

*Of the 66 PAs that had reported the existence of flying squads in the earlier survey, 35 (53.03%) PAs reported that they did not have any flying squads according to data compiled in the current survey.*

**3.10 Adequacy of Antipoaching Measures (Table 3.14)**

*145 (61.7%) of the PAs reported that the antipoaching measures currently being undertaken by them were not adequate, while 47 (20%) PAs reported that such measures were adequate. 3 (1.27%) PAs, viz. Rajmahal National Park, Jharkhand, and Malwan and Naigaon Sanctuaries responded that the question was not applicable in their case. The reason for responding thus for Rajmahal may have been that it is a fossil park. However, the reason for the other two responding thus was not apparent. 40 (17.02%) PAs did not respond to this question.*

**3.11 Guns Within the PA and Surrounding Areas (Table 3.15)**

The existence of private weapons inside or adjacent to a PA pose a special hazard as they can not only be used for poaching but also make it easier for wild animals to be killed while threatening crops or livestock.

*91 (38.72%) PAs reported the existence of registered guns within their boundaries or surrounding areas. The maximum number of licensed guns (2000) was reported from Nagarahole National Park, Karnataka. The average number of guns per PA from among those that reported them was 167.*

*Data for the number of unlicensed guns within or in the surrounds of the PA was inadequate and/or under reported. Only 6 (2.53%) PAs reported that unlicensed guns were also present within or around the PA. The maximum number of unlicensed guns (385) was reported from Talakaveri Sanctuary, Karnataka.*

**3.12 Hunting Permits (No Table)**

Hunting within PAs is strictly prohibited, except in case of animals that pose a threat to human life or property, or for the better management of

the PA. However, by and large hunting within PAs is not allowed except in very rare circumstances.

**Only 2 (0.85%) PAs reported that they had issued hunting permits. These PAs were Tadoba Andhari Tiger Reserve, Maharashtra, and Desert National Park, Rajasthan. In case of the former, the permit was issued for killing a tiger that was declared to be a man eater, while in case of the latter, the permit was issued to kill three Blue bulls "due to crop damage". However, the permit was reportedly not used in the case of the Desert National Park. Data from the previous survey reveal that no such permits had been issued by either of these PAs.**

(Comparative data from the earlier survey shows that Only 2 (5%) of the 43 national parks responding and 3 (2%) of the 187 sanctuaries responding reported the issuing of hunting permits for killing or collecting of animals). The details are given below.

N/S	No. of Permits	Animal and Numbers Involved	Reasons
Bhimbandh S. (Bihar)	11	Wild boar (11)	To stop crop damage
Bhittar Kanika S. (Orissa)	2	Collection of Olive ridley turtle eggs (530)	Research
Simlipal S. (Orissa)	1	Tiger (1)	Man-eater
Ranthambore N. (Rajasthan)	5	Wild boar (6)	Unspecified
Dudhwa N. (Uttar Pradesh)	1	Tiger (1)	Man-eater

### 3.13 Commercial and Developmental Activities Inside PAs (Table 3.16)

The Wild Life (Protection) Act 1972 (and the corresponding J&K Act) specifies that the control of national parks and sanctuaries must vest with the Chief Wildlife Warden of each state (section 33 for sanctuaries, and section 35 for national parks). What this implies is that any activity by any agency or department, other than the Wildlife Wing of the Forest

Department, in a national park or sanctuary, has to be cleared by the Chief Wildlife Warden.

As far back as 1973 the then Prime Minister of India, Smt. Indira Gandhi, in a D.O. letter addressed to all Chief Minister (NO. 694-PM/73 dated December 27, 1973) had suggested that:

The Wildlife Service will manage National Parks and Sanctuaries exclusively, and all staff and activity will be under their control.

In a subsequent letter (dated September 16, 1976) from the Joint Secretary (F & WL), Department of Agriculture, Government of India, it was clarified that :

All roads entering the sanctuaries and national parks should have check posts manned by 3 wildlife forest guards working round the clock.

**78 (33.19%) PAs reported the presence of commercial and/or developmental activities inside the PA. The most common commercial or developmental activity in PAs was that of road construction or maintenance, which was reported from 32 (41.02%) of the PAs reporting such activities. In terms of the impact or affect on the PA, the most impacted PAs from roads were Badalkhol Sanctuary in Madhya Pradesh (100% of the PA), Kolleru Sanctuary in Andhra Pradesh (81.16% of the PA) and Doraji Bear Sanctuary in Karnataka (54.54% of the PA). The other commonly reported commercial or development activities from PAs were:**

**Dams, power or irrigation projects, which were reported from 21 (26.92%) of the PAs responding. Many PAs are created on or around reservoirs formed by dams (eg Pong Lake). However, there are many in which dams or their reservoirs are only a part of the overall area of the PA. In terms of the area of the PA occupied/affected by dams/reservoirs in this category, significant area of the PA being affected was reported from Bor Sanctuary in Maharashtra (32.73% of the PA) and Hadgarh Sanctuary in Orissa (16.61% of the PA).**

*Transmission or power lines, which were reported from 15 (19.23%) of the PAs responding.*

*Commercial extraction of NTFP or Timber from PAs, which was reported from 14 (17.94%) of the PAs responding. Significant percentage of the area of the PA was reported to be affected by this activity from Tamore Pingla Sanctuary in Chattisgarh (100% of the PA), and Badarma (66.44% of the PA) and Debrigarh (95.4% of the PA) Sanctuaries in Orissa.*

*Fishing, Pisciculture, or Acquaculture, which was reported from 9 (11.53%) of the PAs responding. The PAs that reported a significant percentage of their area being affected by these activities were Kolleru Sanctuary in Andhra Pradesh (32.46% of the PA), Pong Lake Sanctuary in Himachal Pradesh (100% of the PA) and Jaikwadi Sanctuary in Maharashtra (70.38% of the PA)*

*Mining or Quarrying were reported from 9 (11.53%) of the PAs responding. In terms of the area affected by mining in absolute terms, the maximum (46 sq km) reported was from Kudremukh National Park in Karnataka. In all other cases, the area impacted was either not reported or was reported to be small.*

*(Comparable data of the earlier survey shows that of the 45 national parks responding, 25 (56%) reported use or departments and agencies other than the Wildlife Wing. Similarly, of the 188 sanctuaries responding, 119 (63%) have such use.)*

*(In national parks the most common use or occupation was that of roads controlled/used by other departments, which was present in 60% of the parks reporting any use. Other relatively common ones were tourism and transmission lines, present in 28%, and irrigation and housing in 20% of the parks responding.)*

*(In the case of sanctuaries, 55% of those having such uses reported the existence of roads, 36% reported transmission lines, and 31% reported irrigation under other government agencies. 20% also*

*reported forestry activities being carried out by wings of the Forest Department other than the wildlife wing.)*

### **3.14 Encroachments (Table 3.17)**

Given the pressure on land in most parts of the country, it is inevitable that PAs would also become a target of encroachers. However, encroachments within PAs can often become a growing threat and seriously affect the integrity of the area. This is especially so when encroachers start "honey combing" the forest and competing with wildlife for food, water and space.

**73 (36.31%) of the 201 PAs that responded to this question reported the incidence of encroachment. In terms of the area of the PA affected by encroachments, the PAs that reported a significant quantum were:**

***Kolleru Sanctuary, Andhra Pradesh reported 250 sq km or 81.16% of its area being encroached!***

***Pakhai Sanctuary, Andhra Pradesh reported 208 sq km or 24.18% of its area being encroached***

***Laokhawa Sanctuary, Assam reported 26 sq km or 37.08% of its area being encroached***

***Hazaribagh Sanctuary, Jharkhand reported 106.31 sq km or 57.15% of its area being encroached***

***Jaikwadi Sanctuary, Maharashtra reported 85 sq km or 24.91% of its area being encroached***

***Action taken by authorities to have the encroachments vacated was reported from 64 (87.67%) of the PAs that reported encroachments. In most cases, cases had been filed in the court, while in some cases evictions had also been attempted.***

*(Comparable data from the earlier survey reveal that 3 (7%) of the 44 national parks and 32 (20%) of the 160 sanctuaries responding reported encroachment.*

*(In all three of the national parks and in 23 (72%) of the 32 sanctuaries reporting encroachment, some action had been reportedly*

taken by the authorities. This, however, varied considerably. In many cases action taken meant initiation of correspondence between the different concerned department, or filing of case.)

**18 of the PAs that reported encroachments in the earlier survey did so in the current one too, while 15 PAs that reported encroachments in the current survey had not done so in the previous one.**

#### **Limitations of the Data**

Many cases of encroachment seem to go unrecorded or unreported. The figures should therefore be taken as reflecting the minimum incidence.

#### **3.15 Permanent Staff (Table 3.18)**

There is a heavy density of human population and a high frequency and intensity of various types of human activities in and around most parks and sanctuaries in India. Their protection, therefore, requires intensive management by properly trained staff.

