Marketing of selected Minor Forest product MFP in Gadchiroli District

Shubhangi.V.Alexander [1*], Shanti R. Patil[2], and R.S.Karangami[3]

1. Assistant Professor, Agril Economics, College of Agriculture, Gadchiroli,
Dr. Panjabrao Deshmukh Krishi Vidyapeeth, Akola (M.S.)

2. Assistant Professor, Agril. Bonaty, College of Agriculture, Gadchiroli,
Dr. Panjabrao Deshmukh Krishi Vidyapeeth, Akola (M.S.)

3. Assistant Professor, Agri. Extn.,College of Agriculture, Gadchiroli,
Dr. Panjabrao Deshmukh Krishi Vidyapeeth, Akola (M.S.)

Corresponding author's email: latikalex@rediffmail.com

ABSTRACT

The present study was conducted in Gadchiroli district of Maharashtra state. In India, Minor Forest Products are an important livelihood source for several communities, particularly those living in forest fringe village. According to census 2011, the tribal population in India was 104 million people which accounts for 8.6 per cent of the total population of the country. It is estimated that, there is one tribal man for every fourteen Indians. In India, nearly 31.00 per cent of them are directly dependent on MFPs for their livelihood. In the present study entitled assess marketing of selected minor forest productsin Gadchiroli district", was undertaken with a view to study the various channels of marketing of MFPs and to analyse the problems faced by the tribal farmers in transacting MFPs. Dhanoratahsil is a tribal dominated tahsil which was selected purposively on the basis of maximum area under forest. Random sampling techniques was fallowed regarding selection of the villages and tribal farmers. In present study represents marketed and marketable surplus of selected MFPs, in case of charoli and gum, marketed surplus is 100.00 per cent means whatever products were collected, the whole quantity was sold to the market. But in case of mohaflower only 7919 kg quantity which was account to 78.26 per cent sold by collector and 2200 kg quantity which account 21.74 per cent kept for family consumption, for making liquor to family consumption Minor Forest Products (MFPs) are seen as crucial in improving the livelihood of tribal poor and to promote sustainability as there is immense potential of these product in value added in national and international market. Tribals farmers obtained employment and additional income trough out the year from the collection of MFPs.

Keywords: Marketing, Minor Forest, Products.

INTRODUCTION

In India, Minor Forest Products are an important livelihood source for several communities, particularly those living in forest fringe village. About 400 million people in India depend on Minor Forest Products (MFPs). According to census, the tribal population in India was 104 million people which accounts for 8.6 per cent of the total population of the country. It is estimated that, there is one tribal man for every fourteen Indians. In India, about 53.00 per cent of total tribal population lives in rural areas and nearly 31 per cent of them are directly dependent on MFPs for their livelihood.

Minor Forest Products (MFPs) technically defined as all vegetables and animals products other than firewood and timber obtained from the forest. Forest produce mainly divided into two categories i.e major and minor product. Major forest products are timber, small wood and fire wood. Minor forest products(MFPs) is defined as non wood forest produce, which can be exploited without harming the forest and will not included minerals as well as forest animals or animals part.

Schedule Tribes (STs) are indigenous, have their own distinctive culture, are geographically isolated and are low in socio economic conditions. For centuries, the tribal groups have remained outside the realm of the general development process due to their habitation in forest and hilly tracts.

The word 'Minor' applied to these types of

products is, however is misnomer, because over the years such products are contributing in much significant way to the national economy. So that, in some of the state as much as 50.00 per cent of the forest revenue is derived from MFPs. It is also reported that MFPs contributed 30.00-50.00 per cent of the total forest revenue of the country. Minor Forest Products (MFPs) are seen as crucial in improving the livelihood of tribal poor and to promote sustainability as there is immense potential of these product in value added in national and international market.

The Gadchiroli district of Maharashtra constitutes of 11299 km of the forest lands making a home for a variety Non Timber Forest Produce (NTFPs) including gum plants, oil seeds. In the Gadchiroli, 13 crucial NTFPs were found among 10 were dominated. The major species are Bamboo, Tendu, Mahua, Charodi, Triphala (Amla, Hirda, Behda), Karanj, Palas, Gum, etc.

METHODOLOGY

Sampling Frame work for Collection and Marketing of MFPs

In the present study entitled "Marketing analysis of minor forest product in Gadchiroli District", was undertaken with a view to study the various channels of marketing of MFPs and to analyse the problems faced by the tribal farmers in transacting MFPs. Dhanoratahsil is a tribal dominated tahsil which was selected purposively on the basis of maximum area under forest. Random sampling techniques was fallowed regarding selection of the villages and tribal farmers. The details of selected sample are given below.

