

Collection and Marketing Practices of Non-Timber Forest Produce (NTFP) - An Empirical Analysis

Dr. M. Muthyalu

Assistant Professor, Department of Cooperative studies, College of Business and Economics
Mekelle University, Mekelle, Ethiopia

***Abstract-**Forests in India are rich in biodiversity and provide a wide range of goods needed by the people. Since time immemorial a large number of poor people living in and around the forest areas and depends heavily on these forests for their livelihood. Therefore, there is an acute need to maintain a good forest cover both in terms of quantity and quality, so as to use it in a sustainable manner. Out of the total 6.5 lakh villages in India, nearly two lakh villages are situated in and around forest areas with a total population of 350 million people as against the total India's population of 103 crores (as per 2001 census) . The majority of these families are dependent on forests for their livelihood. As per the National Forest Policy of 1952, at least 33 per cent or one-third of the total geographical area must be under the forest. Annual forest produce in India is 0.5 cubic meter per hectare as against 2.1 cubic meter per hectare of average annual forest produce of the world. An attempt has been made to analyze the collection and marketing practices of NTFP. The impact of Non-Timber Forest Produce in terms of dependence of the sample respondents on NTFPs, employment opportunities, collection practices, problems involved in the collection of NTFPs, types of NTFP available, processing/value addition practices, earning levels. Further, the impacts of different marketing channels have also been examined and the roles of GCC DR Depot, private traders have been examined.*

Key Words: NTFP, marketing, forest dependent communities, Traders, GCC, VSS,

Introduction

Forests play an important role in improving the social and economic status of the people and in

providing raw material to different industries. Forests are the main source of medicinal herbs. Forests provide direct and indirect employment opportunities for millions. Collection and sale of minor forest produce of different types being carried out by the forest dependent communities as a part of their livelihood. Forests help the millions of people in several ways throughout the globe. Tribals and forests have long been interdependent. Their lives are closely intertwined with the nature. They are born, brought up and die in close vicinity of the forests. They are utilizing the forests for meeting their day-to- day needs. They mostly worship their deity whom they identified with their landscape and nature. As a result they have been socially, economically and politically taken back track. This resulted in leading miserable life in the form of poverty, malnutrition, ignorance and exploitation.

Forest produce can be broadly divided into two categories viz. Major and Minor Forest Produce. Timber yielding trees, ornamental trees and trees used for paper pulp come under the category of Major Forest Produce. The roots, shoots, leaves, fruits, flowers, vegetables, herbs, gum, honey, wax, lac etc. have been categorized as Minor

Collection and Marketing Practices of Non-Timber Forest Produce (NTFP) - An Empirical Analysis

forest Produce. The collection and sale of Non-Timber Forest Produce is still the main economic activity for the majority of the tribal population. They collect NTFP items from the forest in different seasons in different ways to earn their livelihood. In the beginning the tribals used to collect the NTFP only for their self consumption. Subsequently they started giving NTFP to the neighboring non-tribal communities in lieu of other things which was akin to the old barter system. When the tribals came to know through the local traders about the commercial value of some of the items of NTFP, the tribals began the collection of NTFP not only to meet domestic requirements but also as a livelihood to earn income by selling of NTFP to the local traders.

Statement of the Problem

It is estimated that 70 per cent of NTFP is collected in 5 states namely Andhra Pradesh, Bihar, Madhya Pradesh, Maharashtra and Orissa, in India where 65 per cent of the tribal population concentrated. The NTFP are the prime source of raw materials for certain cottage, small and village industries and contribute to the national income through the export and import substitution. It has been estimated that at present the annual collection of the NTFPs in the country as a whole less than the 5 percent of the available potential.

In the absence of access to institutional credit and organized marketing facilities the NTFP collectors were mostly selling their items to the itinerant traders and forced to accept the price offered. Sale to private traders may result in several other types of exploitation. It was said that in many cases (prior to the intervention of the GCC) the traders used to take NTFP in lieu of domestic items like rice, red gram, oil in such cases NTFP collector was exploited by taking more NTFP and offering less consumer goods (in terms of money values. Weights and measures have also been manipulated. Due to

the wide spread illiteracy and ignorance of the NTFP collectors, it was said that in many cases underpayment, deferred payment have taken place. In case of urgency for cash, the traders exploitations have no limits. Apart from the above many other Government and non-Government agencies have been helping the tribals in better marketing of NTFPs so as to free the NTFP collectors from different forms of exploitation.

In the tribal areas for NTFP collectors better marketing is sine-qua-non. Tribals primarily market NTFP and the Agricultural produce. Hence it is important to conduct a research study on the marketing of NTFP which is an important source of income for the forest dependent communities. Most of the earlier studies on the problem of NTFP are mostly descriptive rather than analytical orientation. More over there are no region-specific studies on the impact of institutional agencies viz Community Forest management (CFM), PESA, GCC on sustaining the NTFPs and in strengthening the marketing facilities. Hence, there is a need to conduct micro level studies in remote tribal belts where the problems of these categories are of different nature. It is expected that the research study findings may help the policy makers, implementers, social reformers, researchers, Government and Non-Government Agencies (NGOs) to initiate appropriate measures.

Objectives of the Study:

1. To examine the socio-economic characteristics of the sample households.
2. To study different Marketing channels of NTFP collectors and to analyze the impact of Girijan Cooperative Corporation on the sale pattern of NTFP collectors vis- a-vis with private traders
3. To identify the reasons for availing different channels in NTFP marketing and to study the problems in availing different marketing channels.

Collection and Marketing Practices of Non-Timber Forest Produce (NTFP) - An Empirical Analysis

4. To suggest appropriate measures in the light of the findings of the present study to strengthen the existing infrastructure for NTFP Marketing and to control the exploitation of the private agencies.

Methodology

Selection of the Study Area

Adilabad district of Andhra Pradesh was purposively selected for the research study for the following reasons: The district is having one of the richest forest areas and the forest covered 42.43 per cent of the total geographical area of the district. As per 2001 census the tribal population is predominant in this district. Three out of four forest divisions have also notified under Vth Scheduled known as scheduled areas. Dependency of the people on forest is very high and the tribal people mostly depend on the collection of Non- Timber Forest Produce (NTFP) which is an important source of their income. Under the Community Forest Management VSSs have also been formed in a big way. The literacy levels, the transportation, communications and other infrastructure in the district particularly in the tribal dominated areas are deplorably low. Hence, Adilabad district was chosen for the research study.

Selection of the sample Respondents

In order to collect the necessary primary data for the study a list of NTFP collectors for each village has been prepared. In the next stage 30 per cent of the total households from the sample

villages who are collecting NTFP have been selected on the basis of random sampling method. Care was taken to represent all categories of the households in the total sample. As a result the sample consists of respondents four forest divisions 12 villages and covers 168 respondents belonging to VSS villages and another 82 respondents from Non- VSS villages, which facilitate the comparison of respondents belonging to the said categories of villages.

To make the study more effective focused group discussions (FGD), Participatory Rural Appraisal (PRA), and observation methods were also held with the sample households to understand the views and problems of them in a more intensive manner. Where ever it is necessary different categories of forest department officials have been consulted and accordingly their views and opinions have also been made use of to make the study more meaningful. The primary data collection refers to the year 2008-09. The data were collected preferable from the head of the households. The schedule canvass among the sample households covered different aspects of NTFP collection and marketing.