**26 (11.06%) PAs did not report any permanent staff. One of the problems that PA authorities have is that staff that have been sanctioned are often not posted to PAs. We give below a difference between sanctioned and filled posts at various levels:**

- **Reportedly, a total of 114 posts of ACF's had been sanctioned for PAs that responded to the survey, of which 111 (97.36%) had been filled**
- **Reportedly, a total of 392 posts of Range Officers had been sanctioned for PAs that responded to the survey, of which 370 (94.38%) had been filled**
- **Reportedly, a total of 1032 posts of Deputy Range Officers had been sanctioned for PAs that responded to the survey, of which 1013 (98.15%) had been filled**
- **Reportedly, a total of 2942 posts of Forest Guards had been sanctioned for PAs that responded to the survey, of which 2774 (94.28%) had been filled.**

*Please note that the above data does not give any idea of the variations between the various PAs in terms of their staff strength. Therefore, on the one hand we have PAs that have a staff strength that exceeds 250 people ie; Kaziranga National Park, Assam (520 staff), Nagarhole National Park, Karnataka (263 staff), Indira Gandhi National Park, Tamilnadu (316 staff), and Corbett National Park, Uttaranchal (378 staff) while on the other, there are 30 PAs that have reported less than or equal to 5 people as permanent staff.*

### **3.16 Staff Employed on Daily Wages in PAs (Table 3.19)**

One of the major constraints that PA managers often face is the lack of adequate human power. This problem is partially overcome by employing people on daily wages. Daily wagers perform a wide variety of tasks, ranging from protection and patrolling to office work. This, it can be argued, not only provides employment to local people but also creates a stake for the local people in the well being of the PA. However, on the other hand, it has also been argued that local people are more likely to connive and turn a blind eye to the wrong doings of their fellow villagers that adversely affect the PA.

*Of the 44 National Parks and 166 sanctuaries that responded to this question, 36 (82%) and 108 (65%) respectively reported that staff was employed on daily wages for various purposes in the PA.*

*From the responses to the survey, it emerged that the nature of tasks performed by daily wagers included fire protection, manning barriers and rest houses, patrolling and protection, messenger duties, maintenance of roads etc. inside the PA.*

*In a majority of cases, persons employed on daily wage were from villages within or adjoining the PA. In addition to enhancing the work force available to the PA manger, this was also seen as a way of providing employment to villagers in or around the PA.*

**3.17 Additional Responsibilities of the PA Director (Table 3.20)**

With the exception of tiger reserves and some important national parks, most PAs do not have dedicated PA directors. Usually, an officer of the rank of DCF or CF (in case of tiger reserves) shares the responsibility of more than one PA. In cases where the PA is not under the control of the wildlife wing, the concerned territorial officer looks after the PA in addition to his/her other duties as a territorial officer.

*Of the 211 PAs that responded to this question, in 161 (76%) of the PAs the PA director had responsibilities in addition to managing the PA.*

*As described earlier, additional responsibilities of PA directors included territorial duties and wildlife protection duties in other PAs.*

**3.18 Veterinary Facilities for PAs (Table 3.21)**

To meet emergencies and to take care of general problems relating to the health of wild animals, the presence of a vet within a park or sanctuary is very useful

*Out of 47 National Parks and 178 Sanctuaries that responded to this question, 10 (21%) and 14 (8%) respectively reported the presence of a veterinarian attached to the PA.*

*(Data from the previous survey shows that of the 45 national parks and 199 sanctuaries responding, only 7 (16%) and 12 (6%) respectively had vets)*

*Interestingly, none of the 24 PAs that reported the presence of a vet, had a doctor that specialised in wild animal health.*

**3.19 Availability of Research Staff in PAs (Table 3.24)**

Good research in PAs can form an important input for taking crucial management decisions. Thus, research staff in PAs has a significant role in effective management of the PA.

*Of the 44 National Parks and 177 sanctuaries that responded to this question, only 5 (11 %) and 2 (1%) respectively reported the presence of research staff.*



*The absence of research staff in a vast majority of the PAs suggests that the importance of research as a management tool is perhaps still not recognized adequately.*

**3.20 Availability of Staff Trained in Wildlife Management (Table 3.25)**

*The data shows that of the 47 national parks and 188 sanctuaries responding, 29 (62%) and 65 (36%) had at least one staff member trained in wildlife management.*

*(Corresponding figures from the previous survey show that of the 45 parks that responded, 30 (67%) had at least one member trained in wildlife. For sanctuaries, of the 171 responding, 61 (36%) reported presence of staff with wildlife training.)*

**3.21 Availability of Equipment in PAs (Table 3.26)**

The ability of the staff to optimally manage a protected areas is significantly enhanced by the availability of appropriate equipment. In fact, investment in equipment can not only reduce the human-power required, by making each individual more effective, but also reduce time and allow for the anticipation and consequent prevention of many undesirable activities and occurrences.

*A very high proportion of PAs, 46 (98%) of the 47 national parks and 172 (91%) of the 188 sanctuaries reported the presence of some equipment*

*(Data from the previous survey shows that nationwide, of the 40 national parks and 159 sanctuaries responding, 27 parks (68%) and 79 sanctuaries (50%) reported the existence of one or more kinds of equipment).*

**3.22 Research in PAs (Table 3.27)**

Research on flora, fauna, habitat and ecological processes is an essential component of the initial planning for a national park or sanctuary. In addition, monitoring of evolutionary and ecological changes, and of the human impact on ecosystems, can provide crucial data for continuous planning and management.

Research within parks and sanctuaries also provides data and insights that are of general, or national, value. It can contribute to the national inventory of flora and fauna, and to a mapping of the genetic resources available in the country. It can also help in mass education programmes related to wildlife and ecosystem conservation. Information was therefore sought on past and present research and monitoring efforts.

***Nationwide, out of the 235 PAs that responded, 70 (30%) reported that research was either currently ongoing in the PA or had taken place in the past.***

*(Corresponding figures in the earlier survey were that of the 38 national parks and 166 sanctuaries responding, 16 (42%) of the national parks and 32 (23%) of the sanctuaries reported that research work had been undertaken or was under way)*

#### ***Limitations of the Data***

From this information nothing can be gleaned on the scope and quality of research and monitoring. These probably vary considerably.

#### **3.23 Monitoring Activities in the PA (Table 3.28)**

Periodic monitoring can provide valuable information about ecological trends, particularly on issues such as trends related to the population of fauna and distribution of flora. Such monitoring can facilitate timely management interventions, if such a need were to arise and can also serve as an early warning system against threats to the PA.

***Monitoring activities of various sorts were reported from 32 (68%) of the national parks and 111 (65%) of the 171 sanctuaries that responded.***

***Most PAs reported the following types of monitoring activities: census of select animals such as tigers and elephants using pugmark method, as well as through direct sightings, bird counts and vegetation plots. The frequency of monitoring varied from once every month to once in five years.***

### 3.24 Interpretation and Education Activities in PAs (Table 3.29)

Considering the huge human population in and around parks and sanctuaries, it seems essential that this population be made sensitive to, and supportive of, the need and effort for conserving wildlife and wilderness areas. Without the active co-operation of the local population it would be difficult to give anywhere near the required level of protection to parks and sanctuaries.

One of the ways of enthusing the local population is to run educational programmes where they are informed of the reasons for setting up parks and sanctuaries, of the potential benefits of these areas to them and of the care and attention such areas require. Such educational programmes are mostly known as extension programmes, run by extension officers.

***Of the 45 national parks and 178 sanctuaries that responded to this question, the existence of interpretation and education programmes for surrounding villages was reported from a large number of national parks - 35 (78%), but from a relatively small number of sanctuaries - 63 (35%).***

*(This is a healthy improvement over the data from the previous survey, which revealed that of the 44 national parks and 197 sanctuaries responding, 9 (20%) national parks and 23 (12%) sanctuaries reported that they carried out awareness and extension programmes with neighbouring communities).*

#### **Limitations of the Data**

Responses from many areas indicate that the frequency of these educational programmes is often low and in many cases there is no regular schedule. The content of, and the response to, these programmes also needs to be studied.

### 3.25 Participation in PA Management and presence of NGOs (Table 3.30)

The involvement of people and people's organisations in wildlife management has been recognised as crucial to the protection of wildlife areas. The National Wildlife Action Plan, drawn up by the Government of

India, repeatedly stresses this point. There has also been a task force, set up by the Indian Board for Wildlife, to report on ways and means of eliciting public support for wildlife conservation. (Indian Board of Wildlife, 1983).

*Out of the 236 PAs that responded to the survey, 127 left this question unanswered, while 9 answered it in the negative. Though the nature of participation varied, responses from 99 PAs showed that there was people's participation in some form or the other.*

In most cases PAs that reported people's participation alluded to the involvement of local communities in ecocodevelopment programmes being run by the PA management. In some instances, employment of local people by the forest department was also described as people's participation.