Table 1
The details of selected sample from DhanoraTahasil

Sr.No.	Name of Village	No of sample
1	Kanhartola	10
2	Menda	10
3	Lekha	10
4	Girola	10
5	Horekasa	10
6	hulondi	10
Total no. of tribal farmer Selected for the study		60

In order to fulfill the objectives of study, necessary primary data were collected from the tribal farmers by the personal interview. For this purpose a pre tested questionnaire, specially designed for the present study was used. Three important MFPs i.e Charoli, Gum, and Mohaflower were considered for the study. In addition to this information on marketing cost and marketing margin of wholesalers, retailers were collected from 10 market functionaries by the personal interview method using a structured schedule. The data collected pertains to the agricultural year 2020 and the survey was conducted in the month of January 2021.

Information regarding organizations involved in marketing and processing of MFPs in Gadchiroli district were collected from the office of Mavim (Mahila Arthik Vikas Mahamandal, Gadchiroli), Maharashtra State Rural Livelihood Mission (MSRLM), Godwana Harbs, Science and Technology Research Centre(STRC). Vandhan Vikas Gat, Dhanora etc.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Socio-economics characteristics of tribal farmers

The distribution of tribals according to size of land holding was workout and presented in Table 1. The distribution of tribals in three categories i.e small, medium and large, according to their size of land holding. Out of 60 selected tribal farmers 71.33 per cent belong to small holding groups, 25.00 per cent tribals belonged to medium group and only 03.33 percent tribals belonged to large group of land holdings.

Table 1
Distribution of Tribal's according to land holding

Sr. No	Size of holding	Size limit (ha)	Tribals selected	Average size of holding (ha)
1	Small	Upto 2.00	43(71.66)	1.28
2	Medium	2.01 to 4.00	15(25.00)	2.21
3	Large	Above 4.01	02(03.33)	4.16
	Total		60(100.00)	2.55

(Figure in parenthesis indicate the per cent to total)

Average size of land holding in case of small, medium and large group were 1.28 hectares, 2.21 hectares and 4.16 hectares respectively. Overall land holding was 2.55 hectares.

Table 2
Average size family of selected Tribal farmer

Sr.no	Small	Medium	Large	Overall
Male	1.88 (36.36)	1.86 (39.57)	1.81 (40.04)	1.85 (38.54)
Female	1.27 (24.56)	1.58 (33.62)	1.56 (34.51)	1.47 (30.63)
Children	2.02 (39.07)	1.26 (26.81)	1.15 (25.44)	1.48 (30.83)
Total	5.17 (100.00)	4.7 (100.00)	4.52 (100.00)	4.80 (100.00)

(Figure in parenthesis indicate the per cent to total)

The detailed of average size of family of sample tribal's is presented in Table 2. Overall average number of family members were 4.80 which comprised of 1.85 males 1.47 female and 1.48 children.

It is essential to study the average size of family to get an idea about per person income obtained from MFPs collection. The tribals were divided according to size of land holdings. In general, the size of family for small, medium and large was 5.17, 4.7 and 4.52 members, respectively.

Education is the important factor affecting the standard of living of tribals. Table 3.Indicates the distribution of tribals according to education.

Table 3
Distribution of selected tribal according to education level

Particulars	Land holding size			
	Small	Medium	Large	Overall
Illiterate	1.09 (21.08)	0.67 (14.26)	0.22 (4.87)	0.66 (13.75)
Primary	2.09 (40.43)	1.49 (31.70)	0.60 (13.27)	1.39 (28.96)
Secondary	1.12 (21.66)	1.25 (26.60)	1.03 (22.79)	1.13 (23.54)
Junior college	0.81 (15.66)	1.04 (22.13)	1.51 (33.41)	1.12 (23.33)
UG college	0.06 (1.16)	0.25 (5.32)	1.16 (25.66)	0.69 (14.38)
Total	5.17 (100.00)	4.7 (100.00)	4.52 (100.00)	4.80 (100.00)

(Figure in parenthesis indicate the per cent to total)

It was observed from table 3 that, overall average proportion of illiterate members was highest in small group of tribals i.e 21.08 per cent fallowed by medium group which accounts 14.26 per cent while it was lowest in large group i.e04.87 per cent. Highest per cent of education level was observed in primary group i.e 40.23 per cent in small group, 31.70 per cent in medium group and 13.27 per cent in large group. Per cent of overall total education was observed high in primary group i.e 28.96 per to total education level

Per cent level of education in junior college and UG college was found more in large group than small and medium group and per cent of illitracy was found more in small group of tribals.

