

Most of the states have only information regarding accepted claims and not rejected claims.

- Since most of the North Eastern States are having their non-reserved forest lands already under community ownership of tribals as part of their customary and traditional rights, hence FRA, 2006 is not of much relevance in most parts of North Eastern States.
- FRA is only a recognition of pre-existing rights on habitation and cultivation and community / community forest resource rights. So the case of depletion of forests does not arise after implementation of FRA. FRA is not a land distribution scheme. There is no evidence to show depletion of forest due to implementation of FRA.
- Various High Courts have ordered for suo- moto review of rejected claims as also MoTA have issued advisories from time to time for suo-moto review of rejected claims.
- Secretary suggested that States can send proposals for support from MoTA in pursuance of better implementation of FRA.

9. The general points which emerged after presentations given by the States/UTs are as follows: -

- Maharashtra State has done biodiversity mapping and have worked out the extent of forest land which have increased after implementation of FRA. Case studies of IFR and CFR in the Maharashtra State show that awarding ownership of IFR and CFR resulted in the security of livelihood, food security of marginalized and vulnerable community and in increasing forest covers as well.
- States at present are not in a position to place complete information in their affidavit regarding finally rejected cases at DLC level as FRA Act and Rules