

ISSN: 1412-033X  
E-ISSN: 2085-4722

# BIODIVERSITAS

**Journal of Biological Diversity**

**Volume 17 - Number 1 - April 2016**



Front cover: *Dracocephalum aucheri*  
(PHOTO: KOUROSH KAVOUSI)

---

Published semiannually

PRINTED IN INDONESIA

ISSN: 1412-033X



E-ISSN: 2085-4722





# BIODIVERSITAS

Journal of Biological Diversity  
Volume 17 - Number 1 - April 2016

---

<b>Evaluation of vegetation types in the West Zagros (Beiranshahr region as a case study), in Lorestan Province, Iran</b> ATENA ESLAMI FAROUJI, HAMED KHODAYARI	1-10
<b>Floristic changes at Khersan Glacier Territory, Alamkuh Mountain, Central Alborz, North of Iran</b> KOUROSH KAVOUSI, TAHER NEJADSATARI, YUNES ASRI, HAMID EJTEHADI, RAMEZAN ALI KHAVARI-NEJAD	11-15
<b>Molecular phylogeny of <i>Acer monspessulanum</i> L. subspecies from Iran inferred using the ITS region of nuclear ribosomal DNA</b> HANIF KHADEMI, IRAJ MEHREGAN, MOSTAFA ASSADI, TAHER NEJADSATARI, SHAHIN ZARRE	16-23
<b>Determination of appropriate grid dimension and sampling plot size for assessment of woody species diversity in Zagros Forest, Iran</b> ALI ASGHAR ZOHREVANDI, HASSAN POURBABAEI, REZA AKHAVAN, AMIR ESLAM BONYAD	24-30
<b>Short communication:</b> <b>Algal leaf spot associated with <i>Cephaleuros virescens</i> (Trentepohliales, Ulvophyceae) on <i>Nephelium lappaceum</i> in Thailand</b> ANURAG SUNPAPAO, MUTIARA K. PITALOKA, SIWARET ARIKIT	31-35
<b>Temporal variability in macroinvertebrates diversity patterns and their relation with environmental factors</b> MOHAMMAD HASAN GERAMI, RAHMAN PATIMAR, HOSSEIN NEGARESTAN, HOJJATOLLAH JAFARIAN, MOHAMMAD SEDDIQ MORTAZAVI	36-43
<b>Status of coastal forests of the Northern Sumatra in 2005 (after 2004's tsunami catastrophe)</b> ONRIZAL, MASHHOR MANSOR	44-54
<b>The diversity and distribution of Holothuroidea in shallow waters of Baluran National Park, Indonesia</b> ARIF MOHAMMAD SIDDIQ, TRI ATMOWIDI, IBNUL QAYIM	55-60
<b>Ethnobotany of <i>Canarium</i> plant species used by Tobelo Dalam (Togutil) ethnic community of Halmahera Island, Indonesia</b> M. NASIR TAMALENE, MIMIEN HENIE IRAWATI AL MUHDHAR, ENDANG SUARSINI, FATCHUR RAHMAN, SAID HASAN	61-69
<b>Dominance and diversity studies of tree species in lesser Himalayan forest of Uttarakhand, India</b> A.S. BISHT, A.B. BHATT	70-77
<b>Cellulolytic and hemicellulolytic bacteria from the gut of <i>Oryctes rhinoceros</i> larvae</b> SITI LUSI ARUM SARI, ARTINI PANGASTUTI, ARI SUSILOWATI, TIAHJADI PURWOKO, EDWI MAHAJOENO, WAHYU HIDAYAT, IKOW MARDHENA, DANIEL FAJAR PANUNTUN, DEWI KURNIAWATI, ROBIAH ANITASARI	78-83
<b>Mitigation of mercury contamination through the acceleration of vegetation succession</b> WIWIK EKYASTUTI, ENY FARIDAH, SUMARDI, YADI SETIADI	84-89
<b>Diversity and the role of yeast in spontaneous cocoa bean fermentation from Southeast Sulawesi, Indonesia</b> JAMILI, NUR ARFA YANTI, PRIMA ENDANG SUSILOWATI	90-95