Land utilization pattern

The information about land utilization indicated the area of land actually utilize in different purpose like crop production, irrigation etc. It can be seen from Table 4 that, the overall land holding of selected tribal farmers was found to be 2.55 hectares. The overall fallow land was 9.01 per cent of total land holding, whereas net cultivated land was 92.17 per cent.

Table 4
Land Utilization pattern (ha)

Sr.no	Particulars	Land holding size			
		Small	Medium	Large	Overall
1.	Total land holding	1.28 (100.00)	2.21 (100.00)	4.16 (100.00)	2.55 (100.00)
2	Fallow land	0.16 (12.5)	0.3 (13.57)	0.22 (5.29)	0.23 (9.01)
3	Net cultivated land	1.12 (87.5)	1.91 (86.43)	3.94 (94.71)	2.35 (92.17)
4	Area under irrigation	0.62 (48.44)	1.03 (46.60)	2.10 (50.48)	1.25 (49.02)
5	Gross cropped area	1.74 (135.94)	2.94 (133.03)	6.04 (145.19)	3.57 (140.00)
6	Cropping intensity	155.36	153.93	153.30	154.20

It can be revealed from above table that, the average net cultivated land was highest in large group 03.94 hectare which accounts 94.71 per cent of total land holding area of large farmer, followed by medium group 86.43 per cent and small group 87.50 per cent. The gross cropped area was highest in large group.

Table 5
Cropping pattern of selected tribals

Sr. No	Particular	Land size holding			
		Small	Medium	Large	Overall
1.	Kharif crops				
a.	Paddy	0.95 (54.60)	1.58 (53.74)	3.55 (58.77)	2.02 (56.58)
b.	Soybean	0.12 (6.89)	0.16 (5.44)	0.20 (3.31)	0.16 (4.48)
c.	Tur	0.03 (1.72)	0.08 (2.72)	0.11 (1.82)	0.07 (1.96)
d.	Mung	0.02 (1.15)	0.09 (3.06)	0.08 (1.32)	0.06 (1.68)
	Total	1.12 (64.36)	1.91 (64.97)	3.94 (65.23)	2.35 65.82)

2.	Rabi crop				
a.	Gram	0.28 (16.09)	0.46 (15.65)	0.66 (10.93)	0.46 (12.88)
b.	Linseed	0.29 (16.67)	0.41 (13.95)	0.67 (11.09)	0.45 (12.61)
b.	Wheat	0.04 (2.30)	0.06 (2.04)	0.42 (6.95)	0.17 (4.76)
	Total	0.61 (35.06)	0.93 (31.63)	1.75 (28.97)	0.71 (19.89)
3.	Summer crop				
a.	vegetables	0.01 (0.57)	0.10 (3.40)	0.35 (5.79)	0.15 (4.20)
4.	Gross cropped area	1.74 (100.00)	2.94 (100.00)	6.04 (100.00)	3.57 (100.00)

(Figure in parenthesis indicate the per cent to total)

Table 5 described the cropping pattern of selected tribal farmers and it was found that paddy was dominating crop in kharif season whereas gram and linseed were major crop in rabi season.

In kharif season, the overall area allocated under paddy crop was 2.35 hectares which accounts 65.82 per cent, area under soybean was 0.16 hectares which accounts 4.48 per cent and area under tur and mung were 0.07 hectares and 0.06 hectares respectively. The area under paddy were 0.95 ha, 1.58ha, 3.55 ha in small, medium and large group of tribals respectively   which accounts 54.60 per cent,

53.74 per cent, 58.77 per cent

In rabi season, gram and linseed were important crops grown by selected tribals farmers. It was observed that at overall level the area under gram and linseed were 0.46 ha and 0.45 ha respectively which was 12.88 per cent and 12.61 percent. Area under wheat crop was very less as compare to gram and linseed crop, the overall area under wheat was 0.17 ha which account 4.17 per cent to total gross cropped area.

