

## In fact: Looking behind the numbers on India's 'stable' forest cover

While the best forests have been lost, plantations have been gained, and have

become more visible





The first time the Forest Survey of India (FSI) measured the country's forest cover was in 1987, using satellite data captured during 1981-83. Its latest biennial report released recently shows that India has gained 60,854 sq km of forests over the past three decades, 43,907 sq km having been added under the dense forest category.

In the last two years, while the gain in overall forest cover has been an impressive 3,775 sq km, our dense forests have shrunk by only 654 sq km. These figures were highlighted by the government to claim an overall stability in India's forest cover. Indeed, this is a remarkable feat considering the intense pressure on forest land for the agricultural, industrial and infrastructural needs of a rapidly growing population. But before celebrating the achievement, there is need to look behind the numbers.



Mid-Dense Forest in Palamu Tiger Reserve, Jharkhand. (Express Photo by: Jay Mazoomdaar

The FSI uses satellite images to identify green cover, and does not discriminate between natural forests, plantations, thickets of weeds such as juliflora and lantana, and longstanding commercial crops such as palm, coconut, coffee or even sugarcane. In the 1980s, satellite imagery mapped forests at a 1:1 million scale, missing details of land units smaller than 4 sq km. Now, the refined 1:50,000 scale can scan patches as small as 1 hectare (100 metres x 100 metres), and any unit showing 10 per cent canopy density is considered forest. So millions of these tiny plots that earlier went unnoticed, now contribute to India's official forest cover. This can throw up very interesting results. Take Delhi, for example. The first FSI report recorded only 15 sq km of forests in the capital. The latest report found 189 sq km — an over 12-fold increase in three decades. Nearly a

third of this is recorded under the 'dense' category. So how come oxygenstarved Delhiites do not have a guide map to take a breather in these 'forests'? -

	DENSE	OVERA	LL C	100 mm - 24-	-110 52.4	
1987	357,686	6 640,81	9		a .	
1989	361,412	2 638,80	4	is and		
1991	385,008	639,36	4	A States		
1993	385,676	6 639,38	6	15 Const		
1995	385,756	See Contraction	100.01	9		
1997	367,260		40.00 - 1		Series and	
1999	377,358		637,293			
2001	416,809		675,538		N. ST	
2003	390,564	and the second s	678,333			
2003 (R)	386,191					
2005	387,243		1000		and the second	
2005 (R)	403,420	197 - State State State 200	A CONTRACTOR OF	C. S.		
2007	402,522		-			
2007 (R) 2011	403,666				1 2 2 2 2	
			7 69505	CONTRACTOR OF THE OWNER.	-11 - AND MARKED IN	
					pro la	
2013	404,207 402,247 401,593	697,89	8			and and
2013 2015	402,247	7 697,89 3 701,67	8	NFtoVDF	NF to MDF	Total
2013 2015 L <mark>OSS OF</mark>	402,247 401,593	7 697,89 3 701,67 REST	83	NF to VDF 0	NF to MDF 91	Total 91
2013 2015 LOSS OF 2003-05	402,247 401,593 DENSE FO VDF to NF	7 697,89 3 701,67 REST MDF to NF	8 3 Total	And the second second	- Charles - Charles	-
2013 2015 LOSS OF 2003-05 2005-07	402,247 401,593 DENSE FO VDF to NF 61	7 697,89 3 701,67 REST MDF to NF 1,191	8 3 Total 1,252	0	91	91
2013 2015	402,247 401,593 DENSE FO VDF to NF 61 76	697,89   3 701,67   REST   MDF to NF   1,191 2,130	8 3   Total 1,252   2,206 1	0 36	91 1,441	91 1,477
2013 2015 LOSS OF 2003-05 2005-07 2007-11	402,247 401,593 DENSE FO VDF to NF 61 76 45	697,893   3 701,673   REST   MDF to NF   1,191   2,130   1,888	8 3   Total 1,252   2,206 1,933	0 36 7	91 1,441 1,442	91 1,477 1,449
2013 2015 LOSS OF 2003-05 2005-07 2007-11 2011-13	402,247 401,593 DENSE FO VDF to NF 61 76 45 106	697,89   701,67   REST   MDF to NF   1,191   2,130   1,888   1,505	8 3   Total 1,252   2,206 1,933   1,611	0 36 7 0	91 1,441 1,442 657	91 1,477 1,449 657

Similarly, the highly agricultural Punjab and Haryana have managed to add more than 1,000 sq km each of forests since the 1980s. Arid Rajasthan has gained as much as 30%. A third of Tamil Nadu's forests are on private land that also has a fifth of the state's dense forests. Even as invasive weeds and commercial plantations masqueraded as 'forests' across the country, India kept losing its vital dense forest cover (canopy density of 40% or above). For example, dense forests have shrunk by 2,254 sq km in Gujarat, and by 1,887 sq km in Andhra Pradesh and Telangana since the first FSI report. What's worse, the net loss, or gain, in dense forests does not show how much is actually being lost. A dense forest can deteriorate to open forest (10%-40% canopy density), or can be wiped out altogether to become non-forest. On the other hand, open forests can improve in density, and even non-forests can grow into open and, subsequently, dense forests over a length of time. Since 2003 (see chart), 9,513 sq km of India's dense forests have been wiped out, and have become non-forest areas. What offsets this loss in the forest reports is the conversion of non-forest areas to dense forest every two years. Since 2003, a total of 4,809 sq km of non-forest have become dense forest. In the last two years alone, this has added 1,135 sq km under the best forest category. The secret: these are all fast-growing plantations — not detected by satellites in the early stages, but considered dense forests when they ultimately show up. Planting mixed native species is perhaps the best means to create new forests. But they cannot compensate, certainly not overnight, for the loss of old-growth natural forests. For three decades, our net dense forest cover has remained stable on paper. There is nothing in the FSI reports until 2005 to show how much of these prime forests were actually lost, and compensated for, by plantations. But the data in the last 10 years reveal that we are destroying around 1,000 sq km of dense forest every year, and compensating for nearly half of this with plantations. Depending on where one stands, one can be smug that we are losing only this much and not more, or worry that so much is being lost. Either way, this realisation — and not the jugglery of marginal net gains or losses — is the real takeaway from our forest reports.

Source: http://indianexpress.com/article/explained/in-fact-looking-behindthe-numbers-on-indias-stable-forest-cover/