ward No	Below 30 yrs	31-45 Yrs	46-60 Yrs	60+	Total
6	15	32	8	5	60
8	2	7	2	1	12

Source: field survey, 2007

The respondents of the study area were diverse in terms of age. The age groups of the respondents ranged from 15 years to 66 years. The large no of respondents were 31 to 45 years. Only few no of respondents were participated after the age of 60 and above. In ward no 6, 15 participants were from age below 30 years, 32 respondents were from 31to 45 age group, 8 from 46 to 60 and only 5 respondents were found after the age of 60. Similarly in ward no 8, 2 respondents were below the age of 30 years, 7 respondents were from between the age group 31

to 45, 2 respondents were from 46 to 60 and only 1 respondent was found after the age 60. The table depicts

5.1.3 Sex composition

Table No. 3: Sex Composition of respondent's households.

Ward No.	Male	Female	Total
6	43	17	60
8	7	5	12
Total	50	22	72

Source: field survey, 2007

Large no of Male respondents were found in the study area. The participation of female were very leas in ward no 6 where as it seemed progressive participation in ward no 8. Out of 60 households in ward No 6, 43 households were male participants and only 17 households were female. In ward No 7 out of 12 households, 5were female respondents. It also indicate the increasing trend of female participation in forest management

5.1.4 Family Size

Table No. 4. Family size of respondent household

Ward no	Family member			Total
	3-5	6-8	8+	
6	21	35	4	60
8	4	7	1	12
Total	25	42	5	72

Source: field survey, 2007

It has been observed that the family size also has played important role for the management of the forest. More no of respondents were found in large family size. The study area is highly influenced by the religious and cultural norms and values. Out of 72 respondents 42 respondents were found having the members 6-8 persons. It has been observed that the average family sizes were larger then that of national average. In the study area 23 respondents were from business sector , 7 from service. It shows the positive symptoms of business man for forest management and utilization.

5.1.5 Occupational Status

Table No. 5. Occupational status of respondents' households.

Ward No	Agriculture	Business	Service	Others	Total
6	31	23	4	2	60
8	9	-	3	-	12
Total	40	23	7	2	72

Source: field survey, 2007

The table reveals the fact that most of the respondents were from the agricultural occupations. Some of the forest users' households were from the small market area (weekly market) very few respondents were found engaging in service oriented occupations. Out of the 72 households 40 households were from agriculture field. The study area is also agricultural area.

5.1.6 Educational Status

Table No. 6. Educational attainment of respondents

Ward No.	Primary	L. Secondary	Secondary	I.A	B.A	M.A	Total
6	9	11	28	6	5	1	60
8	2	4	5	1	-	-	12

Source: field survey, 2007

All the respondents of study area were at least completed primary level of education. No illiterate respondents were found in the study area. Most of the respondents were found completed secondary level of school education. Only one respondent was found completed master degree. In the study area literacy rate was found higher than the national average.

5.5 Utilization of community forest in different purposed by the user households

5.5.1 Firewood

Forrest is the main source of collecting firewood for fuel. Firewood is the main source of cooking in the study area. The forest user group has made some rules and regulation for collecting firewood and timbers to the users' households. Before giving this forest to the users' group people used to cut young tress fore firewood but after it has been stopped and they have started different conservation strategy which has helped to maintain the environment green as well as maintain the resources for their consumption.

Table No. 7. Weekly consumption of firewood to users' households.

No of Family Member	Daily use
Below 3	2 Bhari
3-5	4 Bhari
6-8	5 Bhari
8	6 Bhari

Source: field survey, 2007

According to the rule of the weekly consumption the users group has provided the firewood to the users household according to the size of the family for collection of fire wood only the branches of the tree decayed trees, cracked wood and the wood useless to use as timber can be used by the user group.

5.5.2 Grass collections.

The Phagetar community forest is the main place for the collection of grass to feed their domestic animals. According to the agreement the users' households collect grass for their cattle. As per the rules of the forest the users groups have to pay some money for the collection of grass. The fund collected from the users household has used in conservation of forest and to uplift the living standard of the people through different activities.

5.5.3 Timber collections.

For the collection of timber the management committee has made some rules for the user households the use the timber to construct the house and other purposes. The fund collected from the user households has been used for the management of forest production field and welfare of the user households

5.5.4 Availability of forest and forest products

Local people have no access to control over the forest resources before handling over to the community people. The forests at that time were national forest where ownership of the forest and the management of the forest were taken by the government. After handling our forest to the community people the community people have made some rules and regulations for the conduction of the forest.