Tools for data analysis

The collected primary data has been classified and tabulated and to draw meaningful inferences percentages, averages and growth rates have been calculated. Further, appropriate statistical techniques have also been made use of to make the analysis understandable.

Table 1

Distribution of sample respondents among different forest division of Adilabad district

Name of the forest division	Name of the sample VSS villages	No. of Sample respondents (VSS villages)	Name of the sample Non-VSS village	Total Villages	No. of Sample respondents (Non-VSS villages)	Total sample respondents
1. Adilabad	1. Balanpur	39	1. Maruguda	3	22	61
	2. Loddiguda					

Collection and Marketing Practices of Non-Timber Forest Produce (NTFP) - An Empirical Analysis

2. Bellampalli	1. Kolam Jhari	48	1. Surdapur	3	20	68
	2. Murikilanka					
3. Jannaram	1. Birsaipeta	41	1. Laxettipeta	3	20	61
	2. Danthanpalli					
4. Nirmal	1. Ramsingthanda	40	1. Devithanda	3	20	60
	2. Adelli					
Total	8	168	4	12	82	250

Scope and Limitations of the study

Though the study is based on both the primary and secondary sources of data, the study has certain limitations. The secondary sources of data have been compiled from different records, and reports maintained by the forest department officials. Hence, the reliability depends on the accuracy to which the authorities have maintained.

Our empirical study results are based on the primary data collected from chosen respondents based on the recall method from selected areas and as such the accuracy purely depends on their memory power. As the study is based on a limited sample this may not reflect the whole district which has several categories of tribals and as such the results may not be generalized for the whole district. However, it certainly helps in understanding the problem in its totality.

Table 2
Distribution of Sample Respondents by Caste

Division	Type of Village	Caste					Total
		Non-Tribal	Gonds	Kolams	Lambada	Naikpods	
Adilabad	VSS Villages	0 (0.0)	15 (38.5)	22 (56.4)	2 (5.1)	0 (0.0)	39 (100.0)
	Non-VSS Village	0 (0.0)	16 (72.7)	3 (13.6)	0 (0.0)	3 (13.6)	22 (100.0)
	Total	0 (0.0)	31 (50.8)	25 (41.0)	2 (3.3)	3 (4.9)	61 (100.0)
Bellampalli	VSS Villages	0 (0.0)	12 (25.0)	36 (75.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	48 (100.0)
	Non-VSS Village	4 (20.0)	16 (80.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	20 (100.0)
	Total	4 (5.9)	28 (41.2)	36 (52.9)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	68 (100.0)
Jannaram	VSS Villages	16 (39.0)	2 (4.9)	8 (19.5)	2 (4.9)	13 (31.7)	41 (100.0)
	Non-VSS Village	5 (25.0)	15 (75.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	20 (100.0)
	Total	21 (34.4)	17 (27.9)	8 (13.1)	2 (3.3)	13 (21.3)	61 (100.0)

Collection and Marketing Practices of Non-Timber Forest Produce (NTFP) - An Empirical Analysis

Nirmal	VSS Villages	6 (15.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	20 (50.0)	14 (35.0)	40 (100.0)
	Non-VSS Village	4 (20.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	16 (80.0)	0 (0.0)	20 (100.0)
	Total	10 (16.7)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	36 (60.0)	14 (23.3)	60 (100.0)
Total	VSS Villages	22 (13.1)	29 (17.3)	66 (39.3)	24 (14.3)	27 (16.1)	168 (100.0)
	Non-VSS Villages	13 (15.9)	47 (57.3)	3 (3.7)	16 (19.5)	3 (3.7)	82 (100.0)
	Total	35 (14.0)	76 (30.4)	69 (27.6)	40 (16.0)	30 (12.0)	250 (100.0)

Figures in brackets indicates percentages to horizontal totals

The social status of the sample respondents in the study area shows that the total 250 sample respondents have belonged to one of the four tribal communities, i.e. Gonds, Kolams, Lambadas, and Naikpods. Of which Gond Community with 30.4 per cent stood first followed by Kolams with 27.6 per cent Lambadies represented 16 per cent of the sample respondents. Naikpod and Non-tribals represented 12 and 14 per cent respectively. The Gond community is representing highest percentage compared to other communities. In fact Gonds constitute highest percentage in the total tribal population of the Adilabad District.

The sample respondents' education status presented in table 3 shows that 51.2 per cent of the total sample respondents belongs to the illiterate category, highest per cent of illiterates represented in the Bellampalli division with 64.7 per cent and the lowest being the Adilabad division with 34.4 per cent. Can read only and write only category respondents have constituted 20.12 per cent of the total sample. The highest percentage representing this was found in Adilabad division and the lowest percentage represented by the Bellampalli division. In fact can read and write categories are virtually illiterates and never attended any formal

education. Out of curiosity or pressure they have learnt either to read (with out perfection) or to write (not legible) to be stamped as literate people. These may somehow manage to understand certain aspects in unclear manner.

Collection and Marketing Practices of Non-Timber Forest Produce (NTFP) - An Empirical Analysis

Table 3
Distribution of Sample the Respondents according to Education

Division	Type of Village	Education								Total
		Can Read	Can Write	Can only Sign	Illiterate	Primary	SSC	Inter	Degree	
Adilabad	VSS Villages	19	5	1	10	2	0	1	1	39
		(48.7)	(12.8)	(2.6)	(25.6)	(5.1)	(0.0)	(2.6)	(2.6)	(100.0)
	Non-VSS Village	3	3	4	11	1	0	0	0	22
		(13.6)	(13.6)	(18.2)	(50.0)	(4.5)	(0.0)	(0.0)	(0.0)	(100.0)
Total	22	8	5	21	3	0	1	1	61	
	(36.1)	(13.1)	(8.2)	(34.4)	(4.9)	(0.0)	(1.6)	(1.6)	(100.0)	
Bellampalli	VSS Villages	0	1	12	29	3	3	0	0	48
		(0.0)	(2.1)	(25.0)	(60.4)	(6.3)	(6.3)	(0.0)	(0.0)	(100.0)
	Non-VSS Village	0	1	1	15	0	3	0	0	20
		(0.0)	(5.0)	(5.0)	(75.0)	(0.0)	(15.0)	(0.0)	(0.0)	(100.0)
Total	0	2	13	44	3	6	0	0	68	
	(0.0)	(2.9)	(19.1)	(64.7)	(4.4)	(8.8)	(0.0)	(0.0)	(100.0)	
Jannaram	VSS Villages	2	7	2	23	3	3	1	0	41
		(4.9)	(17.1)	(4.9)	(56.1)	(7.3)	(7.3)	(2.4)	(0.0)	(100.0)
	Non-VSS Village	0	2	10	6	0	2	0	0	20
		(0.0)	(10.0)	(50.0)	(30.0)	(0.0)	(10.0)	(0.0)	(0.0)	(100.0)
Total	2	9	12	29	3	5	1	0	61	
	(3.3)	(14.8)	(19.7)	(47.5)	(4.9)	(8.2)	(1.6)	(0.0)	(100.0)	
Nirmal	VSS Villages	3	4	1	22	4	3	3	0	40
		(7.5)	(10.0)	(2.5)	(55.0)	(10.0)	(7.5)	(7.5)	(0.0)	(100.0)
	Non-VSS Village	2	1	1	12	2	1	1	0	20
		(10.0)	(5.0)	(5.0)	(60.0)	(10.0)	(5.0)	(5.0)	(0.0)	(100.0)
Total	5	5	2	34	6	4	4	0	60	
	(8.3)	(8.3)	(3.3)	(56.7)	(10.0)	(6.7)	(6.7)	(0.0)	(100.0)	
Total	VSS Villages	24	17	16	84	12	9	5	1	168
		(14.3)	(10.1)	(9.50)	(50.0)	(7.1)	(5.4)	(3.0)	(0.6)	(100.0)
	Non-VSS	5	7	16	44	3	6	1	0	82

