OPEN ACCESS JOURNALS
Indiana Journal of Economics and Business Management
Abbriviate Tittle- Ind J Econ Bus Manag
ISSN *(Online)*- 2583-3758
Journal Homepage Link- https://indianapublications.com/journal/IJEBM
DOI: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.15849925

INDIANA PUBLICATIONS
PRODUCTIVE AND QUALITY RESEARCH

Research Article

Volume-05|Issue04|2025

Dynamics of Forest Change in Himachal Pradesh

Anay Kumar

Department of Economics, Maharana Pratap Govt.College, Amb, Distt. Una, Himachal Pradesh (India).

Article History
Received: 23.06.2025
Accepted: 02.07.2025
Published: 08.07.2025

Citation
Kumar, A. (2025). Dynamics of Forest Change in Himachal Pradesh. *Indiana Journal of Economics and Business Management, 5*(4), 1-8.

Abstract: This study presents a detailed examination of changing forest patterns in Himachal Pradesh from 2005–06 to 2020–21, focusing on legal classifications, district-wise forest distribution, spatial extent, industrial wood output, and forest-based revenue. The analysis reveals a slight decline in reserved forest areas alongside a significant reduction in un-demarcated forests, raising critical concerns about forest protection and deforestation. Conversely, the increase in demarcated and other classified forest areas signals effective conservation and restoration efforts. District-level assessments highlight a mix of positive and negative trends in forest cover, pointing to the need for targeted conservation strategies in underperforming regions while acknowledging progress in others. The study also explores shifting trends in the composition of major and minor forest products contributing to industrial wood production, with some species declining in importance and others rising, indicative of evolving forest resource dynamics. Revenue analysis shows a decline in certain forest-based income sources, offset by growth in others, reflecting structural changes in the forestry sector. The findings underscore the necessity for integrated forest management, adaptive policy frameworks, and increased environmental consciousness to ensure sustainable forest development and preserve the ecological and economic integrity of Himachal Pradesh's forest ecosystems.

Keywords: Forest dynamics, conservation, ecological change, forest revenue, industrial wood.

INTRODUCTION

Himachal Pradesh, nestled in the lap of the Himalayas, boasts a rich tapestry of biodiversity, with its forests serving as the lifeblood of its ecosystem and economy. Forests, as the lungs of our planet, play a pivotal role in climate regulation, biodiversity conservation, and sustaining countless livelihoods. Himachal Pradesh, with its diverse flora and fauna, has been a crucible of this delicate balance. However, the intricate dance between human development and environmental preservation has led to nuanced changes in the state's forested areas.

By strengthening conservation efforts, embracing sustainable practices, diversifying forest products, and empowering local communities, Himachal Pradesh can safeguard its forests for future generations. As we unravel the intricacies of Himachal Pradesh's forested realms, we embark on a journey that transcends geographical boundaries. It is a collective endeavor, transcending disciplines and communities, to preserve the natural heritage that is not just a testament to the past but a promise for the future.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The literature on forest studies is vast and multifaceted, encompassing a range of topics from conservation and biodiversity to forest management and economic impacts. Key areas of focus include the ecological, social, and economic dimensions of forests, as well as the policies and practices that govern their use and preservation. Research highlights that forests are home to a significant proportion of the world's terrestrial species, providing critical habitats that support ecosystem functions and services (Watson *et al.*, 2018). Conservation efforts often focus on establishing protected areas, restoring degraded lands, and implementing measures to mitigate the impacts of climate change (Laurance *et al.*, 2012). Sustainable forest management (SFM) is a central theme in forest studies. SFM aims to balance the environmental, social, and economic values of forests. It involves practices such as selective logging, agroforestry, and certification schemes like FSC (Forest Stewardship Council) that promote responsible forest use (Lambin *et al.*, 2014). Studies indicate that integrating local knowledge and participatory approaches enhances the effectiveness of SFM (Charnley & Poe, 2007). The economic aspects of forests are well-documented, highlighting their role in livelihoods, especially in rural and indigenous communities. Forests provide a range of goods, including timber, non-timber forest products (NTFPs), and services like ecotourism (FAO, 2020). Research shows that sustainable exploitation of these resources can drive economic development while preserving ecological integrity (Shackleton *et al.*, 2011). Effective governance and policy frameworks are crucial for forest conservation and management. Studies discuss the impact of international agreements like the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) and the REDD+ (Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation) initiative, which aim to incentivize forest conservation through financial mechanisms (Angelsen *et al.*, 2018).