<b>Proof of <i>Acacia nilotica</i> stand expansion in Bekol Savanna, Baluran National Park, East Java, Indonesia through remote sensing and field observations</b> SUTOMO, EDDIE VAN ETEN, LUTHFI WAHAB	96-101
<b>Tropical peatland tree-species diversity altered by forest degradation</b> DWI ASTIANI	102-109
<b>Morphological responses, sensitivity and tolerance indices of four tropical trees species to drought and waterlogging</b> YULIANTI, DEDE J. SUDRAJAT	110-115
<b>Comparative characterization of <i>Macaranga</i> species collected from secondary forests in East Kalimantan for biorefinery of unutilized fast growing wood</b> RUDIANTO AMIRTA, SYAFFIYA ISNU NAFITRI, RETNO WULANDARI, YULIANSYAH, WIWIN SUWINARTI, KRISHNA PURNAWAN CANDRA, TAKASHI WATANABE5	116-123
<b>Evaluation of soybean genotypes for resistance to rust disease (<i>Phakopsora pachyrhizi</i>)</b> APRI SULISTYO, SUMARTINI	124-128
<b>Cowpea Mild Mottle Virus (CpMMV) infection and its effect to performance of South Korean soybean varieties</b> SUTRISNO, HERU KUSWANTORO	129-133
<b>Screening of elite black soybean lines for resistance to rust disease, <i>Phakopsora pachyrhizi</i></b> AYDA KRISNAWATI, GATUT WAHYU A.S., M. MUCHLISH ADIE	134-139
<b>The recovery of Tabunio Watershed through enrichment planting using ecologically and economically valuable species in South Kalimantan, Indonesia</b> SYARIFUDDIN KADIR, BADARUDDIN, NURLINA, ICHSAN RIDWAN, FONNY RIANAWATY	140-147
<b>Anther culture of local upland rice varieties from East Kalimantan: effect of panicle cold pre-treatment and putrescine enriched medium</b> NURHASANAH, ANANDA N. PRATAMA, WIDI SUNARYO	148-153
<b>Karangwangi people's (South Cianjur, West Java, Indonesia) local knowledge of species, forest utilization and wildlife conservation</b> RUHYAT PARTASASMITA, JOHAN ISKANDAR, NICHOLAS MALONE	154-161
<b>Phenetic analysis of the genera <i>Medicago</i> <i>Trigonella</i>, <i>Medicago</i> and <i>Melilotus</i> (Fabaceae) on seed coat in Iran</b> SIMA KHANDANI, MOSTAFA ASSADI, TAHER NEJADSATARI, IRAJ MEHREGAN	162-171
<b>Ethnobotanical study of herbal medicine in Ranggawulung Urban Forest, Subang District, West Java, Indonesia</b> LILY SURAYYA EKA PUTRI, DASUMIATI, KRISTIYANTO, MARDIANSYAH, CHAIRUL MALIK, LAKSMANA PUTRA LEUVINADRIE, EKA ADHI MULYONO	172-176
<b>Dayak Desa forest landuse system as social capital to acquire forest management rights in West Kalimantan, Indonesia</b> EMI ROSLINDA	177-184
<b>The process of rehabilitation of mined forest lands toward degraded forest ecosystem recovery in Kalimantan, Indonesia</b> TRIYONO SUDARMADJI, WAHJUNI HARTATI	185-191
<b>Flowering, fruiting, seed germination and seedling growth of <i>Macaranga gigantea</i></b> DWI SUSANTO, DADDY RUCHIYAT, MAMAN SUTISNA, RUDIANTO AMIRTA	192-199
<b>Species diversity of cerambycid beetles at reclamation area of coal mining in Berau District, East Kalimantan, Indonesia</b> SUGIARTO, CHANDRADEWANA BOER, DJUMALI MARDJI	200-207
<b>Length-weight relationship and population genetic of two marine gastropods species (Turbinidae: <i>Turbo sparverius</i> and <i>Turbo bruneus</i>) in the Bird Seascape Papua, Indonesia</b> DANDI SALEKY, ISDRAJAD SETYOBUDIANDI, HAMID A. TOHA, MUHAMMAD TAKDIR, HAWIS H. MADDUPPA	208-217

