Options for REDD+ action and their effects on forests and people

An introduction for stakeholders in Central Sulawesi

- Full draft for final consultation –

UNEP-WCMC 2012

Table of Contents

1. Introduction

REDD+ (Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and forest Degradation Plus conservation, sustainable management of forests and enhancement of forest carbon stocks) is an approach to climate change mitigation that over the past 10 years has received increasing attention from policy-makers, forest managers and other groups with an interest in climate and forestry issues. The aim of REDD+ is to combat climate change by changing the way in which the management of forests and other land use activities are carried out. Putting REDD+ into practice can involve a broad range of actions, such as protecting the forest from fire or illegal logging, rehabilitating degraded forest areas or introducing new logging practices that cause less damage to vegetation and soils.

It is important for those who make decisions about REDD+ to bear in mind that any such actions will influence many different aspects of the forest, and can have significant effects on the forest environment and the lives of people living in, around and from the forest. Such effects can be positive as well as negative. This document explains some of the considerations that are important when choosing between different options for REDD+ action, and aims to assist decision-makers and stakeholders, including district-level governments and local communities, to assess the consequences of these choices. The information provided in this guide can help to support full and effective participation from local communities and indigenous people in determining the type and location of REDD+ actions, as a basis for obtaining their Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC) to plans for REDD+ implementation.

2.1. The origins of REDD+

Country representatives from around the world have agreed at the Conference of the Parties to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) that a mechanism should be created that would allow developing countries to receive some form of support from developed countries when they undertake activities to mitigate climate change by reducing emissions from deforestation and forest degradation, conserving and enhancing forest carbon stocks and managing forests sustainably. While the details of the agreement are still under negotiation, many actors are already taking steps on a voluntary basis to assist preparations for REDD+ or the implementation of pilot REDD+ projects.

Box 1: Forests and climate change

Climate on earth is strongly determined by the composition of the atmosphere, i.e. the layer of air that surrounds the planet. There are a number of gases that have a high capacity to absorb the warmth that is created by sunlight when it reaches the earth's surface, and prevent it from being reflected back into outer space. The higher the concentration of such greenhouse gases within the atmosphere, the larger the amount of the sun's heat that is retained close to the earth. One of these greenhouse gases is carbon dioxide, a gas that is formed when carbon-rich substances such as fossil fuels, but also wood and other parts of vegetation, are burned or broken down in other ways. Carbon dioxide is naturally present in the atmosphere, however its concentration has been greatly increased as a result of human activities. This is considered to be a cause of climate warming.

Tropical forests contain a very high amount of living and dead plant material both above ground and in the soil, and therefore represent one of the world's largest stores of carbon on land. Maintenance of the carbon reservoirs stored in forest ecosystems therefore plays a vital role in helping to slow the increase of carbon dioxide content in the atmosphere and regulate the global climate.

2.2. Who is involved in preparations for REDD+ in Indonesia?

The spectrum of actors involved in preparations for REDD+ in Indonesia includes the national government as well as province and district governments, agencies of the United Nations, multilateral and bilateral development institutions, national and international NGOs, academic bodies and universities, indigenous people and local communities and the private sector. Together, these actors are developing and testing the methods that will be required to plan, implement, monitor and reward REDD+ actions. They are also working to create the necessary information basis on forests and their carbon stocks.

Fundamental decisions on how to implement REDD+ in Indonesia, the establishment of a supportive legal framework, and the development of the National REDD+ Strategy are the responsibility of the national government. These national level preparations provide the starting point for provincial and district governments when they develop their own strategies for putting REDD+ into practice.

The UN-REDD Programme is one of several international initiatives that support countries in preparing for REDD+. It is carried out in collaboration between the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP). Since 2010, the UN-REDD Progamme in Indonesia has been implementing a series of activities to develop REDD+ methodologies and build capacity on REDD+ issues in Central Sulawesi following its selection as a pilot province. Capacity building in Central Sulawesi has involved a number of workshops engaging local REDD+ actors. These have resulted in the formation of the Central Sulawesi REDD+ Working Group, representing a wide range of stakeholders. In supporting REDD+ in Central Sulawesi, the REDD+ Working Group works with the local government through the Forestry Office of Central Sulawesi Province. The UN-REDD Programme Indonesia's national-level Programme Management Unit (PMU) is involved throughout the process of planning, implementation, and evaluation of activities proposed by the Group.

2.3. REDD+ and local communities

REDD+ actions are particularly relevant for indigenous people and local communities living in and around the forest, as they can affect the quality of their environment and their livelihood opportunities in a positive or negative way, depending on how they are planned and implemented. At the same time, local communities can themselves be involved in REDD+, either by proposing and implementing activities of their own or as partners for external actors for whom their experience and knowledge of the forest can behighly valuable. Local communities can contribute to the planning and implementation of REDD+ actions, as well as to the required monitoring and reporting of REDD+ outcomes, and there is ample evidence that they can be very effective in forest conservation and monitoring. However, in order to achieve successful community involvement in REDD+, activities need to be planned in a way that is compatible with local needs and perceptions, and the roles, rights and responsibilities of all actors need to be clear. Ensuring the full and effective participation of indigenous people and local communities and clarifying land tenure and land use rights is therefore essential for the success of REDD+.

2.4. The multiple benefits of REDD+

When forests that would have been lost or degraded are retained or restored through REDD+, protection and enhancement of carbon stocks is not the only benefit. Other benefits linked to the improved condition of forests can include cleaner water and a lower risk of flood and drought, conservation of fertile soils, higher numbers of rare and threatened plant and animal species and a larger supply of non-timber forest products, as well as increased availability of forest-based job opportunities, livelihoods and income. REDD+ can also lead to wider social benefits through land tenure clarification, enhanced participation in decision-making and better governance. Together, these possible positive effects are often referred to as 'the multiple benefits of REDD+'.

Various factors can affect the extent to which these benefits are delivered, including the type, location and condition of the forest involved, the type of REDD+ actions that are undertaken, how they are implemented, and the extent to which the local population depends on forest resources.

REDD+ actions will result in the greatest amount of multiple benefits if they are designed to fit local conditions. For example, certain actions are most suitable for implementation in forest areas with high environmental value, whilst the benefits yielded by others may be greatest near settlements or on degraded lands. Later sections of this guide include an explanation of where different types of REDD+ actions can and/or should be implemented.

2.5. Safeguards that support the achievement of multiple benefits from REDD+

There are a number of rules that need to be respected in the selection of REDD+ actions, which can prevent harm and support the achievement of multiple benefits from REDD+. Existing rules from the national level include legal provisions such as the conditions of the Forest Law with regard to permissible activities in forests of different functions. At the international level, the Conference of the Parties to the UNFCCC has adopted the Cancun Safeguards, which indicate amongst other things that REDD+ activities should be carried out with respect for the knowledge and rights of indigenous peoples and members of local communities and with the full and effective participation of relevant stakeholders, and that they should be used to incentivize the protection and conservation of natural forests and their ecosystem services, and to enhance other social and environmental benefits.

The Government of Indonesia is taking the Cancun Safeguards as a starting point for the development of a national framework for the implementation of fiduciary, social and environmental REDD+ safeguards. Once the framework is in place, all actors who want to implement REDD+ activities will be required to take steps to ensure risk mitigation as part of the implementation process, through periodic monitoring, reporting and evaluation.

The information contained in this guide can help to assess whether planned or proposed REDD+ actions can be expected to support the protection and conservation of natural forests and their ecosystem services and to enhance other social and environmental benefits, thus indicating whether they are in line with the Cancun Safeguards.

3. Description of possible REDD+ actions and their effects on the different kinds of benefits that can be obtained from the forest

3.1. Overview

There is a range of different actions that can be undertaken to protect, restore and enhance the amount of carbon stored in forests. Following the typology used by the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, REDD+ actions can be grouped into five types of 'activities':

- Reducing emissions from deforestation
- Reducing emissions from forest degradation
- Conservation of forest carbon stocks
- Sustainable management of forests
- Enhancement of forest carbon stocks.

In practice, one and the same action can sometimes contribute to several UNFCCC 'activities'. For example, the introduction of new logging techniques that cause less damage to the forest can be part of the sustainable management of forests, as well as of reducing emissions from forest degradation.

The following sections of this chapter describe options for REDD+ action that can be applied in order to:

- Limit the area of forest that is used for logging or converted to other land uses (as part of reducing emissions from deforestation, reducing emissions from forest degradation and conservation of carbon stocks)
- Reduce damage to the forest from timber extraction and fire (as part of reducing emissions from forest degradation, managing forests sustainably and enhancing forest carbon stocks)
- Rehabilitate degraded forest areas (as part of enhancing forest carbon stocks)
- Increase the density of trees on non-forest land (as part of enhancing forest carbon stocks)

At the end of this chapter, a graphic overview summarizes the impacts of important types of REDD+ actions on multiple benefits and indicates the suitability of each action for implementation in different locations (see charts 1 and 2). Options for action that are included in this overview are marked **in bold** in the text.

When selecting and planning REDD+ actions, it is also important to take into account the three following general principles:

1) It must be possible to measure the impact of the actions on carbon stocks. This is easier for large and visible changes (e.g. the re-establishment of forest on a large area of degraded land) than for small ones (e.g. a small increase in the density of trees in a forest that is used for timber extraction). Ease of measuring success can therefore be an important consideration when choosing REDD+ actions. One way to promote large and visible impacts of REDD+ can be to focus conservation measures on forest areas that are currently suffering high rates of conversion or damage, and to focus restoration measures on severely degraded areas.

2) The results of REDD+ actions must be "permanent" over the duration of the REDD+ project or programme (which is usually several decades). Decision-makers who are tasked with choosing

REDD+ actions therefore need to consider the risk that the forest areas that have been maintained, restored or created under REDD+ will later be damaged as a result of human actions or natural events like fire or drought. Actions whose results have a high risk of being reversed should not be selected.

3) It must be ensured that the implementation of REDD+ actions in one area does not just lead to the shifting of the activities causing forest conversion or damage to another area. In REDD+ terminology, this is often referred to as 'avoiding leakage'. For example, REDD+ will not provide success if the amount of timber cutting in one forest concession is reduced, but at the same time the amount of timber cutting is increased in another concession. To some degree the use of appropriate and effective land-use planning strategies can help to address these issues.