***Corresponding Author:** Anay Kumar

National and subnational policies also play a significant role, with case studies illustrating the successes and challenges in implementing forest laws and regulations (Larson & Ribot, 2007). There is growing recognition of the role of local communities in forest management. Participatory approaches that involve community members in decision-making processes lead to more equitable and sustainable outcomes (Agrawal & Gibson, 1999). Literature suggests that community forestry, where local populations have rights to manage and benefit from forest resources, can enhance conservation efforts and improve livelihoods (Ostrom, 1990). The interplay between forests and climate change is a critical area of research. Forests act as carbon sinks, sequestering CO2 and helping to mitigate global warming (Pan *et al.*, 2011). Conversely, deforestation and forest degradation contribute significantly to greenhouse gas emissions. Studies explore strategies to enhance the role of forests in climate change mitigation, including afforestation, reforestation, and sustainable forest management practices (Bonan, 2008). Advances in technology, such as remote sensing, GIS (Geographic Information Systems), and satellite imagery, have revolutionized forest studies. These tools allow for more accurate monitoring and assessment of forest cover, health, and changes over time (Hansen *et al.*, 2013). Technology also plays a role in enforcement and compliance, helping to detect illegal activities and assess the effectiveness of conservation initiatives (Asner *et al.*, 2005). Forests act as major carbon sinks, absorbing significant amounts of carbon dioxide from the atmosphere. Studies highlight their role in mitigating climate change by reducing greenhouse gas concentrations (Bonan, 2008). Forest dynamics and their impact on the global carbon cycle have been extensively researched, indicating that deforestation and forest degradation significantly contribute to carbon emissions (Pan *et al.*, 2011). Forests are biodiversity hotspots, harboring a vast array of species. Research shows that tropical forests alone contain more than half of the world's species (Myers *et al.*, 2000). Ecosystem services provided by forests include water regulation, soil protection, and pollination. These services are crucial for maintaining ecological balance and supporting human life (Costanza *et al.*, 1997). Forests contribute to the economy through timber production, non-timber forest products, and tourism. The sustainable management of forests can lead to long-term economic benefits while preserving ecological integrity (FAO, 2010). Studies emphasize the importance of forest-based industries and their role in rural development, providing employment and income to millions of people worldwide (Arnold, 1998). Many indigenous communities have deep cultural connections with forests. Research highlights the role of forests in maintaining the cultural heritage, traditions, and livelihoods of these communities (Gadgil *et al.*, 1993). The social benefits of forests include recreation, mental health improvement, and educational opportunities. Urban forests and green spaces are particularly noted for enhancing the quality of life in cities (Tzoulas *et al.*, 2007). The primary drivers of deforestation include agricultural expansion, logging, and infrastructure development. Studies have quantified the rate of deforestation and its impacts on biodiversity and carbon emissions (Hansen *et al.*, 2013). Forest degradation, often resulting from selective logging and other human activities, leads to a decline in forest health and function. Research stresses the need for sustainable management practices to prevent degradation (Putz *et al.*, 2008). Climate change poses a significant threat to forest ecosystems, altering growth patterns, species composition, and increasing the frequency of forest fires and pest outbreaks. Studies call for adaptive management strategies to enhance forest resilience (Allen *et al.*, 2010). Conservation strategies such as protected areas, sustainable forestry practices, and reforestation are crucial for preserving forest ecosystems. Research underscores the effectiveness of these strategies when combined with community involvement and strong governance (Chazdon *et al.*, 2009). The role of international agreements and policies, such as the REDD+ (Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation) framework, has been analyzed, showing mixed results in terms of implementation and impact (Angelsen, 2009). There is a need for integrated approaches that combine ecological, economic, and social perspectives in forest management. Future research should focus on developing models that incorporate these dimensions for sustainable forest management (Sayer *et al.*, 2013). Advances in remote sensing and GIS technologies offer new opportunities for monitoring forest health, deforestation rates, and biodiversity. Research should explore how these technologies can be effectively utilized for forest conservation (Turner *et al.*, 2015). Effective forest conservation requires robust policies and governance structures. Future studies should examine the impact of different policy frameworks and governance models on forest conservation outcomes (Ostrom, 2009).