5.5.5 Availability of firewood for fuel.

Firewood is the main source of fuel for cooking and heating. As reported by the respondents in the field survey, they were collecting the firewood hepartzly. There were no rules as they were even using young tree for tire wood. The

consumption pattern of the forest products have changed as well as decreased after the implementation of community forest.

Table No. 8 Collection of Firewood was easily available

Ward No.	No of H.H. agree	No of Household disagree	Total
6	54	6	60
8	11	1	12

Source: field survey, 2007

The table depicts the fact that the consumption pattern of the firewood has been decreased after the community forest. The respondents has stated that the collection of fire wood is difficult to them other c.f. it indicates the conservation of forest.

5.6 Impact of Community forest

Table No. 9. Availability of fodder easily and sufficiently after C.F.

Ward No.	agree	disagree	Total
6	43	17	60
8	9	3	12
Total	52	20	72

Source: field survey, 2007

Forest is the main source the collection of fodder for the domestic animal in the study area. In this case the management group has made some rules and regulations. According to the rules and regulation they collect the fodder for domestic animals. After being the community forest they started different conservation measures which helped in availability of fodder to the animals. Main no of respondents has stated that the process of collection of fodder is easy and available in the forest.

5.7 Utilization of timber

5.7.1 Perception of respondents towards using the timber before and after C.F.

Table No. 10: No of respondents participated towards the perception of timer before and after community forestry

Ward No.	Respondents perception		
	Better then before	Not so good	Bad
6	36	15	9
8	8	3	1
Total	44	16	10

Source: field survey, 2007

Timber is used for the construction of house and animal sheds. The consumption pattern of the timber is varied from house of house. The respondents participated in the field survey stated that the process for using the timber is seen better then before and available than before.

5.7.2 Availability of leaf and bedding materials.

Table No. 11: Respondents perception towards the collection of leaf an bedding materials after C.F.

Respondents	Sufficiently available	Not available
Ward No. 6	39	21
Ward No. 8	7	5

Source: field survey, 2007

The source of leaf and bedding materials for livestock in the research area were fallen dry leaf (Putkar) and lopped green foliage of tree (Sottar) collected from the forest. These dry leaf and green foliage of trees are used to make compost manure which is necessary to grow the productivity of land. The perception of the respondents for collecting bedding and leaf seem positive after C.F. They stated that the consumption pattern decreased after C.F. but they have felt easy process for the collection

5.7.3 Availability of wild life

Table No. 12: Perception of respondents to the statement "wildlife is more available after C.F. than before.

Statement, wildlife is more available than before		Ward No 6	Ward No. 8
	Yes		47
No		13	4

Source: field survey, 2007

Community forest management is improved and forest has been dense and automatically the available of wild animals are increased and their movement is seen in forest. In the study area out of the total 72 respondents 55 respondents stated that the movement of wild life has been increased than before. It indicates the incensement of the wild life increase the biodiversity and to maintain the ecosystem.

5.7.4 Live stock searing after community forest.

Table No. 13: No of respondents agreed and disagreed on the statement "live stock increased after community forest".

Respondents	Yes	No
Ward No. 6	36	26
Ward No. 8	10	2

Source: field survey, 2007

According to the respondents the no of livestock increased after establishment of community forestry because of availability of fodder and management of the grazing areas. Many factors might be responsible for the incensement of livestock but one of the key factors stated by the respondents in the field survey was management of fodder in the community forests, providing loan to the poor, cross-breeding conducting from CFUG.s as income generating program.

5.8 Prices of forest products.

Table No. 14: Perceptions of the respondents on price of forest products are make reasonable after community forest.

Ward No.	Respondents agreed	Respondents disagreed
Ward No. 6	39	21
Ward No. 8	3	9
Total	42	30

Source: field survey, 2007

According to the community forest legislation CFUGs have the right to decide the prices of their forest products. So, the price of forest products varied from one group to another. In the study are the collection of firewood bedding materials, fodder were distributed tree of cost to all households after paying the users fee. Timber is the main product of the forest. Where the households should pay certain amount of money to the CFUGs. Majority of the respondents have accepted the price declared by CFUGS but the respondents not accepted the price declared by the CFUGS were also pronounceable. Out of the 72 household 42 household accepted

were as 30 households did not accept the price of forest product (Timber) declared by the CFUGS.