When REDD+ actions are implemented, appropriate monitoring therefore needs to be carried out to show that the measures are successful, that the results are permanent and that shifting of land use does not cancel out the achieved carbon benefits. Changes in biodiversity and ecosystem services should also be monitored, as the knowledge gained can later help to improve the choice of REDD+ actions that achieve multiple benefits. The information can also be used to demonstrate compliance with social and environmental safeguards.

3.2 Options for limiting the forest area that is subject to land use change and timber extraction in order to reduce deforestation and forest degradation

One approach to reducing the rate of deforestation and forest degradation is to **maintain intact natural forest or forest with a low degree of disturbance** by limiting the area of forest that is used for timber extraction or converted to other land uses. This can be done both by limiting legal forest use and conversion, e.g. issuing fewer permits, stopping the issuance of permits in certain areas or providing incentives for permit holders to refrain from using or converting the forest, and by controlling illegal forest use and conversion.

Intact natural forest has the highest carbon content of all land use types and also provides the best protection for biodiversity, soil and water resources. The multiple benefits of maintaining forest are highest in areas that are important for biodiversity (e.g. areas where rare and endemic plant and animal species occur, such as the anoa, maleo or babirusa), and in areas where soil and water resources can easily be damaged by logging and forest conversion (e.g. on steep slopes and along river banks). The establishment of conservation areas and protection forest in areas that are important for biodiversity can help to preserve natural forest. Smaller-scale reserves interspersed with production forest can also form part of a sustainable approach to forest management (see section 3.3).

Maintaining natural forest can be a very cost-efficient approach for REDD+ because it often requires little investment other than identifying suitable areas, raising awareness and enforcing regulations. However, limiting the use of the forest area can restrict the income and livelihood opportunities of local communities and cause conflicts with other stakeholders (e.g. logging concessionaires). It can also lead to the displacement of forest use to other places. In order to balance this, plans for REDD+ that are based on maintaining forest should as a complement include the promotion of other income and livelihood opportunities. These additional actions will themselves have environmental or socio-economic impacts that need to be considered.

Box 2: Comparing the biodiversity benefits of natural forests and cacao agroforestry in Central Sulawesi

A large number of scientific investigations have compared the biodiversity of natural forest and cacao agroforestry systems in Central Sulawesi. The groups of animals and plants that have been studied include birds, amphibians, reptiles, butterflies, bees, wasps, beetles, ants, trees, forest herbs and mosses. The results vary between the different groups of species, but there are some general trends. As the studies reveal, total species numbers are high in both natural forest and cacao agroforestry. However, a large share of the typical forest species, including many endemic and threatened species, occur only in the forest and are unable to use the agroforestry areas as a habitat. As a result, transformation from near-primary forest to agroforestry has little effect on overall species richness, but reduces the species richness of forest-using species by 60%. One can conclude that undisturbed rainforest areas are most important for the conservation of forest specialists and endemics but that cacao plantations, if managed to maintain a high and diverse cover of forest trees, can still provide a valuable habitat to native biodiversity. They are also likely to maintain important ecological functions, such as pollination and natural pest control. (Sources: Abrahamczyk et al. 2008, Bos et al. 2007, Cicuzza et al. 2011, Maas et al. 2009, Schulze et al. 2004, Steffan-Dewenter et al. 2007, Wanger et al. 2009; most of these studies have been carried out as part of the STORMA project)

Encouraging the **use of non-timber forest products** such as rattan, honey or agathis resin, or facilitating the generation of income from such products, can often help to improve local livelihoods if it is possible to use or create access to a suitable market. If a range of non-timber forest products are sustainably extracted and marketed, forests can often provide greater economic benefit than if they are used exclusively for timber. The subsistence value of forest products can also be high for local communities. It is important to avoid the risk of overharvesting target species in order to prevent decline of the potential income, and to minimize negative impacts from harvesting on biodiversity, soil or water resources. As long as the rates of harvesting and the harvesting methods are sustainable, use of non-timber forest products normally has little impact on biodiversity and ecosystem services. One important way to ensure sustainable harvesting levels is to carry out monitoring of the resource, which is best undertaken by the users themselves.

Other examples of ways to balance the livelihood impacts of limiting forest use include the promotion of alternative sources of income from tourism or the production of handicrafts.

Box 3: Overharvesting – a serious threat to the supply of non-timber forest products

A review of seventy case-studies that quantify the ecological effects of harvesting non-timber forest products from plant species (Ticktin 2004) warns that many non-timber forest products are currently harvested at high levels that are unlikely to be sustainable in the long term.

An example of the negative economic effects that can result from overharvesting has been provided by the use of wild rattan in Central Sulawesi. An analysis carried out between 1996 and 2000 showed that both the number and the length of harvestable canes was significantly lower in 2000 than in 1996. In fact, in 2000 there was less than half the amount of harvestable cane as recorded on the same plants in 1996, despite the fact that cane cutting stimulates new growth. The reduction in mean cane length reduced returns to labour and required collectors to travel further into the forest. (FAO 2002)

Reduced availability of non-timber forest products often has particularly negative impacts on poor communities. An analysis of the use of forest products in and around Lore Lindu National Park showed that such products are an important resource for the poorest third of the households, and contribute to 21% of their total household income. (Schwarze 2007) Achieving sustainability in the use of non-timber forest resources can therefore contribute to poverty reduction.

In situations where agricultural expansion is the main driver of forest conversion, changing cultivation methods can be a way to balance the limitation of potential income when restrictions on conversion are imposed or enforced more strictly. There are two main options for doing this. One is to increase crop yields per hectare, the other is to switch to producing crops that provide higher profits.

The impacts of changing methods in agriculture depend very much on the baseline situation and the new methods that are introduced. To illustrate this, **intensification with high-input conventional methods** and **switching to organic agriculture** will be described as two scenarios. In practice, many intermediate forms exist between these two extremes. A third potential option for increasing agricultural income per hectare, agroforestry, is described later (see section 3.5).

Conventional methods for increasing agricultural productivity through intensification usually involve the cultivation of monocultures of high-yield varieties with high inputs of energy, fertilizer and agrochemicals such as pesticides and herbicides. While such cultivation systems can be successful at raising yields and producing more income, they require high initial investment and are rather susceptible to crop failure after extreme climate events or pest outbreaks. They also generally have negative impacts on biodiversity and soil and water quality, as well as on the climate. Greenhouse gas emissions are caused by the depletion of soil carbon stocks and the large energy demand for heavy machinery and the production of agrochemicals. More sustainable intensification can be achieved when the suitability of the site and the requirements of the crop are carefully considered, excess inputs are avoided and advanced methods for the control of pests and weeds are applied.

In organic agriculture, efforts to increase yield usually focus on enhancing soil fertility through organic inputs and avoiding of intensive tillage, as well as on using site-adapted varieties of crops and minimizing use of agrochemicals. Organic agriculture therefore tends to have positive effects on soil carbon stocks and soil and water quality. Due to the lower application of chemicals, there is normally also a small benefit for biodiversity, including the biodiversity of adjacent streams and water bodies. Although organic farming requires specific skills and know-how, it is often more affordable for smallholder farmers and more robust against extreme events than high-input cultivation systems. Where access to premium markets is available, organic farming can provide higher profits than conventional agriculture.

Any kind of increase in agricultural productivity can potentially lead to increased conversion pressure. It is therefore extremely important to treat agriculture and forest use as a linked system and plan measures accordingly.

Box 4: Can low-input agriculture systems benefit poor farmers as well as the global climate?

There are a number of ways in which low-input agricultural systems can prove advantageous to poor farmers. In a review of case studies of organic farming and resource-conserving agriculture from around the world, Bennett and Franzel (2009) found that on average conventional farmers see their total variable costs decline when they change to low-input systems, because lower costs for material inputs more than offset the higher labour costs. It has also been pointed out that higher labour requirements can have positive effects on rural employment. Further, low-input systems often include avoiding of monocultures and diversification of crops. This can reduce vulnerability to price fluctuations and crop failure and increase income. And finally, increases in the quality of the environment, such as better water quality and healthier food, can lead to additional improvements in the well-being of communities (See also IFOAM 2009, Murniati et al. 2001, Tscharntke et al. 2012, Giovanucci 2007, Gardjito 2011).

However, the comparative advantages of organic or other sustainable forms of agriculture over conventional farming depend on the cropping system and local circumstances. For example, researchers investigating the potential of the System of Rice Intensification, a low-input method aimed at increasing rice harvests through higher labout input and use of organic fertilizer, found that in Indonesia the system was capable of raising the productivity of land, water, seeds, capital, and labor (Gardjito 2011). A study on traditional and intensified coconut farming systems in North Sulawesi (Waney and Tujuwale 2002) found that traditional technologies were far more successful than intensified systems with higher fertilizer and chemical inputs. By contrast, a study comparing more traditional shade-grown cocoa production with intensified full-sun agroforestry in Central Sulawesi (Juhrbandt 2010) found that in this case the intensification pathway was financially favourable, and that the main risks were related to long-term agronomical and ecological sustainability.In this case, the near-term financial interests of farmers may therefore be at odds with efforts to make agriculture more climate-friendly.

3.3 Options for managing forest more sustainably in order to reduce forest degradation and enhance forest carbon stocks

Sustainable management of production forests that are used for timber extraction aims to ensure that management is carried out in such a way that the productivity of the forest and its environmental and socio-economic value will be maintained over the long term. Because it minimises degradation of the forest in areas that would otherwise be treated less carefully, sustainable forest management can be a useful strategy for REDD+. However, measuring the carbon gains or avoided losses of carbon through changes in forest management is normally more difficult than for REDD+ approaches based on forest conservation or forest restoration.

Minimum standards for ensuring the sustainability of forest use are required by the Indonesian legal framework on forestry, for example in regulations concerning the TPTI (selective cutting and planting) system. Stricter control and enforcement of these regulations can be a necessary first step to stop forest degradation. More demanding voluntary standards are available for use in forest certification, e.g. under the LEI or FSC certification standards. Forest certification requires the forest user to comply with a number of conditions on how the forest is managed, and in turn allows the use of a certification label that confirms that the wood and timber products have been produced in a responsible manner. This can make it possible to sell them at a higher price. Obtaining the necessary documentation for the certification process can be a challenge for small forest enterprises and managers of community forest, although some certification standards have introduced simplified procedures to make it easier for these groups to participate in the market.

