

# Birds in Coffee Agroforestry Systems of West Lampung, Sumatra.

Trudy Rochelle O'Connor Submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Geographical and Environmental Studies, University of Adelaide October 2005

## Declaration

This work contains no material which has been accepted for the award of any other degree or diploma in any university or other tertiary institution and, to the best of my knowledge and belief, contains no material previously published or written by another person, except where due reference has been made in the text.

I give consent to this copy of my thesis, when deposited in the University Library, being available for loan and photocopying.

Trudy Rochelle O'Connor October 2005

#### Abstract

In the Sumberjaya district of West Lampung, Indonesia, there has been widespread replacement of rainforest by robusta coffee. However, few studies have explored the relationship between birds and coffee gardens in Southeast Asia. This study examines the use of coffee gardens and other habitats by birds in the Sumberjaya and Pesisir regions. Birds and their habitat use were surveyed, as were structural and floristic vegetation features. Interviews with farmers indicated land management practices and limitations, as well as local perceptions of shade trees, birds and conservation programs.

There were clear differences in bird diversity and assemblage uniqueness between types of coffee gardens. Over the region, 'multistrata' gardens supported the greatest number of species. However, all coffee types had lower taxonomic diversity of birds than did forest. Frugivores, and birds of high conservation dependence, were poorly represented in coffee gardens. Microhabitat use by birds was significantly different between habitats, and it appeared that the birds did make use of structural features as they became available.

Farmers indicated that shade trees had benefits such as sheltering coffee plants, and providing produce, but were also apprehensive about over-shading. Many claimed that bird assemblages have changed, yet while describing habitat loss as a past problem, few people felt that forest loss would cause bird deaths. Most farmers believed that coffee gardens had potential to provide useful bird habitat. Interviewees believed that both Government and the community were responsible for conservation. Many showed interest in co-operative conservation programs, particularly if they allowed farmers flexibility, or if they involved incentives related to land tenure. There was also interest in market-based schemes such as eco-certification.

The primary action needed for conservation of Sumberjaya's birds is to minimise ongoing forest degradation. This may be achieved by linking incentives such as land tenure to forest protection. Capacity to create a certified coffee scheme may be limited by poor coffee quality and inappropriate garden characteristics. Farms maintained primarily for coffee production showed limited value for rainforest-adapted birds. However, the Krui damar gardens suggest a model, which as a forest buffer zone, may allow a more gentle spatial transition from agricultural to forest conditions.

## Table of Contents

Declaration	ii
Acknowledgements	ix
Dedications	X
Chapter 1 Introduction to the birds in coffee gardens of Lampung	11
1.1 The threatened rainforests of Sumatra.	12
1.2 The urgency of conservation	13
1.3 The birds	14
1.4 Sumberjava	15
1.5 The importance of farming regions	15
1.6 Why study birds?	16
1.7 The role of coffee gardens	17
1.8 Aims of this project	
1.9 Summary	
Chapter 2 Current knowledge of the effects of habitat modification on Indonesian bit	ds. and the
role of coffee gardens as bird habitat.	
2.1 Introduction	
2.2 Landcover change and biodiversity in tropical environments	
2.3 Landscape re-habilitation	27
2.4 The role of plantations	
2.5 Agroforestry models	
2.6 Coffee	
2.7 Farmer incentives	
2.8 Conclusion	64
Chapter 3 Physical and social conditions in West Lampung	65
3.1 Introduction	66
3.2 Location and topography	66
3.3 Climate	68
3.4 Geological history	69
3.5 Soils	69
3.6 Vegetation	70
3.7 History of settlement, cultivation and trade in western Indonesia	79
3.8 Aoriculture	86
3.9 Financial factors in Sumberiava coffee gardens	90
3.10 Conclusion	95
Chapter 4 Methods	96
4.1 Site location	
4.2 Vegetation survey	90
4.3 Bird surveys	101
A A Interviews	110
4.5 A palveis of data	11/
Chapter 5 Results of vegetation surveys	125
5.1 Definition of habitat types	125
5.2 Assigning sites to babitat groups	132
5.3 Canopy depth	134
5.4 Eleristic composition	,1J4 135
Chapter 6 Depute of hird surveys	133
6.1 Numbers of birds	140 171
6.2 Bind accompliance	141
6.2 Species composition	143 140
0.5 Species composition	14ð 152
0.4 Guilds and recard groups	133
6.6 A ativity	10Z
0.0 ACTIVITY	1/3