*As far as the involvement of NGOs is concerned, 23(49%) of the 44 national parks and 35 (21%) of the 163 sanctuaries that responded, reported the involvement of NGOs in some form or the other with the PA.*

*(With regard to NGOs associated with PAs, there is some improvement compared to the data from the previous survey. when, of the 47 national parks and 198 sanctuaries responding, only 8 (17%) and 23 (12%) respectively reported association of NGOs.)*

### **3.26 Poaching (Table 3.22)**

*Of the 235 PAs responding, 72 (31%) reported poaching cases. As far as poaching methods are concerned, 32 PAs reported shooting, 23 trapping/netting and 4 reported hunting by dogs.*

*(In the previous survey of the 48 national parks and 170 sanctuaries responding, 26 (54%) and 75 (44%) respectively reported instances of poaching)*

### **3.27 Offences (Table 3.23)**

Details regarding different types of recorded offences under the Wild life (Protection) Act were collected for each park and sanctuary. These figures can be indicators of the human pressures on these areas.

Of the 44 national parks and 170 sanctuaries that responded to this question, 26(59%) of the national parks and 98(56%) of the sanctuaries reported incidence of one or more types of offences.

(In the previous survey, of the 45 national parks and 172 sanctuaries responding, 31(69%) and 96 (56%) respectively reported one or more offences)

A comparative analysis between the offences reported in the old survey and the new survey is presented below:

Category of offence(section of wildlife act)	Newsurvey <sup>1</sup> PA /%	Old survey <sup>2</sup> PA/ %
Illegal alteration of boundary (26A (3) & 35 (5))	2(0.85%)	Not present in old data
Improper entry (27.1)	11(4.7%)	25 (12%)
Improper conduct (27.2)	2(0.85%)	5 (7%)
Causing damage to boundary mark (27.3)	1(0.4%)	Not present in old data
Teasing/molesting of Wild Animals (27.4)	5(2.2%)	Not present in old data
Destruction, exploitation, etc of wildlife (29 & 35.6)	38(16%)	59 (27%)
Causing fire (30)	28(12%)	23 (11%)
Illegal weapons (31)	13(6%)	22 (10%)
Use of explosives/ other banned substances (32)	2 (0.85%)	5 (2% )
Illegal activities (33)	21 (9%)	Not present in old data
Grazing livestock without vaccination (33A)	11 (4.7%)	Not present in old data
Non-registration of arms (34.1)	2 (0.85%)	3 (1%)
Illegal granting of new arms licenses (34.3)	0	Not present in old data
Grazing in national park (35.7)	11(4.7%)	50 (23%)
Others	32 (13.7%)	1(0.46%)

<sup>1</sup> All percentages given in this section have been calculated out of a total of 47 national parks and 188 sanctuaries responding

<sup>2</sup> All percentages given in this section have been calculated out of a total of 45 national parks and 172 sanctuaries responding

### **Limitation of the Data**

These figures only reflect offences, which have been detected and officially recorded. There could be many other offences, which have not been detected or not officially recorded.

Secondly, the number of recorded cases of a particular offence in a park or sanctuary does not necessarily reflect the incidence of that offence in the area, nor do a higher number of recorded cases in a particular area necessarily reflect negatively on the efficiency of the protection staff. In fact, it is possible that in many instances a higher number of cases have been recorded in parks and sanctuaries where the protection staff is very active and detects and takes action on a larger proportion of the offences occurring.

Comparisons between different protected areas would also be invidious without analysing data on their relative areas, the existence of human pressures, the extent of such pressure, availability of personnel and facilities, etc.



STAT SECTOR	SUB-SECTOR	SCHEME	TYPE OF SCHEME	Central Share	HEADS					
					Total Allocation for the Eighth Plan (1992-97)	Expenditure (1992-93)	Expenditure (1993-94)	Approved Outlay (1994-95)	Anticipated Expenditure (1994-95)	Proposed Outlay (1995-96)
A&N	FOR	Forests	State		0.00	0.00	31.90	0.00	31.90	
AP	FOR	Action Plan for conservation and management of Andaman and Nicobar mangroves	State							
AP	FOR	Sanctuaries preservation of degraded forestry	CSS	50.00	500.00	137.88	155.00	150.00		280.00
AP	FOR	Scheme retained as CSS								
AP	FOR	Already transferred : Forest protection (Biotic Interference)	CSS	50.00	80.00					
AP	ST&E	Science, Technology & Environment	State		25.00		5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00
ASS	FOR&WL	Agricultural Research and Education	State		150.00		30.00	30.00	30.00	31.00
ASS	FOR&WL	Wildlife preservation : Strengthening of Wildlife organisation	State							
ASS	FOR&WL	Wildlife preservation : Development/Management of Wildlife Areas	State		??		50.00	50.00	50.00	52.00
ASS	FOR&WL	Zoological park : State Zoo	State		150.00		28.00	28.00	28.00	30.00
ASS	FOR&WL	Zoological Park : Control of Poaching	State		20.00		4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00



STAT SECTOR	SUB-SECTOR	SCHEME	TYPE OF SCHEME	Central Share	HEADS					
					Total Allocation for the Eighth Plan (1992-97)	Expenditure (1992-93)	Expenditure (1993-94)	Approved Outlay (1994-95)	Anticipated Expenditure (1994-95)	Proposed Outlay (1995-96)
ASS	FOR&WL	Agricultural Research and Education Public Garden : Development of Botanical gArden	State		100.00			16.00	16.00	15.00
ASS	FOR&WL	Agricultural Research and Education Biotic Interference	State		100.00			4.00	4.00	1.00
ASS	FOR&WL	Agricultural Research and Education Conservation of Rhino	State					5.00	5.00	50.00
ASS	FOR&WL	Agricultural Research and Education Tiger Project	CSS		225.00			38.00	38.00	40.00
ASS	FOR&WL	Agricultural Research and Education Assistance to Guwahati Zoo	CSS		20.00			3.00	3.00	3.00
ASS	FOR&WL	Agricultural Research and Education Assistance to Kaziranga National park	CSS		20.00			3.00	3.00	3.00
ASS	FOR&WL	Agricultural Research and Education Bamadi Wildlife Sanctuary	CSS		20.00			3.00	3.00	3.00
ASS	FOR&WL	Agricultural Research and Education Nameri Wildlife Sanctuary	CSS		20.00			3.00	3.00	3.00
ASS	FOR&WL	Agricultural Research and Education Captive Breeding	CSS		20.00			3.00	3.00	3.00

STAT SECTOR	SUB-SECTOR	SCHEME	TYPE OF SCHEME	State Share	Central Share	HEADS					
						Total Allocation for the Eighth Plan (1992-97)	Expenditure (1992-93)	Expenditure (1993-94)	Approved Outlay (1994-95)	Anticipated Expenditure (1994-95)	Proposed Outlay (1995-96)
ASS FOR&WL	Agricultural Research and Education	Wildlife education cum interpretation centre	CSS			30.00			3.00	3.00	3.00
ASS FOR	Forestry	Preservation of Wildlife	State								
ASS FOR	Forestry	Botanical garden	State			40.00			11.00	11.00	14.00
ASS FOR&WL	Forestry	Preservation of Wildlife	Add Plan			30.00			5.00	5.00	10.00
ASS FOR&WL	Forestry	Botanical Garden	Add Plan			60.00			10.00	10.00	12.00
ASS FOR	Forestry	Development of infrastructure for protection of forest from biotic interference	CSS	100.00		100.00		5.62	4.00	4.00	1.00
ASS FOR	Forestry	Assistance for control of poaching and illegal trade	CSS		100.00	20.00		5.60	4.00	5.00	4.00
ASS FOR	Forestry	100% GA Scheme : Rhino Conservation	CSS		100.00			117.00	5.00	213.00	50.00
ASS FOR	Forestry	Project tiger	CSS	50.00	50.00	450.00		41.40	76.00	76.00	80.00
ASS FOR	Forestry	Assistance to Guwahati Zoo	CSS	50.00	50.00	40.00		3.10	6.00	6.00	6.00
ASS FOR	Forestry	Development of Kaziranga National Park	CSS	50.00	50.00	40.00					
ASS FOR	Forestry	Development of Barnadi Wildlife Sanctuary	CSS	50.00	50.00	40.00			6.00	6.00	6.00

STAT SECTOR	SUB-SECTOR	SCHEME	TYPE OF SCHEME	State Share	Central Share	HEADS					
						Total Allocation for the Eighth Plan (1992-97)	Expenditure (1992-93)	Expenditure (1993-94)	Approved Outlay (1994-95)	Anticipated Expenditure (1994-95)	Proposed Outlay (1995-96)
ASS	FOR	Forestry	CSS	50.00	50.00	40.00			6.00	6.00	6.00
		Development of Nameri Wildlife Sanctuary									
		Assistance for Captive Breeding and Rehabilitation of Endangered Species Fauna				40.00			6.00	6.00	6.00
ASS	FOR	Forestry	CSS	50.00	50.00						
		Assistance for Wildlife Education cum Interpretation Centre				60.00			6.00	6.00	6.00
ASS	FOR&WL	Forestry	State			150.00			14.00	14.00	16.00
		Management plan									
ASS		Schemes retained as CSS	CSS	50.00	50.00	225.00		40.70	38.00	38.00	40.00
		Assistant to Ghy. Zoo									
ASS		Schemes retained as CSS	CSS	50.00	50.00	20.00		1.55	3.00	3.00	3.00
		Development of Bamadi Wildlife Sanctuary									
ASS		Schemes retained as CSS	CSS	50.00	50.00	20.00					
		Development of Kaziranga Park				20.00					
		Assistance to captive breeding and rehabilitation to endangered									
ASS		Schemes retained as CSS	CSS	50.00	50.00	20.00			3.00	3.00	3.00
		Assistance for wildlife education and inter protection centre									
ASS		Schemes retained as CSS	CSS	50.00	50.00	30.00			3.00	3.00	3.00
		Assistance for wildlife education and inter protection centre									