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

1. To analyze the changes in the distribution of forested areas in Himachal Pradesh from 2005-06 to 2020-21 based on legal status
2. To assess the district-level distribution of forest areas within Himachal Pradesh and identify trends in forest coverage across different districts.
3. To examine the shifts in industrial wood production, focusing on major and minor forest products, and identify changes in the significance of various forest species.
4. To analyze the sources of forest revenue and their changes over the study period.
5. To provide insights into the positive and negative trends observed in Himachal Pradesh's forest ecosystem and forest-related revenue streams.

***Corresponding Author:** Anay Kumar

DATA AND METHODOLOGY

This study relies on secondary data from reliable government sources to analyze the percentage of forest area, its proportion relative to the geographical area, and the value/output of major and minor forest products across districts in Himachal Pradesh. Data from 2005-06 to 2020-21 is used to calculate percentage changes, growth rates, and statistical comparisons, highlighting economic contributions and regional variations.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Over the past 15 years, from 2005-06 to 2020-21, these forests have undergone substantial transformations. This period has witnessed dynamic shifts in their composition, legal status, and economic contributions, painting a vivid picture of the changing landscape of the state. These changes, whether positive or concerning, shed light on the intricate relationship between environmental conservation and economic sustainability. This study delves into the intricacies of these changes, offering a comprehensive analysis spanning legal delineations, district-level distributions, and economic dimensions. The state's forest ecosystem, marked by the rise of demarcated forests and the expansion of certain species in industrial wood production, reflects commendable strides in conservation and sustainable management. However, these positive trends are juxtaposed against challenges such as the reduction in reserved forests and dwindling revenue streams, necessitating a recalibration of policies and practices. In this backdrop, understanding the nuanced patterns that have emerged becomes paramount. Positive trends underscore the success of conservation initiatives, affirming the importance of community engagement and sustainable practices. Conversely, negative trends serve as cautionary signals, prompting the need for immediate and informed actions to protect what remains and rejuvenate what has been lost. This study, through a meticulous examination of these trends, aims to provide actionable insights.

Table 1: Distribution of forest area as a percentage of the total is categorized based on its legal status

Classification of Forest/Years	Forest Area (In Square Kilometer)		Percentage of Forest Area	
	2005-06	2020-21	2005-06	2020-21
Reserved Forest	1,896	1,883	5.12	4.96
Demarcated Forests	11,830	12,852	31.94	33.87
Un-demarcated Forests	21,213	16,035	57.28	42.26
Other Forests	2,094	7,178	5.65	18.92
Total Forest	37,033	37,948	100.00	100.00

Source: 1) Forest department of Himachal Pradesh
2) Statistical Abstract of Himachal Pradesh 2005-06 and 2020-21.

Table 1 provides insights into the distribution of forested areas as a percentage of the total land area, classified by their legal status for the years 2005-06 and 2020-21. Notably, there have been significant changes in the distribution over this period. In 2005-06, reserved forests constituted 5.12% of the total, but by 2020-21, this figure had slightly decreased to 4.96%. Similarly, un-demarcated forests, which accounted for a substantial 57.28% in 2005-06, have notably reduced to 42.26% in 2020-21. However, the negative trends, such as the reduction in reserved forests and un-demarcated forested areas, raise concerns. A decrease in reserved forests indicates potential challenges in maintaining protected areas, while the decline in un-demarcated forested areas may be indicative of deforestation or changes in land use that could have adverse environmental consequences.

Conversely, there has been an upward trend in demarcated forests, which grew from 31.94% in 2005-06 to 33.87% in 2020-21. Furthermore, other forested areas have also expanded, rising from 5.65% in 2005-06 to 18.92% in 2020-21. The positive trends, including an increase in demarcated forests and the expansion of other forested areas, suggest that efforts have been made to enhance forest conservation and rehabilitation. These trends reflect a proactive approach to protecting and expanding forested areas, which is encouraging for biodiversity, climate mitigation, and overall environmental health.