A number of approaches can form part of sustainable forest management. These can include **reduced impact logging techniques** that aim to limit damage to vegetation and soil during timber extraction, observing harvesting limits (e.g. only cutting trees of a certain diameter or only cutting a fixed amount of timber per hectare), designating 'buffer areas' in sensitive locations so that no trees will be cut there (e.g. on steep slopes and in riparian zones to avoid soil erosion), supporting the regeneration of forest after cutting by assisting natural regeneration or through **enrichment planting**, and the establishment of small-scale conservation areas in areas that are important for biodiversity and rare or endemic species (see also section 3.2).

Reduced impact logging techniques involve planning and controlling tree felling to minimize the impact of timber harvesting on the surrounding forest. Conventional logging techniques damage or kill much of the remaining vegetation during harvesting and cause heavy disturbance to the soil, both of which can result in large losses of carbon. Reduced impact logging can reduce the amount of carbon released by these activities, and also reduces soil erosion and surface runoff, which means that soil quality will be maintained, the risk of flooding and pollution of streams is reduced and water storage in soils is enhanced. In comparison to conventional logging, reduced impact logging techniques generally have positive impacts on biodiversity. Implementation costs can be an important consideration for logging operators. Reduced impact logging takes more preparation time than conventional logging, but the cost of the logging activity itself need not be higher if it is well planned. In the long term, reduced impact logging is likely to contribute to higher income from the forest by reducing degradation and the time needed for the forest to recover. Because of lower reliance on heavy machinery, reduced impact logging can also provide better job opportunities.

Box 5: Costs and benefits of improved logging techniques

The benefits of Reduced Impact Logging as compared to conventional logging have been the subject of scientific research for a considerable time. A study in Sabah, Malaysia, concluded that Reduced Impact Logging converted a much smaller proportion of the area to bare soil than did Conventional Logging (8% vs. 17%). As a consequence, it was estimated that Reduced Impact Logging caused significantly lower amounts of sediment to be deposited in downstream settlement ponds. Also, it was found that it caused a much smaller decline in rattan abundance from unlogged forest levels than conventional techniques. (Healey et al. 2000)

Putz et al. (2008) found that in forests subjected to conventional logging, average carbon emissions after harvest were over 100 tons per hectare, and that a large part of these emissions could be avoided through improved harvesting practices, mainly due to reduced collateral damage.

Both Healey and Putz confirm that the carbon stocks on sustainably logged plots can still be significantly higher (by around 20 %) than those on conventional logging sites at the beginning of the next harvesting period, which potentially also means higher revenues from the next logging cycle.

With regard to the costs of improving logging techniques, research results indicate that although Reduced Impact Logging can result in direct costs to timber producers, there are also possible savings, for example by reducing bulldozer time used for skid trail construction. In the long term, avoiding the damage resulting from poor logging practices is likely to provide net benefits in terms of timber yields, non-timber forest products and environmental services. (Applegate 2001, Applegate et al. 2004)

Enrichment planting supplements the number of trees in an area by planting and thus speeds up the process of forest regrowth. This technique can be applied in areas such as moderately degraded or logged over forest. Enrichment planting has noticeable potential to speed up carbon sequestration and increase carbon storage within an area. If it is designed and implemented well (e.g. using native species and taking care not to cause unnecessary damage during the planting operation), enrichment planting can be beneficial for biodiversity, soil and water resources. Depending on the choice of species to be planted, it can also be designed to increase the availability of non-timber forest products (positively impacting livelihoods of local people), to benefit valued wildlife, and/or to increase numbers of desirable timber species within an area.

In addition to unsustainable timber harvesting, forest degradation can also be caused by human-induced fires, e.g. when fire spreads from agricultural areas into the forest. Raising awareness of the need for **fire control** and increased enforcement of rules for preventing fire in both protected and managed forest areas at risk can play a critical role in ensuring the conservation of carbon stocks. Burning of vegetation results in a significant release of carbon from both the plant matter itself and the soil. In areas like Central Sulawesi, where frequent fires are not a natural part of the vegetation cycle, control of fire can be expected to have positive impacts on carbon storage, biodiversity, soil quality and erosion control, water resources, the availability of non-timber forest products and the livelihoods of local people.

3.4 Options for rehabilitating degraded forest land in order to enhance forest carbon stocks

When the vegetation and soil of a forest have been strongly disturbed by human activities such as logging or burning, a situation can arise where the growth of new trees becomes very slow or even impossible, either because the fertile soil layers have been lost or because the new vegetation, e.g. *alang alang* grass, inhibits tree growth. Assisting the recovery of forest on such degraded areas (for example so-called critical land or *lahan kritis*) can be a useful approach for REDD+ that provides both environmental and socio-economic benefits. The rehabilitation of degraded forest land involves re-establishing the productivity and some of the plant and animal species that were originally present at the site.

There are a number of different methods for forest rehabilitation, and choosing the right method for a given location is important for success. More intensive methods may be required on severely degraded lands than on lands that are only slightly degraded. All successful rehabilitation efforts will re-establish tree cover. However, the benefits for biodiversity and ecosystem services, including the availability of non-timber forest products, depend upon the tree species and methods that are used. Rehabilitation methods include allowing for **natural regeneration** through activities such as protection of the site from disturbance and threat management, **assisting natural regeneration** through additional interventions to speed up the process of natural regeneration, and **enrichment planting** with native species to speed up the re-establishment of a tree layer.

Natural regeneration uses minimal interventions to allow a natural process of forest colonization and succession. The management of threats such as grazing, fire, extractive use or invasive species are the only practices considered appropriate to this technique. Natural regeneration is a very cost-effective approach to forest rehabilitation. However severely degraded sites are unlikely to be suitable locations, and the availability of seeds from nearby sites in order for vegetation to re-establish is essential for its success.

Assisted natural regeneration involves additional human intervention to speed up the process of natural regeneration, and aims to enhance the ability of species to regenerate, particularly where some of the conditions for natural regeneration are lacking. Practices can include planting perch trees to attract birds that disperse seeds, planting nurse trees to provide shade and protection for seedlings of species that are adapted to growing in the forest interior and to stablise soils, soil restoration through the use of green manure, the removal of external pressures such as weeds, clearing competing vegetation, or the addition or removal of drainage. As a result of additional management, this technique is more expensive than natural regeneration alone.

Where land is significantly degraded, enrichment planting with mixed native species can be used to create a forest that resembles natural forest in its structure and species composition. Practices can include the use of methods to clear competing vegetation, manage pests and encourage rapid tree growth. This technique is more expensive than natural or assisted natural regeneration. The multiple benefits that can be achieved using enrichment planting have been described in section 3.3.

In some cases, where rehabilitation with native species is not possible or extremely expensive because of severely damaged soils and harsh environmental conditions, establishing plantations of timber species or tree crops may be an alternative. The impacts of timber and tree crop plantations are described in the following chapter. On state forest land, appropriate permits need to be obtained in order to establish plantations unless the land is already so degraded that there is no natural forest vegetation left.

Box 6: Choosing appropriate methods for forest restoration

Southeast Asia holds large areas of degraded land that have been abandoned and could potentially regenerate to forest, but are prevented from natural recovery because of soil degradation, recurring disturbance, and isolation from intact forests. Often, grasses or ferns become dominant in the altered environment and prevent the re-establishment of trees.

Decisions on which restoration strategies to adopt should consider the cost and benefits associated with different objectives of restoration, and the extent to which the processes of natural regeneration have been interrupted.

Assisted natural regeneration is most suitable for restoring areas where some level of natural succession is in progress. As a first condition, sufficient tree regeneration must be present so that their growth can be accelerated. Seedlings of pioneer tree species are often found among and below the weedy vegetation even on a seemingly weed-dominated land. Supplemental planting can be carried out if the density of natural regeneration is not sufficient. To ensure further successional development, remnant forest should be in proximity so that there would be sufficient input of seeds. Most importantly, it must be possible to prevent further disturbances such as fire, grazing, and illegal logging (Shono et al. 2007).

Compared to conventional reforestation methods involving planting of tree seedlings, Assisted Natural Regeneration offers significant cost advantages because it reduces or eliminates the costs associated with propagating, raising, and planting seedlings. It aims to accelerate, rather than replace, natural successional processes by removing or reducing barriers to natural forest regeneration. (Shono et al. 2007)

Enrichment planting aims to increase regeneration and productivity by planting seedlings of desirable species. In the past, nitrogen fixing exotic pioneer species have often been favoured for this purpose. However, given the significant problems with invasive species, awareness of the advantages of using native species has increased. Matching sites and species is a pre-condition for success. (Kettle et al. 2010)

In contrast to enrichment planting, full replanting involves higher cost and is normally carried out with the aim to establish timber plantations for commercial use, rather than to restore the original forest cover and its ecological qualities. Setting up plantations can involve intensive techniques such as creation of a nurse canopy followed by under-planting with the target species, as well as intensive weeding and thinning to favour target species growth.

Carbon stocks in both vegetation and soils can be significantly enhanced through forest rehabilitation. Re-establishing natural or near-natural forest through (assisted) natural regeneration or enrichment planting generally leads to higher carbon stocks than the establishment of intensively managed plantations. In terms of benefits for biodiversity conservation, water regulation and soil conservation, (assisted) natural regeneration is usually the best option, followed by enrichment planting. In the case of assisted natural regeneration and enrichment planting, the selection of species for planting activities can be made so as to increase the availability of non-timber forest products.

3.5 Options to increase the density of trees on non-forest land

On non-forest land, REDD+ actions can be undertaken to increase the amount of trees by re-establishing native forest (see previous chapter).

It is also possible to enhance carbon stocks by establishing **plantations of timber species or tree crops**, or by introducing **agroforestry** methods on agricultural land. However, it is not yet clear whether for carbon accounting purposes plantations and agroforestry systems will be counted as 'forest' in Indonesia, and thus whether their carbon stocks will be included in the calculation of REDD+ carbon outcomes. In any case, it is likely that their carbon stocks will only be allowed to count towards REDD+ targets if they are established on land that has already been without forest cover for a long period of time, as the rules set up under the UNFCCC are intended to avoid incentives for the conversion of natural forest to plantations.