Marketed surplus and marketable surplus for MFPs

Table 6
Marketed surplus and Marketable surplus for selected MFPs

MFPs	Total quantity (kg)	Marketable surplus	Marketed surplus
Charoli	1006 (100)	00 (00.00)	1006 (100)
Gum	507 (100.00)	00 (00.00)	507 (100.00)
Mohaflower	10119 (100.00)	2200 (21.74)	7919(78.26)

(Figure in parenthesis indicate the per cent to total)

Table 6. represents marketed and marketable surplus of selected MFPs, in case of charoli and gum, marketed surplus is 100 per cent means whatever products were collected, the whole quantity was sold to the market. But in case of mohaflower only 7919 kg quantity which was account to 78.26 per cent sold by collector and 2200 kg quantity which account 21.74 per cent kept for family consumption, for making liquor to family consumption

It is observed from table 6 that, marketed surplus is more than marketable surplus, as they

having urgent requirement of money, whatever the prices they sold maximum quantity of produce to market

Marketing channels for MFPs

It was observed that in the movement of Charoli, Gum and Mohaflower from collecter to ultimate consumer,   the Self Help Group/Village Organization, wholesaler, retailers were involved as intermediaries. With these intermediaries the commodity passes through four different channels as prescribed below.

A. Channel-I Producer – Consumer

B. Channel II Collector   SHG (Village Organization) Wholesaler Retailer Consumer

C. Channel III   Collector   Wholesaler Retailer Consumer

D. Channel IV Collector   Retailer Consumer

The information about marketing channels prevailing in the study area for MFPs, quantity of produce marketed through various channels is presented in Table 7.

It is observed from Table 7 that maximum numbers of collector 37,39,23 were using Channel-III for marketing of charoli, gum and mahaflower repectively, whereas the numbers of collector using Channel-II were 18,12 and 17 respectively.

Regarding quantity marketed, it was observed that, maximum proportion of total quantity of charoli i.e 61.67 per cent passed through Channel-III followed by 30.00per cent through Channel-II and remaining 03.33 and 05.00 per cent passed through channel I Channel-IV respectivily.

Table 7
Channelwise distribution of MFPs collector and quantity marketed through various channels

Sr.No.	Channels of Marketing	Charoli		Gum		Mohaflower	
		No. of Collectors	Total quntity Marketed (Kg)	No. of Collectors	Total quntity Marketed (Kg)	No. of Collectors	Total quntity Marketed (Kg)
1.	Channel-I	02	33.53 (3.33)	03	25.35 (5.00)	08	1055.87 (13.33)
2.	Channel-II	18	301.80 (30.00)	12	101.4 (20.00)	17	2243.72 (28.33)
3.	Channel-III	37	620.37 (61.67)	39	329.55 (65.00)	23	3035.62 (38.33)
4.	Channel - IV	03	50.25 (5.00)	06	50.68 (10.00)	12	1583.8 (20.00)
Total		60 (100.00)	1006 (100.00)	60 (100.00)	507 (100.00)	60 (100.00)	7919 (100.00)

(Figure in parenthesis indicate the per cent to total)

In case of gum, 65.00 per cent quantity passed though channel III followed by channel II (20.00), channel IV(10.00) and Channel I (05.00). In case of mohaflower quantity of produce passed through all channels which were observed in study area. For marketing of mohaflower channel I contibuted 13.33 per cent, which indicated that, collector directly sold moahaflower to the consumer also and maximum portion of total quantity was sold through channel III(38.33), followed by channel II and channel IV.

The analysis concluded that, on the basis of number of collector and quantity handled Channel-III was the most dominating channel in the study area, indicating the necessity of services of intermediaries in marketing of MFPs.

Marketing cost and producers share in consumer rupees

It can be seen from table 8.that, total marketing cost required by charoli was 1797 rupees per quintal while for gum 1651 rupees per quintal whereas marketing cost for mohaflower was 1190 rupees per quintal. It is observed that charoli required highest marketing cost because of high perishability of charoli pod. In case of charodi wholesaler incurred highest marketing cost i.e 37.42 per cent followed by retailer and SHG i.e 27.55 per cent and 22.34 per cent respectively, of total marketing cost .Similarly in case of gum and mohaflower, wholesaler incurred highest marketing cost i.e 39.46 per cent and 38.42 per cent respectively to the total marketing cost followed by retailer and SHG group.