5.9 Forest based occupation and Income generating activities conducted by the CFUG

Table No. 15: Forest based occupation of respondents.

Respondents	Yes	No	Fuel Wood sale	Charcoal Sale	Wood processing	Herbs	Total
Ward No. 6	8	52	4	1	2	1	
Ward No. 8	4	8	3	-	-	1	
Total	12	60	7	1	2	2	

Source: field survey, 2007

Some of the respondents in the study area have stated that their main occupation for livelihood is forest based occupation out of 72 households 12 households are engaged in forest based occupation. Among the forest based occupation firewood selling was the major occupation (7 households) followed by wood processing (2 households) and medicinal herbs (2 households) the fuel wood collectors stated in the field survey that the rules of collecting firewood should not be implemented and charge of money for per Bhari should be decreased. Otherwise the sources of livelihood of the poor people will be in crisis.

5.9.1 Cardamom Production

The Phagator community forest user group has initiated cardamom production in side the community forest for 12 years. The community forest user groups were directly and indirectly beneficial from the cardamom production. It has provided seasonal job opportunity to the jobless people in the one hand where on the other hand it has provided loan to the people in chief wage from the cardamom production to establish business and cottage industry to the user's households.

5.10 Forest based occupation

Table No. 16: Establishment of the cottage industry from the loan provided by the CFUG in Sakranti Bazar VDC Ward No. 6 and 8

S.N.	Type of Industry	Number
1	Cottage industry	1
2	Animal husbandry	15 H.H.
3	Grocery shop	2

Source: field survey, 2007

The community forest user group has also invested some amount of money in different field by which the local people are directly advantages. the money which is obtained from the cardamom export business they have used to develop their own society. They have established cottage industry which produces goods from the locally available raw materials. Doko, Dalo, Nanglo, and other different banes products are some example in animal husbandry different people have got loan in animal husbandry Goat, cow, chicken, etc and some example of animal husbandry. Two grocery shop have been established from the loan provided by the CFUC in ward No 6 which area is also known ass the small market area (weekly Hat Bazar)

5.11 Local Community Development from Community Forestry

Community forests have multi-functions ranging from protection to production. It is one of the major resources directly affecting the survival of rural people. It serves services and products to rural livelihood and environment. CF fulfils subsistence needs of women, poor and backward peoples well as commercial needs of well off people. The benefits providing to local communities and environment by community forest of Terhathum district range from protection of erosion to religious function to watershed stabilization to biodiversity conservation to community developments to uplift the socioeconomic condition. The benefits in this study are defined as all those perceive by the users. The study has demonstrated that there were significant changes taking place in forest condition following hand-over to FUGs. Total benefits achieved by local communities can be categorized into three major heading i.e. social, economic and ecological.

5.11.1 Social Benefits

Table No. 17: Local community Development Activities in Sakranti Bazar VDC

CFUG	Development Works
Phagetar	(i) School maintenance (ii) Drinking Water pipe (iii) Resting house (iv) Temple (v) Goat-keeping (vi) School Furniture Supply (vii) Improve cooking stove (viii) Income generation activities

Source: field survey, 2007

It is strongly anticipated that CF if managed on a sustainable basis by local people, could offer various social benefits.

5.11.2 Increased the status of FUG, women and poor

FUG, a legal body and functional unit of CF, usually consists of 20 to 150 households, manages its forest according to an Op that defines the use pattern and their needs. Principally FUSs are groups of people residing around forest utilize the

forest products (Dhungana, 2001). It is an autonomous institution and Executive committee is representative of users, responsible to accomplish the activities and authorities provided by the general assemblies of users (Upreti, 2000). The level of awareness, self-confidence and management skills of CFUGs are increasing because of various forest extension activities. Many CFUGs are emerging as a functional institution and gradually strengthening their position but institutional development aspect is still weak. Similar observation was also noticed by Poudel (1999)

All users of community forests have equal rights and responsibilities. Some of the users in study area are suffering from poverty and deprivation. They are depending mainly on available community forests for their survival. The position of women and poor in the study area is subordinate due to socio-cultural structure of the society. Even within such environment, the status of women and poor people has been gradually improved due to the efforts of community forests. Women and poor/backward people are increasingly involved in community forests management processes in Sakranti VDC.