Collection and Marketing Practices of Non-Timber Forest Produce (NTFP) - An Empirical Analysis

	Villages	(6.1)	(8.5)	(19.5)	(53.7)	(3.7)	(7.3)	(1.2)	(0.0)	(100.0)
	Total	29	24	32	128	15	15	6	1	250
		(11.6)	(9.6)	(12.8)	(51.2)	(6.0)	(6.0)	(2.4)	(0.4)	(100.0)

Figures in brackets indicates percentages to horizontal totals

Table 4
Distribution of Sample Respondents by Primary Occupation

Forest Division	Type of village	Primary Occupation					Total
		Agriculture	Agricultural Labour	Non-Agricultural Labour	Service	Others	
Adilabad	VSS Villages	24 (61.5)	8 (20.5)	6 (15.4)	0 (0.0)	1 (2.6)	39 (100.0)
	Non-VSS Village	14 (63.6)	6 (27.3)	2 (9.1)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	22 (100.0)
	Total	38 (62.3)	14 (23.0)	8 (13.1)	0 (0.0)	1 (1.6)	61 (100.0)
Bellampalli	VSS Villages	21 (43.8)	17 (35.4)	9 (18.8)	1 (2.1)	0 (0.0)	48 (100.0)
	Non-VSS Village	12 (60.0)	3 (15.0)	5 (25.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	20 (100.0)
	Total	33 (48.5)	20 (29.4)	14 (20.6)	1 (1.5)	0 (0.0)	68 (100.0)
Jannaram	VSS Villages	25 (61.0)	9 (22.0)	7 (17.1)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	41 (100.0)
	Non-VSS Village	10 (50.0)	3 (15.0)	7 (35.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	20 (100.0)
	Total	35 (57.4)	12 (19.7)	14 (23.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	61 (100.0)
Nirmal	VSS Villages	28 (70.0)	1 (2.5)	11 (27.5)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	40 (100.0)
	Non-VSS Village	14 (70.0)	2 (10.0)	4 (20.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	20 (100.0)
	Total	42 (70.0)	3 (5.0)	15 (25.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	60 (100.0)
Total	VSS Villages	98 (58.3)	35 (20.8)	33 (19.6)	1 (0.6)	1 (0.6)	168 (100.0)
	Non-VSS Villages	50 (61.0)	14 (17.1)	18 (22.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	82 (100.0)
	Total	148 (59.2)	49 (19.6)	51 (20.4)	1 (0.4)	1 (0.4)	250 (100.0)

Figures in brackets indicates percentages to horizontal totals

The table 4 shows that a large percentage of sample respondents of the Nirmal division with 70 per cent followed by Adilabad Division with 62.3 per cent followed by Jannaram Division with 57.4 per cent and Bellampally division with 48.5per cent have

chosen agriculture as their principal occupation. The percentage of respondents depending on agriculture as their primary occupation varied from 48.5 per cent in Bellampalli division to 70 per cent in Nirmal division. It is mainly Nirmal division there is a good potential for choosing

Collection and Marketing Practices of Non-Timber Forest Produce (NTFP) - An Empirical Analysis

agriculture because of availability of adequate irrigation facilities. At the same time, it is interesting to note that 20.4 per cent of the sample respondents have also derived their livelihoods through non-agriculture labour followed by the agriculture labour with 19.6 per cent. It is also observed that the tribal people have also diversified their occupations from

agriculture labour to non agriculture labour. There was only one sample respondent just 0.4 per cent constituting have reported that he is in government service in addition to other activities. There were not many variations in the percentage of sample respondents depending on agriculture labour and non agriculture labour as their primary occupation.

Table 5
Distribution of Sample Respondents by Landholdings

Division	Type of villages	Area in acres					Total
		< 2	2 .1 - 4	4.1 - 6	6.1 >	Land Less	
Adilabad	VSS Villages	1 (2.6)	24 (61.5)	8 (20.5)	1 (2.6)	5 (12.8)	39 (100.0)
	Non-VSS Village	1 (4.5)	11 (50.0)	4 (18.2)	0 (0.0)	6 (27.3)	22 (100.0)
	Total	2 (3.3)	35 (57.4)	12 (19.7)	1 (1.6)	11 (18.0)	61 (100.0)
Bellampalli	VSS Villages	8 (16.7)	12 (25.0)	5 (10.4)	3 (6.3)	20 (41.7)	48 (100.0)
	Non-VSS Village	3 (15.0)	5 (25.0)	8 (40.0)	0 (0.0)	4 (20.0)	20 (100.0)
	Total	11 (16.2)	17 (25.0)	13 (19.1)	3 (4.4)	24 (35.3)	68 (100.0)
Jannaram	VSS Villages	9 (22.0)	15 (36.6)	12 (29.3)	1 (2.4)	4 (9.8)	41 (100.0)
	Non-VSS Village	0 (0.0)	4 (20.0)	7 (35.0)	8 (40.0)	1 (5.0)	20 (100.0)
	Total	9 (14.8)	19 (31.1)	19 (31.1)	9 (14.8)	5 (8.2)	61 (100.0)
Nirmal	VSS Villages	2 (5.0)	17 (42.5)	13 (32.5)	2 (5.0)	6 (15.0)	40 (100.0)
	Non-VSS Village	2 (10.0)	6 (30.0)	9 (45.0)	0 (0.0)	3 (15.0)	20 (100.0)
	Total	4 (6.7)	23 (38.3)	22 (36.7)	2 (3.3)	9 (15.0)	60 (100.0)
Total	VSS Villages	20 (11.9)	68 (40.5)	38 (22.6)	7 (4.2)	35 (20.8)	168 (100.0)
	Non-VSS Villages	6 (7.3)	26 (31.7)	28 (34.1)	8 (9.8)	14 (17.1)	82 (100.0)
	Total	26 (10.4)	94 (37.6)	66 (26.4)	15 (6.0)	49 (19.6)	250 (100.0)

Figures in brackets indicates percentages to horizontal totals

Collection and Marketing Practices of Non-Timber Forest Produce (NTFP) - An Empirical Analysis

The land holding pattern of the sample respondents is examined in table 5 from the analysis it is clear that respondents possessing the less than 2 acres of land constituted 10.4 per cent which is highest in Bellampalli division and lowest from Adilabad division. Table 5 also shows that nearly 38 per cent respondents possess land in between 2.1 to 4 acres division wise analysis shows that 57.4 per cent in Adilabad division 25 percent in Bellampalli division belongs to this land holding category. 4 to 6 acres of land holding respondent constituted 26.4 in the total. While 19.1 per cent of Bellampalli Division and 36.7 per cent of Nirmal Division have been represented in this

category. Only 6 per cent of the sample respondents have possessed land more than 6 acres. 19.6 per cent of the sample respondents have not reported any land at their disposal. It is found that in the tribal areas most of the tribal communities are collecting NTFP items. According to their availability during the specified seasons and as such these people due to certain inherent problems are not evincing interest on adequately spending on forming as they wanted to require the NTFP from the forest area so as to bridge the income gap to the desired extend

Table: 6

Source -Wise Distribution of Average Income of the Sample Respondents during the reference year (in Rs.)