STAT SECTOR	SUB-SECTOR	SCHEME	TYPE OF SCHEME	State Share	Central Share	HEADS					
						Total Allocation for the Eighth Plan (1992-97)	Expenditure (1992-93)	Expenditure (1993-94)	Approved Outlay (1994-95)	Anticipated Expenditure (1994-95)	Proposed Outlay (1995-96)
ASS	Schemes retained as CSS	Beneficiary oriented scheme for tribal development	CSS	100.00		100.00			20.00		20.00
ASS	Schemes retained as CSS	Development of Pobitra wildlife Sanctuary	CSS	100.00		150.00			30.00		35.00
ASS	Schemes retained as CSS	Project Elephant	CSS			100.00		21.72	50.00		115.00
ASS	Schemes transferred to state	Rhino Conservation	State	100.00				117.00	5.00	213.00	50.00
ASS	Schemes transferred to state	Asstt. to control of poaching and illegal trade	State			20.00		5.60	4.00	5.00	4.00
ASS	Schemes transferred to state	Development of infrastructure protection of forests to Biotic interference	State			100.00		5.82	4.00	4.00	1.00
BIH FOR	Forestry	Pola?? Tiger Project	CSS	50.00	50.00	150.00		21.97	40.00	35.00	50.00
BIH FOR	Forestry	V??? Tiger Project	CSS	50.00	50.00	150.00		0.00	5.00	5.00	50.00
BIH AGRI&AA	Forestry & Wildlife	Forestry & Wildlife	State			10391.00			3264.00	1033.92	3264.00
BIH AGRI&AA	Forestry & Wildlife	Forestry and Wildlife	District			13131.00					
BIH FOR&WL	Forestry & Wildlife Department	Intensification of Management	State			125.00	5.52	4.82		5.52	

STAT SECTOR	SUB-SECTOR	SCHEME	TYPE OF SCHEME	State Share	Central Share	HEADS					
						Total Allocation for the Eighth Plan (1992-97)	Expenditure (1992-93)	Expenditure (1993-94)	Approved Outlay (1994-95)	Anticipated Expenditure (1994-95)	Proposed Outlay (1995-96)
BIH	FOR&WL	Forestry & Wildlife Department	State			25.00	1.97	1.21		1.25	
BIH	FOR&WL	Planning and Monitoring	State			75.00	11.76	4.68		0.22	
BIH	FOR&WL	Research and evaluation	State			250.00	49.20	14.91		16.85	
BIH	FOR&WL	Wildlife & Env. Forestry	State			500.00					
BIH	FOR&WL	Deve.lpment of Sanctuaries	State			50.00					
BIH	FOR&WL	Development of National Park	State	50.00	50.00	50.00					
BIH	FOR&WL	Sanjoy Bio. Park	State			395.00	75.00	50.00		50.00	
BIH	FOR&WL	Ranchi Bio. Park	State			800.00	80.00	27.13		15.22	
BIH	FOR&WL	Palamau Tiger Reserve	State	50.00	50.00	150.00	29.16	32.10		36.00	
BIH	FOR&WL	Valmiki Magger T.P.	State			150.00				5.00	

STAT SECTOR	SUB-SECTOR	SCHEME	TYPE OF SCHEME	Central Share	HEADS							
					Total Allocation for the Eighth Plan (1992-97)	Expenditure (1992-93)	Expenditure (1993-94)	Approved Outlay (1994-95)	Anticipated Expenditure (1994-95)	Proposed Outlay (1995-96)		
BIH	FOR&WL	Forestry & Wildlife Department	State		150.00							
BIH	AGRI&AA	Forestry and Wildlife	State			1055.19		3264.00	1033.92		3264.00	
CHA	ST&E	Ecology Environment	State		2.50			0.50	0.50		0.50	
CHA	ST&E	Ecology Environment	State		1.00			15.00	15.00		14.00	
CHA	AGRI&A	Desilting of Sukhna lake	State		135.00			35.00	35.00		42.00	
CHA	AGRI&A	Forest conservation and dev.	State		50.00			8.50	8.50		2.40	
D&D	FOR&WL	Preservation of wildlife	State		26.48			6.70	6.70		3.45	
D&D	FOR&WL	Fudam Bird Sanctuary, Diu	Centre		30.00			17.26	10.00		2.26	
D&N	FOR&WL	Wildlife sanctuary	District		32.00			0.00	10.00		2.00	
D&N	FOR&WL	Development of existing zoo	District		40.00			0.00	5.00		2.00	
D&N	FOR&WL	Zoological Park	District		30.00				10.00		2.26	
D&N	ENV/FOR &WL	Wildlife Sanctuary	State		32.00				10.00		2.00	
D&N	ENV/FOR &WL	Development of existing zoo	State		32.00				10.00		2.00	

STAT SECTOR	SUB-SECTOR	SCHEME	TYPE OF SCHEME	State Share	Central Share	HEADS					
						Total Allocation for the Eighth Plan (1992-97)	Expenditure (1992-93)	Expenditure (1993-94)	Approved Outlay (1994-95)	Anticipated Expenditure (1994-95)	Proposed Outlay (1995-96)
D&N	ENV/FOR &WL	Environment, Forest & Wildlife	State			40.00			5.00	5.00	2.00
GOA	AGRI&AA	Forestry & Wildlife	State				298.00		217.00	214.00	233.00
GOA	AGRI&AA	Forestry & Wildlife	State			1065.00			217.00	161.00	233.00
GOA	FOR	Action Plan for conservation of mangrove ecosystem : Plantation and maintenance of earlier plantation	CSS		100.00			5.20	7.50	7.50	7.00
GOA	FOR	Assistance for development of National Parks and sanctuaries at Cotigao	CSS		100.00			2.20	1.77	1.77	2.00
GOA	FOR	Assistance for development of National Parks and sanctuaries at Bondla	CSS						0.25	0.25	1.00
GOA	FOR	Assistance for development of National Parks and sanctuaries at Bhavwan, Mahavir W.L.S.	CSS					3.20	2.40	2.40	3.00

STAT	SECTOR	SUB-SECTOR	SCHEME	TYPE OF SCHEME	State Share	Central Share	HEADS				
							Total Allocation for the Eighth Plan (1992-97)	Expenditure (1992-93)	Expenditure (1993-94)	Approved Outlay (1994-95)	Anticipated Expenditure (1994-95)
GOA	FOR	Schemes retained as CSS	Development of National Parks	CSS		100.00		14.91	1.56	1.56	1.00
GOA	FOR	Schemes retained as CSS	Modern forest fire control methods	CSS		100.00			11.88	11.88	12.00
GOA	FOR	Schemes retained as CSS	Assistance for the Development of Dr. Salim Ali Bird Sanctuary, Chorao	CSS		100.00			4.00	4.00	4.00
HAR	FOR&WL	Breeding of Endangered species	Pheasant Breeding centre at Mormi	State			30.00	4.33	5.15	4.00	3.00
HAR	FOR&WL	Development of Buffer Zone	Eco-development of buffer zone of Bhindawas wildlife Sanctuary	State			5.00			0.50	3.00
HAR	FOR&WL	Development of Buffer Zone	Land acquisition	State			25.00				
HAR	FOR&WL	Development of Buffer Zone	Development of Wildlife Habitat and extension of mini zoo, Jind in Bir Bara Ban, Jind Wildlife Sanctuary	State			20.00		5.00	5.00	3.00
HAR	FOR&WL	Development of Buffer Zone	Khaparwas/Chhuchhakw as Wildlife Sanctuary	State			20.00		0.08	0.50	1.00