However, even if some or all types of plantations and agroforestry systems are excluded from carbon accounting, they can still have a role in REDD+ as part of a strategy to reduce pressure on natural forests by providing alternative sources of income and livelihoods, as well as food, timber and non-timber forest products. (See also section 3.2.) Also, a number of donors and some of the standards for forest carbon projects that issue carbon credits for the voluntary market include plantations and agroforestry in their portfolio of eligible activities.

Plantations are artificially established areas of tree stands, using either native or non-native species. They can be composed of a single species (monoculture) or mixed species. Plantations usually store less carbon than natural forest (although this may vary depending on the age and type of the plantation), so they will only result in carbon gains if they are established on non-forest land or in areas of heavily degraded forest. Another issue to keep in mind is that plantations are often more likely to be damaged due to extreme weather events or pest outbreaks than natural forest, thus their carbon stocks may be less permanent.

Although plantations provide lower benefits for biodiversity than natural forest, they can still enhance biodiversity if properly planned and implemented. Biodiversity outcomes will depend on the design of the plantation, with mixed cultures and native species that are managed to increase structural diversity providing the greatest benefits. Plantations can also have positive impacts on ecosystem services such as maintaining the quality of soil and water resources, and they can be designed to provide non-timber forest products. Again, benefits tend to be greater in plantations of mixed native species than in non-native monocultures. Plantations can also be certified by schemes which attest that they are responsibly managed, which can enhance the value of timber or tree crops produced in these areas. However, investment costs for plantations can be high, and this can pose a barrier to their establishment, particularly for poor communities.

Box 7: Enhancing the ecological benefits of plantations

Among all tree-dominated ecosystems, plantations often have the smallest environmental benefits. In a study on different land use types and their value for forest birds in Central Sulawesi, plantations recorded only 32% of the forest bird species. (Sodhi 2005). Intensively managed plantations often lack dense understorey vegetation, which not only decreases habitat functions for native biodiversity, but also makes them vulnerable to soil erosion and degradation. Various studies have confirmed the reductions in carbon stocks that occur when forests are converted to plantations. According to Lasco (2002), conversion to tree plantations can reduce carbon density to less than 50% of the original forest stock.

A number of approaches can be used to design plantations in a way that enhances their environmental functions without losing economic profitability. Such approaches include using indigenous species rather than exotic species, creating species mosaics by matching species to particular sites, embedding the plantations in a matrix of intact or restored vegetation, using species mixtures rather than monocultures, avoiding clearance of remnant natural forest or encouraging a diverse plant understorey. The degree of ecological restoration possible using these alternatives ranges from modest to significant, although none is likely to achieve complete restoration. (Lamb 1998, Miles et al. 2010, Kanowski et al. 2005)

Agroforestry combines crop production with tree planting on agricultural land. These systems store and sequester more carbon than conventional agriculture. Trees and shrubs planted on agricultural land can provide crops, timber or non-timber forest products such as cocoa, coffee, rubber or agathis resin (damar). In complex agroforestry systems with high canopy cover, species richness can be comparable to natural forest, although the species composition will be different and many endemic forest species may be absent. Soil fertility and erosion control is generally higher in agroforestry systems than in conventional agriculture, and this methodology also has the potential to supply some of the same resources that are usually harvested as non-timber forest products. The specific benefits gained from agroforestry will depend upon the species planted and the methods that are used. Agroforestry can often be more accessible to local communities than intensive monoculture production systems, because lower initial investment is needed.

4 Planning REDD+ actions to suit local conditions

Choosing the right location is crucial for the success of any REDD+ action, as the amount of benefits that can be obtained in terms of carbon, income generation, biodiversity and ecosystem services depends on the natural and socio-economic conditions of the area. Land use rights (such as customary rights to forest use and existing concessions), legal provisions related to forest management and compatibility of planned actions with REDD+ safeguards also need to be observed.

The potential for carbon benefits depends both on current carbon stocks (with high carbon forest areas preferable for actions to maintain forest, and areas with strongly depleted stocks preferable for rehabilitation) and on expected land use developments. Intact forest areas that are at high risk of conversion or degradation, and degraded areas with low chances of spontaneous recovery should be a priority for REDD+ actions as long as there is a realistic chance of success.

The amount of benefits that can be achieved for local livelihoods depends on population density, current levels of income, current occupation patterns and the degree to which local people depend on the forest for their income. For example, the same type of REDD+ action will have different livelihood impacts for communities which gain part of their income from tourism, communities that depend heavily on agriculture or communities engaged in fishery or aquaculture.

Benefits for biodiversity can be maximized by prioritizing forest conservation efforts and concentrating them on high biodiversity areas or small forest patches that are important for linking larger forest areas and allowing species to move between them. Forest rehabilitation can be used to create buffer zones around high biodiversity areas and to relieve land use pressure on intact forest areas.

The potential for REDD+ to enhance ecosystem services depends both on the characteristics of landscape and vegetation, and on the location of the area in relation to the potential beneficiaries of the service. For example, REDD+ actions can provide the largest benefits in the form of watershed protection if they improve forest condition in sensitive locations (such as on steep slopes and in areas with vulnerable soil types) and if a large number of settlements or sensitive infrastructure are located downstream of the site. Increasing the availability of non-timber forest products is most beneficial in areas that are close to settlements where such products are traditionally used.

Maps of carbon stocks and of factors related to pressures on the forest (such as areas of recent deforestation or areas of high population growth) or to multiple benefits (such as high biodiversity areas or areas with a high risk of erosion) can be helpful in order to identify promising approaches to REDD+ for a given area. The planning of specific actions should take place in consultation with all relevant stakeholders and be further informed by local knowledge and expertise. Chart 2 gives an overview of some of the basic principles that should be observed when matching REDD+ actions to a site.

Chart 1: Overview of options for REDD+ action and their impacts on multiple benefits

This chart shows examples of possible REDD+ actions, and acts as a guide to the expected impacts of these actions on factors such as carbon, ecosystem services and livelihoods. It is based on a review of international scientific literature, with a particular focus on studies that were carried out in Sulawesi (see list of references). Where the scientific evidence appeared uncertain (e.g. in cases where there were some studies who came to different conclusions, where the studies showed that impacts are highly context-specific, where only few papers could be found that address a certain type of impact, or where most of the evidence found came from countries other than Indonesia), this was marked in the chart by a light shading as described in the legend.

It is important to note that the chart does not provide an exhaustive list of possible actions, but rather includes some of the most important options as identified from a study of project documents and REDD+ strategies in Indonesia. Impacts depend both on the type of action and on the baseline situation (i.e. what kind of land use would take place without the REDD+ action), which is why for some rows of the table a particular baseline situation is specified. As the outcomes of any type of action can vary depending on local circumstances and on how well the action is designed and implemented, this chart can only serve to provide initial orientation. More specific studies on how and where actions are best carried out should take place in later planning stages. It is also important that any REDD+ actions should be accompanied by appropriate monitoring, in order to assess whether targets related to multiple benefits are being met.

KEY:	Impacts		Costs	Ease of measuring carbon benefits
	Positive	**Negative**		
High			$$$	
Medium			$$	
Low			$	
Neutral				

Shading indicates degree of certainty of impacts:

High certainty **Low certainty**

APPROACH	Impacts on:						Cost	Ease of measuring carbon benefits
	Carbon	**Biodiversity**	**Soil**	**Water**	**NTFPs**	**Livelihoods**		
Reducing Deforestation:								
Maintaining natural forest and preventing conversion							$	
Promoting the use of **non-timber forest products (NTFPs)** **at sustainable harvesting levels** to provide alternative livelihoods							$	
Intensification of agriculture (annual or tree crops) with conventional methods using high energy and chemicals input, to decrease conversion pressure							$$	

APPROACH	Impacts on:						Cost	Ease of measuring carbon benefits
	Carbon	Biodiversity	Soil	Water	NTFPs	Livelihoods		
Change from conventional agriculture to **organic farming** to decrease conversion pressure by increasing profitability	●	●	⬤	⬤	□	◯	$	●
Reducing Forest Degradation / Sustainable Management of Forest:								
Change from conventional logging to **Reduced Impact Logging (RIL)** in production forest	●	●	⬤	⬤	○	○	$	●
Enrichment planting in moderately degraded / logged over forest	⬤	●	○	○	◯	◯	$$	⬤
Fire control to prevent fire through raised awareness and increased enforcement in forest areas at risk	●	●	●	●	●	○	$	⬤
Enhancing Forest Carbon Stocks:								
Rehabilitation of significantly degraded land through **(assisted) natural regeneration**	⬤	⬤	⬤	⬤	⬤	◯	$	⬤
Rehabilitation of significantly degraded land through **enrichment planting**	⬤	⬤	⬤	⬤	⬤	◯	$$	⬤
Timber or crop tree plantations (on non-forest land):								
Monoculture plantation (timber or tree crops) of non-native species **on non-forest land**	◯	○	○	○	□	◯	$$$	⬤
Plantation of **mixed native species** (timber or tree crops) **on non-forest land**	◯	●	●	●	○	◯	$$$	⬤
Agroforestry:								
Conversion of open agricultural land to **agroforestry**	◯	⬤	●	●	⬤	○	$$	⬤

Chart 2: Conclusions as to where and how activities should be implemented

This chart illustrates where different types of REDD+ actions can and/or should be implemented, taking into account both legal regulations and environmental factors such as the terrain and current condition of the vegetation.