A comprehensive analysis of the contributing factors behind these trends is essential. This analysis could include factors such as land development, agricultural practices, urbanization, policy changes, and their impacts on the region's forests.

***Corresponding Author:** Anay Kumar

Table 2: Percentage of Total Forest Area in Different Districts of Himachal Pradesh

Districts/Years	Forest Area (In Square Kilometer)		Percentage of Forest Area	
	2005-06	2020-21	2005-06	2020-21
Bilaspur	428	343	1.16	0.90
Chamba	5,030	5,523	13.58	14.55
Hamirpur	219	165	0.59	0.44
Kangra	2,842	3,131	7.67	8.25
Kinnaur	5,093	5,595	13.75	14.74
Kullu	4,952	4,590	13.37	12.10
Lahual-spiti	10,133	10,953	27.36	28.86
Mandi	1,860	2,014	5.02	5.31
Shimla	3,418	3,591	9.23	9.46
Sirmaur	1,843	1,205	4.98	3.18
Solan	728	626	1.97	1.65
Una	487	212	1.32	0.56
Himachal Pradesh	37,033	37,948	100.00	100.00

Source: 1) Forest department of Himachal Pradesh
2) Statistical Abstract of Himachal Pradesh 2005-06 and 2020-21.

Table 2 presents a comparative analysis of the forested areas as a percentage of the total land area across different districts of Himachal Pradesh for the years 2005-06 and 2020-21. The data reveals notable shifts in forest coverage during this period. In the districts of Bilaspur, Hamirpur, Kullu, Sirmaur, Solan, and Una, Himachal Pradesh, there has been a noticeable reduction in forested areas, decreasing from 1.16%, 0.59%, 13.37%, 4.98%, 1.97%, and 1.32% in 2005-06 to 0.90%, 0.44%, 12.10%, 3.18%, 1.65%, and 0.56% in 2020-21. This negative trend signifies a significant decline in forest cover in these districts, emphasizing the importance of conservation efforts and increased environmental awareness in these regions.

Conversely, in the districts of Chamba, Kangra, Kinnaur, Lahaul-Spiti, Mandi, and Shimla, there has been an increase in forested areas, rising from 13.58%, 7.67%, 13.75%, 27.36%, 5.02%, and 9.23% in 2005-06 to 14.55%, 8.25%, 14.74%, 28.86%, 5.31%, and 9.46% in 2020-21. This positive trend signifies a commendable growth in forest cover, underscoring successful conservation efforts and heightened environmental consciousness in these districts.

Table 3: Percentage of Forest Area to Geographical Area in Different Districts of Himachal Pradesh

Districts/Years	Geographical Area of Districts	Forest Area (In Square Kilometer)		Percentage of Forest Area to Geographical Area	
		2005-06	2020-21	2005-06	2020-21
Bilaspur	1,167	428	343	36.7	29.4
Chamba	6,522	5,030	5,523	77.1	84.7
Hamirpur	1,118	219	165	19.6	14.8
Kangra	5,739	2,842	3,131	49.5	54.6
Kinnaur	6,401	5,093	5,595	79.6	87.4
Kullu	5,503	4,952	4,590	90.0	83.4
Lahual-spiti	13,841	10,133	10,953	73.2	79.1
Mandi	3,950	1,860	2,014	47.1	51.0
Shimla	5,131	3,418	3,591	66.6	70.0
Sirmaur	2,825	1,843	1,205	65.2	42.7
Solan	1,936	728	626	37.6	32.3
Una	1,540	487	212	31.6	13.8
Himachal Pradesh	55,673	37,033	37,948	66.5	68.2

Source: 1) Forest department of Himachal Pradesh
2) Statistical Abstract of Himachal Pradesh 2005-06 and 2020-21.