STAT SECTOR	SUB-SECTOR	SCHEME	TYPE OF SCHEME	Central Share	HEADS							
					State Share	Total Allocation for the Eighth Plan (1992-97)	Expenditure (1992-93)	Expenditure (1993-94)	Approved Outlay (1994-95)	Anticipated Expenditure (1994-95)	Proposed Outlay (1995-96)	
HAR	FOR&WL	Development of Wildlife Sanctuary	State							0.50	0.50	3.00
HAR	FOR&WL	Deer Park at Chaubi???	State		15.00	1.72	1.49	5.00	3.50	2.50	2.50	
HAR	FOR&WL	Chabutra at Meham	State		110.00	12.20	4.10	19.00	14.00	19.00	19.00	
HAR	FOR&WL	Extension of Zoos in the state	State		20.00	6.67	4.00	4.00	2.50	2.00		
HAR	FOR&WL	Habitat Management	State		30.00	3.50	2.58	3.00	2.40	3.00		
HAR	FOR&WL	Habitat Management	State		20.00	1.95	4.10	1.50	2.00	3.00		
HAR	FOR&WL	Development of Wildlife at Abushehar Kala Titar Tourist Complex	CSS		10.00	0.31	1.00	1.00	1.00	3.00		
HAR	FOR&WL	Development of Bhindawas Wildlife Sanctuary	CSS									
HAR	FOR&WL	Development of Saraswati Plantation Wildlife Sanctuary	CSS									
HAR	FOR&WL	Development of Bir Shikargah Wildlife Sanctuary	State		15.00		2.33	4.00	3.00	7.00		
HAR	FOR&WL	Habitat Management	State		10.00	1.28		2.00	1.00	3.00		

STAT SECTOR	SUB-SECTOR	SCHEME	TYPE OF SCHEME	State Share	Central Share	HEADS					
						Total Allocation for the Eighth Plan (1992-97)	Expenditure (1992-93)	Expenditure (1993-94)	Approved Outlay (1994-95)	Anticipated Expenditure (1994-95)	Proposed Outlay (1995-96)
HAR	FOR&WL	Protection of Wildlife in Multiple use areas	State			125.00	8.84	9.30	20.00	19.40	20.00
HAR	FOR&WL	Control over poaching and illegal trade in wildlife and its products	State			10.00	1.19	1.50	1.00	1.00	2.00
HAR	WL	Protection of wildlife in multiple use areas	State			125.00	8.84	9.30	20.00	19.40	20.00
HAR	WL	Control over poaching and illegal trade in wildlife and its products	State			10.00	1.19	1.50	1.00	1.00	2.00
HAR	WL	Development of Nahar wildlife sanctuary	State			20.00	6.67	4.00	4.00	2.50	2.00
HAR	WL	Development of Wildlife at Abushehar Kala Titar Tourist	State			30.00	3.50	2.58	3.00	2.40	3.00
HAR	WL	Development of Bhindawas Wildlife Sanctuary	CSS	60.00	40.00	20.00	1.95	4.10	1.50	2.00	3.00
HAR	WL	Development of Saraswati Planton Wildlife Sanctuary	CSS	60.00	40.00	10.00	0.31	1.00	1.00	1.00	3.00
HAR	WL	Development of Bir Shikargah Wildlife Sanctuary	State			15.00		2.33	4.00	3.00	7.00

STAT SECTOR	SUB-SECTOR	SCHEME	TYPE OF SCHEME	State Share	Central Share	HEADS							
						Total Allocation for the Eighth Plan (1992-97)	Expenditure (1992-93)	Expenditure (1993-94)	Approved Outlay (1994-95)	Anticipated Expenditure (1994-95)	Proposed Outlay (1995-96)		
HAR	WL	Development of Abushehar Wildlife Sanctuary	State			10.00	1.28		2.00	1.00	3.00		
HAR	WL	Deer Park at Chaubisi-ka-Chabutra at Meham	State			15.00	1.72	1.49	5.00	3.50	2.50		
HAR	WL	Extension of Zoos in the State	State			110.00	12.20	4.10	19.00	14.00	19.00		
HAR	WL	Pheasant breeding centre at Mormi	State			30.00	4.33	5.15	4.00	3.00	3.00		
HAR	WL	Eco-development of Buffer Zone of National Parks and Bhindawas Wildlife Sanctuary	CSS	60.00	40.00	5.00			0.50	0.50	3.00		
HAR	WL	Land aquisition	State			25.00							
HAR	WL	Development of Wildlife habitat and extension of Mini Zoo Jind in Bir-Bara Ban, Jind Wildlife Sanctuary	State			20.00		5.00	5.00	1.70	3.00		
HAR	WL	Chhuchkwas Wildlife Sanctuary	CSS	80.00	20.00	20.00		0.08	0.50	0.50	1.00		
HAR	WL	Establishment and development of Kalesar Wildlife Sanctuary	CSS	67.00	33.00				0.50	0.50	3.00		

STAT SECTOR	SUB-SECTOR	SCHEME	TYPE OF SCHEME	State Share	Central Share	HEADS					
						Total Allocation for the Eighth Plan (1992-97)	Expenditure (1992-93)	Expenditure (1993-94)	Approved Outlay (1994-95)	Anticipated Expenditure (1994-95)	Proposed Outlay (1995-96)
HAR WL	Wildlife Preservation	Development of Bhindawas Wildlife Sanctuary	Centre	60.00	40.00	20.00	3.90	4.00	4.00	4.00	5.00
HAR WL	Wildlife Preservation	Development of Saraswati Plantation Wildlife Sanctuary	Centre	60.00	40.00	25.00	6.75	1.00	4.00	4.65	5.00
HAR WL	Wildlife Preservation	Ecodevelopment of Buffer zone of National Parks in Bhindawas Wildlife Sanctuary	Centre	60.00	40.00	20.00	4.30	4.00	1.00	3.60	4.00
HAR WL	Wildlife Preservation	Chheichhalwas/Kheparw as wildlife Sanctuary	Centre	80.00	20.00	20.00	5.00	2.00	5.00	4.88	5.00
HAR WL	Wildlife Preservation	Establishment and development of Kalesar Wildlife Sanctuary	Centre	67.00	33.00			2.00	2.00	2.35	6.00
HAR WL	Wildlife Preservation	Nagaimala Wildlife Sanctuary	Centre			25.00					
HAR WL	Wildlife Preservation	Chhilchhila Wildlife Sanctuary	Centre								
HAR WL	Wildlife Preservation	Control over Poaching	Centre				0.36				
HAR WL	Wildlife Preservation	Development of Sultampur National Park	CSS	100.00		10.00	1.51	1.00		2.75	5.00

STAT SECTOR	SUB-SECTOR	SCHEME	TYPE OF SCHEME	State Share	Central Share	HEADS							
						Total Allocation for the Eighth Plan (1992-97)	Expenditure (1992-93)	Expenditure (1993-94)	Approved Outlay (1994-95)	Anticipated Expenditure (1994-95)	Proposed Outlay (1995-96)		
HAR	Wildlife Preservation	Preparation to Educational Material Ecology of Sultanpur National Park	CSS	100.00						1.00		0.74	
HAR	Wildlife Preservation	Wildlife Preservation	District			500.00	42.29	47.63	75.00			85.00	
HAR	Wildlife Preservation	Forestry and Wildlife	State			500.00	42.29	47.63	75.00	60.00		82.50	
HP	Forestry & Wildlife	Wildlife	State			700.00	169.00	150.89	169.00	169.00		487.00	
HP	Social and Farm Forestry	World Bank Aided Forestry Res. & Edu. Pro.	Centre			0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00		150.00	
HP	Wildlife	State Sector Scheme : Wildlife Management and Nature Conservation	Centre			100.00	13.00	13.12	15.00	15.00		16.00	
HP	Wildlife	State Sector Scheme : Improvement & Development of Wild Life Sanctuary	Centre			150.00	29.14	43.82	45.92	45.92		50.00	
HP	Wildlife	State Sector Scheme : Development of Himalayan Zoological Park	Centre			175.00	75.52	49.48	61.26	61.26		71.00	

STAT SECTOR	SUB-SECTOR	SCHEME	TYPE OF SCHEME	Central Share	HEADS						
					Total Allocation for the Eighth Plan (1992-97)	Expenditure (1992-93)	Expenditure (1993-94)	Approved Outlay (1994-95)	Anticipated Expenditure (1994-95)	Proposed Outlay (1995-96)	
HP	WL	State Sector Scheme : Strengthening of Wild Life Wing (RNS)	Centre		15.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
HP	WL	State Sector Scheme : Awareness of Nature & Wildlife Conservation in Youths	Centre	50.00	20.00	3.34	2.95	3.38	3.38	4.00	4.00
HP	WL	State Sector Scheme : Captive Breeding/Rehab. For Endangered Species	Centre	50.00	25.00	3.91	4.32	5.40	5.40	6.00	6.00
HP	WL	Central Sector Schemes : Intensive Management of Wild Life Sanctuaries	Centre	50.00	125.00	32.58	24.02	24.29	24.29	25.00	25.00
HP	WL	Central Sector Schemes : Control of Poaching & Illegal trade	Centre	50.00	10.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
HP	WL	Central Sector Schemes : Dev. of Great Himalayan National Park Kullu	Centre	50.00	45.00	8.71	9.18	9.55	9.55	10.00	10.00
HP	WL	Central Sector Schemes : Development of Pin Valley National Park	Centre	50.00	35.00	3.75	4.00	4.20	4.20	5.00	5.00