6.7 Biogeographic Factors	179
6.8 Invertebrates	
6.9 Summary of main findings	
Chapter 7 Results of interviews	
7.1 Interviewee characteristics	
7.2 Farm characteristics	191
7.3 Shade trees	198
7.4 Birds	
7.5 Attitudes towards conservation	212
7.6 Marketing of coffee in Lampung	
7.7 Captive bird trade	
7.8 Conclusion	
Chapter 8 Discussion: The state of birds and conservation in West Lampung coffee la	indscapes230
8.1 Contribution of coffee gardens to regional bird assemblages	231
8.2 Differences between the bird assemblages of coffee garden types	236
8.3 Optimising the landscape for birds and people	241
8.4 Maximising benefits of coffee farms for birds	242
8.5 Engaging the community	250
8.6 Conclusion	
Chapter 9 Conclusion: Possible futures for the birds of Sumberjaya	
9.1 Study findings	
9.2 What can be done?	270
9.3 Study limitations and further study	271
9.4 The place of Sumberjaya in global biodiversity conservation	
References	
Appendices	
Appendix A: List of Surveyed Bird Species, Guilds, Feeding Groups, I	Forest Affinity
and Migratory Status	
Appendix B: Survey dates, times and environmental variables	291
Appendix C: Interview question guide: Indonesian and English translation	
Appendix D: Surveyed plant types, function and abundance	
Appendix E: Pairwise tests of floristic composition	
Appendix F: Pairwise tests of bird species composition	
Appendix G: Pairwise tests of simplified habitats according to bird f	eeding group
membership	
Appendix H: Pairwise tests of simplified habitats according to bird guild men	nbership310
Appendix I: pairwise tests for sites on the basis of dominant tree type	
Appendix J - Pairwise comparisons between habitats for number of	birds in each
microhabitat	
Appendix K: Microhabitat use and environmental variables	
Appendix L List of all bird species recorded, including opportunistics	

## List of Figures

Figure 1.1 Indonesia, indicating Lampung and the main study area in Sumberjaya	12
Figure 3.1 Sumatra, showing topographic relief, and the areas of field study of Sumberj	aya and the
Pesisir, respectively east and west of the Bukit Barisan Range.	67
Figure 3.2 Sumberjaya study area.	67
Figure 3.3 Pesisir study area	67
Figure 3.4 Land use change in Sumberjava 1970-2000	74
Figure 3.5 Growth of the human population in Sumberjaya sub district 1978-1988	83
Figure 3.6 Allocation of land for food production in Lampung province in 2003	87
Figure 4.1 Sumberjaya region, showing study site locations.	98
Figure 4.2 Study site locations in the Pesisir Region.	98
Figure 4.3 Collection of leaf litter for calibration of leaf litter scale.	101
Figure 5.1 PCA of sites according to non-coffee variables	130
Figure 5.2 PCA of shaded coffee sites based on vegetation variables	132
Figure 5.3 The difference between maximum tree height and the mean of the mode tree	ee height at
each site.	135
Figure 5.4 Vegetation abundance index at each site, indicating agroforestry function of	vegetation
type	137
Figure 5.5 Distribution of all sites (except paddy habitats) according to their similarity	of floristic
composition (by abundance scores).	137
Figure 5.6 Dominant tree type in plots with canopy cover $> 1/16$ of area	138
Figure 5.7 Mass of leaf litter samples from 0.25m <sup>2</sup> plots as a function of leaf litter score.	139
Figure 6.1 Numbers of individual birds of all species, per site, in various habitats, cumul	ative for all
surveys	142
Figure 6.2 The number of birds surveyed in all habitats, excluding birds flying overhead	143
Figure 6.3 Cumulative number of species for each habitat type (mean per site) in each su	rvev144
Figure 6.4 Shannon-Wiener genus diversity for individual sites for all habitats	146
Figure 6.5 Species accumulation with site for six randomly chosen and ordered sites	in each of
three coffee habitats: monoculture, simple shade and multistrata.	148
Figure 6.6 MDS of sites according to the similarity of their bird species composition	152
Figure 6.7 The levels of Bray-Curtis similarity between the bird species composition a	t each site.
	152
Figure 6.8 MDS of sites on the basis of the feeding groups represented by the bird ass	emblage at
each site.	154
Figure 6.9 The number of surveyed birds in feeding groups in each habitat	154
Figure 6.10 The number of surveyed birds in guilds in each habitat	157
Figure 6.11 The two dimensional MDS plot of all sites according to the similari	ty of their
constituent bird guilds	157
Figure 6.12 The mean number of birds per site in the <i>a priori</i> defined groups of species' t	olerance to
open habitats, as they occurred in all the habitats surveyed.	161
Figure 6.13 The mean number of birds per site and proportion of birds in each habita	t that were
considered to be' resident', 'migrant', or 'either resident or migrant'	162
Figure 6.14 MDS of sites by bird assemblage	163
Figure 6.15 MDS of sites by bird assemblage	164
Figure 6.16 MDS of sites by bird assemblage	164
Figure 6.17 MDS of sites according to bird assemblage	165
Figure 6.18 MDS of sites by bird assemblage	167
Figure 6.19 MDS of sites by bird assemblage	168
Figure 6.20 MDS of sites by bird assemblage	168
Figure 6.21 Distribution of sites by bird assemblage, indicating the dominant tree type	at the site.
	169
Figure 6.22 The relative similarity of habitats according to the mean number of birds	surveyed in
each of their constituent microhabitats.	171