Division	Type	Average/Percentage	Agriculture	Agriculture and Silvicultural works	Subsidiary occupation	Non-Agri. Labour	NTFP Collection	Value addition	Total
Adilabad	VSS	Average	15372	1564	1128	4462	4236	8564	35326
		Percentage to Total	43.5	4.4	3.1	12.6	11.9	24.2	100.0
	Non VSS	Average	20873	1000	4027	4205	3455	1591	35150
		Percentage to Total	59.4	2.8	11.5	12.0	9.8	4.5	100.0
Bellampalli	VSS	Average	14313	563	6477	4169	5219	0	30740
		Percentage to Total	46.6	1.8	21.1	13.6	17.0	0.0	100.0
	Non VSS	Average	19250	950	4750	5830	2610	0	33390
		Percentage to Total	57.6	2.8	14.2	17.4	7.8	0.0	100.0
Jannaram	VSS	Average	29329	3049	4000	4276	5073	0	45727
		Percentage to Total	64.1	6.7	8.7	9.4	11.1	0.0	100.0
	Non VSS	Average	25200	1525	4100	5850	3100	0	39775
		Percentage to Total	63.5	3.8	10.3	14.7	7.7	0.0	100.0

Collection and Marketing Practices of Non-Timber Forest Produce (NTFP) - An Empirical Analysis

		Total							
Nirmal	VSS	Average	29925	5688	4568	3620	715	0	44515
		Percentage to Total	67.2	12.8	10.3	8.1	1.6	0.0	100.0
	Non VSS	Average	26450	2975	4450	4975	535	0	39385
		Percentage to Total	67.2	7.6	11.3	12.6	1.4	0.0	100.0
Total	VSS	Average	22234	2716	4043	4131	3811	2141	39076
		Percentage to Total	56.8	6.9	10.5	10.5	9.7	5.6	100.0
	Non VSS	Average	22943	1613	4332	5215	2425	398	36926
		Percentage to Total	62.4	4.3	11.7	14.1	6.5	1.0	100.0

Note: 1. Subsidiary occupations refers to Agricultural related activities like poultry/milch animals/sheep rearing

2. Value addition through NTFP, as a separate activity.

Figures in brackets indicates percentages to horizontal totals

Source-wise average income of the sample respondents is presented in table 6. From the analysis

collecting the NTFP on a regular basis that to for disposal.

It is clear that in both the VSS and Non-VSS areas of all the four forest divisions of the study area, agricultural income constituted highest percentage among the VSS and Non-VSS Households. The analysis further shows that in both VSS and Non-VSS areas Nirmal represented the highest percentage of Agricultural income with 67.2 per cent (in both VSS and Non-VSS areas) followed by Jannaram division with 64.1 per cent in VSS areas as against 63.5 per cent in Non-VSS areas.

Next to the primary occupation 36 per cent of the income in Adilabad division and 11 percent in Jannaram division have derived through NTFP collection which is also their secondary occupation. It only means that for many sample Households next to agriculture collecting the NTFP both for domestic use and sale have been contributing to their total income. In Nirmal division the NTFP collection, has been taking place on par with their counter parts. However, due to poor market infrastructures with particular reference to non availability of the DR Depots are preventing these Households from

Collection and Marketing Practices of Non-Timber Forest Produce (NTFP) - An Empirical Analysis

Table 7
Marketing Agencies chosen by the sample NTFP Collectors by disposal of Non-perishable item

	Category of Villages	Forest Department				GCC				Private Traders				Direct Sales				Total Sales			
		No. of HHs	Qty. sold (in Kgs)	Income Derived (in Rs.)	Average Price (in Rs.)	No. of HHs	Qty. sold (in Kgs)	Income Derived (in Rs.)	Average Price (in Rs.)	No. of HHs	Qty. sold (in Kgs)	Income Derived (in Rs.)	Average Price (in Rs.)	No. of HHs	Qty. sold (in Kgs)	Income Derived (in Rs.)	Average Price (in Rs.)	No. of HHs	Qty. sold (in Kgs)	Income Derived (in Rs.)	Average Price (in Rs.)
Beedi Leaves	VSS	126	158548	573944	3.6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	3244	11127	3.43	141	161792	570317	3.525
	Non-VSS	62	52647	189529	3.6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	1615	4845	3	67	54262	179065	3.3
Mahua Flower	VSS	0	0	0	0	113	26110	145433	5.57	0	0	0	0	27	565	3288	5.82	140	26675	151914	5.695
	Non-VSS	0	0	0	0	35	7757	50343	6.49	15	3160	9322	2.95	0	0	0	0	50	10917	51528	4.72
Mahua Seed	VSS	0	0	0	0	62	8530	87006	10.2	0	0	0	0	6	55	550	10	68	8585	86709	10.1
	Non-VSS	0	0	0	0	9	565	5464	9.67	16	915	2681	2.93	0	0	0	0	25	1480	9324	6.3
Gum	VSS	0	0	0	0	3	18	2160	120	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	18	2160	120
	Non-VSS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	22	1760	80	0	0	0	0	4	22	1760	80
Total Non-Perishable NTFP items	VSS	126	158548	573944	3.6	178	34658	4705517	135.8	0	0	0	0	48	3864	74382	19.3	352	197070		
	Non-VSS	62	52647	189529	3.6	44	8322	134484	16.16	35	4097	351850	85.9	5	1615	4845	3	146	66681		

Collection and Marketing Practices of Non-Timber Forest Produce (NTFP) - An Empirical Analysis

Figures in brackets indicates percentages to horizontal totals

Collection and Marketing Practices of Non-Timber Forest Produce (NTFP) - An Empirical Analysis

From the table 7 is clear that as for as Kendu leaves are concerned forest department has been chosen by the NTFP collectors (both in VSS and non-VSS areas with 89 and 92 percent respectively. Next to forest department the only source chosen for the said items was direct disposal either to the processor or to the ultimate consumer. Incase of Kendu leaves collectors it was said that where ever purchasing centers have been opened.

Incase of mahua flower in VSS areas GCC formed as the major source with 81 per cent in VSS areas followed by direct sales. However, a non-VSS areas they said channel has been used by just 70 per cent of the respondents. GCC is the major channel for mahua flower so also for mahua seed. However, in case of mahua seed in non-VSS areas GCC role is minimum as and the direct sale is predominant. It was said that in

certain non-VSS areas in the study region GCC has not opened its outlet and as such the mahua seed collectors have to necessarily seek the private traders for disposal. Mahua flower and mahua seed if they are to be used in final form (generally in beverages). The said NTFP collector has to follow certain procedures which are in force. Otherwise it is a crime. Incase of Gum in VSS areas GCC is the alone source chosen for disposing while in non-VSS areas it is private traders. The reasons for this state of affairs are same as discussed earlier.