***Corresponding Author:** Anay Kumar

Table 3 provides insights into the percentage of forest area relative to geographical area in various districts of Himachal Pradesh during the years 2005-06 and 2020-21. During this period, the overall forest area as a percentage of the geographical area in Himachal Pradesh increased from 66.5% in 2005-06 to 68.2% in 2020-21, indicating a positive trend in forest conservation efforts.In the districts of Bilaspur, Hamirpur, Kullu, Sirmaur, Solan, and Una, Himachal Pradesh, there was a notable decrease in the forest area as a percentage of the geographical area. In 2005-06, these districts had forest cover percentages of 36.7%, 19.6%, 90.0%, 65.2%, 37.6%, and 31.6%, respectively. However, by 2020-21, these figures had declined to 29.4%, 14.8%, 83.4%, 42.7%, 32.3%, and 13.8%. These districts exhibited negative trends, signifying a concerning reduction in forest area relative to their geographical expanse.

Conversely, in the districts of Chamba, Kangra, Kinnuar, Lahaul-Spiti, Mandi, and Shimla, there was a substantial increase in forest area as a percentage of the geographical area. In 2005-06, these districts boasted forest cover percentages of 77.1%, 49.5%, 79.6%, 73.2%, 47.1%, and 66.6%, respectively. By 2020-21, these percentages had risen to 84.7%, 54.6%, 87.4%, 79.1%, 51.0%, and 70.0%. These districts displayed positive trends, indicating significant growth in forest cover relative to their geographical size.

Table 4: Percentage of output and the value of major forest produce to the total industrial wood production in Himachal Pradesh

Major Forest Produce	Output of Major Forest(M^3)		Percentage of Output of Major Forest		Value of Major Forest (Rs. In '000')		Percentage of The Value of Major Forest	
	2005-06	2020-21	2005-06	2020-21	2005-06	2020-21	2005-06	2020-21
Teak	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00
Shisham	1,974	858	0.48	0.44	19,937	11,063	0.31	0.33
Sal	8,274	3,698	2.00	1.88	67,847	1,01,673	1.05	2.98
Deodar	38,693	41,653	9.34	21.23	11,45,313	14,46,109	17.74	42.49
Chail	86,479	61,761	20.88	31.48	9,16,677	5,07,120	14.20	14.90
Kail	56,886	29,747	13.74	15.16	15,70,054	7,24,578	24.32	21.29
Fir/Spruce	2,02,590	42,495	48.92	21.66	26,74,188	5,24,898	41.43	15.42
Chilgoza-Pine	00	54	00	0.03	00	443	00	0.01
Other-BL Species	19,209	15,924	4.64	8.12	61,469	87,311	0.95	2.57
Total Industrial Wood	4,14,105	1,96,190	100.00	100.00	64,55,485	34,03,195	100.00	100.00

Source: 1) Forest department of Himachal Pradesh
2) Statistical Abstract of Himachal Pradesh 2005-06 and 2020-21.

Table-4 provides insights into the changes in the contribution of major forest produce to Himachal Pradesh's total industrial wood production from 2005-06 to 2020-21. Over this period, there have been notable shifts in the percentage of output and the value of various forest products. In terms of output percentage, a negative trend is observed in Shisham, Sal, and Fir/Spruce. In 2005-06, these species accounted for 0.48%, 1.88%, and 48.92% of total industrial wood production, respectively. However, by 2020-21, their contributions had decreased to 0.44%, 1.88%, and 21.66%, indicating a decline in their relative importance within the industrial wood production sector in Himachal Pradesh. Conversely, there has been a positive trend in the output percentage of Deodar, Chail, Kail, Chilgoza-Pine, and Other-BL Species. Their respective contributions have increased from 9.34%, 20.88%, 13.74%, 0.0%, and 4.64% in 2005-06 to 21.23%, 31.48%, 15.16%, 0.03%, and 8.12% in 2020-21. This suggests a growing significance of these species in Himachal Pradesh's total industrial wood production.

Turning to the value percentage, there is a negative trend in Kail and Fir/Spruce. In 2005-06, they represented 24.32% and 41.43% of the total industrial wood production's value, respectively. However, by 2020-21, their shares had declined to 21.29% and 15.42%, indicating a reduction in their value contribution.

Conversely, a positive trend is observed in the value percentage of Shisham, Sal, Deodar, Chail, Chilgoza-Pine, and Other-BL Species. Their respective contributions have increased from 0.31%, 1.05%, 17.74%, 14.20%, 0.0%, and 0.95% in 2005-06 to 0.33%, 2.98%, 42.49%, 14.90%, 0.01%, and 2.57% in 2020-21. This indicates an enhancement in the value of these species within the context of Himachal Pradesh's total industrial wood production.