STAT	SECTOR	SUB-SECTOR	SCHEME	TYPE OF SCHEME	State Share	Central Share	HEADS							
							Total Allocation for the Eighth Plan (1992-97)	Expenditure (1992-93)	Expenditure (1993-94)	Approved Outlay (1994-95)	Anticipated Expenditure (1994-95)	Proposed Outlay (1995-96)		
HP	WL	Wildlife	Central Secotr Schemes : Improvement & Development of Wild Life Sanctuaries	Centre	100.00		0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
J&K	ST&E	Ecology & Environment	Development of Wet land Bodies	State			215.00	0.79	12.57	30.00	30.00	30.00	33.60	
J&K	FOR&WL	Wildlife Preservation	Development of National Parks & Wildlife Sanctuaries	Centre	0.00	100.00	185.00	8.88	8.86	19.76	19.76	19.76	55.00	
J&K	FOR&WL	Wildlife Preservation	Snow Leopard Recovery Programme	Centre	0.00	100.00	80.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
J&K	FOR&WL	Wildlife Preservation	Development of wildlife education/interpretation programme	CSS	50.00	50.00	75.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
J&K	FOR&WL	Wildlife Preservation	Captive Breeding programme	CSS	50.00	50.00	100.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
J&K	FOR&WL	Wildlife Preservation	Improvement of wetland reserves	CSS	50.00	50.00	180.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
J&K	FOR&WL	Wildlife Preservation	Control of poaching and illegal trade	CSS	50.00	50.00	30.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
J&K	FOR&WL	Wildlife Protection	Research Survey and Census	State			20.00	2.08	4.14	3.36	3.36	3.36	3.68	
J&K	FOR&WL	Wildlife Protection	National Parks & Sanctuaries	State			150.00	17.58	19.23	22.14	22.14	22.14	24.42	

STAT SECTOR	SUB-SECTOR	SCHEME	TYPE OF SCHEME	Central Share	State Share	HEADS					
						Total Allocation for the Eighth Plan (1992-97)	Expenditure (1992-93)	Expenditure (1993-94)	Approved Outlay (1994-95)	Anticipated Expenditure (1994-95)	Proposed Outlay (1995-96)
J&K	FOR&WL	Wildlife Protection	State			30.00	15.50	15.18	15.76	15.76	17.08
J&K	FOR&WL	Small and Big Game Reserves	State			60.00	12.25	18.25	23.14	23.14	25.40
J&K	FOR&WL	Wildlife Protection	State			25.00	6.25	10.04	9.10	9.10	10.18
J&K	FOR&WL	Wetland Reserves	State			10.00	1.00	1.01	1.00	1.00	1.08
J&K	FOR&WL	Captive Breeding and Reh. Programme	State			25.00	5.90	1.56	4.00	4.00	4.48
J&K	FOR&WL	Wildlife Week and Pub.	State			5.00	1.30	0.96	0.50	0.50	0.56
J&K	FOR&WL	Nature Club Project	State			15.00	5.20	0.50	1.00	1.00	1.12
J&K	FOR&WL	Training Symposium/Con.	State			5.00	0.85	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
J&K	FOR&WL	Forests Biosphere Reserve	State			10.00	5.84	5.52	5.00	5.00	5.60
J&K	FOR&WL	Assistance for Crop Cattle damage	State			25.00	6.50	6.93	9.00	9.00	10.08
J&K	FOR&WL	Eco Development	State			0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
J&K	FOR&WL	Strengthening of W.P.C. of Poaching	State			665.00		131.00	174.00	174.00	180.00
J&K	FOR&WL	Establishment of furpheasant/Chakour	State			100.00		15.66	30.00	30.00	40.00
KER	FOR&WL	Wildlife Sanctuaries and Tiger Reserve	CSS	50.00							
KER	FOR&WL	Forestry & Wildlife National Parks	CSS	50.00							



STAT SECTOR	SUB-SECTOR	SCHEME	TYPE OF SCHEME	State Share	Central Share	HEADS					
						Total Allocation for the Eighth Plan (1992-97)	Expenditure (1992-93)	Expenditure (1993-94)	Approved Outlay (1994-95)	Anticipated Expenditure (1994-95)	Proposed Outlay (1995-96)
KER	FOR&WL	Forestry & Wildlife	CSS		50.00	25.00		3.24	15.00	15.00	15.00
KER	FOR&WL	Forestry & Wildlife	CSS		50.00	50.00		3.32	24.00	24.00	20.00
KER	FOR&WL	Forestry and Wildlife	CSS		100.00	200.00		27.00	50.00	50.00	50.00
KER	FOR&WL	Forestry and Wildlife	CSS		100.00	200.00		20.00	50.00	50.00	50.00
KER	FOR&WL	Forestry and Wildlife	CSS		100.00	3250.00		27.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
KER	FOR&WL	Forestry and Wildlife	CSS		100.00				273.20	273.20	273.00
KER	FOR&WL	Forestry and Wildlife	CSS		100.00					120.00	120.00
KER	FOR&WL	Forestry and Wildlife	State			50.00			8.00	8.00	8.00
KER	ST&E	Other Scientific Research	State			275.00			65.00	65.00	85.00
KER	FOR&WL	Wildlife	State			125.00			62.00	62.00	65.00
KER	FOR&WL	Wildlife	State	50.00		665.00			174.00	174.00	180.00

STAT SECTOR	SUB-SECTOR	SCHEME	TYPE OF SCHEME	State Share	Central Share	HEADS					
						Total Allocation for the Eighth Plan (1992-97)	Expenditure (1992-93)	Expenditure (1993-94)	Approved Outlay (1994-95)	Anticipated Expenditure (1994-95)	Proposed Outlay (1995-96)
KER	FOR&WL	Wildlifd	State	50.00		100.00			30.00	30.00	40.00
KER	FOR&WL	National Parks	State								
KER	FOR&WL	Agasthyavanam Biological Park	State			500.00			120.00	120.00	120.00
KER	FOR&WL	Kumarakam Bird Sanctuary	State			75.00			10.00	10.00	10.00
KER	FOR&WL	Afforestation in Memory of National leaders	State			400.00			75.00	75.00	75.00
KER	FOR&WL	Control of poaching and illegal trade	State			25.00			15.00	15.00	15.00
KER	FOR&WL	Education and interpretation in wildlife	State			50.00			24.00	24.00	20.00
KER	FOR&WL	Separate Cadre of watchers and guards of tribals	State			10.00			5.00	5.00	5.00
KER	FOR&WL	Wildlifd	State			125.00			25.00	25.00	35.00
KER	FOR&WL	Wildlifd	State								
MEG	FOR&WL	Wildlifd	State								
MEG	ENV/FOR &WL	Forestry and Wildlife	CSS		100.00	90.00		300.00		300.00	300.00
MEG	ENV/FOR &WL	Other Expenditure	State			5.00			2.00	2.00	3.00
MEG	ENV/FOR &WL	Zoological Park	State			1000.00			169.00	169.00	120.00
MEG	ENV/FOR &WL	Wildlifd	State								
MEG	ENV/FOR &WL	Ext. Aided Project	State			100.00			100.00		

STAT	SECTOR	SUB-SECTOR	SCHEME	TYPE OF SCHEME	State Share	Central Share	HEADS					
							Total Allocation for the Eighth Plan (1992-97)	Expenditure (1992-93)	Expenditure (1993-94)	Approved Outlay (1994-95)	Anticipated Expenditure (1994-95)	Proposed Outlay (1995-96)
MIZ	ENV/FOR &WL	Environmental Forestry and Wildlife	Wildlife Preservation	District			190.00	35.71			47.65	59.00
MIZ	ENV/FOR &WL	Environmental Forestry and Wildlife	Zoological Parks	District								
MIZ	ENV/FOR &WL	Environmental Forestry and Wildlife	Wildlife preservation	State			190.00		49.00	47.65		53.50
MIZ	FOR	Schemes retained as CSS	Development of sanctuaries	CSS		100.00		15.00				
PUN	FOR&WL	Forestry & Wildlife	Assistance for the control of poaching and illegal trade in wildlife	CSS	50.00	50.00	10.00					
PUN	FOR&WL	State Level Schemes	Preservation of Wildlife (Committed)	State				38.82	40.80			45.00
PUN	FOR&WL	State Level Schemes	Establishment of Zoological Park (a) at Chhat Bir (Committed)	State				123.27	121.80			150.00
PUN	FOR&WL	State Level Schemes	Control of poaching and illegal trade in Wild Life	State			10.00		0.13			0.10
PUN	FOR&WL	State Level Schemes	Establishment of Tiger Safari at Ludhiana	State			50.00	10.00	5.00			15.00