The comparative price analysis shows that average price is higher incase of the institutional agencies like forest department incase of the sale of Kendu leaves. While incase of Mahua flower average price is higher when it is sold to out side the GCC and in case of Mahua seed once again the price is higher when it is sold to the GCC

Table 8

Sample respondents response on Processing/Value addition undertaken before the sale of NTFP

Division	Type of village	Processing		Total
		Yes	No	
Adilabad	VSS Village	13(33.3)	26(66.7)	39(100.0)
	Non-VSS Village	0(0.0)	22(100.0)	22(100.0)
	Total	13(21.3)	48(78.7)	61(100.0)
Bellampa	VSS Village	0(0.0)	48(100.0)	48(100.0)
	Non-VSS Village	0(0.0)	20(100.0)	20(100.0)
	Total	0(0.0)	68(100.0)	68(100.0)
Jannaram	VSS Village	0(0.0)	41(100.0)	41(100.0)
	Non-VSS Village	0(0.0)	20(100.0)	20(100.0)
	Total	0(0.0)	61(100.0)	61(100.0)
Nirmal	VSS Village	0(0.0)	40(100.0)	40(100.0)
	Non-VSS Village	0(0.0)	20(100.0)	20(100.0)
	Total	0(0.0)	60(100.0)	60(100.0)

Collection and Marketing Practices of Non-Timber Forest Produce (NTFP) - An Empirical Analysis

Total	VSS Village	13(7.7)	155(92.3)	168(100.0)
	Non-VSS Village	0(0.0)	82(100.0)	82(100.0)
	Total	13(5.2)	237(94.8)	250(100.0)

Figures in brackets indicates percentages to horizontal totals

From the table 8 it is cleared that only 5 percent of the sample respondents have reported the value addition being under taken one aspect. Closer examination of the analysis, further reveals that only in one VSS village fall under Adilabad Division have under taken this activity i.e. incense (Agarbatti) sticks making. Due to the initiation of the forest department the VSS could establish contact with one of the incense agencies. However, none of the sample

respondents have not thought of value addition activities. During our focused group discussions the respondents in unanimity stated that they do not have neither scientific nor technical knowledge to undertake any value addition activity. Added to this due to immediate cash needs they prefer in selling in a raw manner (as is where basis is). Due to this problem the NTFP Collectors were unable to realize maximum from the disposers, which needs immediate attention

Table 9

Mode of Transport used by the Sample Respondents in disposal of the NTFP items

Forest Division	Type of village	Mode of Transport				Total
		Cycle	Bus+ Head loads	Bullock cart	Head Load	
Adilabad	VSS Village	8 (20.5)	2 (5.1)	10 (25.6)	19 (48.7)	39 (100.0)
	Non-VSS Village	2 (9.1)	0 (0.0)	10 (45.5)	10 (45.5)	22 (100.0)
	Total	10 (16.4)	2 (3.3)	20 (32.8)	29 (47.5)	61 (100.0)
Bellampa	VSS Village	4 (8.3)	2 (4.2)	5 (10.4)	37 (77.1)	48 (100.0)
	Non-VSS Village	12 (60.0)	1 (5.0)	2 (10.0)	5 (25.0)	20 (100.0)
	Total	16 (23.5)	3 (4.4)	7 (10.3)	42 (61.8)	68 (100.0)
Jannaram	VSS Village	5 (12.2)	3 (7.3)	3 (7.3)	30 (73.2)	41 (100.0)
	Non-VSS Village	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	20 (100.0)	20 (100.0)
	Total	5 (8.2)	3 (4.9)	3 (4.9)	50 (82.0)	61 (100.0)

Collection and Marketing Practices of Non-Timber Forest Produce (NTFP) - An Empirical Analysis

Nirmal	VSS Village	14 (35.0)	0 (0.0)	7 (17.5)	19 (47.5)	40 (100.0)
	Non-VSS Village	3 (15.0)	5 (25.0)	5 (25.0)	7 (35.0)	20 (100.0)
	Total	17 (28.3)	5 (8.3)	12 (20.0)	26 (43.3)	60 (100.0)
Total	VSS Village	31 (18.5)	7 (4.2)	25 (14.9)	105 (62.5)	168 (100.0)
	Non-VSS Village	17 (20.7)	6 (7.3)	17 (20.7)	42 (51.2)	82 (100.0)
	Total	48 (19.2)	13 (5.2)	42 (16.8)	147 (58.8)	250 (100.0)

Figures in brackets indicates percentages to horizontal totals

From the table 9 it is clear that nearly three-fifths of the sample respondents in all have stated that they have been carrying the NTFP for disposal either at GCC or to be private traders. In case of certain NTFP items viz. Broomsticks, Custard apple and forest based fruits. They have also carrying to be places of consumption so as to directly sell to the consumer.

The critical analysis presented reveals that next to head loads cycle was preferred, followed by bullock carts and a least percentage (5.2 per cent) of the respondents have availed bus transportation. However, even those who have avail this mode have revealed that as many as 68 per cent of the sample respondents spread over in 8 villages of the study areas have no bus facility from their village and as such they carry most of their NTFP items on head up to the nearest road point (ranging 2-6 kms).

It has also been reported that in case of Mahua flower they generally carry on bicycle. It was said that all these respondents are maintaining the bicycles for multi uses including in the movement of NTFP. It was also stated by nearly 17 per cent of the sample respondents have been making use of their own bullock carts in movement of NTFP with particular kendu leaves. During the course of the present study it was found that the respondents who have also having agriculture as their primary occupation,

said to be making use of the same both for agriculture purpose and NTFP disposal.

It is also observed that in the study area due to lack of adequate transport facilities and backwardness of the sample respondents they are still adopting traditional modes of transport.

Collection and Marketing Practices of Non-Timber Forest Produce (NTFP) - An Empirical Analysis

Table 10
Main problems faced by the sample respondents in storing the NTFP

Division	Type of village	Storage problems								Total
		Pest, Rains weight loss	Rains	Rats/Rodents	Theft	Loss in weight	climatic changes	Other problems	Sold immediately	
Adilabad	VSS Village	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	13 (33.3)	0 (0.0)	19 (48.7)	7 (17.9)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	39 (100.0)
	Non-VSS Village	2 (9.1)	4 (18.2)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	5 (22.7)	11 (50.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	22 (100.0)
	Total	2 (3.3)	4 (6.6)	13 (21.3)	0 (0.0)	24 (39.3)	18 (29.5)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	61 (100.0)
Bellampa	VSS Village	0 (0.0)	3 (6.3)	11 (22.9)	2 (4.2)	26 (54.2)	6 (12.5)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	48 (100.0)
	Non-VSS Village	1 (5.0)	3 (15.0)	8 (40.0)	0 (0.0)	7 (35.0)	1 (5.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	20 (100.0)
	Total	1 (1.5)	6 (8.8)	19 (27.9)	2 (2.9)	33 (48.5)	7 (10.3)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	68 (100.0)
Jannaram	VSS Village	0 (0.0)	5 (12.2)	5 (12.2)	2 (4.9)	18 (43.9)	8 (19.5)	3 (7.3)	0 (0.0)	41 (100.0)
	Non-VSS Village	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	13 (65.0)	6 (30.0)	1 (5.0)	0 (0.0)	20 (100.0)
	Total	0 (0.0)	5 (8.2)	5 (8.2)	2 (3.3)	31 (50.8)	14 (23.0)	4 (6.6)	0 (0.0)	61 (100.0)
Nirmal	VSS Village	1 (2.5)	2 (5.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	2 (5.0)	0 (0.0)	10 (25.0)	25 (62.5)	40 (100.0)
	Non-VSS Village	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	2 (10.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	18 (90.0)	20 (100.0)
	Total	1 (1.7)	2 (3.3)	2 (3.3)	0 (0.0)	2 (3.3)	0 (0.0)	10 (16.7)	43 (71.7)	60 (100.0)