Overall, there are contrasting trends in both output and value percentages for various major forest produce in Himachal Pradesh, with some species declining in importance while others are on the rise over the 15-year period from 2005-06 to 2020-21.

***Corresponding Author:** Anay Kumar

Table 5: Percentage of output and the value of minor forest produce to the total industrial wood production in Himachal Pradesh

Minor Forest Produce	Output of Minor Forest (Hectare/Tonne)		Percentage of Output of Minor Forest		Value of Minor Forest (Rs. In '000')		Percentage of The Value of Minor Forest	
	2005-06	2020-21	2005-06	2020-21	2005-06	2020-21	2005-06	2020-21
Bamboo	1,889	00	13.13	0.00	1,090	00	0.95	00
Resin	8,508	5,094	59.17	45.00	51,342	45,938	44.77	10.04
Bhabbar Grass	397	00	2.76	00	150	149	0.13	0.03
Medicinal Herbs	1,744	2,088	12.13	18.44	42,380	2,44,950	36.95	53.52
Khair	1,844	4,139	12.80	36.56	8,836	1,63,934	7.70	35.82
Other Minor	00	00	00	00	10,889	2,681	9.49	0.59
Total	14,379	11,321	100.00	100.00	1,14,687	4,57,652	100.00	100.00

Source: 1) Forest department of Himachal Pradesh
2) Statistical Abstract of Himachal Pradesh 2005-06 and 2020-21

Table-5 provides an overview of the changes in the role of minor forest produce in Himachal Pradesh's overall industrial wood production from 2005-06 to 2020-21. This period has witnessed significant changes in the proportions of output and value contributed by various forest products. Regarding output percentage, there is a clear downward trajectory for Bamboo, Resin, and Bhabbar Grass. In 2005-06, these species constituted 13.13%, 59.17%, and 2.76% of the total industrial wood production, respectively. However, by 2020-21, their contributions had dwindled to 0.00%, 45.00%, and 0.00%, signifying a decline in their relative importance within Himachal Pradesh's industrial wood production sector.

Conversely, we observe a positive trend in the output percentage of Medicinal Herbs and Khair. Their respective contributions have risen from 12.13% and 12.80% in 2005-06 to 18.44% and 36.56% in 2020-21, indicating a growing significance of these species in Himachal Pradesh's total industrial wood production. Shifting focus to the value percentage, a similar declining trend is observed in Bamboo, Resin, Bhabbar Grass, and other minor species. In 2005-06, they accounted for 0.95%, 44.77%, 0.13%, and 9.49% of the total industrial wood production's value. However, by 2020-21, their shares had diminished to 0.00%, 10.04%, 0.03%, and 0.59%, indicating a decrease in their value contribution. Conversely, there has been a positive trend in the value percentage of Medicinal Herbs and Khair. Their respective contributions rose from 36.95% and 7.70% in 2005-06 to 53.52% and 35.82% in 2020-21.

Table 6: Percentage of Net Forest Revenue from Various Sources in Himachal Pradesh

Source of revenue	Net Forest Revenue (Rs. In Lakhs)		Percentage of Net Forest Revenue	
	2005-06	2020-21	2005-06	2020-21
Timber and other forest	38.5	566.80	0.26	11.44
Timber and other forest by consumers/ purchasers	4,480.1	2,278.45	29.94	45.98
Drift and waif wood	00.0	00.0	00.0	00.0
Sale of timber and other forest produce (other than HPSFC)	672.8	130.22	4.50	2.63
Minor Forest Produce including medicinal plants	30.6	33.98	0.20	0.69
Grazing and Grass	10.8	7.97	0.07	0.16
Miscellaneous Products	9,727.9	1,935.75	65.01	39.06
Revenue from forests not managed by Govt.	2.4	2.37	0.02	0.05
Net Revenue	14,963.1	4,955.54	100.00	100.00

Source: 1) Forest department of Himachal Pradesh
2) Statistical Abstract of Himachal Pradesh 2005-06 and 2020-21

Table 6 illustrates the changes in the percentage of net forest revenue from different sources in Himachal Pradesh between 2005-06 and 2020-21. During this period, there has been a decline in forest revenue, particularly in the sale of timber and other forest produce (excluding HPSFC) and miscellaneous products. The percentage of net revenue from these sources decreased from 4.53% and 65.01% in 2005-06 to 2.63% and 39.06% in 2020-21, indicating a negative trend in forest revenue.