Allocation of certain patches of community forests to rural poor for the cultivation of cash crops has been started in some part of Nepal (Upreti, 2000) but, there were no any special schemes and such initiatives for poor people for increasing and promoting their livelihood opportunities in study area. The domination of elite and higher class and caste groups on CFUG formation, decision-making and forest resource distribution is still prevalent. Moreover, the existing CF management system is started to give priority for creation of a forest structure and silviculture system more suited for timber production than fuel wood under coppice management. Lower caste and poor people do not have capacity to purchase sawn timber (Traditionally they had been obtaining it, albeit illicitly, free of cost) and it may not be a priority for them (Yadav and Branney, 1999). Furthermore, thought they diversify their livelihood, they rarely have skills or knowledge to allow them to switch into occupations offering higher returns to efforts. However, the level of direct benefit from CFs to rural people is relatively satisfactory in study area of Sakranti VDC

5.11.3 Increased Level of Awareness

The local people's cooperation and their involvement in forest management activities have key role in community forest management. Without the participation of local people in forest management, all the efforts and initiatives would not give any fruitful result from such efforts. The level of awareness of users has been

increasing in Sakranti VDC due to the participation of local people in several opportunities and extension programs (training, workshop, general assemblies, executive committee etc.) created by themselves and different stakeholders in CF. The increasing level of awareness of local people towards CF and its benefits has played significant contribution in management of CF on sustainable basis. Such successive and effective implementation CF has increased the level of awareness towards forest management.

5.11.4 Increased people's Participation

Effective implementation of CF has increased the people's participation. Various forestry extension program are contributing in increase the awareness level of propel in regards to community forestry and it ultimately leads to increase in people's participation in various community forest management activities. The participation of women and the disadvantaged groups is particularly important for the success of community forestry at local level. The participation of women and disadvantaged groups in study area Sakranti VDC is relatively low in comparison to other groups and men but the number of participants from them is progressively increasing.

5.11.5 Increased community Development Activities

Several comm.unity development activities have been performed with the help of CFUG fund Phagetar CFUG has collected fairly large amount of money in their fund. It has started to utilized their funds in community development activities (Social reforms and public constructions) like construction of schools, resting house, temple, school maintenance and furniture supply, plant establishment etc. and forest management in addition.

Similarly, all the studied CFUG has started to build community development infrastructures with the mobilization of their generated fund from CF. The detail community development activities performed with the help of CFUG fund have listed below.

5.11.6 Economic Benefits

CF integrates both ecology and economy. Local communities have managed their forest resources to obtain various wood and non-wood forest products and services. CF provides not only products and services but also possibilities for income. The increased forest resources and effective management of these resources in CF has provided the following significant economic benefits to the users.

5.11.7 Income Generation

One of the most influential factors in CF of Sakranti VDC is income generation. As farm size and productivity decline under presence of increasing populations, the capacity of farm households to maintain food self sufficiency progressively declines (Arnold, 1991) and they are forced to increasingly to turn to cash crops and to off farm employment. It has been estimated that already more than a third of rural household income is derived from non-farm activities (Liedholm and Mead, 1986). There is wide range of forest products which rural people gather, produce and trade in order to derive income. Gather forest products include fuel wood, gums, rattan, wild edible fruits, medical plants, etc. can create opportunities to generate income. All CFUS generate groups fund by new membership fee, renew fee, membership fee from segregated family, punishment and major portion of the CFUG fund accrue from selling dried, decayed and diseased trees.

5.11.8 Environment Management

Forest does not only create income for the people but also has a great role for keeping balance between population and environment. It helps to maintain greenery which helps to promote natural beauty of the place. It gives shelter for the wild animals which have played great roles for maintaining balance in ecosystem. The various species of animals, birds and vegetation can be grown in the forest. Like wise Phagetar CF has also given the shelter for wild animals like leopard bear, deer and other animals too. Five species of rhododendron can be found here which have attracted the local people during season.

The important characteristics of environmental benefits is that their presence and absence may strongly affect the social welfare of the user groups (Dixon et. al., 1989) Hence it is necessary to include these benefits in sharing mechanisms among the users. Some of the major benefits of CF regarding ecology are as follows.

5.11.9 Employment Generation

Various community development activities and CF management activities have generated several employment opportunities for local especially off form employment. Some people are employed as forest watchers fire protections, nursery manager etc. through CF. More over, community development activities performed by CFUG fund account for generating more employment opportunities (activities) for wage labour peoples. CF at present in Sakrnati has increased to fulfill the basic needs and few are stepping toward collection selling and processing the forest

production. Actually the generation of adequate employment opportunities for rural people and helps introducing poverty and increase standard of living.