Table 8
Marketing cost and producers share in consumer rupees per quintal

Sr.no	Item	Charoli	Gum	Mohaflower
	Cost incurred by Collector			
1	Loading and unloading	110	55	15
2	Cost of packing	12	25	25
3	Transportation	65	62	12
4	Weighing charges	17	12	25
5	Hamali	15	16	12
6	Miscellaneous	09	10	08
	Total	228(12.69)	180(10.91)	97(8.15)
	Cost incurred by SHG/VO			
1	Storage	132	118	112
2	Cleaning	105	85	36
3	Transportation	131	120	116
4	Weighing charges	2.5	3.5	2.6
5	Hamali	16	15	20
6	Miscellaneous	15	10	15
	Total	401.5 (22.34)	351.5 (21.29)	301.6 (25.34)
	Cost incurred by Wholesaler			
1	storage	115	80	65
2	Gunny bags	10	10	10
3	Transportation	415	390	210
4	Weighing charges	2.5	3.5	3.5
5	Labour charges	130	110	106
6	miscellaneous	65	58	64
	Total	672.5 (37.42)	651.5 (39.46)	458.5 (38.53)
	Cost incurred by Retailer			
1	Transportation	315	290	165
2	Labour charges	125	120	104
3	miscellaneous	55	58	64
	Total	495 (27.55)	468 (28.35)	333 (27.98)
	Total marketing cost (A+B+C+D)	1797 (100.00)	1651 (100.00)	1190.1 (100.00)
	PRODUCERS SHARE IN CONSUMER RUPEE (%)	31.25	37.5	50.00

(Figure in parenthesis indicate the per cent to total)

CONCLUSION

The present marketing system of MFPs in study area were imperfect in nature. Few market intermediaries dominated the market and collector have less control in fixing the price of their produce. Due to improper transportation, storage, processing and absence of sufficient market information etc. producers often are exploited by the traders, which reduces the producer's share in consumer price. Collection of MFPs and processing of raw material from forest has high potential for value addition which gives employment throughout the year to the tribal farmers

REFERENCES

Basu, D. Kharga.,Anindita, S., K. PradhanAnd Roy, Rakesh2021. Focusing The Relationship Of Net Profit With The Determinant Attributes Of Rural Entrepreneurs. Indian Journal Of Extension Education, 57(2): 135-138

Bodade, V.M., P.R. Awaghad, Bodade, A.A. 2016. Marketing Of Minor Forest Product InAmravati District, International Journal Of Applied And Pure Science And Agriculture, Scientific Journal Impact Factor 3.762

Jayshri R. Kankate, R.G. DeshmukhAndRushikesh K. Patil. 2020. Marketing Systems Of Minor Forest Products And Identification Of Constraints Faced By TribalsFor Marketing Of Minor Forest Product. Int.J.Curr.Microbiol.App.Sci. 9(12): 960-965.

Kumar BG, Sendhil R, Venkatesh P, Raja R, Jayakumar V AndJeyakumar S (2009). Socio Economic Impact Assessment Of Livelihood Security In Agriculture, Animal Husbandry And Aquaculture On The Tsunami-Hit Lands Of Andaman. Agricultural Economics Research Review 22 (Conference Number) 483-494.

Mahesh, L. Sudharani, V., Suneetha Devi K.B. And M. Jagan Mohan Reddy 2018).Income Generation OfTribal Farmers Of AdilabadAnd Their Relationship With Profile Characteristics.Int.J.Curr.Microbiol.App.Sci7(11): 2035-2041

Manish, Mishra And Mukta, Shrivastava. 2015. Trade Of Minor Forest Products In The Rural Markets Of Central India, Biological Forum – An International Journal 7(2): 516-521

Maske M, Mungole A, Kamble R, Chaturvedi A AndChaturvedi A (2011). Impact Of Non-Timber Forest Produces (Ntfps) On Rural Tribes Economy In GondiaDistrict Of Maharashtra India. Archives OfApplied Science Research 3 (30) 109-114.

Mohammad Ajaz-Ul-Islam, SM SulaimanQuli, R RaiAndPA Sofi2013. Livelihood Contributions Of Forest Resources To The Tribal Communities Of Jharkhand .Indian Journal OfFundamental And Applied Life Sciences ISSN. Vol. 3 (2) April-June, Pp. 131-144

Saha, R. 2018. The Economic Contribution OfForest Resources: Evidence From Tribal Communities Of Jangalmahal Area. International Journal OfResearch And Analytical Reviews. 5 (1): 487-497

Sandee, Kumar And G. L. Meena. 2018. Procurement And Marketing Of Non-Timber Forest Products.Indian Forester, 144 (3) : 252-259

Shalini, Saboo2019. Value Addition To Minor Forest Produce: Gateway To   Economic Empowerment Of Jharkhand Tribals. Indian Journal Of Public Administration, 65(1) 189–200,

Verma, S. K. &Paul, S. K. 2016. Sustaining The Non-Timber Forest Products (Ntfps) Based Rural Livelihoods Of Tribals In Jharkhand: Issues And Challenges. Jharkhand Journal OfDevelopment And Management Studies, 14 (1): 6865-6883

Yadav M., Basera, K. 2013. Status Of Forest Products Production And Trade, Working Paper Series (2013/1).

....