Total	VSS Village	1 (0.6)	10 (6.0)	29 (17.3)	4 (2.4)	65 (38.7)	21 (12.5)	13 (7.7)	25 (14.9)	168 (100.0)
	Non-VSS Village	3 (3.7)	7 (8.5)	10 (12.2)	0 (0.0)	25 (30.5)	18 (22.0)	1 (1.2)	18 (22.0)	82 (100.0)
	Total	4 (1.6)	17 (6.8)	39 (15.6)	4 (1.6)	90 (36.0)	39 (15.6)	14 (5.6)	43 (17.2)	250 (100.0)

Figures in brackets indicates percentages to horizontal totals

The storage problems of the sample respondents are shown in table 10. From table 10 it is found that 90 sample respondents (36 per cent) were faced loss in weight in their NTFP items followed by 15.6 percent of the sample respondents have faced the problem with Rats and rodents, another 15.6 per cent of the sample respondents were faced by whether changes, 6.8 per cent of the respondents were faced by rains, only 1.6 per cent of the respondents were faced by pest, another 1.6 per cent of the sample respondents of the sample respondents were faced by theft, other problems faced by 5.6 per cent respectively. Further, it is noticed that 43

respondents or 17.2 per cent of the sample respondents were not faced any storage problems.

From the table 10 it is clear that multiple problems have been reported by the sample NTFP collectors (including VSS and non VSS same households) have revealed that the main problem they have experienced was deterioration in quality. In order to be substantial information on the said problems during the course of FGD we have elicited their views experienced this regard. In the absence of scientific knowledge they are drying the said items beyond the required level.

Table 11
Problems being faced by the sample respondents in selling NTFP to the private traders

Forest Division	Type of Village	Problems with private traders						Total (N)
		Not sold to the private traders	False weightment	Under payment	Un-remunerative price	Supply of false marking information	Other Problems	
Adilabad	VSS Village	34 (87.2)	5 (12.9)	2 (5.2)	3 (7.8)	1 (2.3)	1 (2.6)	39
	Non-VSS Village	14 (63.6)	3 (13.5)	1 (4.5)	3 (27.3)	1 (4.5)	4 (18.2)	22
	Total	48 (78.7)	8 (12.8)	3 (4.8)	6 (9.6)	2 (3.2)	5 (8.0)	61
Bellampa	VSS Village	48 (100.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	48
	Non-VSS Village	10 (50.0)	7 (35.0)	4 (20.0)	3 (15.0)	2 (10.0)	1 (5.0)	20
	Total	58 (85.3)	7 (10.3)	4 (5.8)	3 (4.5)	2 (2.4)	1 (1.2)	68
Jannaram	VSS Village	41 (100.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	41
	Non-VSS Village	1 (5.0)	5 (25.0)	6 (30.0)	6 (30.0)	3 (15.0)	2 (10.0)	20
	Total	42 (68.9)	5 (8.2)	6 (9.8)	6 (9.8)	3 (4.8)	2 (3.2)	61
Nirmal	VSS Village	20 (50.0)	8 (20.0)	6 (15.0)	5 (12.5)	4 (10.0)	5 (12.5)	40
	Non-VSS Village	10 (50.0)	6 (30.0)	3 (15.0)	2 (10.0)	1 (5.0)	2 (10.0)	20
	Total	30 (50.0)	14 (24.0)	9 (13.5)	7 (12.0)	5 (7.5)	7 (12.0)	60
Total	VSS Village	143 (85.1)	13 (7.7)	8 (4.7)	8 (4.7)	5 (2.9)	6 (3.5)	168
	Non-VSS Village	35 (42.6)	21 (25.6)	14 (17.0)	14 (17.0)	7 (8.5)	9 (10.9)	82
	Total	178 (71.2)	34 (13.6)	22 (8.8)	22 (8.8)	12 (4.8)	15 (6.0)	250

Figures in brackets indicates percentages to horizontal totals

Collection and Marketing Practices of Non-Timber Forest Produce (NTFP) - An Empirical Analysis

From the table 11 it is clear that of the total 82 respondents 34 respondents have reported that they being cheated by the private traders in the weightment. It was said that both the balance and the weights are manipulated which a lay man cannot identify the defect so easily. These respondents due to certain cross checks only could reveal the said problem. Further, 22 respondents have reported the under payment. These respondents have revealed that they could not get the full payment for their products. Deductions have been made from out of the sale proceeds in the name of impurity and other usual deductions for which these is no basis. Similar numbers of respondents have also stated that they fail to realize remunerative price. In fact they were confused in the process of price fixation. As they familiar with him so long

they were unable to demand higher price than the one offered by him.

It was stated by 12 respondents due to the tactics of private traders they could not get right information about the price and related matter. As a result they forfeit economically. By the time they could realize the tract it was like barking after the thieves left the robbery places. As many as 15 respondents have state that they have experienced hot burning problems in the disposal of NTFP. It was stated that though they offered quality items no premium price offered. Moreover the private trader is not generous in dealing with the items. Certain portion (a fraction of the last weight) is taken away without paying for it. These traders also cheated them by offering consumer goods in lieu of NTFP.

Table 12
Sample respondents reasons for sale through GCC

Division	Type of VSS	Sample respondents reasons						Total
		Supply of Domestic Commodities	Reasonable Price	Prompt Payment	Correct Weighment	Provision of Loan	GCC not available	
Adilabad	VSS Village	17 (43.6)	2 (5.1)	7 (17.9)	5 (12.8)	8 (20.5)	0 (0.0)	39 (100.0)
	Non-VSS Village	12 (54.5)	0 (0.0)	4 (18.2)	1 (4.5)	5 (22.7)	0 (0.0)	22 (100.0)
	Total	29 (47.5)	2 (3.3)	11 (18.0)	6 (9.8)	13 (21.3)	0 (0.0)	61 (100.0)
Bellampa	VSS Village	13 (27.1)	1 (2.1)	22 (45.8)	2 (4.2)	10 (20.8)	0 (0.0)	48 (100.0)
	Non-VSS Village	1 (5.0)	0 (0.0)	8 (40.0)	11 (55.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	20 (100.0)
	Total	14 (20.6)	1 (1.5)	30 (44.1)	13 (19.1)	10 (14.7)	0 (0.0)	68 (100.0)
Jannaram	VSS Village	19 (46.3)	1 (2.4)	4 (9.8)	5 (12.2)	12 (29.3)	0 (0.0)	41 (100.0)
	Non-VSS Village	10 (50.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	10 (50.0)	20 (100.0)
	Total	22 (36.1)	1 (1.6)	4 (6.6)	5 (8.2)	12 (19.7)	17 (27.9)	61 (100.0)
Nirmal	VSS Village	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	40 (100.0)	40 (100.0)

Collection and Marketing Practices of Non-Timber Forest Produce (NTFP) - An Empirical Analysis

