

Poverty and Conservation Learning Group
Monthly Journal Digest
Issue 10: August 2013

This Journal Digest is a Poverty and Conservation Learning Group (PCLG) information service intended to keep readers up to date with new journal articles on issues relating to biodiversity conservation and poverty alleviation as they are published. This is produced on a monthly basis, covering articles that have been published in the previous month. Please note that the summaries provided are *not* the official abstracts of the articles.

Our current journal watch list includes: African Journal of Ecology; Agricultural Sciences News; Agriculture, Ecosystems & Environment; AMBIO; Animal Conservation; Antipode; Biodiversity; Biodiversity and Conservation; Biological Conservation; Conservation and Society; Conservation Biology; Conservation Evidence; Conservation Letters; Development and Change; Diversity and Distributions; Ecological Economics; Ecology; Ecology and Society; Ecosystem Services; Environment and History; Environment and History; Environmental Conservation; Environmental Ethics; Ethics and the Environment; Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment; Global Environmental Change; Human Dimensions of Wildlife; International Journal of Biodiversity Science, Ecosystem Services & Management; International Journal of Environmental Studies; Journal for Nature Conservation; Local Environment; Management of Environmental Quality; Natural Resources Forum; Nature; Oryx; PNAS; Science; Society & Natural Resources; The Journal of Environment & Development; The Journal of Environment Development; Trends in Ecology and Evolution; Wildlife Research; World Development.

We would welcome your feedback on the usefulness of this service and your suggestions on key journals that we should add to our watch list to ensure we provide the most comprehensive service possible. Please contact us at pclg@iied.org

Ecosystem Services, Conservation and Poverty Alleviation

Peh, K SH., Balmford, A., Bradbury, R., Brown, C., Butchart, S., Hughes, F., Stattersfield, A., Thomas, D., Walpole, M., Bayliss, J., Gowing, D., Jones, J., Lewis, S., Mulligan, M., Pandeya, B., Stratford, C., Thompson, J., Turner, K., Vira, B., Willcock, S., Birch, J. (2013); **TESSA: A toolkit for rapid assessment of ecosystem services at sites of biodiversity conservation importance**; *Ecosystem Services*. Advance Online Publication; 9 July 2013.

It is important for decision-makers to be aware of how changes to important biodiversity conservation sites affect the ecosystem services they often provide for local people. This article aims to redress the relative dearth of empirical studies that present this information. One reason for the absence of data is that there is a lack of appropriate methods and tools for ecosystem service assessment that don't require substantial resources or specialist technical knowledge. This study presents a Toolkit for Ecosystem Service Site-based Assessment (TESSA), which provides non-specialist stakeholders with a selection of methods for identifying which ecosystem services may be important for a site, and for evaluating the benefits that people currently gain from them, compared with those expected under alternative land-uses. The toolkit encourages and enables users to collect new field data themselves at low cost and for little effort. This data could then be incorporated into regular monitoring programmes.

Elsevier; <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ecoser.2013.06.003>.

Dressler, WH., To, PX., Mahanty, S. (2013); **How Biodiversity Conservation Policy Accelerates Agrarian Differentiation: The Account of an Upland Village in Vietnam**; *Conservation and Society*; 11(2), 130-43.

This paper describes how the implementation of Vietnam's recent biodiversity conservation policy has increased the economic value of nature, whilst also creating sustained conflict and exacerbating agrarian differentiation in an upland village near the Ba Vi National Park. The efforts to make conservation marketable have both increased the financial value of forestland and drawn new capital investments. However, Ba Vi's local elites have been able to monopolise these new forms of wealth due to their connections to political parties, contributing to the already unequal distributions of wealth and power in the region. The rise in land value has also allowed these few to become landlords, and thus to have further power and incentive to dispossess other, less affluent, villagers. This increased social division has led to the over-exploitation of forests within the Park through illegitimate agricultural expansion, thus negatively affecting both livelihoods and biodiversity resources.

Meadknow Publications; <http://dx.doi.org/10.4103/0972-4923.115727>.

Rantala, SE., Vihemäki, H., Swallow, BM., Jambiya, G. (2013); **Who Gains and Who Loses from Compensated Displacement from Protected Areas? The Case of the Derema Corridor, Tanzania**; *Conservation and Society*; 11(2), 97-111.