<b>Responses of the Arabidopsis KNOX and Boron transport gene mutants against the deficiency and overdose of Boron nutrient</b> WIDI SUNARYO, NURHASANAH	218-221
<b>Stand damage due to mono-cable winch and bulldozer yarding in a selectively logged tropical forest</b> YOSEP RUSLIM, RUSPITA SIHOMBING, YASON LIAH	222-228
<b>Anatomical structure and antioxidant activity of red bulb plant (<i>Eleutherine americana</i>) on different plant age</b> EVI MINTOWATI KUNTORINI, MARIA DEWI, MISRINA	229-233
<b>Shade tree species diversity and coffee productivity in Sumberjaya, West Lampung, Indonesia</b> RUSDI EVIZAL, SUGIATNO, FEMBRIARTI ERRY PRASMATIWI, INDAH NURMAYASARI	234-240
<b>Evaluating the level of sustainability of privately managed forest in Bogor, Indonesia</b> TATAN SUKWIKA, DUDUNG DARUSMAN, CECEP KUSMANA, DODIK RIDHO NURROCHMAT	241-248
<b>The diversity of plant species, the types of plant uses and the estimate of carbon stock in agroforestry system in Harapan Makmur Village, Bengkulu, Indonesia</b> WIRYONO, VENNY NOVIA UTAMI PUTERI, GUNGGUNG SENOAJI	249-255
<b>Ethno-medicinal plants used for herbal medication of jaundice by the indigenous community of Tripura, India</b> DIPANKAR DEB, B.K. DATTA, JABA DEBBARMA, SOURABH DEB	256-269
<b>Short Communication: Genetic identification of local pigs, and imported pigs (Landrace and Duroc) based on cytochrome b sequence analysis</b> TETY HARTATIK, BAYU DEWANTORO PUTRO SOEWANDI, SLAMET DIAH VOLKANDARI, ARNOLD CHRISTIAN TABUN, SUMADI, WIDODO	270-274
<b>Review: The diversity of local cattle in Indonesia and the efforts to develop superior indigenous cattle breeds</b> SUTARNO, AHMAD DWI SETYAWAN	275-295
<b>Short Communication: Detection of plasmids and curing analysis in copper resistant bacteria <i>Acinetobacter</i> sp. IrC1, <i>Acinetobacter</i> sp. IrC2, and <i>Cupriavidus</i> sp. IrC4</b> WAHYU IRAWATI, TRIWIBOWO YUWONO, AMANDA RUSLI	296-300
<b>Short Communication: Inventory of native orchids in Makki Sub-District, Lanny Jaya, Papua, Indonesia</b> VERENA AGUSTINI, LISYE I ZEBUA, NONANCE WENDA	301-305
<b>Assessment of competition indices of an unlogged oriental beech mixed stand in Hyrcanian forests, Northern Iran</b> MOJTABA AMIRI, REZA NAGHDI	306-314
<b>The population of spotted cuscus (<i>Spilocuscus maculatus</i>) and its habitat carrying capacity in Numfor Island, Papua, Indonesia</b> ANTON SILAS SINERY, WARTIKA ROSA FARIDA, JACOB MANUSAWAI	315-321
<b>Review: Climate-induced hydrological changes and the ecology of tropical freshwater biota</b> SUNARDI, GERHARD WIEGLEB	322-331
<b>Responses to environmental and socio-economic changes in the Karangwangi traditional agroforestry system, South Cianjur, West Java</b> JOHAN ISKANDAR, BUDIAWATI SUPANGKAT ISKANDAR, RUHYAT PARTASASMITA	332-341
<b>Four newly recorded <i>Amanita</i> taxa from India</b> YADWINDER SINGH, MUNRUCHI KAUR	342-348
<b>Culturable fungal diversity associated with forest leaf litter from Bhandara District of Maharashtra, India</b> SUNIL M. AKARE, WALAY Y. TAGADE, ASHISH R. WARGHAT, AVILEKH NARYAL, ASHWANI BHARDWAJ	349-358

<b>The roles of community fruit garden (tembawang) on maintaining forest structure, diversity and standing biomass allocation: an alternative effort on reducing carbon emission</b> DWI ASTIANI, RIPIN	<b>359-365</b>
<b>Short Communication: Fusarium as endophyte of some terrestrial orchid from Papua, Indonesia</b> SUPENI SUFAATI, VERENA AGUSTINI, SUHARNO	<b>366-371</b>
<b>Plants diversity of the deforested peat-swamp forest of Tripa, Indonesia</b> DJUFRI, WARDIAH, ZAINAL A. MUCHLISIN	<b>372-376</b>
<b>Short Communication: Rhizoctonia-like fungi isolated from roots of Dendrobium lancifolium var. papuanum and Calanthe triplicata in Papua, Indonesia</b> VERENA AGUSTINI, SUPENI SUFAATI, SUHARNO, NUTTIKA SUWANNASAI	<b>377-383</b>
<b>Diversity of Selaginella across altitudinal gradient of the tropical region</b> AHMAD DWI SETYAWAN, JATNA SUPRIATNA, DEDY DARNAEDI, ROKHMATULOH, SUTARNO, SUGIYARTO	<b>384-400</b>