	Non-VSS Village	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	20 (100.0)	20 (100.0)
	Total	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	60 (100.0)	60 (100.0)
Total	VSS Village	49 (29.2)	4 (2.4)	33 (19.6)	12 (7.1)	30 (17.9)	40 (23.8)	168 (100.0)
	Non-VSS Village	23 (28.2)	0 (0.0)	12 (14.6)	12 (14.6)	5 (6.1)	30 (36.5)	82 (100.0)
	Total	72 (28.8)	4 (1.6)	45 (18.0)	24 (9.6)	35 (14.0)	70 (28.0)	250 (100.0)

Figures in brackets indicates percentages to horizontal totals

From the table 12 it is clear that as many as 45 sample respondents have stated the prompt payment and correct weighing were the reasons for the sale of NTFP through GCC. Since 14 percent of the respondents have availed the loan being provided by Girijan Primary Co operative Marketing Society (GPCMS) which induced them to dispose of the NTFP. As stated earlier the GCC is meant for sale of NTFP and purchase of essential commodities, and as such as many as 29 percent of the sample respondents have revealed that they are primarily making use of the GCC for more than one reason. Soon after the disposal of the NTFP the forest dependent communities are able to purchase the needed domestic commodities in the same premises. However, negligible percentage of sample respondents has stated that the reasonable price is also one of the reasons for choosing the GCC for the sale of their NTFP. In all nearly 28 percent of the sample respondents have not availed GCC in the disposal of NTFP and as a result they were

unable to say or respond anything on the said issue. The critical analysis clearly shows that of all the reasons stated by the sample respondents fall under the category of the VSS have positively respondent compare to the respondents belonging to the non-VSS category.

In the study area the sample respondents have been making use of weekly shandies for the sale of their NTFP items. In addition to purchase the needed groceries is meant for the week. Village shandies have been in existence since a long in both the tribal and non-tribal areas. In non tribal areas to weekly shandies have been catering to the needs of the villagers in the form of supplying essential commodities more specifically groceries, vegetables, cloth, refreshments etc. All this clearly shows that in spite of the existence of the institutional agencies like GCC still the traditional channels like village shandies are no less important. The important NTFP items sold at weekly shandies includes Jeedipandlu, Usiri, Seethahal, Mahua flower and Muripandlu.

Table 13
Important problems faced by the Sample Respondents during the NTFP collection

Division	Problems reported									Total
	Fear of wild animals	Long travel for NTFP collection	Lack of technical knowledge/skills in collection of NTFP	Problem of sunstroke	Depletion of NTFP species	Lack of scientific knowledge about the collection of NTFP	Fear of wild animals + Long travel for NTFP collection + Pro. of sunstroke (3 problems reported)	Problem of sunstroke + Depletion of NTFP species (2 problems reported)	Fear of wild animals + Problem of sunstroke (2 problems reported)	

Collection and Marketing Practices of Non-Timber Forest Produce (NTFP) - An Empirical Analysis

								house holds)	house holds	ds)	
Adilabad	VSS	7 (17.9)	17 (43.6)	1 (2.6)	9 (23.1)	1 (2.6)	0 (0.0)	4 (10.3)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	39 (100.0)
	NV	1 (4.5)	9 (40.9)	0 (0.0)	1 (4.5)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	11 (50.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	22 (100.0)
		Total	8 (13.1)	26 (42.6)	1 (1.6)	10 (16.4)	1 (1.6)	0 (0.0)	15 (24.6)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)
	Bellampa	VSS	0 (0.0)	2 (4.2)	0 (0.0)	22 (45.8)	1 (2.1)	0 (0.0)	8 (16.7)	5 (10.4)	10 (20.8)
NV		9 (45.0)	4 (20.0)	0 (0.0)	4 (20.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	3 (15.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	20 (100.0)
		Total	9 (13.2)	6 (8.8)	0 (0.0)	26 (38.2)	1 (1.5)	0 (0.0)	11 (16.2)	5 (7.4)	10 (14.7)
Jannaram		VSS	4 (9.8)	6 (14.6)	0 (0.0)	15 (36.6)	3 (7.3)	0 (0.0)	10 (24.4)	2 (4.9)	1 (2.4)
	NV	3 (15.0)	7 (35.0)	0 (0.0)	3 (15.0)	3 (15.0)	0 (0.0)	2 (10.0)	1 (5.0)	1 (5.0)	20 (100.0)
		Total	7 (11.5)	13 (21.3)	0 (0.0)	18 (29.5)	6 (9.8)	0 (0.0)	12 (19.7)	3 (4.9)	2 (3.3)
	Nirmal	VSS	12 (30.0)	14 (35.0)	0 (0.0)	4 (10.0)	5 (12.5)	0 (0.0)	4 (10.0)	0 (0.0)	1 (2.5)

Collection and Marketing Practices of Non-Timber Forest Produce (NTFP) - An Empirical Analysis

	NV	2	6	0	5	5	2	0	0	0	20
		(10.0)	(30.0)	(0.0)	(25.0)	(25.0)	(10.0)	(0.0)	(0.0)	(0.0)	(100.0)
	Total	14	20	0	9	10	2	4	0	1	60
		(23.3)	(33.3)	(0.0)	(15.0)	(16.7)	(3.3)	(6.7)	(0.0)	(1.7)	(100.0)
	VSS	23	39	1	50	10	0	26	7	12	168
		(13.7)	(23.2)	(0.6)	(29.8)	(6.0)	(0.0)	(15.5)	(4.2)	(7.1)	(100.0)
	NV	15	26	0	13	8	2	16	1	1	82
		(18.3)	(31.7)	(0.0)	(15.9)	(9.8)	(2.4)	(19.5)	(1.2)	(1.2)	(100.0)
Total	Total	38	65	1	63	18	2	42	8	13	250
		(15.2)	(26.0)	(0.4)	(25.2)	(7.2)	(0.8)	(16.8)	(3.2)	(5.2)	(100.0)

Figures in brackets indicates percentages to horizontal totals

From the Table 13 it is clear that of the total 250 sample respondents 26 per cent of the sample respondents have expressed the long travel for NTFP collection is one of the important problem. It was said that the NTFP collectors have to travel varying distances ranging from 1 KM to 4 KMs to collect the NTFP. Sometimes they may even go to deep of the forests in search of specific species. Even these sample respondents have revealed their bad experiences too. For the collection of beedi leaves and Mahua flower these respondents have traveled along distances them other items. It is logically stated by these sample respondents that due to large scale dependence for NTFP, they may not get reasonable quality if they go to smaller distances due to heavy competition. As such they prefer to go for of places to extract larger quantities otherwise their days labour goes waste. Due to the shrinkage of NTFP spices also leading to heavy competition among the

NTFP collectors and at times it may lead internal conflicts among themselves. Since they have to travel long distances it has been reported. 25.2 per cent of the sample responds that they may prone to sunstroke during the summer seasons.

As many as 16.8 per cent of the sample respondents have stated multiple problems viz. fear of wild animals, long travel, sunstroke. In addition to the said problems the fear of wild animals has been reported. 15 per cent of the sample respondents have also expressed the problem of wild animals. As a result the sample households enter the forest area with a feeling of fear and insecurity. It was also reported informally that they are also prove to harassment frequently by the forest officials in some protect or other which may curtail their freedom in NTFP collection.