On the positive side, there has been an increase in net revenue from timber and other forest products sold to consumers/purchasers, minor forest produce including medicinal plants, and revenue from forests not managed by the government. The percentage of net revenue from

***Corresponding Author:** Anay Kumar

these sources rose significantly from 0.26%, 29.94%, 0.20%, and 0.02% to 11.44%, 45.98%, 0.69%, and 0.05% in 2020-21, respectively, indicating a positive trend in these aspects of forest revenue.

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS

The data presented in Tables 1 to 6 highlights significant shifts in the forested areas, their composition, and their economic contributions in Himachal Pradesh over the 15-year period from 2005-06 to 2020-21. While there have been both positive and negative trends, there are clear indications of changing dynamics in the state's forest ecosystem and its economic relevance. The positive trends, such as the increase in demarcated forests, the expansion of other forested areas, and the growing importance of certain forest species in industrial wood production, reflect commendable efforts in forest conservation and rehabilitation. These trends are encouraging for biodiversity conservation, climate mitigation, and overall environmental health. However, the negative trends, particularly the reduction in reserved forests, the decline in un-demarcated forested areas, and the decrease in forest revenue from certain sources, raise concerns. These trends may signify challenges in maintaining protected areas, potential deforestation or changes in land use, and a decline in the economic contribution of specific forest products.

In light of these findings, it is essential for policymakers, environmental organizations, and local communities to take proactive measures to address these challenges and build on the positive trends. Strengthening conservation efforts is crucial, with intensified protection of reserved and un-demarcated forested areas through stricter enforcement of conservation laws, enhanced monitoring and surveillance, and increased community engagement in forest protection initiatives. Emphasizing sustainable forest management practices can ensure the long-term health and productivity of forests, promoting responsible logging practices and reforestation efforts. Diversifying the range of forest products is also important, as it can reduce dependence on specific species and enhance economic resilience by responding to changing trends in industrial wood production. Furthermore, exploring new avenues for generating revenue from forests, such as eco-tourism and non-timber forest products, can contribute to local livelihoods while protecting the environment. Regularly reviewing and adapting forest policies through consultations with stakeholders, including local communities and environmental organizations, is essential to address emerging challenges and opportunities. Engaging local communities in forest conservation and sustainable resource management, empowering them to become stewards of the forest, and providing incentives for sustainable practices can foster greater community involvement. Improving monitoring and enforcement of forestry regulations is necessary to curb illegal logging and encroachments, utilizing technology and satellite imagery for real-time monitoring of forested areas.

Additionally, investing in reforestation and afforestation programs to increase forest cover in districts experiencing a decline, promoting the planting of native species, and restoring degraded ecosystems are vital. By focusing on sustainable conservation efforts, policy adjustments, community involvement, and ongoing evaluation, Himachal Pradesh can work towards ensuring that its forests remain a vital asset for both environmental health and economic sustainability in the years to come.