---

## Shade tree species diversity and coffee productivity in Sumberjaya, West Lampung, Indonesia

RUSDI EVIZAL<sup>1,A</sup>, SUGIATNO<sup>1</sup>, FEMBRIARTI ERRY PRASMATIWI<sup>2</sup>, INDAH NURMAYASARI<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Agrotechnology, Faculty of Agriculture, University of Lampung, Sumantri Brojonegoro No. 1, Bandar Lampung 35145, Lampung, Indonesia. Tel.: +62721704946, Fax.: +62721770347, ✉email: rusdievizal@yahoo.com

<sup>2</sup>Department of Agribusiness, Faculty of Agriculture, University of Lampung, Sumantri Brojonegoro No. 1, Bandar Lampung 35145, Lampung, Indonesia

Manuscript received: 19 October 2015. Revision accepted: 22 March 2016.

**Abstract.** *Evizal R, Sugiarno, Prasmatiwi FE, Nurmayasari I. 2016. Shade tree species diversity and coffee productivity in Sumberjaya, West Lampung, Indonesia. Biodiversitas 17: 234-240.* Shade tree is an important variable that determines the productivity and sustainability of coffee plantation. In West Lampung, Indonesia coffee is grown on private land and on state land of Community Forest Program (CFP) using various types of shade trees. The research explored the diversity of shade trees and its influence on the productivity of coffee farms. The study area was one purposively sampled coffee farmer group in Sumberjaya District, West Lampung. We purposively chose one coffee farmer group. The group members' farms located in private land and in CFP land were sampled randomly, each consisted of 18 farms. From each farm, we observed a plot of 50 m x 50 m and interviewed the farmer who managed the farm. Data collected were on the species and the number of trees, farm age, coffee tree densities, and productivity of coffee in the last 3 years. Data analyses of important value, tree species diversity, correlation, and regression were performed. Shade trees found in coffee farms of Sumberjaya were 36 species, 10 species (28%) of them were legume trees. Technical shade trees that have high importance value was *Gliricidia sepium* and *Erythrina sububrams*. Multi Purpose Trees Species (MPTS) widely planted were *Durio zibethinus* and *Parkia speciosa*. The wood trees with a high importance value in the CFP coffee farms were *Shorea javanica* and *Michelia champaca* while in private coffee farms were *Maesopsis eminii* and *Litsea* sp. Based on Shannon's index ( $H'$ ) and Simpson's dominance index ( $\lambda$ ), a high diversity of shade tree species was found in CFP coffee farms at age 20 years. Shade trees with high dominance index had a positive effect on productivity of coffee and the percentage of MPTS had a negative effect. Whereas, the types of land tenure (private or CFP) and the abundance of shade trees did not affect the productivity of coffee.

**Keywords:** coffee, community forest, productivity, shade tree diversity

### INTRODUCTION

Lampung Province is a center of the production of Indonesian Robusta coffee which is grown mainly in the mountainous region of Bukit Barisan (Philpott et al. 2008), including on private land and on the state land of Community Forest Program (CFP). As farmers participate in CFP must plant at least 400 trees per hectare, the CFP significantly increased planting of wood trees species and Multi Purpose Trees Species (MPTS) and also increased farmers' income (Pender et al. 2008).

Cultivating coffee under varieties of shade tree species is one of local wisdoms that has long been practiced in the District of Sumberjaya, West Lampung (Verbist et al. 2005). Understanding the diversity, characteristics and functions of shade trees as well as its strata is important in efforts to improve the sustainability of coffee agro-ecosystem (Mamani-Pati et al. 2012), and to improve biodiversity conservation (Lopez-Gomez et al. 2008) including to conserve native tree species (Tadesse et al. 2014).