STAT SECTOR	SUB-SECTOR	SCHEME	TYPE OF SCHEME	Central Share	HEADS					Proposed Outlay (1995-96)	
					State Share	Expenditure (1992-93)	Expenditure (1993-94)	Approved Outlay (1994-95)	Anticipated Expenditure (1994-95)		(Rs. in Lakhs)
					Total Allocation for the Eighth Plan (1992-97)						
PUN	State Level Schemes	Assistance for the development of selected Zoos (CSS - State Share)	State		10.00	5.00	4.87			15.00	
RAJ	Environmental Forestry and Wildlife	Preservation of Wildlife	State		900.00		170.00		170.00	273.00	
RAJ	Forestry	Tiger Project, Ranthambhore	CSS	100.00	612.73	86.69	162.00		162.00	175.00	
RAJ	Forestry	Tiger Project, Sariska	CSS	100.00	489.27	62.92	116.00		116.00	130.00	
RAJ	Forestry	Development of Ghana Bird Sanctuary	CSS	50.00	250.00	19.79	25.00		25.00	25.00	
RAJ	Forestry	Desert National Park	CSS	100.00	225.00	5.86	15.00		15.00	10.00	
RAJ	Forestry	Development of Other Sanctuaries	CSS	100.00	875.00	38.09	100.00		100.00	100.00	
RAJ	Forestry	Improvement of Zoos	CSS	50.00	200.00	6.19	20.00		20.00	20.00	
SIK	Ecology and Environment	Conservation Programme : Wetland conservation	State		30.00		6.00		6.00	8.00	
SIK	Ecology and Environment	Research and Receneration : Botanic Garden	State		18.00		3.00		3.00	3.00	
SIK	Forestry & Wildlife	Forest conservation development and regeneration : Biosphere Reserve	State		17.00		3.00		3.00	4.00	

STAT	SECTOR	SUB-SECTOR	SCHEME	TYPE OF SCHEME	State Share	Central Share	HEADS								
							Total Allocation for the Eighth Plan (1992-97)	Expenditure (1992-93)	Expenditure (1993-94)	Approved Outlay (1994-95)	Anticipated Expenditure (1994-95)	Proposed Outlay (1995-96)			
SIK	FOR&WL	Forestry & Wildlife	Forest conservation development and regeneration : Biodiversity Hotspot conservation	State											
SIK	FOR&WL	Forestry & Wildlife	Plantation Scheme : Greening of ecologically Fragile Areas	State			197.00		25.00	25.00	70.00				
SIK	FOR&WL	Forestry & Wildlife	Plantation Scheme : Rehabilitation of fire damaged area	State			197.00		20.00	20.00	70.00				
SIK	FOR&WL	Forestry & Wildlife	Plantation Scheme : Regeneration of conifer forests	State			49.00			5.00	12.00				
SIK	FOR&WL	Forestry and Wildlife	Khanchandzonga National Park				100.00			24.00	22.00	24.00			
SIK	FOR&WL	Forestry and Wildlife	Development of Maino Sanctuary	Centre			100.00			10.00	5.60	10.00			10.00
SIK	FOR&WL	Forestry and Wildlife	Fambong tho Sanctuary	Centre			100.00			14.00	12.50	14.00			14.00
SIK	FOR&WL	Forestry and Wildlife	Shingba Rhododendron Sanctuary	Centre			100.00			9.00	9.00	9.00			10.00
SIK	FOR&WL	Forestry and Wildlife	Kyongosia alpine Sanctuary	Centre			100.00			11.00	8.00	11.00			11.00
TN	FOR	Forests	Wild Life	State						0.67	36.66	54.47			71.62
TN	FOR	Forests	Zoological Park	State						90.00	92.40	121.13			132.50

STAT SECTOR	SUB-SECTOR	SCHEME	TYPE OF SCHEME	State Share	Central Share	HEADS					
						Total Allocation for the Eighth Plan (1992-97)	Expenditure (1992-93)	Expenditure (1993-94)	Approved Outlay (1994-95)	Anticipated Expenditure (1994-95)	Proposed Outlay (1995-96)
TN	FOR	Forests	Tiger Reserve Scheme	Centre	100.00			20.19	65.00	68.25	115.00
TN	FOR	Forests	Conservation and Management of mangroves	Centre	100.00			4.00	0.01	22.68	25.00
TN	FOR	Forests	Development of Vadamthangal Birds Sanctuary	Centre	100.00			1.04	0.01	10.62	12.00
TN	FOR	Forests	Establishment of Gulf of Mannar Biosphere Reserve	Centre	100.00			24.52	0.01	53.01	55.00
TN	FOR	Forests	Development of Pulicat Lake Bird and Marine Development	Centre	100.00			2.66	2.20	5.36	7.00
TN	FOR	Forests	Wild Life Preservation - Project Elephant - Anamalai and Mudumalai	Centre	100.00			0.00	0.01	114.00	115.00
TN	FOR	Forests	Development of Vettangudi Bird Sanctuary, P.M. Devar Dist.	Centre	100.00			2.00	0.01	3.15	5.00
TN	FOR	Forests	Development of Grizzled Squirrel Wild Life Sanctuary	Centre	100.00			2.93	0.01	20.67	22.00
TN	FOR	Forests	Development of Karikili Sanctuary	Centre	100.00			0.27	0.01	8.05	10.00

STAT SECTOR	SUB-SECTOR	SCHEME	TYPE OF SCHEME	State Share	Central Share	HEADS					
						Total Allocation for the Eighth Plan (1992-97)	Expenditure (1992-93)	Expenditure (1993-94)	Approved Outlay (1994-95)	Anticipated Expenditure (1994-95)	Proposed Outlay (1995-96)
TN	FOR	Forests	Centre		100.00			1.08		6.35	8.00
TRI	FOR&WL	Conservation of Wildlife	State			205.00			31.30		44.30
TRI	FOR&WL	Conservation of Wildlife	State			0.00			360.00		0.70
TRI	ST&E	Conservation Programme	State			15.47			0.00		0.00
TRI	ST&E	Conservation Programme	State			3.87			0.00		0.00
TRI	FOR&WL	Forest & Wildlife	State			26.42			5.40		5.40
				2404.00	5696.00	52255.39	881.86	4364.86	13061.44	8421.84	14866.79

## Annex 2

### PRELIMINARY PRIORITISATION OF NATIONAL PARKS AND SANCTUARIES

**Introduction:** It is recognised at the outset that national parks and sanctuaries are in themselves a priority because these protected areas (PAs) are among the last repositories of India's wild biodiversity. Much of India's vast faunal and floral wealth is now contained only within PAs which offer, arguably, the only viable strategy for *in-situ* conservation of most wild species. As such, we would like to assume that the biodiversity occurring in all PAs needs to be conserved with the same degree of efficacy and urgency. However, this may not be possible for the following reasons:-

1. The resources available for conservation are scarce, and can not be used to protect the entire PA network of the country with the same level of effectiveness and efficiency.
2. There are certain PAs which harbour species or communities which are rare or threatened. It is necessary to identify these and take steps for their conservation before taking up other sites for conservation. While efforts have been made by the government to do this through initiatives like the Project Tiger, there are many more sites which need to be prioritised, and action taken for their immediate conservation.
3. There are also certain PAs which face a high level of threats or pressures. These PAs, especially the ones which harbour rare or threatened species or communities, need to be identified so that the necessary steps can be taken for their conservation.

It is for all these reasons that a prioritisation exercise for PAs is needed. An added benefit of carrying out a prioritisation exercise is that it helps in making an assessment of the information needed for prioritisation. This in turn is helpful in making an assessment of the gaps which exist in information about PAs. Once these gaps are identified, action can be taken to collect information



to try and fill them, so that the correct priorities for conservation can be identified.

**Methodology:** According to a list made available by the Ministry of Environment and Forests, Government of India, at present there are over 525 PAs in the country. Of these, 100 are located in the Andaman and Nicobar Islands. This preliminary prioritisation exercise has been undertaken for 253 PAs located in the Indian Mainland. These PAs were picked up for the prioritisation exercise because data was already available with the Indian Institute of Public Administration (IIPA) for these sites. Meanwhile, as a part of the PAs prioritisation exercise, questionnaires have already been sent out to all the PAs for updating the existing database. So far, around 50 of these questionnaires have been filled and returned. We hope that data for more PAs will come in soon and will help us in updating the information for the 253 PAs for which a database exists, and also allow for the inclusion of the remaining PAs into the prioritisation exercise.

Apart from the 253 PAs for which data was available with the IIPA, an additional 20 PAs have been included in this exercise and have been listed as having a very high value, which means that they are priority sites, because they harbour a rare or threatened species or community. Of the 253 PAs for which data was available with the IIPA, there were 15 for which an accurate evaluation could not be made due to lack of sufficient data. However, these sites too, have been listed as having a very high value, since they too, harbour a rare or threatened species or community.

PAs located in the Andaman and Nicobar, and Lakshadweep Islands are not being taken up because they are ecologically very different from the Indian Mainland, and need to be looked at separately.

The PAs have been prioritised on the basis of their:-

1. **Biological Value:** This is being ascertained through identifying the diversity of forest types and subtypes occurring in the PA and looking at whether any of them are rare or threatened, the

species occurring in the PA and whether any of them are endemic, rare, or threatened, the size of the PA, its proximity or connectivity to other PAs, whether the PA is located in a biogeographic province which does not have an adequate area under protection or whether it is located in a biogeographic province where the total number of PAs is inadequate etc.