KEY:	High	Medium	Low
Suitability	High	Medium	Low

APPROACH	Legal status					Terrain and other environmental factors			
	State forest land (Kawasan Hutan)								
	Production Forest	Limited Production Forest	Protection Forest	Conservation Areas	Non-state forest land (APL)	Degraded land	Steep slopes	Riparian zones	High conservation value areas
Reducing Deforestation:									
Maintaining natural forest and preventing conversion	High	High	High	High	High	Low	High	High	High
Promoting the use of **non-timber forest products (NTFPs) at sustainable harvesting levels** to provide alternative livelihoods	High	High	Medium	Medium	High	Low	Medium	Medium	Medium
Intensification of agriculture (annual or tree crops) with conventional methods using high energy and chemicals input, to decrease conversion pressure	Low	Low	Low	Low	Medium	Medium	Low	Low	Low
Change from conventional agriculture to **organic farming** to decrease conversion pressure by increasing profitability	Low	Low	Low	Low	Medium	Medium	Medium	Medium	Medium
Reducing Forest Degradation / Sustainable Management of Forest:									
Change from conventional logging to **Reduced Impact Logging (RIL)** in production forest	High	High	Low	Low	High	Low	x Low	x Low	x Low

x: These areas would normally be excluded from logging activities under RIL guidelines; *: In production forest areas without present forest cover, it is legally possible to establish plantations

APPROACH	Legal status					Terrain and other environmental factors			
	State forest land (Kawasan Hutan)								
	Production Forest	Limited Production Forest	Protection Forest	Conservation Areas	Non-state forest land (APL)	Degraded land	Steep slopes	Riparian zones	High conservation value areas
Enrichment planting in moderately degraded / logged over forest	●	●	○	○	●	●	◐	◐	◐
Fire control to prevent fire through raised awareness and increased enforcement in forest areas at risk	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●
Enhancing Forest Carbon Stocks:									
Rehabilitation of significantly degraded land through **(assisted) natural regeneration**	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●
Rehabilitation of significantly degraded land through **enrichment planting**	●	●	◐	◐	●	●	●	●	◐
Timber or crop tree plantations (on non-forest land):									
Monoculture plantation (timber or tree crops) of non-native species **on non-forest land**	* ◐	○	○	○	◐	◐	○	○	○
Plantation of **mixed native species** (timber or tree crops) **on non-forest land**	* ◐	○	○	○	◐	●	○	○	○
Agroforestry:									
Conversion of open agricultural land to **agroforestry**	○	○	○	○	●	●	○	○	◐

5. Concluding recommendations

Any plans for the implementation of REDD+ should strive to consider all possible effects on people and the environment. It is important to remember that the effects of REDD+ actions will not only depend on the activity itself, but also on how well it is designed and implemented in accordance with local circumstances (e.g. forest rehabilitation methods should be adjusted depending on the status of the degraded site, whilst reduced impact logging methods need to take account of the characteristics of the forest and soil). The information provided in this document is intended to give actors involved in REDD+ a first orientation for the selection of appropriate actions and suitable locations for their implementation, as well as for the assessment of proposals for action made by others.

The selection of REDD+ activities should be made through a consultative process involving all stakeholders (e.g. indigenous people and local communities, forest experts, relevant authorities), and a consideration of legal regulations and factors such as the terrain and current condition of the vegetation in the proposed location. The information contained in this guide can be used to inform local stakeholders about the likely effects of different choices on their living environment and socio-economic wellbeing, as a basis for obtaining their Free, Prior and Informed Consent to proposed measures. Expert advice should be sought in order to refine the approach to apply the selected actions, and to specify the steps needed for their implementation.

Finally, it is crucial to monitor the outcomes of REDD+ measures, in order to check whether the intervention is having the intended effects on carbon stores, biodiversity, ecosystem services and livelihoods. This can serve both as an early warning system to highlight any potential problems, and to give an early indication of success. Monitoring the impacts of REDD+ actions on multiple benefits will also help to further broaden the evidence base on the suitability and likely outcomes of different approaches.

References

The following references have been consulted in the production of this document.

Abdulkadir-Sunito, M., Syaukat, Y. 2004. Farmers First: the Socio-Economic Consideration of Organic Agriculture. Simposium Nasional ISSAAS: Pertanian Organik. Bogor

Abrahamczyk, S., Kessler, M., Dwi Putra, D., Waltert, M., Tscharntke, T. 2008. The value of differently managed cacao plantations for forest bird conservation in Sulawesi, Indonesia. Bird Conservation International 18:349–362.

Adeney, J. M., Ginsberg, J. R., Russell, G. J., Kinnaird, M. F. 2006. Effects of an ENSO-related fire on birds of a lowland tropical forest in Sumatra. Animal Conservation, 9, 292-301.

Agus, F., Runtunuwu, E., June, T., Susanti, E., Komara, H., Syahbuddin, H., Las, I., van Noordwijk, M. 2009. Carbon dioxide emission in land use transitions to plantation. Jurnal Litbang Pertanian, 28: 119-126.

Albrecht, A. , Kandji, S.T. 2003. Carbon sequestration in tropical agroforestry systems. Agriculture, Ecosystems and Environment 99: 15–27.

Ansell, F.A., Edwards, D.P., Hamer, K.C. 2011. Rehabilitation of Logged Rain Forests: Avifaunal Composition, Habitat Structure, and Implications for Biodiversity-Friendly REDD+. Biotropica, 43: 504-511.

Applegate, G. 2001. Financial costs of reduced impact timber harvesting in Indonesia: case study comparisons, in Enters, T., Durst, P.B., Applegate, G.B., Kho, P.C.S., Man, G. 2002. Applying Reduced Impact Logging to Advance Sustainable Forest Management. Asia-Pacific Forestry Commission International Conference Proceedings, 26 February-1 March 2001, Kuching, Malaysia, FAO Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific, Bangkok, Thailand.

Applegate, G., Putz, F.E., Snook, L.K. 2004. Who Pays for and Who Benefits from Improved Timber Harvesting Practices in the Tropics? Lessons Learned and Information Gaps. CIFOR, Jakarta, Indonesia.

Ariyanti, N.S., Bos, M.M., Kartawinata, K., Tjitrosoedirdjo, S.S., Guhardja, E., Gradstein, S.R. 2008. Bryophytes on tree trunks in natural forests, selectively logged forests and cacao agroforests in Central Sulawesi, Indonesia. Biological Conservation 141: 2516 –2527.

Balch, J. K., Nepstad, D. C., Curran, L. M., Brando, P. M., Portela, O., Guilherme, P., Reuning-Scherer, J. D. de Carvalho, O. 2011. Size, species, and fire behavior predict tree and liana mortality from experimental burns in the Brazilian Amazon. Forest Ecology and Management, 261, 68-77.

Banana, A.Y. 1996. Non-timber forest products marketing: field testing of the marketing information system methodology, in FAO International Conference on Domestication and Commercialization of Non-Timber Forest Products in Agroforestry Systems, ICRAF, Nairobi, Kenya, 19-23 February 1996.

Barlow, J., Peres, C. A., Lagan, B. O., Haugaasen, T. 2003. Large tree mortality and the decline of forest biomass following Amazonian wildfires. Ecology Letters, 6, 6-8.

Barlow, J., Peres, C. A., Henriques, L. M. P., Stouffer, P. C., Wunderle, J. M. 2006. The responses of understorey birds to forest fragmentation, logging and wildfires: An Amazonian synthesis. Biological Conservation, 128, 182-192.

Barlow, J., Gardner, T.A., Araujo, I.S., Bonaldo, A.B., Costa, J.E., Esposito, M.C., Ferreira, L.V., Hawes, J., Hernandez, M.I.M., Hoogmoed, M.S., et al. 2007. Quantifying the biodiversity value of tropical primary, secondary, and plantation forests. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences , 104:18555-18560.

Barlow, J., Peres, C. A. 2008. Fire-mediated dieback and compositional cascade in an Amazonian forest. Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B-Biological Sciences, 363, 1787-1794.

Barlow, J., Parry, L., Gardner, T.A., Ferreira, J., Aragão, L.E.O.C., Carmenta, R., Berenguer, E., Vieira, I.C.G., Souza, C., Cochrane, M.A. 2012. The critical importance of considering fire in REDD+ programs. Biological Conservation. In Press.

Bennett, M., Franzel, S. 2009. Can organic and resource-conserving agriculture improve livelihoods? A meta-analysis and conceptual framework for site-specific evaluation. ICRAF Occasional Paper No. 11. Nairobi: World Agroforestry Centre.

Bertault, J.G., Sist, P. 1997. An experimental comparison of different harvesting intensities with reduced-impact and conventional logging in East Kalimantan, Indonesia. Forest Ecology and Management 94:209-218.

Bishop, J.T. (ed.) 1999. Valuing Forests: A Review of Methods and Applications in Developing Countries .International Institute for Environment and Development: London.

Bos, M.M., Steffan-Dewenter, I., Tscharntke, T. 2007A. The contribution of cacao agroforests to the conservation of lower canopy ant and beetle diversity in Indonesia. Biodiversity and Conservation 16: 2429-2444.

Bos, M.M., Höhn, P., Saleh, S., Büche, B., Buchori, D., Steffan-Dewenter, I., Tscharntke, T. 2007B. Insect diversity responses to forest conversion and agroforestry management, in Tscharntke, T., Leuschner, C., Zeller, M., Guhardja, E., Bidin, A. (eds), The stability of tropical rainforest margins, linking ecological, economic and social constraints of land use and conservation, Springer, Berlin, pp 279-296.

Bos, M.M., Tylianakis, J.M., Steffan-Dewenter, I., Tscharntke, T. 2008. The invasive Yellow Crazy Ant and the decline of forest ant diversity in Indonesian cacao agroforests. Biological Invasions 10:1399-1409.

Brockerhoff, E.G., Jactel, H., Parrotta, J.A., Quine, C.P., Sayer, J., Hawksworth, D.L. 2008. Plantation forests and biodiversity: oxymoron or opportunity? Biological Conservation 17:925–951.

Carnus, J.M., Parrotta, J. Brockerhoff, E., Arbez, M., Jactel, H., Kremer, A., Lamb, D., O'Hara, K., Walters, B. 2006. Planted Forests and Biodiversity. Journal of Forestry, 104 : 65-77.

Certini, G. 2005. Effects of fire on properties of forest soils: A review. Oecologia, 143: 1-10.

Chazdon, R.L. 2008. Beyond Deforestation: Restoring Forests and Ecosystem Services on Degraded Land. Science 320: 1458-1460.

Chhatre, A., Agrawal, A. 2009. Trade-offs and synergies between carbon storage and livelihood benefits from forest commons. PNAS, 106: 17667-17670.