5.11.10 Availability of Forest Production

Forest is the main source of energy for about 95 percent of the people. About 42 percent of the total digestible nutrient to cattle is obtained from the forests (MOPE, 1998). Forest products continue to be items of daily requirement of the ordinary people (Dhungana, 1999). Forest have traditionally been the main source of sustenance for rural people in Terhathum District. CF is an effective tool for poverty reduction and for income distribution. Most of the expected economic benefits of CF to the rural communities were expected to be non-monetary and strongly related to subsistence use (AIDAB, 1991). Subsistence needs of rural people are directly or indirectly linked with forest resources. Increased availability to forest products such as grass, leaf litter, green fodder, medicinal herbs and plants, fuel wood, poles and timbers in CF, which are integral component of rural household, have made the rural people's livelihood easier and trouble free. However, poor and disadvantaged households are not benefiting more due to getting fewer amounts of forest products because of the controlling measure of OP. They are entirely dependent on forest and they may be unable to meet their basic needs according to operational guidelines.

More fuel wood and fodder are available nearby. So women can save several hours per day on these once cumbersome daily tasks (FAO, 2000). The saved time especially by women and children, who normally collect these forest products could be used for education and training. User women can and are involved in an increasing number of income generating activities, which have increased their income sizably.

5.11.11 Successful Regeneration

More sustainable use of natural resources has direct impact on the improvement of natural capital. All people affect the environment, but the poor tend to be the most vulnerable to the effects of environmental degradation. There is a conspicuous degree of forest condition improvement due to the management of forest by local community. FUGs primarily promote natural regeneration (Dhital et. al., 2001), but they are also establishing the preserving trees in their home around. The result of reduced illicit feeling, controlled timber smugglers, reduced forest encroachment, reduced grazing and more effective forest fire control, and there is changing the forest status and the emerging successful regeneration. All the low

category forests have been converted into green atmosphere with dense and rich tree seedling and saplings. Overall indications are that forest condition is improving particularly in relation to the number and growth of young stems especially of timber species. Increased availability of forest products such as grass, leaf litter, green fodder, medicinal plants, fuel wood, poles and timbers in CF, which are integral component of rural household, have made the rural people's livelihood easy. Overall, it makes the cordial atmosphere between forest people interaction.

5.11.12 Forest Resources

Major forest resources directly affecting the livelihood of rural people are fodder, fuel wood, timber, litter, bedding materials, medicinal plant, non-timber forest products etc. Forest management activities, subsistence activities, and income generating activities are major activities directly related to the livelihood requirement of users. Forest plays a vital role in almost all rural based people. In study area, forests have been providing the local people's subsistence needs. Fodder and fuel wood are major forest resources for the survival of poorest people. It is depicted that the fodder and fuel wood collection from forest is efficiently reduced due to raised level of awareness of agro forestry and better management of CF.

5.11.13 Forest Management

Forest management operation shall encourage the efficient use of the forest's multiple product and services to ensure economic viability and a wide range of environmental and social benefits (Meek, 2001). It is the process of making and implementing decisions to meet people's needs which involves the establishment or improvement, protection and use of forest products on a sustainable basis (Gajurel, 1990). Sustainable management and development of forests through involving communities as FUGs is very important with regard to forest development. The basic philosophy of CF in Nepal is the transfer of decision making and implementing power from foresters to the users so that the forest have been managed, protected and utilized by local users on a sustainable basis.

The studied CFUG was protection oriented. Protection from the illicit fuel wood collectors, grazing, timber smugglers and fire was the forest management strategy of Sakranti rather than reforestation. Furthermore, they have protection strategy only in terms of monocultures Sal species (Best timber) locally called Kathmandu. It has been creating problems to rural poorer families because they may

not have access to forest products. FUGs have protected, and managed the forests more efficiently than they were before hand over. They have created positive livelihoods impact at the household level through effective management of CF, mobilizing generated revenue and earned from forest management, and fulfilling forest products needs (Tembe, 2001). Such successful examples of forest management have become attraction for both local people interested in CF and government.

CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

6.1 Summary:

The study summarized with the objectives of identifying the source of income and assessing the pattern and process of income distribution of community forest among the user group members. It is found that there is positive impact of forest product on users group. Such impacts are revealed in the form of income generation, construction works and awareness of people on the need for conservation of natural resources. The study has been also designed to review the policy statements and subsequent actions by other community forest for equitable distribution of forest income. Finally it has been planned to analyzed the aforesaid issues based on finding and suggest appropriate recommendations for future action.

Ward no. 8 and 6 of Sakranti VDC were chosen for the purpose of the study as it is located semi commercial type of community forestry management. This place is a representative location for low to mid hill area of Nepal and was a convenient place for carrying out the research as the researcher was familiar with few people there and considered easy for building quick report. The VDC had a total population of 3,834 with an average family size of 5.3 about 49.54% of the population were male and 50.46% was female.

Khet, Bari, Khar Bari and the forest were found as the major land use system in the VDC. Approximately 14.62% of the VDC area has covered by forest. Climatically, the area falls under the sub-tropical region of Nepal Most of the forest area was handed over to the users by district forest office. Only 51 (8%) household have been selected from the population out of 346 households of community forest users.

The main objective of the community forest program has been envisaged to meet basic forestry needs such as firewood, fodder, and leaf litter and timber for the communities. They established fund, which was accumulated by different activities such as selling product, penalty, membership fee, application fee, awards, subsidy, etc. The study found that the distribution process of firewood is fair and equitable permission was given for firewood once a year for some days in the month of Mangsir to Magh. Before entering the forest area the users were divided into different groups. In order to avoid the conflict the Forest Committee have managed

coupen system (Gola System), considering the number of houses. The distribution of firewood is based on lucky draw. FUC might decide to collect nominal charge from users.

Timber was also distributed in concession rate within user group. But it was provided free of cost in case of natural disasters and calamities affected users. Sometimes, conflicts arise due to misunderstanding between the users and FUC. Specially lower cast and women group were not satisfied with the distribution process because their participation in the assemblies was not satisfactory. But up till now the problem has been resolved with the help of some elderly people the school teachers and the officials of the district forest office.

6.2 Conclusion

The study “Importance of Community Forestry to the users group” has tried to explore the situation and the impact of community forestry on the various aspects of people living in the area. Some of the conclusion has listed here.

1. Considering the age sex composition of selected household age group between 30-45 and male members were found more active than other age group and female.
2. Brahmin and Chhetri cast groups are seemed to be more active for the management of forest than other suppressed ethnic groups in the study area but the scenario of participation of suppressed groups seems to be increasing.
3. The main occupation of people in the study area is agriculture so the respondents are also more for agricultural occupation
4. No respondents were found illiterate in the study area and only one respondent found completed master degree so the literacy rate also seems to be about than national average.
5. The consumption pattern of forest resources is determined on the basis of family size. It shows the great interest of people for the conservation of resources.
6. Some of the respondent households have also conducted income generation activities through the forest based resources and it has helped to maintain livelihood and to improve their living standard
7. Through the income of community forest, people living in that area are benefited from the various ways. Some portion of income has invested for

the establishment of cottage industry which has supported to provide employment opportunities and improve their living standard.

8. Community forest user group has also conducted community development programs like awareness, road construction school building maintenance. Drinking water supply, resting house public toilet, improve cooking stove etc which have greatly facilitated the life people in that area.
9. The Phagetar community forest user group has also conducted environment management programs like training for making compost, management of solid wastes etc which has managed the environment of that area.
10. The programs which are conducted by the Phagetar community forest user group supported the livelihood of people though there are some complication and difficulties.

6.3 Recommendation

A nation wide study is needed to explore the situation and impact of community forest on the various aspects of human life. It can be relate with poverty, suppressed ethnic group and there relationship from the various angles. Community forest study with different aspects of socio-economic consideration will be highly reasonable in the field of research in the days to come. Specific research regarding to the participation and the impact of suppressed ethnic group on community forest will be highly appreciable.

