PPI Funded Tree Plantation and Survival Project at Village level in active collaboration with Community
Final Consolidated 3 Year Report – July 2015 to September 2018

Broad goal of this project is
Through planting and nurturing a mix of trees with focus on horticulture, floriculture, timber, fodder, fuel wood:

1. Meet balanced nutrition needs of the family,
2. Help generate incomes for enhancing quality of life,
3. Build awareness of need to restore ecological balance and reduce adverse impact of global warming and
4. Realise vital role played by trees to achieve all of the above.

Backdrop

Like last year this year too the Government launched a massive tree plantation programme. Most of the Government supported institutions had to plant specified number of trees. Hence our coverage of schools is less than last year. Further due to the uncertain pattern of rains in recent times coupled with preoccupation of the community in paddy transplanting the actual planting of trees had to be delayed to avoid damage due to excessive moisture or dry spell as the case may be. Given the large geographical spread of beneficiaries monitoring and capacity building continues to pose a challenge and monitoring system needs to be reviewed and tightly defined.

Target Group

Table below gives a year wise summary.

Item Description	Year 1 – 2015 - 2016	Year 2 – 2016 - 2017	Year 3 – 2017 - 2018
Number of trees planted	1111	1866	1501
Total beneficiaries	189	376*	309*
Villages covered	6	10	10
Women self help groups	15	20	14
Farmers	33	46	50
MLDT staff	17	15	20
Schools / institutions	Nil	7	4
School children	Nil	30	nil
Village hamlets (persons)	Nil	2 (93)	1(20)

* does not include schools

The trend in size as well as profile of beneficiaries has been maintained from last year. Number of schools has reduced on account of the tree planting drive of the Government that saturated most schools capacity for planting. Schools selected have been largely residential where care will be taken of trees even during school vacations.

Variety of Trees Planted

Sr. No.	Tree Name	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3
	Fruit			
1	Mango	380	606	500
2	Guava	117	157	165
3	Chikkoo	124	255	158
4	Lemon	88	94	92
5	Jackfruit	47	152	95
6	Kaju	40	47	71
7	Awala		19	10
8	Bor	2	22	35
9	Jambhul - black		21	50
10	Jambhul - White	50	60	75
11	Custard apple		25	40
12	Ram Phal		41	25
13	Almond	27	31	30
14	Drum sticks		32	
15	Coconut	45	70	5
16	Tamarind		2	
17	Jam	22		
	Wood / Bamboo			
18	Bamboo		5	
19	Teak		5	
	Green manure			
20	Karanj		5	10
21	Kadulimbb	6	5	
	Flowering / ornamental			
	Sonchafa	163	106	100
	Parijatak		15	
	Madhumalti		10	
	Gulmohur		20	3
	Ratrani		5	
	Ashok		20	10
	Palm		5	
	Rain tree			9
	Morpankhi			7
	Kanher			1
	Jaswand			1
	Jasmine			5
	Shevanti			2
	Ananta			2
	Medicinal			
	Rudraksha		5	
	Bel		7	

	Reetha		3	
	Raktachandan		3	
	Brahmi		5	
	Spices			
	Curry leaves		3	
	Bay leaf		5	
	Total Trees Planted	1111	1866	1501

This year there is an interesting variety of trees planted especially in flowering variety primarily in schools.

Fruit trees like last year dominate. Most of the women from SHGs plant trees around their house or in their nutritional gardens. Consequently they prefer fruit trees for serving their family needs. Farmers too on account of small land holdings are keen to plant trees which will provide them some income in the future through sale of fruits. Given their context and resource base it is prudent to respect their wishes.

So while we would desire increased biodiversity even across categories there is a limit to which this can be achieved.

Tree Survival & Mortality Status as of June 2018

Tree Survival

	2015	2016	2017
Trees planted	1111	1866	1501
Survival year 1 end	915	1812	1444
Survival rate Year 1	82%	97%	96%
Survival year 2 end	902	1802	
Survival rate	81%	96%	
Survival year 3 end	898		
Survival rate	80%		

Tree mortality

Tree type	2015	2016	2017	Total
Mortality after one year	196	54	66	316
Mortality after two years	13	10		23
Mortality after three years	4			4
Total mortality	213	64	66	343

Analysis of Tree Mortality

Tree Type	Rodent	Forest fire	Pest attack	Fungus	Total
Mango	55	7	92	96	250
Coconut	3		6	1	10
Chikoo	3		1	3	7
Sonchafa			11	1	12
Cashew	1		1		2
Guava	2			3	5
Lemon	7		1	4	12
Jackfruit	10		1	5	16
jambhul	5		1	4	10
Drumstick	1		6	7	14
Bor				1	1
Parijatak			1		1
Kadamb	1		1		2
Total	88	7	122	125	342*

- short of accounting for one tree in analysis

Mortality has been high in year 1 planted trees and primarily mango. As stated in Year 1 report the quality of mango saplings procured in year 1 were of poor quality and many did not survive beyond year 1. Subsequent years we changed the nursery and performance improved along with input provided by our monitoring team.