Cicuzza, D., Kessler, M., Clough, Y., Pitopang, R., Leitner, D., Tjitrosoedirdjo, S.S. 2011. Conservation Value of Cacao Agroforestry Systems for Terrestrial Herbaceous Species in Central Sulawesi, Indonesia. Biotropica, 43(6): 755–762.

Cleary, D.F.R., Genner, M.J. 2004. Changes in rain forest butterfly diversity following major ENSO-induced fires in Borneo. Global Ecology and Biogeography, 13: 129–140.

Clough, Y., Putra, D.D., Pitopang, R., Tscharntke, T. 2009. Local and landscape factors determine functional bird diversity in Indonesian cacao agroforestry. Biological Conservation 142: 1032–1041.

Clough, Y., Barkmann, J., Juhrbandt, J., Kessler, M., Wanger, T.C., Anshary, A., Buchori, D., Cicuzza, D., Darras, K., Putra, D.D., Erasmi, S., Pitopang, R., Schmidt, C., Schulze, C.H., Seidel, D., Steffan-Dewenter, I., Stenchly, K., Vidal, S., Weist, M., Wielgoss, A.C., Tscharntke, T. 2011. Combining high biodiversity with high yields in tropical agroforests. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences 108:8311-8316.

Cochrane, M. A., Schulze, M. D. 1999. Fire as a recurrent event in tropical forests of the eastern Amazon: Effects on forest structure, biomass, and species composition. Biotropica, 31, 2-16.

Corre, M.D., Dechert, G., Veldkamp, E. 2006. Soil Nitrogen Cycling following Montane Forest Conversion in Central Sulawesi, Indonesia, Soil Science Society of America Journal 70:359–366.

Crucefix, D. 1998. Organic Agriculture and Sustainable Rural Livelihoods in Developing Countries. Soil Association

Cunningham, A., Ingram, W., Dos Kadati, W., Howe, J., Sujatmoko, S., Refli, R., Liem, J.V., Tari, A., Maruk, T., Robianto, N., Sinlae, A., Ndun, Y., Made Maduarta, I., Sulistyohardi, D., Koeslutat, E. 2011. Hidden economies, future options: Trade in non-timber forest products in eastern Indonesia. ACIAR Technical Reports No. 77. Australian Centre for International Agricultural Research: Canberra.

Davis, A.J. Does Reduced-Impact Logging Help Preserve Biodiversity in Tropical Rainforests? A Case Study from Borneo using Dung Beetles (Coleoptera: Scarabaeoidea) as Indicators. Environmental Entomology, 29:467-475.

Dechert, G., Veldkamp, E., Anas, I. 2004. Is soil degradation unrelated to deforestation? Examining soil parameters of land use systems in upland Central Sulawesi, Indonesia. Plant and Soil 265: 197–209.

Edwards, D.P., Ansell, F.A., Ahmad, A.H., Milus, R., Hamer, K.C. 2009. The value of rehabilitating logged rainforest for birds. Conservation Biology 23:1628-1633.

Edwards, D.P., Woodcock, P., Edwards, F.A., Larsen, T.H., Hsu, W.W., Benedick, S., Wilcove, D.S. 2012. Reduced-impact logging and biodiversity conservation: a case study from Borneo. Ecological Applications, 22: 561-571.

Enters, T., Durst, P.B., Applegate, G.B., Kho, P.C.S., Man, G. 2002. Applying Reduced Impact Logging to Advance Sustainable Forest Management. Asia-Pacific Forestry Commission International Conference Proceedings, 26 February-1 March 2001, Kuching, Malaysia, FAO Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific, Bangkok, Thailand.

Ewers, R. M., Scharlemann, J. P. W., Balmford, A., Green, R. E. 2009. Do increases in agricultural yield spare land for nature? Global Change Biology (2009), doi: 10.1111/j.1365-2486.2009.01849.x

FAO. 1995. Marketing information systems for non-timber forest products. Community Forestry Field Manual n.6

FAO. 2002. Rattan: Current Research Issues and Prospects for Conservation and Sustainable Development. Non-Wood Forest Products Series, n. 14.

FAO. 2011. Assisted Natural Regeneration of Forests http://www.fao.org/forestry/anr/en/

Feintrenie, L., Chong, W.K., Levang, P. 2010a. Why do farmers prefer oil palm? Lessons learnt from Bungo district, Indonesia. Small-scale Forestry: 9, 379-396.

Feintrenie, L., Schwarze, S., and Levang, P. 2010b. Are local people conservationists? Analysis of transition dynamics from agroforests to monoculture plantations in Indonesia. Ecology and Society 15(4): 37. [online] URL: http://www.ecologyandsociety.org/vol15/iss4/art37/

Galudra, G., Fay, C. 2007. Is Hutan Tanaman Rakyat a new paradigm in community based tree planting in Indonesia? ICRAF Working Paper Number 45, ICRAF Southeast Asia.

Gardjito. 2011. Analysis on sustainability of organic farming in rice intensification. Bogor Agricultural University (IPB).

Gibson, L., Lee, T.M., Koh, L.P., Brook, B.W., Gardener, T.A., Barlow, J., Peres, C.A., Bradshaw, C.J.A., Laurance, W.F., Lovejoy, T.E., Sodhi, N.S. 2011. Primary forests are irreplaceable for sustaining tropical biodiversity. Nature, advance online publication.

Ginoga, K., Wulan, Y.C., Lugina, M. 2002. Potential of agroforestry and plantation systems in Indonesia for carbon stocks: an economic perspective. Working Paper CC14, ACIAR Project ASEM 2002/066.

Giovanucci, D. 2007. Organic Farming as a Tool for Productivity and Poverty Reduction in Asia. Input paper for the International Fund for Agricultural Development /NACF Conference Seoul, 13-16 March 2007.

Griscom, B., D. Ganz, N. Virgilio, F. Price, J. Hayward, R. Cortez, G. Dodge, J. Hurd, F. L. Lowenstein, B. Stanley. 2009. The Hidden Frontier of Forest Degradation: A Review of the Science, Policy and Practice of Reducing Degradation Emissions. The Nature Conservancy, Arlington, 76 pages.

Gustafsson, L., Nasi, R., Dennis, R., Nghia, N.H., Sheil, D., Meijaard, E., Dykstra, D., Priyadi, H. and Thu, P.Q. 2007. Logging for the ark: Improving the conservation value of production forests in South East Asia. CIFOR: Bogor, Indonesia.

Hartanto, H. Prabhu, R., Widayat, A.S.E., Asdak, C. 2003. Factors affecting runoff and soil erosion: plot-level soil loss monitoring for assessing sustainability of forest management. Forest Ecology and Management, 180:361–374.

Healey, J.R., Price, C., Tay, J. 2000. The cost of carbon retention by reduced impact logging. Forest Ecology and Management 139:237-255.

Hertel, D., Harteveld, M.A., Leuschner, C. 2009. Conversion of a tropical forest into agroforest alters the fine root-related carbon flux to the soil. Soil Biology and Biochemistry 41, 481–490.

Hoehn, P., Steffan-Dewenter, I. Tscharntke, T. 2010. Relative contribution of agroforestry, rainforest and openland to local and regional bee diversity. Biodiversity Conservation, 19:2189–2200.

Houghton, R. A., Skole, D. L., Nobre, C. A., Hackler, J. L., Lawrence, K. T. & Chomentowski, W. H. (2000) Annual fluxes or carbon from deforestation and regrowth in the Brazilian Amazon. Nature, 403, 301-304

IFOAM 2009. The contribution of organic agriculture to climate change mitigation. Brochure.

Imai, N., Samejima, H., Langner, A., Ong, R.C., Kita, S., Titin, J., Chung, A.Y.C., Lagan, P., Lee, Y.F., Kitayama, K. 2009. Co-Benefits of Sustainable Forest Management in Biodiversity Conservation and Carbon Sequestration. Plos One 4:e8267

ITTO / IUCN. 2009. Guidelines for the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity in tropical timber production forests. ITTO, Yokohama, Japan and IUCN, Gland, Switzerland.

ITTO 2002. ITTO Guidelines for the restoration, management and rehabilitation of degraded and secondary tropical forests. ITTO Policy Development Series No 13.

Jahroh, S. 2010. Organic farming development in Indonesia: lessons learned from organic farming in West Java and North Sumatra. Contribution to ISDA Conference on Innovation and Sustainable Development in Agriculture and Food 2010.

Jiang, J.S., Wang, R.S. 2003. Hydrological eco-service of rubber plantations in Hainan Island and its effect on local economic development. Journal of Environmental Sciences – China, 15: 701-709.

Juhrbandt, J. (2010): Economic valuation of land use change - A case study on rainforest conversion and agroforestry intensification in Central Sulawesi, Indonesia. Dissertation. Georg-August-Universität Göttingen

Kang, B.T., Akinnifesi, F.K. 2000. Agroforestry as alternative land-use production systems for the tropics . Natural Resources Forum, 24:137- 151.

Kanowski, J., Catterall, C.P., Wardell-Johnson, G.W. 2005. Consequences of broadscale timber plantations for biodiversity in cleared rainforest landscapes of tropical and subtropical Australia. Forest Ecology and Management, 208: 359-372.

Kagawa, A., Sack, L., Duarte, K., James, S. 2009. Hawaiian native forest conserves water relative to timber plantation: Species and stand traits influence water use. Ecological Applications, 19: 1429-1443.

Kessler, M., Keßler, P.J.A., Robbert Gradstein, S., Bach, K., Schmull, M., Pitopang, R. 2005. Tree diversity in primary forest and different land use systems in Central Sulawesi, Indonesia. Biodiversity and Conservation 14: 547–560.

Kettle,C.J. 2010. Ecological considerations for using dipterocarps for restoration of lowland rainforest in Southeast Asia. Biodiversity Conservation, 19:1137–1151.

Killmann, W., Bull, G.Q., Schwab, O., Pulkki, R.E. 2001. Reduced impact logging: does it cost or does it pay? In Enters, T., Durst, P.B., Applegate, G.B., Kho, P.C.S., Man, G. 2002. Applying Reduced Impact Logging to Advance Sustainable Forest Management. Asia-Pacific Forestry Commission International Conference Proceedings, 26 February-1 March 2001, Kuching, Malaysia, FAO Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific, Bangkok, Thailand.