2. **Pressures or threats** on the PA due to consumptive human use by local and other people and/or institutions. A large number of different types of pressures or threats are being evaluated.
3. **Management and legal status** of the PA:

A detailed explanation of the above is not attached with this report but is available separately. The valuation framework was applied to the 253 PAs for which data was available, and a table of the values resulting from the application of the valuation framework was constructed. The biological values were added to get the overall biodiversity value of the PA. The values mentioned above have been further subdivided in order to categorise PAs. These categories are:-

1. In terms of the value of a PA, each area has been subclassified as:-
  - a. Either a Very High Value PA, or
  - b. A High Value PA.
2. In terms of pressures or threats on the PA, each area has been subclassified as:-
  - a. Either a High Pressure PA, or
  - b. A Low Pressure PA.
3. In terms of the legal and management status of a PA, each area has been subclassified as:-
  - a. Either a Low Legal and Management Status PA, or
  - b. A High Legal and Management Status PA.

On the basis of the categories outlined above, PAs have been classified within each biogeographic province. It would be reasonable to assume that all the PAs which fall into the category of very high value PAs would be the priority areas for conservation. However, those among the very high value PAs which also have a high level of pressures being exerted on them would have a priority greater than those with a lower level of pressures. Further, if a very high value and high pressure PA also has a low legal and management status, efforts for its conservation would have to be taken up before the others. This is because the same level of pressures or threats being exerted on a certain PA would have a greater impact on it if the management and legal status was low and a lesser impact if the management and legal status was high.

Therefore, the highest priority would be those PAs which have a very high value, are threatened due to a high level of pressures, and where the legal and management status is low. Conversely, the lowest priority would be given to those PAs which have a high value and low level of pressures coupled with a high legal and management status. For the purpose of this report, the following is being assumed to be the order of priority of PAs:-

1. Very High Biodiversity + High Pressure + Low Legal and Management Status
2. Very High Biodiversity + High Pressure + High Legal and Management Status
3. Very High Biodiversity + Low Pressure + Low Legal and Management Status
4. Very High Biodiversity + Low Pressure + High Legal and Management Status
5. High Biodiversity + High Pressure + Low Legal and Management Status
6. High Biodiversity + High Pressure + High Legal and Management Status

7. High Biodiversity + Low Pressure + Low Legal and Management Status

8. High Biodiversity + Low Pressure + High Legal and Management Status

To distinguish between Very High Value and High Value PAs, the median or the middle point was taken as a cutoff from the column of overall value of the PA. All PAs which had an overall value of 20.24 (the median) or more were identified as very high value sites, while the others were marked as high value sites. As already mentioned, those PAs which harbour rare or threatened habitats or species and for which either the data were either inadequate or did not exist, were also identified and added to the list of very high value PAs.

A total of 162 PAs have been identified as very high value sites. The number of high value sites is 111. At least one PA from all the biogeographic provinces of the Indian Mainland is represented in the list of very high value sites. The only state which is not represented in the list of very high priority PAs is Tripura. The number of very high value sites for each state and biogeographic province as well as their order of priority is as follows:

STATE	BIOGEOGRAPHIC PROVINCE	ORDER OF PRIORITY	NUMBER OF PAs	
Andhra Pradesh	Deccan Plateau (6A)	2	1	
		Not Determined <sup>1</sup>	3	
	Central Plateau (6B)	1	1	
		2	4	
		4	1	
	Eastern Plateau (6C)	1	1	
	East Coast (10B)	4	1	
		Not Determined	1	
	<b>Number of Very High Value PAs in State</b>			<b>13</b>
	Arunachal Pradesh	East Himalaya (2D)	2	1
		4	4	
		Not	3	

<sup>1</sup> These are those PAs for which we did not have any data but which have been included as priority sites because they harbour rare or threatened species or communities.

STATE	BIOGEOGRAPHIC PROVINCE	ORDER OF PRIORITY	NUMBER OF PAs
		Determined	
	<b>Number of Very High Value PAs in State</b>		<b>8</b>
<b>Assam</b>	Brahmaputra Valley (8A)	2	1
		3	1
		4	2
		Not Determined	1
	<b>Number of Very High Value PAs in State</b>		<b>5</b>
<b>Bihar</b>	Chota Nagpur Plateau (6D)	2	3
		4	1
	Lower Gangetic Plain (7B)	2	1
		Not Determined	1
	<b>Number of Very High Value PAs in State</b>		<b>6</b>
<b>Goa</b>	Western Ghats (5B)	4	1
	<b>Number of Very High Value PAs in State</b>		<b>1</b>
<b>Gujarat</b>	Kachh Desert (3A)	2	2
		Not Determined	1
	Gujarat-Rajwara (4B)	2	4
		3	1
		4	1
	West Coast (10A)	4	1
	<b>Number of Very High Value PAs in State</b>		<b>10</b>
<b>Haryana</b>	Punjab Plains (4A)	4	2
	<b>Number of Very High Value PAs in State</b>		<b>2</b>
<b>Himachal Pradesh</b>	Ladakh (1A)	3	1
	North West Himalaya (2A)	1	4
		2	4
		4	2
	Western Himalaya (2B)	1	2
		3	2
	<b>Number of Very High Value PAs in State</b>		<b>15</b>
<b>Jammu &amp; Kashmir</b>	Ladakh (1A)	3	2
		4	1
	North West Himalaya (2A)	4	2
		Not Determined	1
	<b>Number of Very High Value PAs in State</b>		<b>6</b>
<b>Karnataka</b>	Malabar Plains (5A)	2	1
	Western Ghats (5B)	2	3
		3	1
		4	3

STATE	BIOGEOGRAPHIC PROVINCE	ORDER OF PRIORITY	NUMBER OF PAs
		Not Determined	2
Karnataka	Deccan Plateau (6A)	3	1
	<b>Number of Very High Value PAs in State</b>		<b>11</b>
Kerala	Western Ghats (5B)	2	4
		3	2
		4	2
	<b>Number of Very High Value PAs in State</b>		<b>8</b>
Madhya Pradesh	Gujarat-Rajwara (4B)	2	3
		4	2
	Eastern Highlands (6C)	2	1
		4	5
	Central Highlands (6E)	1	2
		2	2
		3	1
		4	4
	<b>Number of Very High Value PAs in State</b>		<b>20</b>
Maharashtra	Malabar Plains (5A)	4	1
	Western Ghats (5B)	4	1
		Not Determined	1
	Central Plateau (6B)	2	1
		3	1
	Central Highlands (6E)	2	2
		4	1
	West Coast (10A)	4	1
	<b>Number of Very High Value PAs in State</b>		<b>9</b>
Manipur	Assam Hills (8B)	4	1
	<b>Number of Very High Value PAs in State</b>		<b>1</b>
Meghalaya	Assam Hills (8B)	Not Determined	1
	<b>Number of Very High Value PAs in State</b>		<b>1</b>
Mizoram	Assam Hills (8B)	3	1
	<b>Number of Very High Value PAs in State</b>		<b>1</b>
Nagaland	Assam Hills (8B)	4	1
	<b>Number of Very High Value PAs in State</b>		<b>1</b>
Orissa	Eastern Plateau (6C)	2	1
	Chota Nagpur Plateau (6D)	2	1
	East Coast (10B)	1	1
	<b>Number of Very High Value PAs in State</b>		<b>3</b>
Punjab	Punjab Plains (4A)	3	2
	<b>Number of Very High Value PAs in State</b>		<b>2</b>
Rajasthan	Thar Desert (3B)	2	1

STATE	BIOGEOGRAPHIC PROVINCE	ORDER OF PRIORITY	NUMBER OF PAs
		4	1
	Punjab Plains (4A)	4	1
<b>Rajasthan</b>	Gujarat-Rajwara (4B)	1	3
		2	6
		4	1
	<b>Number of Very High Value PAs in State</b>		<b>13</b>
<b>Sikkim</b>	Central Himalaya (2C)	4	1
	<b>Number of Very High Value PAs in State</b>		<b>1</b>
<b>Tamil Nadu</b>	Western Ghats (5B)	1	1
		2	2
		3	1
	Deccan Plateau (6A)	Not Determined	1
	East Coast (10B)	3	1
		4	1
		Not Determined	1
	<b>Number of Very High Value PAs in State</b>		<b>8</b>
<b>Uttar Pradesh</b>	Western Himalaya (2B)	2	2
		4	2
	Gujarat-Rajwara (4B)	2	1
	Central Highlands (6E)	2	1
		4	1
	Upper Gangetic Plains (7A)	1	2
		2	1
		4	1
		Not Determined	1
	<b>Number of Very High Value PAs in State</b>		<b>12</b>
<b>West Bengal</b>	Central Himalaya (2C)	3	1
	Lower Gangetic Plains (7B)	4	1
		Not Determined	2
	East Coast (10B)	4	1
	<b>Number of Very High Value PAs in State</b>		<b>5</b>

As can be seen from the table given above, the maximum number of very high value PAs (20) are located in Madhya Pradesh. Himachal Pradesh has 15, while Andhra Pradesh and Rajasthan have 13 each. There are several