REFERENCE

- Acharya, K.P. 2001. Managing Forests in Community Forestry in Nepal. *Banko Janakari* Vol. 11(2). Kathmandu, Nepal.
- Adhikari, B. 2001, Socio-Economic Heterogeneity and Income DistributionM Evidence from Common Property, Resource Management *Journal of Forestry and Livelihoods* Vol. 1(1). Jeewan Printing Support Press, Kathmandu, Nepal.
- AIDAB, 1991, *Nepal Australia Community Forestry Project Phase 4* . AIDAB, Design Document, NACFP/4, Canberra, Australia.
- Amold, J.E.A. 1991 *Integrating Community; Ten Years Review Forest, Trees and People* Community Forestry Note 7 FAO, Rome, Italy.
- Bhatia, A. 1999 *Participatory Forest Management Implicatyions for Policy and Human Resources Development in the Hindu Kush Himalayas*. Volume V. ICIMOD, Kathmantu, Nepal.
- Bhatterai, B. and H.R. Ojha, 2001. *Distribution Impact of Community Forestry, Who is Benefiting from Nepal's Community Forests?* Available at <http://www.panasia.org.sg/nepalnet/forestry/comm.fors.htm>
- Byron, N. and J.E.M. Arnold, 1999 What futures for the people of the tropical Forests ? *World Development*, 27 (5): 789-805
- Central Bureau of Statistics, (CBS), 2006. *Nepal in Figure*, Kathmandu, Nepal
- CBS, 2001. *Population Census 2001*. CBS, Kathmandu, Nepal.
- CBS, 2001. *Statistical Pocket Book 2002*. CBS, Kathmandu, Nepal.
- Chhetri R.B. 1999. *The Rhetoric and Realities of People's Participation in conservation and Development in Nepal: an anthropological Prespective*. In Anthropology and Sociology of Nepal; Cultures, Societies, Ecology and development Chhetri R B and O P Gurung (eds) SASION, Kathmandu, Nepal
- Chhetri R.B and M.C. Nurese 1992Equity in User Group forestry: Implementation of Community Forestry in Central Nepal.
- District Statistics of Forest, 2006. Terhathum,
- Dhal, D.R. 1994. *A review of Forest User Groups: A Case Studies from Eastern Nepal*. ICIMOD, Kathmandu, Nepal.
- DFRS, 1999. *Forest Resources of Nepal 1997-1998*. Department of Forest Research and Survey Publication No. 72. Kathmandu, Nepal.
- DOF, 2002/2003. *Community Forestry Development Program in Nepal: An Introduction*. Department of Forests, Community Division, Kathmandu, Nepal.
- FAO, 1978. *Forestry for Local Community*. FAO, Rome, Italy.
- Gilmour, D.A and R.J. Fisher, 1991. *Villagers, Forest and Foresters: Philosophy Process and Practice of Community Forestry in Nepal*. Sahayogi Press, Kathmandu, Nepal.
- Government of Nepal/ADB/FINNNIDA, 1988. *Muster Plan for Forestry Sector Nepal*. Ministry of Forest and Soil conservation (MOFSC), Kathmandu, Nepal.
- Government of Nepal 1988. *Master Plan of Forestry Sector*. Forest Department. Kathmandu, Nepal.
- Government of Nepal 1993. *Forest Act 1993*. Forest Department, Kathmandu, Nepal.
- Government of Nepal 1999 *Guideline for Inventory of Community Forests*. Ministry of Forest and Soil Conservation, Department of Forests, Community and Private Forest Division, Kathmandu, Nepal.
- Government of Nepal 2003 *Community Forestry Database*. Forest Department, Kathmandu, Nepal.