Figure 6.23 Number of birds engaged in various activities in each habitat
Figure 6.24 Distribution of foraging birds between microhabitat types in shade and monoculture
coffee habitats
Figure 6.25 Mean height of foraging birds in all habitats
Figure 6.26 The distribution of bird activities in both tree and non-tree vegetation types178
Figure 6.27 Bird activities in various vegetation types
Figure 6.28 The estimated distance, in metres, from forest of all study sites, grouped by habitat type 180
Figure 6.29 The distribution of sites according to similarity of bird assemblage
Figure 6.30 MDS of bird assemblages by region.
Figure 6.31 The distribution of sites according to the similarity of their neighbouring habitats 182
Figure 7.1 Proportion of interviewed farmers citing various sources of education for coffee
management techniques
Figure 7.2 Stated frequency of application of manufactured chemicals (pesticides, herbicides and
fertilisers) at each site, including only those frequencies quantified by farmers,
Figure 7.3 Frequency of application of fertilser, pesticides and herbicides stated by farmers at each
site
Figure 7.4 Interviewed coffee farmers' stated reasons for growing trees in their gardens200
Figure 7.5 Distribution of interviewed farmers' preferences for length of gap between planting
coffee and shade trees
Figure 7.6 The percentage of respondent farmers of gardens classified as 'monoculture coffee',
'shade coffee' and damar for this study, and their descriptions of where they have seen
birds in their gardens
Figure 7.7 The percentage of respondent farmers of gardens classified as 'monoculture coffee',
'shade coffee' and damar for this study, and their descriptions of the activities in which
they have seen birds engaged in the gardens
Figure 7.8 Responses of farmers on bird population trends
Figure 7.9 Distribution of respondents' opinions regarding the length of time over which bird populations have declined (total n=13) 210
Figure 7.10 Respondents' opinions of the time over which bird declines have occurred in each
region, as well as the length of time since deforestation, as defined by farmers maintaining
gardens in the same region. Each entry denotes one respondent. The data suggest a lag
between deforestation and bird declines
Figure 7.11 Stated opinions of the community regarding the role of coffee and damar gardens (as
locally relevant) to bird conservation
Figure 7.12 Stated community perceptions of the result for birds if the forests in which they live are
lost. (Total n=35)

## List of Tables

Table 4.1 Vegetation descriptors used in study plots	
Table 4.2 Vegetation abundance class types and scores	116
Table 4.3 Guilds and feeding groups	
Table 5.1 Eigenvalues for the PCA of non-coffee vegetation variables	129
Table 5.2 Eigenvectors for vegetation variables, indicating contribution to PC axes	129
Table 5.3 Allocation of sites to habitat and other descriptive groups	
Table 6.1 Shannon-Wiener taxonomic diversity at species, genus and family level	145
Table 6.2 Number of species unique to particular coffee habitat combinations	147
Table 6.3 The mean number of birds of each species per site in each habitat, and the	total number
of birds of each species counted in nine surveys at each site	148
Table 6.4 Near threatened species surveyed	151
Table 6.5 Pairwise Tests of simplified habitats according to species composition	153

Table 6.6 No. of migratory and residential birds per site and (proportion) of birds i	n each habitat .
(excludes birds with insufficient identification)	161
Table 6.7 The number of birds surveyed in each vegetation type	166
Table 6.8 Microhabitat use by birds in each habitat type	172
Table 6.9 The mean number of invertebrates per dry mass of vegetation (g) for f	ive plant types.
Table 6.10 Invertebrate mass (derived from body length) found on eight vegetation	n samples from
each of five plant types commonly found in coffee gardens	
Table 6.11 Invertebrate mass in monoculture and multistrata coffee habitats	
Table 7.1 Farm history, tenure and harvest indicated by farmers at all properties surv	eyed192
Table 7.2 Frequency of management activities as indicated by property owners	
Table 7.3 Respondent attitude toward and knowledge of birds	204
Table 7.4 Perceived help and damage by birds in gardens	
Table 7.5 Responses collected from different regions regarding bird population a	and assemblage
change and possible causes	
Table 7.6 Perceived role of birds in the environment	212