Klein, A-M., Steffan-Dewenter, I., Buchori, D., Tscharntke, T. 2002 Effects of Land-Use Intensity in Tropical Agroforestry Systems on Coffee Flower-Visiting and Trap-Nesting Bees and Wasps, Conservation Biology 16: 1003-1014.

Kleinhans, A., Gerold, G. 2003 Impact of rainforest conversion on water yield, seasonal flow and floods in a tropical catchment in Central Sulawesi, Indonesia, EGS - AGU - EUG Joint Assembly, Abstracts from the meeting held in Nice, France, 6 - 11 April 2003.

Kobayashi, S. 2004. Landscape rehabilitation of degraded tropical forest ecosystems: Case study of the CIFOR/Japan project in Indonesia and Peru. Forest Ecology and Management, 201: 13-22.

Kusters, K., R. Achdiawan, B. Belcher, and M. Ruiz Pérez. 2006. Balancing development and conservation? An assessment of livelihood and environmental outcomes of nontimber forest product trade in Asia, Africa, and Latin America. Ecology and Society 11: 20

Lamb, D. 1998. Large-scale Ecological Restoration of Degraded Tropical Forest Lands: The Potential Role of Timber Plantations. Restoration Ecology, 6: 271–279.

Lamb, D., Erskine, P.D., Parrotta, J.A. 2005. Restoration of Degraded Tropical Forest Landscapes, Science, 310: 1628-1632.

Langner, A., Samejima, H., Ong, R.C., Titin, J., Kitayama, K. 2012. Integration of carbon conservation into sustainable forest management using high resolution satellite imagery: A case study in Sabah, Malaysian Borneo. International Journal of Applied Earth Observation and Geoinformation, 18:305–312.

Lasco, R.D. 2002. Forest carbon budgets in Southeast Asia following harvesting and land cover change. Science in China, Series C, 45 Supp: 55-64.

Lasco, R.D. MacDicken, K.G., Pulhin, F.B., Guillermo, I.Q., Sales, R.F., Cruz, R.V.O. 2006. Carbon stocks assessment of a selectively logged dipterocarp forest and wood processing mill in the Philippines. Journal of Tropical Forest Science, 18: 166–172.

Lehébel-Péron, A., Feintrenie, L., Levang, P. 2011. Rubber agroforests' profitability, the importance of secondary products. Forests, Trees and Livelihoods 20: 69-84.

Leimona, B., Joshi, L. 2010. Eco-certified natural rubber from sustainable rubber agroforestry in Sumatra, Indonesia - Final report. World Agroforestry Centre: Bogor, Indonesia.

Liao, C., Luo, Y., Fang, C., Li, B. 2010. Ecosystem carbon stock influenced by plantation practice: implications for planting forests as a measure for climate change mitigation. *Plos One* 5**:**e10867.

Maas, B., Putra, D.D., Waltert, M., Clough, Y., Tscharntke, T. , Schulze, C.H. 2009. Six years of habitat modification in a tropical rainforest margin of Indonesia do not affect bird diversity but endemic forest species. Biological Conservation 142: 2665–2671.

Medjibe, V.P., Putz, F.E., Starkey, M.P., Ndouna, A.A., Memiaghe, H.R. 2011. Impacts of selective logging on above-ground forest biomass in the Monts de Cristal in Gabon. Forest Ecology and Management 262:1799-1806.

Meine van Noordwijk,M., Suyanto,S., Budidarsono,S., Sakuntaladewi,N., Roshetko,J.M., Tata,H.L.,

Miles, L., Kapos, V., Dunning, E. 2010. Ecosystem services from new and restored forests: tool development. Multiple Benefits Series 5. 1-43. Cambridge, UK, Prepared on behalf of the UN-REDD Programme. UNEP World Conservation Monitoring Centre.

Miller, S.D.,Goulden, M.L., Hutyra, L.R., Keller, M., Saleska, S.R., Wofsy, S.C.,Figueira, A.M.S., da Rocha, H.R., de Camargo, P.B. 2011. Reduced Impact Logging Minimally Alters Tropical Rainforest Carbon and Energy Exchange, PNAS, 108:19431-19435.

Moegenburg, S.M., Levey, D.J. 2002. Prospects for conserving biodiversity in Amazonian extractive reserves. Ecology Letters, 5: 320-324.

Montagnini, F., Nair, P.K.R. 2004. Carbon sequestration: An underexploited environmental benefit of agroforestry systems. Agroforestry Systems 61: 281–295.

Moura-Costa, P., Wai, Y.S., Lye, O.C., Ganing, A., Nussbaum, R., Mojiun, T. 1994. Large scale enrichment planting with dipterocarps as an alternative for carbon offset – methods and preliminary results. Proceedings of the 5th Round Table Conference on Dipterocarps, Chiang Mai, Thailand, Journal of Tropical Forest Science: 1-11, FRIM, Kuala Lumpur.

Murdiyarso, D., Widodo, M. And Suyamto, D. 2002. Fire risks in forest carbon projects in Indonesia, Science in China (Series C), Suppl. 45: 66-74.

Murniati, D., Garrity, P., Gintings, A.N. 2001. The contribution of agroforestry systems to reducing farmers' dependence on the resources of adjacent national parks: a case study from Sumatra, Indonesia. Agroforestry Systems 52: 171-184.

Natadiwirya, M., Matikainen, M. 2001. The financial benefits of reduced impact logging: saving costs and the forest A case study from Labanan, East Kalimantan. In Enters, T., Durst, P.B., Applegate, G.B., Kho, P.C.S., Man, G. 2002. Applying Reduced Impact Logging to Advance Sustainable Forest Management. Asia-Pacific Forestry Commission International Conference Proceedings, 26 February-1 March 2001, Kuching, Malaysia, FAO Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific, Bangkok, Thailand.

Nelson, M., Silverstone, S., Chinners Reiss, K., Vakil, T., Robertson, M. 2011. Enriched secondary subtropical forest through line-planting for sustainable timber production in Puerto Rico, Bois et Forets des Tropiques, 309 : 51-61.

Olschewski, R., Klein, A.M., Tscharntke, T. 2010. Economic trade-offs between carbon sequestration, timber production, and crop pollination in tropical forested landscapes. Ecological Complexity, 7, 314–319.

Otsamo, A. 2001. Forest plantations on Imperata grasslands in Indonesia - Establishment, silviculture and utilization potential. Academic dissertation Faculty of Agriculture and Forestry of the University of Helsinki

Paquette, A., J. Hawryshyn, A. Vyta Senikas, and C. Potvin. 2009. Enrichment planting in secondary forests: a promising clean development mechanism to increase terrestrial carbon sinks. Ecology and Society, 14: 31.

Pattanayak, S., Sills, E. 1998. Do tropical forests provide natural insurance? Prepared for presentation at the 1st World Congress of Environmental and Resource Economists Venice, Italy; June, 1998.

Penot, E. 1997. Prospects for Conservation of Biodiversity within Productive Rubber Agroforests in Indonesia. In: Sist, P., Sabogal, C., Byron, Y. (eds) Selected Proceedings of an International Workshop: Management of Secondary and Logged-Over Forests in Indonesia, Center for International Forestry Research, Bogor, Indonesia.

Perfecto, I., Vandermeer, J. 2008. Biodiversity Conservation in Tropical Agroecosystems A New Conservation Paradigm. Ann. N.Y. Acad. Sci. 1134: 173–200 (2008)

Pinard, M.A., Putz, F.E. 1996. Retaining Forest Biomass by Reducing Logging Damage. Biotropica, 28: 278-295.

Pinard, M.A., Putz, F.E., Tay, J. 2000. Lessons learned from the implementation of reduced impact logging in hilly terrain in Sabah, Malaysia, International Forestry Review, 2:33-39.

Potter, L. and Lee, J. 1998. Tree Planting in Indonesia: Trends, Impacts and Directions. CIFOR Occasional Paper No. 18

Priyadi, H., Gunarso, P., Sist, P., Dwiprabowo, H. 2006. Reduced-impact logging (RIL) Research and Development in Malinau Research Forest, East Kalimantan: A challenge of RIL adoption. Presented at: Regional Workshop - RIL Implementation in Indonesia with reference to Asia-Pacific Region: Review and Experiences, Bogor, Indonesia, 15-16 February 2006.

Putz F.E., Zuidema, P.A., Pinard, M.A., Boot, R.G.A., Sayer, J.A., Sheil, D., Sist, P., Vanclay, J.K. 2008. Improved Tropical Forest Management for Carbon Retention. PLoS Biology 6:e166.

Putz, F.E., Zuidema, P.A., Synnott, T., Peña-Claros, M., Pinard, M.A., Sheil, D., Vanclay, J.K., Sist, P., Gourlet-Fleury, S., Griscom, B., Palmer, J., Zagt, R. 2012. Sustaining conservation values in slectively logged tropical forests: The attained and the attainable. Conservation Letters, 5: 296-303.

RECOFTC 2009. Decoding REDD: Forest Restoration in REDD+. RECOFTC - The Center for People and Forests, Bangkok, Thailand.

Rice, R.A., Greenberg, R. 2000. Cacao Cultivation and the Conservation of Biological Diversity. Ambio, 29: 3.

Rist, L. Shanley, P., Sunderland, T., Sheil, D., Ndoye, O., Liswanti, N., Tieguhong, J. 2012. The impacts of selective logging on non-timber forest products of livelihood importance. Forest Ecology and Management, 268: 57–69.

Roshetko, J.M., Delaney, M., Hairiah, K., Purnomosidhi, P. 2002. Carbon stocks in Indonesian homegarden systems: Can smallholder systems be targeted for increased carbon storage? American Journal of Alternative Agriculture 17:138-148.

Ros-Tonen, M.A.F. 2000. The role of non-timber forest products in sustainable tropical forest management. Holz als Roh- und Werkstoff, 58: 196-201.

Ros-Tonen, M.A.F., Wiersum, K.F. 2003. The importance of non-timber forest products for forest-based rural livelihoods: an evolving research agenda. Paper presented at The International Conference on Rural Livelihoods, Forests and Biodiversity 19-23 May 2003, Bonn, Germany.