REFERENCES

1. Agrawal, A., & Gibson, C. C. (1999). Enchantment and disenchantment: The role of community in natural resource conservation. *World Development*, 27(4), 629-649.
2. Allen, C. D., Macalady, A. K., Chenchouni, H., Bachelet, D., McDowell, N., Vennetier, M., & Cobb, N. (2010). A global overview of drought and heat-induced tree mortality reveals emerging climate change risks for forests. *Forest Ecology and Management,* 259(4), 660-684.
3. Angelsen, A. (2009). Realising REDD+: National strategy and policy options. *CIFOR*.
4. Angelsen, A., *et al.* (2018). Transforming REDD+: Lessons and new directions. *CIFOR*.
5. Arnold, J. E. M. (1998). Managing forests as common property. FAO Forestry Paper 136. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations.
6. Asner, G. P., *et al.* (2005). Selective logging in the Brazilian Amazon. *Science, 310*(5747), 480-482.
7. Bonan, G. B. (2008). Forests and climate change: forcings, feedbacks, and the climate benefits of forests. *Science,* 320(5882), 1444-1449.
8. Charnley, S., & Poe, M. R. (2007). Community forestry in theory and practice: Where are we now? *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 36, 301-336.
9. Chazdon, R. L., Peres, C. A., Dent, D., Sheil, D., Lugo, A. E., Lamb, D., & Miller, S. E. (2009). The potential for species conservation in tropical secondary forests. *Conservation Biology, 23*(6), 1406-1417.
10. Costanza, R., d'Arge, R., de Groot, R., Farber, S., Grasso, M., Hannon, B., & van den Belt, M. (1997). The value of the world's ecosystem services and natural capital. *Nature*, 387(6630), 253-260.
11. FAO. (2010). *Global Forest Resources Assessment 2010*. FAO Forestry Paper 163. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations.
12. FAO. (2020). *Global Forest Resources Assessment 2020*. FAO.
13. Gadgil, M., Berkes, F., & Folke, C. (1993). Indigenous knowledge for biodiversity conservation. *Ambio*, 22(2/3), 151-156.
14. Hansen, M. C., Stehman, S. V., & Potapov, P. V. (2013). Quantification of global gross forest cover

***Corresponding Author:** Anay Kumar

loss. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 110(52), 20892-20897.
15. Hansen, M. C., *et al.* (2013). High-resolution global maps of 21st-century forest cover change. *Science*, 342(6160), 850-853.
16. Lambin, E. F., *et al.* (2014). Effectiveness and synergies of policy instruments for land use governance in tropical regions. *Global Environmental Change*, 28, 129-140.
17. Larson, A. M., & Ribot, J. C. (2007). The poverty of forestry policy: double standards on an uneven playing field. *Sustainability Science*, 2(2), 189-204.
18. Laurance, W. F., *et al.* (2012). Averting biodiversity collapse in tropical forest protected areas. *Nature,* 489(7415), 290-294.
19. Myers, N., Mittermeier, R. A., Mittermeier, C. G., Da Fonseca, G. A., & Kent, J. (2000). Biodiversity hotspots for conservation priorities. *Nature,* 403(6772), 853-858.
20. Ostrom, E. (2009). A general framework for analyzing sustainability of social-ecological systems. *Science,* 325(5939), 419-422.
21. Ostrom, E. (1990). *Governing the commons: The evolution of institutions for collective action*. Cambridge University Press.
22. Pan *et al.* (2011). A large and persistent carbon sink in the world's forests. *Science,* 333(6045), 988-993.
23. Putz, F. E., Zuidema, P. A., Synnott, T., Peña-Claros, M., Pinard, M. A., Sheil, D., & Vanclay, J. K. (2008). Improved tropical forest management for carbon retention. *PLoS Biology*, 6(7), e166.
24. Sayer, J., Sunderland, T., Ghazoul, J., Pfund, J. L., Sheil, D., Meijaard, E.,. & Buck, L. E. (2013). Ten principles for a landscape approach to reconciling agriculture, conservation, and other competing land uses. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 110(21), 8349-8356.
25. Shackleton, C. M., *et al.* (2011). Non-Timber Forest Products: Concept and Definitions. In Non-Timber Forest Products in the Global Context. *Springer*. 3-21.
26. Turner, W., Spector, S., Gardiner, N., Fladeland, M., Sterling, E., & Steininger, M. (2015). Remote Sensing for Biodiversity Science and Conservation. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution,* 18(6), 306-314.
27. Tzoulas, K., Korpela, K., Venn, S., Yli-Pelkonen, V., Kazmierczak, A., Niemela, J., & James, P. (2007). Promoting Ecosystem and Human Health in Urban Areas Using Green Infrastructure: A Literature Review. *Landscape and Urban Planning,* 81(3), 167-178.
28. Watson, J. E. M., *et al.* (2018). The Exceptional Value of Intact Forest Ecosystems. *Nature Ecology & Evolution*, 2(4), 599-610.

***Corresponding Author:** Anay Kumar