Three Year Budget

Sr. No	Item Description	Rate per unit Rs.	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3
1	Saplings – 1834	10 - 120	80000	80000	80000
2	Treeguards	45	82530	82530	82530
3	Transportation cost of saplings		3000	3500	4000
4	Capacity Building workshops In house -4 External - 1	In house – 1000/workshop External – 10000/workshop	14000	14000	14000
5	Field supervisor	5000/month; 10% increase annually	60000	66000	72600
6	Administrative costs – communication, documentation, conveyance etc		25000	30000	36000
	Total		**264530**	**276030**	**289130**

Budget Vs. Expenses Year I

Sr. No	Item Description	Rate per unit Rs.	Year 1 Budget	Year 1 Expenses	Remarks
1	Saplings – 1834	10 - 120	80000	71965	
2	Treeguards	45	82530	17930	Use of tree guards made by farmers rather than procuring ready made reduced cost significantly
3	Transportation cost of saplings		3000	2600	
4	Capacity Building workshops In house -4 External - 1	In house – 1000/workshop External – 10000/workshop	14000	7500	We need to invest much more in capacity building which we intend to do this year
5	Field supervisor	5000/month; 10% increase annually	60000	60000	
6	Administrative costs – communication, documentation, conveyance etc		25000	18000	Got shared across other projects and hence reduced utilisation
	Total		**264530**	**177995**	

Unutilised funds at end of year 1 = Rs. 86535

Budget Vs. Expenses Year II

Sr. No	Item Description	Rate per unit Rs.	Budget year II	Year II Expenses	Remarks
1	Saplings – 1834	10 - 120	80000	145950	We had surplus from year 1 Rs. 65435saplings and tree guards which was utilized this year to expand beneficiary coverage
2	Treeguards	45	82530	45250	Use of tree guards made by farmers rather than procuring ready made reduced cost significantly
3	Transportation cost of saplings		3500	3350	
4	Capacity Building workshops In house -4 External - 1	In house – 1000/workshop External – 10000/workshop	14000	10000	Since beneficiaries are highly dispersed organizing formal training proves difficult. We are thus investing in capacity building of our monitoring team which in turn disseminate inputs during their monitoring visits.
5	Field supervisor	5000/month; 10% increase annually	66000	66000	
6	Administrative costs – commn., convey. etc, co		30000	20000	Got shared across other projects and hence reduced utilisation
	Total		**276030**	**290550**	**14520 excess spend adjusted against the Rs. 86535 surplus carried over from year I**

Excess spend year 2 = 14520 adjusted against available surplus in year 1 of Rs. 86535/. Net available surplus at end of year 2 = Rs. 72015/.

Budget Vs. Expenses Year III

Sr. No	Item Description	Rate per unit Rs.	Budget Year 3	Expenses	Remarks
1	Saplings – 1834	10 - 120	80000	119400	39400 has been spent by adjusting with surplus from tree guards
2	Treeguards	45	82530	36225	46305 avl as tree guards improvised using bamboo from farmers resulting in cost reduction.
3	Transportation cost of saplings		4000	3600	
4	Capacity Building workshops In house -4 External - 1	In house – 1000/workshop External – 10000/workshop	14000	14000	Trg Inputs deployed thru our field team as beneficiaries widely dispersed
5	Field supervisor	5000/month; 10% increase annually	72600	72600	
6	Administrative costs – communication, documentation, conveyance etc		36000	36000	
	Total		**289130**	**281825**	

Surplus at end of year 3 = Rs. 7305.

Total unutilized funds at end of year 3 = Rs. 72015 + 7305 = 79320/. This surplus has resulted primarily due to improvisations in tree guards

whereby farmers were provided nets and copper wire and made tree guards themselves as against buying ready guards from outside.

We propose to utilize these funds towards:

1. Continuing Monitoring of trees planted in year 2 & 3
2. Capacity building especially around the causes of mortality identified so that preventive actions can be released to preserve trees planted
3. Balance to be utilized for saplings and tree guards next year