## List of Plates

Plate 1 The margin of forest clearance for coffee planting at Bodong, Sumberjaya	72
Plate 2 Sumberjaya landscape in the Laksana district	72
Plate 3 A damar harvester in Pahmungan, Krui	77
Plate 4 Bukit Rigis hill, in the Bodong area, Sumberjaya	
Plate 5 Rice paddy below Simpangsari village.	
Plate 6 Road from Simpangsari to Tepus and Laksana areas	
Plate 7 Invertebrate traps	110
Plate 8 A farmer shows the bird chart used in interviews	112
Plate 9 Paddy (site Purajaya 1)	126
Plate 10 Damar (site Krui 3)	126
Plate 11 Imperata (site Trimulyo 2)	127
Plate 12 Low scrub (site Purajaya 3)	127
Plate 13 Tall scrub (site Tepus 4)	127
Plate 14 Forest (site Laksana 4)	128
Plate 15 FB2, The site that was surveyed but excluded from all analyses, due to th	e progressive
removal of trees and coffee bushes for the establishment of a chilli farm	
Plate 16 Monoculture coffee garden (site Leuwi Monyet 2)	131
Plate 17 Simple shade coffee garden (site Gunung Terang 4)	133
Plate 18 Multistrata coffee garden (site Gunung Terang 2)	134
Plate 19 Closed multistrata coffee garden (site Leuwi Monyet 3)	134
Plate 20 Caged birds for sale in Simpangsari village	213
Plate 21 Hornbills in Pramuka bird market, Jakarta	227
Plate 22 Captive eagles for sale in Pramuka bird market, Jakarta	228

## Acknowledgements

This project has been very rewarding, and has challenged me in many ways. It is clear that it would never have reached completion without the assistance provided to me by many people along the way. I am very grateful for their help.

Firstly, many thanks to my primary supervisor, Dr Peter Gell, of the University of Adelaide, as well as my co-supervisors, Assoc. Prof. David Paton and Dr Marcus Lane, also of the University of Adelaide; Assoc. Prof. Lesley Potter of Australian National University (formerly at the University of Adelaide) and Dr Meine van Noordwijk, of the International Centre for Research in Agroforestry (ICRAF) Southeast Asia for sharing with me their time, energy and ideas across their various areas of expertise, and for being patient and understanding throughout this lengthy project. I am also grateful to the late Dr Timothy Whitmore, of University of Cambridge, who supervised me in the initial proposal and literature review for this project.

During my fieldwork in Indonesia, I was assisted by many people, who shared their knowledge, friendship, culture and country. I am grateful to the residents of Lampung who allowed me to survey birds on their properties, and were generous in their participation in interviews. Particular thanks also to my field assistants, Fauzan Syamsuri, Agus and, especially to the wonderfully patient Jufri, who assisted me during bird surveys and interviews, as well as helping me to better understand the way things work in the Sumberjaya. I was also helped by many ICRAF staff in both Sumberjaya and Bogor. In particular, a big thankyou to Susilo Ady Kuncoro, Rudy Harto Widodo, Ery Nugraha and Nugroho Prastowo.

The creation of my thesis involved another group of helpers, to whom I am also very grateful. Several people provided helpful comments on my drafts, including my 'editing angel' Wendy Telfer, who has supported me through the entire process, as well as Matt Ward and my mum, Pam O'Connor, who certainly knows where to put a comma. My brother, Trent O'Connor, Suzanne Donaldson, Justin Nottage and Marg Young were also wonderful in helping to solve my technological headaches.

Finally, thanks to those who have sustained me throughout this adventure, in particular, my Mum and Dad, who have been endlessly patient and supportive, also the people and birds of Lampung, who made it so worthwhile for me.

## Dedications

#### To the memories of

Dr Tim Whitmore, whose research, writing and teaching inspired a generation in their appreciation and study of tropical rainforests. He supervised the early proposal for this study, and provided the advice and encouragement I needed to embark on this challenging journey.

and

#### My brother, Travis Kieran O'Connor

A fine person.

Golden - winged, silver-winged, Winged with flashing flame, Such a flight of birds I saw, Birds without a name: Singing songs in their own tongue-Song of songs- they came.

One to another calling, Each answering each, One to another calling In their proper speech: High above my head they wheeled, Far out of reach

On wings of flame they went and came With a cadenced clang: Their silver wings tinkled, Their golden wings rang; The wind it whistled through their wings Where in heaven they sang.

They flashed and they darted Awhile before mine eyes, Mounting, mounting, mounting still, In haste to scale the skies, Birds without a nest on earth, Birds of Paradise.

from 'Birds of Paradise' by Christina Rossetti