Ecological functions of the shade trees in coffee agroforestry system are as environmental services, such as recycling nutrients (Lopez-Rodriguez et al. 2015), driving soil conservation (Lin and Richards 2007), improving

growth, productivity, and quality of coffee (Bote and Struik 2011), and regulating biomass production (Evizal et al. 2009) including fire wood and timber as a source of alternative income (Shalene et al. 2014) and fodder for livestock production (Geta et al. 2014). Farmers realize those functions but decisions on shade trees management are more to keep the coffee production rather than reasons of environmental services (Cerdan et al. 2012). However, study on coffee agroforestry in Sumberjaya is important to support the conservation of water supply to the electric power plant of Way Besai (Pasha et al. 2012). Management of agroforestry systems in a sustainable manner requires conservation and proper management of MPTS strata (Tschardt et al. 2011).

Shade trees in coffee plantations can be technical shade trees, wood trees, or MPTS. Determining the composition of shade trees is important to maintain the balance of the ecological functions and the coffee agro-ecosystem productivity (Tschardt et al. 2011). Technical shade trees are legume trees planted on coffee plantations, not to harvest the yield but to provide shade for the coffee plants. In West Lampung, technical shade trees most widely grown are *Erythrina sububrams* and *Gliricidia sepium* (Evizal et al. 2012).

CFP of coffee plantations in protected areas requires planting trees or MPTS that will affect the shade tree diversity and productivity of coffee plants under the shade. The research objectives were to explore the diversity of shade trees and its influence on the productivity of coffee plantations on private land and CFP land in District of Sumberjaya, West Lampung.

**MATERIALS AND METHODS**

**Field study**

We purposively chose one coffee farmer group in Sumberjaya District, West Lampung, Indonesia (Figure 1). The group members’ farms located in private land and in CFP land were sampled randomly, each consisted of 18 farms. From each farm, we observed a plot of 50 m x 50 m and interviewed the farmer who managed the farm. Data collected were on the species and the number of the trees, farm age, coffee tree densities, and productivity of coffee in the last 3 years.


**Data analysis**

Data analyses of importance value, tree species diversity, correlation, and regression were performed. Analyses of Importance Value (IV) and diversity index are based on report of Sumantra et al. (2012). We calculated IV as sum of Relative Density and Relative Frequency and expressed diversity index based on the proportion (n/N) of individuals (n) of one particular species found (i) divided by total number of individuals found (N). The formula of Shannon-Wiener index of species diversity (H') is:

$$H' = - \sum_{i=1}^n \left[ \frac{n_i}{N} \ln \left( \frac{n_i}{N} \right) \right]$$

We calculate Simpson’s dominance index (λ) using formula (Morris et al. 2014):

$$\lambda = \sum_{i=1}^n \left[ \frac{n_i}{N} \right]^2$$



**Figure 1.** Study site in Sumberjaya, West Lampung, Indonesia (in red mark) (ICRAF in Pender et al. 2008)



## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### Importance value

Shade trees found in coffee farms of Sumberjaya were 36 species, 10 species (28%) of which were legume trees, namely *Gliricidia sepium*, *Erythrina sububrams*, *Leucaena glauca*, *Dalbergia latifolia*, *Paraserianthes falcataria*, *Parkia speciosa*, *Swietenia mahagoni*, *Acacia* sp., *Archidendron pauciflorum*, and *Archidendron microcarpum*. CFP coffee farms had higher richness of shade trees with 31 species, whereas private coffee farms had 24 species. Comparing between coffee farms at age of <20 year and at age of 20 year, the density of shade trees increased from 97 to 160 trees in private coffee farms and from 276 to 350 trees in CFP coffee farms (Table 1). Technical shade trees species found in coffee farms were *gliricidia* (*Gliricidia sepium*), corral trees (*Erythrina sububrams*), leucaena (*Leucaena glauca*), black rosewood (*Dalbergia latifolia*), and paraserianthes (*Paraserianthes falcataria*) but only *gliricidia* and coral trees had high Importance Value. MPTS widely

planted in coffee farms were stink bean (*Parkia speciosa*), durian (*Durio zibethinus*), jackfruit (*Artocarpus heterophyllus*) and bananas (*Musa paradisiaca*). The wood trees with a high importance value in the CFP coffee farms were *Shorea javanica* and *Michelia champaca* while in private coffee farms were *Maesopsis eminii* and *Litsea* sp.