The social impacts of the sometimes exclusionary nature of conservation, as well as the existing mechanisms and policies in place to mitigate negative impacts, are attracting increasing amounts of attention. Yet still, the factors that affect the restoration well-being among people whose access to resources has changed due to conservation are poorly understood. This article presents an analytical framework for studying the social impacts of conservation interventions, and factors affecting post-intervention livelihood rehabilitation. This framework is used to analyse the consequences of the displacement of farmers in north-eastern Tanzania, who were given monetary compensation to mitigate livelihood losses. Quantitative and qualitative data were collected over the two years following their displacement, and the findings indicate that conservation intervention contributed to local social differentiation. Women and the poorest farmers suffered from the severest negative impacts in comparison to the wealthier members of the community. The paper recommends that conservation planners diligently identify the rights-holders who are entitled to compensation, promptly implement *ex ante* risk management mechanisms, and give careful attention to the most appropriate forms of compensation and support measures.

Meadknow Publications; <http://dx.doi.org/10.4103/0972-4923.115721>

Cinner, J., Huchery, C. (2013); **A comparison of social outcomes associated with different fisheries co-management institutions**; *Conservation Letters*. Advance Online Publication, July 24, 2013.

Collaborative management is increasingly being employed in fisheries to promote sustainability, equity, and compliance. However, little is known about how these outcomes are related to specific institutional arrangements, in particular the types of rules being used. This paper analyses how people's perceptions of livelihood and compliance outcomes are related to the number of rules in place, the configurations of the rules, and the type of collaborative management arrangement in place. It was discovered that perceived compliance was lower when more than two rules were in use, suggesting that the complexity of regulations tends to hinder compliance. Moreover, resource users under locally managed protected areas and customary management arrangements were more likely to perceive beneficial livelihood outcomes than users under national park and devolved governance arrangements.

Wiley; <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/conl.12057>

REDD+, Biodiversity and Poverty Alleviation

Matiku, P., Caleb, M., Callistus, O. (2013); **The Impact of Participatory Forest Management on Local Community Livelihoods in the Arabuko-Sokoke Forest, Kenya**, *Conservation and Society*; 11(2), 112-129.

The impact of participatory forest management (PFM) on forest-adjacent household livelihoods in the Arabuko-Sokoke forest in Kenya is examined in this paper. The impacts on households in PFM zones are compared with households in non-PFM zones. Other questions raised include whether forest conservation benefits exceed the conservation costs, whether PFM zones have higher household benefits than non-PFM zones, and whether benefits and costs depreciate with distance away from the forest edge. Data were collected along 10km transects at 1km intervals, sampling 600 households up to 5km away from the forest. The results show varied household dependence. The forest conservation benefits exceed costs in PFM zones but the forest is a cost in non-PFM zones, and costs and benefits reduce with distance from the forest edge. In conclusion, it is stated that PFM is a tool that can be of benefit to the Arabuko-Sokoke forest with support from the adjacent local communities.

Meadknow Publications; <http://dx.doi.org/10.4103/0972-4923.115724>

Robinson, JZ., Albers, HJ., Meshack, C., Lokina, RB. (2013); **Implementing REDD through community-based forest management: Lessons from Tanzania**; *Natural Resources Forum*. Advance Online Publication, 25 June, 2013.

REDD (Reduced Emissions from Deforestation and Degradation) aims to slow carbon releases caused by forest disturbance by making payments conditional on forest quality

over time. Community-based forest management (CBFM), a form of participatory forest management, was chosen by the Tanzania Forest Conservation Group as a model for implementing REDD pilot programmes. Payments are made to villages that have the rights to forest carbon. In exchange, the villages must be able to demonstrate the reduction of deforestation at the village level. This paper, using this pilot programme as a case study, combined with a review of the literature, provides ideas for REDD implementation in sub-Saharan Africa. It is suggested that implementing REDD through CBFM-type structures can create appropriate incentives and thus affect behaviour at the village level when the recipients of the REDD funds are also the key drivers of forest change. When external forces drive forest change, however, REDD through CBFM-type structures becomes more of an enforcement programme with the local communities rather than government agencies being responsible for the enforcement.

Wiley; <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/1477-8947.12018>