Sayer, J., Chokkalingam, U., Poulsen, J. 2004. The restoration of forest biodiversity and ecological values. Forest Ecology and Management 201:3-11.

Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity 2009. Connecting Biodiversity and Climate Change Mitigation and Adaptation: Report of the Second Ad Hoc Technical Expert Group on Biodiversity and Climate Change. SCBD Technical Series No. 41. Montreal.

Schulze, C.H., Waltert, M., Kessler, P.J.A., Pitopang, R., Shahabuddin, Veddeler, D., Mülenberg, M., Robbert Gradstein, S., Leuschner, C., Steffan-Dewenter, I., Tscharntke, T. 2004A. Biodiversity indicator groups of tropical land-use systems: comparing plants, birds and insects. Ecological Applications 14: 1321–1333.

Schulze, C.H., Steffan-Dewenter, I., Tscharntke, T. 2004B. Effects of land use on butterly communities at the rainforest margin: A case study from Central Sulawesi, in Gerold, G., Fremerey, M., Guhardja, E. (Eds.) Land Use, Nature Conservation, and the Stability of Rainforest Margins in Southeast Asia, Spinger, Berlin.

Schulze, M. 2008. Technical and financial analysis of enrichment planting in logging gaps as a potential component of forest management in the eastern Amazon. Forest Ecology and Management, 255: 866-879.

Schwarze, S., Schippers, B., Weber, R., Faust, H., Wardhono, A., Zeller, M., Kreisel, W. 2007. Forest Products and Household Incomes: Evidence from Rural Households Living in the Rainforest Margins of Central Sulawesi, in Tscharntke T, Leuschner C, Zeller M, Guhardja E, Bidin A (eds), The stability of tropical rainforest margins, linking ecological, economic and social constraints of land use and conservation, Springer Verlag Berlin 2007, pp 209-224.

Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity. 2001. Sustainable management of non-timber forest resources. CBD Technical Series no. 6. Montreal.

Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity 2009. Connecting Biodiversity and Climate Change Mitigation and Adaptation: Report of the Second Ad Hoc Technical Expert Group on Biodiversity and Climate Change. SCBD Technical Series No. 41. Montreal.

Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity. 2011. REDD-plus and Biodiversity. CBD Technical Series no. 59. Montreal.

Setyawati, T. 2010. Biodiversity Conservation and Forest Management in Indonesia, in Sheil, D., Putz, F. and Zagt, R. (eds) Biodiversity conservation in certified forests. ETFRN News 51: 99-101.

Shaanker R,U., Ganeshaiah, K.N., Krishnan, S., Ramya, R., Meera, C., Aravind, N.A., Kumar, A., Rao, D., Vanaraj, G., Ramachandra, J., Gauthier, R., Ghazoul, J., Poole, N., Reddy, B.V.C. 2004. Livelihood gains and ecological costs of non-timber forest product dependence: assessing the roles of dependence, ecological knowledge and market structure in three contrasting human and ecological settings in south India. Environmental Conservation 31:242-253.

Shahabuddin., Schulze, C.H., Tscharntke, T. 2005. Changes of dung beetle communities from rainforests towards agroforestry systems and annual cultures in Sulawesi (Indonesia). Biodiversity and Conservation 14: 863–877.

Shono, K., Cadaweng, E.A., Durst, P.B. 2007. Application of assisted natural regeneration to restore degraded tropical forestlands. Restoration Ecology, 15: 620-626.

Siebert, S. 2001. Sustainable harvesting of wild rattan: viable concept or ecological oxymoron? Unasylva, 51-52.

Siebert, S. Belsky, J.M., Mogea, J. 2001. Managing rattan diversity for forest conservation. Final Report, U.S. Agency for International Development; Bureau for Global Programs, Field Support and Research; Center for Economic Growth.

Silver, W.L., Ostertag, R. Lugo, A.E. 2000. The potential for carbon sequestration through reforestation of abandoned tropical agricultural and pasture lands. Restoration Ecology, 8: 394-407.

Sist, P., Fimbel, R., Sheil, D., Nasi, R. Chevallier, M-H. 2003. Towards sustainable management of mixed dipterocarp forests of Southeast Asia: moving beyond minimum diameter cutting limits, Environmental Conservation, 30: 364–374.

Slik, J. W. F., Verburg, R. W., Kessler, P. J. A. 2002. Effects of fire and selective logging on the tree species composition of lowland dipterocarp forest in East Kalimantan, Indonesia. Biodiversity and Conservation, 11, 85-98.

Slik, J. W. F., Breman, F. C., Bernard, C., van Beek, M., Cannon, C. H., Eichhorn, K. A. O., Sidiyasa, K. 2010. Fire as a selective force in a Bornean tropical everwet forest. Oecologia, 164, 841-849.

Smiley, G.L., Kroschel, J. 2008. Temporal change in carbon stocks of cocoa–gliricidia agroforests in Central Sulawesi, Indonesia. Agroforestry Systems 73:219–231.

Sodhi, N.S., Koh, L.P., Prawiradilaga, D.M., Darjono, Tinulele, I., Putra, D.D., Tan, T.H.T. 2005 Land use and conservation value for forest birds in Central Sulawesi (Indonesia). Biological Conservation, 122: 547-558.

Steffan-Dewenter, I., Kessler, M., Barkmann, J., Bos, M.M., Buchori, D., Erasmi, S., Faust, H., Gerold, G., Glenk, K., Gradstein, S.R., Guhardja, E., Harteveld, M., Hertel, D., Hohn, P., Kappas, M., Kohler, S., Leuschner, C., Maertens, M., Marggraf, R., Migge-Kleian, S., Mogea, J., Pitopang, R., Schaefer, M., Schwarze, S., Sporn, S.G., Steingrebe, A., Tjitrosoedirdjo, S.S., Tjitrosoemito, S., Twele, A., Weber, R., Woltmann, L., Zeller, M., Tscharntke, T. 2007.Tradeoffs between income, biodiversity, and ecosystem functioning during tropical rainforest conversion and agroforestry intensification. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America 104:4973-4978.

Sulaeman, Y., Minasny, B., McBratney, A. B. 2010. Monitoring Spatio-Temporal Changes of Soil Carbon in Java Using Legacy Soil Data. Proc.of Int. Workshop on Evaluation and Sustainable Management of Soil Carbon Sequestration in Asian Countries. Bogor, Indonesia Sept. 28-29, 2010

Tacconi, L. 2003. Fires in Indonesia, Causes, costs and policy implications. CIFOR, Jakarta, Indonesia. University of Helsinki.

Tang, X.Y., Liu, S.G., Liu, J.X., Zhou, G.Y. 2010. Effects of vegetation restoration and slope positions on soil aggregation and soil carbon accumulation on heavily eroded tropical land of Southern China. Journal of Soils and Sediments, 10: 505-513.

Ticktin, T. 2004. The ecological implications of harvesting non-timber forest products. Journal of Applied Ecology, 41: 11-21.

Trauernicht, C., Ticktin, T. 2005. The effects of non-timber forest product cultivation on the plant community structure and composition of a humid tropical forest in southern Mexico. Forest Ecology and Management, 219 : 269-278.

Tscharntke, T., Clough, Y., Bhagwat, S. A., Buchori, D., Faust, H., Hertel, D., Hölscher, D., Juhrbandt, J., Kessler, M., Perfecto, I., Scherber, C., Schroth, G., Veldkamp, E., Wanger, T. 2010. Multifunctional shade-tree management in tropical agroforestry landscapes – a review. doi: 10.1111/j.1365-2664.2010.01939.x; Journal of Applied Ecology

Tscharntke, T., Leuschner, C., Zeller, M., Guhardja, E., Bidin, A. (eds) 2007. The stability of tropical rainforest margins, linking ecological, economic and social constraints of land use and conservation, Springer Verlag - Berlin, pp 209-224.

Tscharntke, T., et al. Global food security, biodiversity conservation and the future of agricultural intensification. Biol. Conserv. (2012), doi:10.1016/j.biocon.2012.01.068

UN ESCAP. 2002. Organic agriculture and rural poverty alleviation Potential and best practices in Asia. United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific

Van Noordwijk, M., Suyanto, S., Budidarsono, S., Sakuntaladewi, N., Roshetko, J.M., Tata, H.L., Galudra, G., Fay, C. (2007) Is Hutan Tanaman Rakyat a new paradigm in community based tree planting in Indonesia?, ICRAF Working Paper Number 45, ICRAF Southeast Asia.

Waltert, M., Mardiastuti, A., Mühlenberg, M. 2004. Effects of Land Use on Bird Species Richness in Sulawesi, Indonesia. Conservation Biology, 18:1339-1346.

Wanger, T. C., Rauf, A., Schwarze, S. 2010. Pesticides and tropical Biodiversity. Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment - 2010, 4, 178-179

Wanger, T.C., Saro, A., Iskandar, D.T., Brook, B.W., Sodhi, N.S., Clough, Y., Tscharntke, T. 2009. Conservation value of cacao agroforestry for amphibians and reptiles in South-East Asia: combining correlative models with follow-up field experiments. Journal of Applied Ecology, 46: 823–832.

Wayney, N. and Tujuwale, J. 2002. Traditional versus intensive coconut production in North Sulawesi. Sam Ratulangi University Faculty of Agriculture.

World Bank. 2006. Sustaining economic growth, rural livelihoods and environmental benefits: strategic options for forest assistance in Indonesia. Jakarta, Indonesia.

Zarin, D. J., Davidson, E. A., Brondizio, E., Vieira, I. C. G., Sa, T., Feldpausch, T., Schuur, E. A., Mesquita, R., Moran, E., Delamonica, P., Ducey, M. J., Hurtt, G. C., Salimon, C., Denich, M. 2005. Legacy of fire slows carbon accumulation in Amazonian forest regrowth. Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment, 3, 365-369.

Zhou, G.Y., Morris, J.D., Yan, J.H., Yu, Z.Y., Peng, S.L. 2002. Hydrological impacts of reafforestation with eucalypts and indigenous species: a case study in southern China. Forest Ecology and Management, 167: 209-222.

Zimmerman, B.L., Komos, C.F. 2012. Prospects for Sustainable Logging in Tropical Forests. Bioscience, 62: 479-487.