7.2 per cent of the sample respondents have also expressed the problem of depletion of

Collection and Marketing Practices of Non-Timber Forest Produce (NTFP) - An Empirical Analysis

NTFP. It was said that due to fast deterioration (as a result of larger extraction) and also due to the adoption of unscientific methods of extraction, destruction of the forests by the tribals and others leading to depletion of the NTFP items.

Recommendations

1. Unscientific NTFP extraction or collection may lead to depletion of the valuable species and may even disappear in due course of time affecting the forest dependent communities. Hence, the knowledge on identification of different NTFP species their characteristics and maturity time must be imparted. It is also suggested that the GCC, Forest department and other agencies should train the NTFP collectors on non-destructive or scientific extraction of NTFP for ensuring the sustainable growth o NTFP species.
2. Efforts should be made to undertake certain value addition activities for the NTFP items available locally processed or semi-processed activities at the primary level through Self Help Groups (SHGs), Village Organizations (VOs) and Mandala Mahila Samakhyas (MMSs) should develop the relevant rural technologies for value addition of NTFP items. This may help the NTFP collectors to gain much with limited cost.
3. Due to lack of provisions of post harvesting techniques of NTFP items its collectors have been facing the problems of deterioration in quantity and quality of NTFP. Hence, there is a need to build the capacities of the NTFP collectors on post harvesting techniques i.e. drying, cleaning. These measures may also help the NTFP collectors in obtaining higher returns.
4. Providing adequate transportation facilities for the benefit of the NTFP collectors may improve their access to distant markets where there is adequate demand for the region specific NTFP items.
5. At present the NTFP collectors do not have access to adequate, accurate and timely market information. Hence, institutional marketing agencies should create database market information and should provide to the forest dwellers in their understandable language or form through pamphlets, wall writings, electronic media, etc.
6. Our study result shows that certain areas lack the facility of DR Depots. Hence, opening of more GCC Daily Requirement Depots in the interior tribal areas, may go in a long way in protecting the NTFP collectors from the clutches of the private traders.
7. Still the NTFP collectors are indebted to the private traders leading to disposal of their NTFP to them or through them. As a result these people heavily loosing by paying exorbitant rate of interest on one hand and he is also deprived of the remunerative/prevaling price leading to considerable loss. To tide over the crisis there is a need to supply adequate credit through GPCMS. Moreover the NTFP collectors should augment their income sources, which may also prevent seeking often the financial support from the private traders.
8. In order to encourage the NTFP collectors to market NTFP at right plane and at the right time strengthening of market extension needs special attention. As the NTFP collectors are mostly illiterates and tradition bound appropriate extension methods needs to be evolved.

Collection and Marketing Practices of Non-Timber Forest Produce (NTFP) - An Empirical Analysis

9. As the GCC is not only purchasing the NTFP but also supplying the essential commodities at their outlets. It is also equally important to supply the agricultural inputs at subsidized prices. This is necessary because certain NTFP collectors do possess small piece of land and are cultivating the crops.

References

1. Bahuguna V.K. (2000) "Forests in the economy of rural poor: An estimation of the dependency level" *AMBIO*, Vol.29, No. 3, March 2000, p.p. 126-129.
2. Barthakur, I.K. "Tribal Economy" *Yojana*, Vol. 33, No.2, December 1-15, 1989.
3. Bhaskar, K. (2001) "Community Participation shows the path for the success of Joint Forest Management, the case of Gundlamadugu VSS of A.P. Man and Life, Vol. 27, No. 1&2, Jan-June
4. Blay, Dominic, Jr, (1996), *The use and management of Non-Timber Forest Produce in Ghana, Management of Minor Forest Produce for sustainability* (Shira and Mathur, eds.) Oxford & IBH, New Delhi. P.p. 224-228
5. Chandrasekharan, C. (1996) *Non-wood forest produces a global view of potential and challenges. Management of Minor Forest produces for sustainability* (Shira and Mathur, eds) Oxford & IBH, New Delhi. P.p.3-13
6. Debarata Lahiri (2000) *Pooling of Minor forest produce through LAMPS in Southern districts of West Bengal.*
7. D.V. Singh, D.N. Sharma & R.L.Verma (AERC, H.P.Unishoula-5 (1992) *Productions and marketing of Minor forest products: Indian Journal of Agricultural Marketing*, July-Dec 1992.
8. Elizabeth, j.z. et.al (2002) *influence of markets and policy on spatial patterns of non timber forest product extraction. Land economics*, 78 (2), 2002(may): 260 -271
9. FAO (1990) *The major significance of Minor Forest Produce: the local use and value of forests in the west African Humid Forest Zone community*, Forestry notes 6.. FAO, Rome.
10. Girish M.R (1999) *Department of Agricultural Economics, UAS, GKVK, Bangalore Role of Non-Timber forest products in the tribal Economy – An Economic study in Western Ghats region of Karnataka*, 1999.
11. Gopal rao, n. (1987) *significance of minor forest produce in tribal economy: a case study. Kurukshetra*. 35(10), 1987 (July) 23-28 & 38.

Collection and Marketing Practices of Non-Timber Forest Produce (NTFP) - An Empirical Analysis

12. Haimendorf, Furer, C.Von, (1945) Tribal Population of Hyderabad, in Upadhyay V.S. and Pandey G. (ed) Tribal Development in India, Crown Publication, Ranchi.
13. Kamat, g.s. (1998) Managing marketing of forest produce: role of cooperatives. Khadi Gramodyog, 34(11), 1988 (August) 491-494.
14. Lalthara (1976) marketing of agricultural and forest produce. Journal of the Lalbahgadur shastri national academy of administration, 21 (1), 1976(spring): 433-436
15. Mohapatra, P.M., and Mohapatra, P.C (1996). Forest Management in tribal Areas Forest policy and peoples participation – concept , New Delhi, 1997 p.p.189
16. Murthy, I.K. et al, (2004), “The Ecological Impact of JFM in Karnataka” in N.H. Ravindranath and Sudha, P. 9Ed), JFM in India, Spread, Performance and Impact, University Press (India) Private Limited, Hyderabad.
17. Prasad, R.R. (1984), Tribals in Forest Ecology, Mainstream, Vol. XI, XII, No. 50, p.p. 15-17.
18. Ramesh Singh, M. (2006). “Tribal Development in 21st Century”, Mittal Publications, New Delhi.
19. Saravana, S., (2003) Marketing of Non-Timber Forest Produce and Functions of LAMPS in salem district of Tamilnadu, My Forestry, Vol. 39 (2), June-2003
20. Vidyarthi, A.K. and Gupta, H.S. (2001) Non-Wood Forest Produce in village economy: A case study in Chotanagapur region, Bihar, Journal of Tropical Forestry, Vol. 17 (2), p.p. 18-23.

Author's Profile



Dr. M. Muthyalu has studied M.A. degree in rural development and he obtained Ph.D. degree in rural development from Srikrishna Devaraya University, Ananthapur, India. Then he worked in different institutions in the field of Rural Development and cooperative sectors. Presently, he is working as an Assistant Professor in the department of cooperative studies, Mekelle University, Ethiopia. He has published articles in reputed national and international journals.

Collection and Marketing Practices of Non-Timber Forest Produce (NTFP) - An Empirical Analysis

**Collection and Marketing Practices of Non-Timber Forest Produce (NTFP) - An
Empirical Analysis**