


कॉस्ट/बेनीफिट एनालिसिस

आवेदक मेसर्स सिंघल एनर्जी प्रा.लि. ग्राम— तराईमाल, ब्लाक— तमनार जिला— रायगढ़ के निकट स्थापित स्पंज आयरन प्लांट एवं प्रस्तावित 10 मे.वा. कैप्टिव पॉवर प्लांट हेतु गेरवानी नाला से प्लांट तक पानी ले जाने हेतु कुल 0.117 है. वनभूमि का भारत सरकार के नवीन मार्गदर्शी हैंडबुक के पृष्ठ क्रमांक 101 के टेबल (A) क्रं. 1 के अनुसार 20.000 है. तक के वनभूमि व्यपवर्तन प्रस्ताव में कॉस्ट/बेनीफिट एनालिसिस प्रपत्र की आवश्यकता नहीं है। प्रपत्र संलग्न है।



(जी.के. मिश्रा)

मैनेजर

मेसर्स सिंघल एजनी प्रा.लि.



वनमण्डलाधिकारी

रायगढ़ वनमण्डल रायगढ़

Annexure III

Conducting cost-benefit analysis for projects involving forest diversion

- (i) While considering proposal for diversion of forest land for non-forestry use, it is essential that ecological and environmental losses and eco-economic distress caused to the people who are displaced are weighted against economic and social gains.
- (ii) Whenever the forest land is involved in the development projects, the cost of ecosystem services and fragmentation of habitat of wildlife and economic distress caused to people dependent on forests and the cost of settlement of people dependent on forest should also be added as the cost of forest diversion in addition to the standard project cost which would have been incurred by the user agencies without involvement of forest land while conducting the cost benefit analysis of the project. Similarly, the benefits from the project accruing due to diversion of forest land and used in the project should also be accounted for in the benefits component in addition to the standard benefits of the project which would have been accrued without involvement of forest land while conducting the cost benefit analysis and determining the benefit and cost ratio (BC ratio).
- (iii) The cost of compensatory afforestation and its maintenance in future and soil & moisture conservation at present discounted value and future benefits from such Compensatory Afforestation accruing over next 50 years monetized and discounted to the present value should be included as cost and benefits respectively of compensatory afforestation while conducting the cost benefit analysis and determining the benefit and cost ratio (BC ratio).
- (iv) Table-A lists the details the types of projects involving forest land for which cost-benefit analysis will be required. Table-B lists the parameters according to which the cost aspect of forest land diverted for the development projects will be determined, while Table-C lists the parameters for assessing the benefits accruing to the project using of forest land.
- (v) A cost-benefit analysis as above should accompany the proposals sent to the Central Government for forest clearance under the Forest Conservation Act.

Table-A: Cases under which a cost-benefit analysis for forest diversion are required

S. No.	Nature of proposal	Applicable/ not applicable	Remarks
1	All categories of proposals involving forest land upto 20 hectares in plains and upto 5 hectare in hills.	Not applicable	These proposals may be considered on a case-to-case basis and value judgment.
2	Proposal for defence installation purposes and oil prospecting (prospecting only).	Not applicable	In view of national Priority accorded to these sectors, the proposals would be critically assessed to help ascertain that the utmost minimum forest land is diverted for non-forest use.

3	Habitation, establishment of industrial units, tourist lodges complex and other building construction.	Not applicable	These activities being detrimental to protection and conservation of forest, as a matter of policy, such proposals would be rarely entertained.
4	All other proposals involving forest land more than 20 hectares in plains and more than 5 hectares in hills including roads, transmission lines, minor, medium and major irrigation projects, hydro projects, mining activity, railway lines, location specific installations like micro-wave stations, auto repeater centers, TV towers etc.	Applicable	These are cases where a cost-benefit analysis is necessary to determine when diverting the forest land to non-forest use in the overall public interest.

Table-B: Estimation of cost of forest diversion

S. No.	Parameters	Remarks
1	Ecosystem services losses due to proposed forest diversion.	Economic value of loss of eco-system services due to diversion of forests shall be the net present value (NPV) of the forest land being diverted as prescribed by the Central Government (MoEF&CC). <i>Note: In case of National Parks the NPV shall be ten (10) times the normal NPV and in case of Wildlife Sanctuary the NPV shall be five (5) times the normal NPV or otherwise prescribed by the ministry or any other competent authority.</i>
2	Loss of animal husbandry productivity, including loss of fodder.	To be quantified and expressed in monetary terms or 10% of NPV applicable whichever is maximum.
3	Cost of human resettlement.	To be quantified and expressed in monetary terms as per approved R&R plan.
4	Loss of public facilities and administrative infrastructure (Roads, building, schools, dispensaries, electric lines, railways, etc.) on forest land, which would require forest land if these facilities were diverted due to the project.	To be quantified and expressed in monetary terms on actual cost basis at the time of diversion.

5	Possession value of forest land diverted.	30% of environmental costs (NPV) due to loss of forests or circle rate of adjoining area in the district should be added as a cost component as possession value of forest land whichever is maximum.
6	Cost of suffering to oustees.	The social cost of rehabilitation of oustees (in addition to the cost likely to be incurred in providing residence, occupation and social services as per R&R plan) be worked out as 1.5 times of what oustees should have earned in two years had he not been shifted.
7	Habitat Fragmentation Cost.	While the relationship between fragmentation and forest goods and services is complex, for the sake of simplicity the cost due to fragmentation has been pegged at 50% of NPV applicable as a thumb rule.
8	Compensatory Afforestation and soil & moisture conservation cost.	The actual cost of compensatory afforestation and soil & moisture conservation and its maintenance in future at present discounted value.

Table-C-Existing guidelines for estimating benefits of forest-diversion in CBA

Sr. No.	Parameters	Remarks
1	Increase in productivity attribute to the specific project.	To be quantified & expressed in monetary terms avoiding double counting.
2	Benefits to economy due to the specific project.	The incremental economic benefit in monetary terms due to the activities attributed to the specific project.
3	No. of population benefited due to specific project.	As per the Detailed project report.
4	Economic benefits due to of direct and indirect employment due to the project.	As per the Detailed project report.
5	Economic benefits due to Compensatory afforestation.	Benefits from such Compensatory Afforestation accruing over next 50 years monetized and discounted to the present value should be included as benefits of Compensatory Afforestation. *For benefits of CA the guideline of the Ministry for NPV estimation may be consulted.

Note-1: Net Present value (NPV) of environment and ecosystem services loss:

The concept of Net Present Value of the forest land diverted is a scientific method of calculating the environmental cost and other losses caused due to diversion of

forest land for non-forestry purposes. The NPV represents the net value of various ecosystem services and other environmental services in monetary terms which the forest would have provided if the forest would not have been diverted.

Note-2: Possession value of forest land diverted:

The forest land diverted for the project such as irrigation, hydropower, railways, roads, wind, and transmission lines and mining etc. are unlikely to be returned and remains in possession of the user agencies. Therefore 30% of the net present value (NPV) of forest land diverted or market rate of adjoining area in the district should be added as a cost component as "possession value of forest land" in addition to the environmental costs due to loss of forests.