- Goutam Rogila 2001. *Community Forestry of the Upliftment of Disadvantage groups in the Nepalese Society: A gender Perspective analysis*, An Unpublished Master Degree Dissertation Submitted to Central Department of Sociology Anthropology T.U.
- Hobley mary, 1991. *From Active to passive participatory forestry: Nepal* , in projects with People, Peter Oakley atal, International Labour Office, Geneva.
- Ibscher, A. 1999. *Bio-diversity of Community Forestry: Assessment in the Different Forest Types in the Mid-hills of Nepal*. NSCFP, Kathmandu, Nepal
- Kaystha, B.P.1991. *Elements of Community Forestry in Nepal*, Department of Forest, Babarmahal, Kathmandu, Nepal.
- Fafry, T., 2000. *Women, Human Capital and Livelihoods: An Ergonomic Perspectives*. Natural Resource Perspectives No. 54. Available at <http://www.odi.org.uk/nrp/54.html>.
- Joshi, A.L. 1997. Empowering Local Users in Forest Management of Nepal *Banko Janakari* Vol. 7(2): 32-38. Kathmandu, Nepal.
- Karki, M., J.B.S. Karki and N . Karki, 1994. *Sustainable Management of Common Forest Resource: An Evaluation of Selected Forest User Groups in Western Nepal*. ICIMOD, Kathmandu, Nepal.
- Kharel, R. 1998, Conflict in Community Forestry in Nepal, *Banko Janakari* Vol. 8(2). Kathmandu, Nepal
- Kayastha, Baban Prasad, *Elements of Community Forestry in Nepal*, Kathmandu, Nepal.
- Nepalko Samudayak Ban Sambandhi Kanuni Bavyastha, 2004. Samudayak Ban Upabhokta Mahasang, Nepal.
- New ERA, 1998. Population and Community Forest Management. Lesson from An Action Research in Nepal. New Era, Kathmandu, Nepal.
- Oakley Peter 1991. *Project with People: The practice of Participation in Rural Development*, International Labour Office, Geneva.
- Shrestha, K.B. 1996. Community Forestry in Nepal: An Overview of Conflicts Discussion Paper Series No. MNR 6/2. ICIMOD, Kathmandu, Nepal.
- Shrestha, Dr. Raj Bahadur, 2002. *The Challenge of Forestry Research and Survey in Nepal, community forest Bulletin*, Department of Forest, Bahar mahal, Kathmandu, Vol. VIII,
- Upadhyaya, C.P. 1989, *Common Property Mangement and Products, Distribution (People's perception and role in Gorkha, Nepal)*. A Thesis submitted in partical fulfillment of requirements for the Degree of Master of Science (Forestry) at Los Banos University.

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR HOUSEHOLD SURVEY

1. Socio-economic Status of Respondent.
Name of community forestry
VDC Ward No.
Village
Name of the respondent Age Sex.....
Caste Religion Education Occupation
2. Are you a member of forest user group?
(a) Yes (b) No
3. If yes, who asked you for membership of forest user group?
(a) Friends (b) Leader of the village (c) family member (d) state if other
.....
4. If you are a member of CFUG what do you feel ?
(a) Positive (b) Negative (c) Neutral
5. If Positive, what for?
It Provides.
(a) Fodder (b) Firewood (c) Building Materials (d) Natural beauty
(e) Maintain environmental balance
6. When did you involve into the community forest user group? Date
7. Do you go to forest regularly for supervision?
(a) Yes (b) No (c) Never
8. If yes, how many times do you go to the forest per weeks?
(a) One times (b) Two times (c) Three times (d) More then 3 times
9. How many times in a year does the general assembly convince?
(a) One times (b) Two times (c) Three times (d) More then 3 times
10. What is your main source of fuel for cooking?
(a) Community forest (b) Natural forest (c) Animal dung
(d) State if others
11. Who collects fire wood?

(a) Male (b) Female (c) Both

12. What measures should be adopted to protect the forest being destroyed?

(a) Involvement (b) Participation (c) Awareness
(d) Rules and regulation (e) State if others

13. How many times does the forest be opened for firewood in a year?

(a) One times (b) Two times (c) Three times (d) More then 3 times

14. What types of tree will be given to cut as timber in the agreement letter

(a) Decayed (b) Crooked (c) Use less wood
(d) Branches (e) All of above

15. In agreement letter what types of trees are strictly prohibited to cut?

(a) Chilauane (b) Uttis (c) Gurans (d) patle (e) pine

16. How many charge in taken for per Bhari fire wood ?

(a) 25 paisa (b) 50 paisa (c) 1 Rupee (d) more then 1 Rupee

17. Which things can be obtained with out any charge?

.....

18. Who has to form the fund?

.....

19. How will the fund be collected?

.....

20. How much money can be punished for the crime?

.....

21. If some one destroyed the forest illegally again and again what types of punishment will be given?

.....

22. Are you satisfied with community forest management practices in your village?

(a) Yes (b) No.

If yes, what are the noticeable benefits you received?

.....

If no, what are the major weaknesses?

.....

23. Is hunting inside the community forest allowed?
.....
24. How do you think the community forest will be sustainable?
.....
25. What change have you observed before and after the jungle?
(a) Positive (b) Negative (c) No Change
26. What impact has led down by the community forest to you?
(a) Positive (b) Negative (c) No impact
27. How many female are there in the community forest management group?
.....
28. Can forest influence in development activities?
(a) Yes (b) No
If yes, what development activities are going on from the income of forest?
.....
29. Can forest help to change the socio-economic status of users?
(a) Yes (b) No.