These results indicated that the shade trees commonly found in coffee farms in Sumberjaya were exotic species. Native tree species that had significant importance value in the CFP coffee farms were *Durio zibethinus*, *Alstonia scholaris*, *Shorea* sp. and *Shorea javanica*. Trees of native species and exotic species were planted because it has economic value as an incentive (Ambinakudige and Sathish 2008), so that shaded coffee farms could serve as refugia for native tree species (Tadesse et al. 2014). In Sumberjaya, shade trees also functions as source of fodder from leaves of *Gliricidia sepium*, *Erythrina sububrams*, *Paraserianthes falcataria*, *Maesopsis eminii*, *Litsea* sp., *Michelia champaca*, *Artocarpus heterophyllus*, *Artocarpus champeden* and *Persea americana*.

**Table 1.** Abundance and importance value (IV) of shade trees in private and CFP coffee farms

Tree species	Private (n=18)				CFP (n=18)			
	< 20 y		20 y		< 20 y		20 y	
	Tree ha <sup>-1</sup>	IV	Tree ha <sup>-1</sup>	IV	Tree ha <sup>-1</sup>	IV	Tree ha <sup>-1</sup>	IV
<i>Gliricidia sepium</i>	12.50	19.85	73.73	64.05	67.78	32.86	43.75	17.34
<i>Erythrina sububrams</i>	6.67	13.80	14.54	21.09	7	8.78	9.75	7.62
<i>Leucaena glauca</i>	1.67	5.17	0	0	0	0	0.75	1.83
<i>Dalbergia latifolia</i>	0	0	0.27	2.17	0	0	7.75	7.05
<i>Paraserianthes falcataria</i>	0	0	0.91	2.57	0	0	0	0
<i>Maesopsis eminii</i>	12.5	23.30	6.64	10.15	0.22	2.164	1.25	1.97
<i>Litsea</i> sp.	14.5	21.92	3.45	6.16	3.33	3.29	0	0
<i>Alstonia scholaris</i>	0	0	8	6.99	0.67	2.32	25.62	12.16
<i>Swietenia mahagoni</i>	7.33	14.50	0	0	13	10.95	0	0
<i>Michelia champaca</i>	4	7.59	0	0	54.11	32.08	45.12	20.96
<i>Tectona grandis</i>	0	0	0	0	0	0	3.5	2.61
<i>Shorea</i> sp.	0	0	0	0	0	0	3.125	2.51
<i>Cananga</i> sp.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.75	1.83
<i>Toona sinensis</i>	8.333	12.08	0	0	0	0	0	0
<i>Acacia</i> sp.	0	0	2.27	3.42	0	0	0	0
<i>Shorea javanica</i>	0	0	0	0	57.78	27.16	65	23.42
<i>Parkia speciosa</i>	3.333	6.90	7.73	12.83	18.44	19.17	21	14.07
<i>Durio zibethinus</i>	4.17	11.21	23.82	28.88	28.89	20.87	36.87	21.83
<i>Artocarpus heterophyllus</i>	2.33	12.76	6.09	13.8	4	7.70	7.12	10.10
<i>Musa paradisiaca</i>	11	21.74	6.27	11.92	2.22	2.89	6.25	5.01
<i>Persea americana</i>	0.33	7.24	0.73	4.45	2.78	5.17	5.75	8.09
<i>Cinnamomum burmannii</i>	0.50	3.97	0	0	0	0	5	3.04
<i>Archidendron pauciflorum</i>	0	0	4.54	4.84	8.22	13.39	1.87	3.76
<i>Carica papaya</i>	0.67	4.14	0	0	0	0	0	0
<i>Areca catechu</i>	4.667	8.28	0	0	0.89	2.40	5.12	4.69
<i>Anacardium occidentale</i>	2	5.52	0	0	0	0	0	0
<i>Artocarpus communis</i>	0	0	0	0	2.22	2.89	5	4.65
<i>Aleurites moluccana</i>	0	0	0	0	3.11	5.29	2.5	2.33
<i>Mangifera indica</i>	0	0	0.82	4.51	0	0	0.37	1.72
<i>Artocarpus champeden</i>	0	0	0.27	2.17	0	0	0.63	1.79
<i>Hevea brasiliensis</i>	0	0	0	0	0	0	42.5	13.76
<i>Ceiba pentandra</i>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.75	1.83
<i>Syzygium aromaticum</i>	0	0	0	0	0	0	2.5	2.33
<i>Gnetum gnemon</i>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.25	1.68
<i>Archidendron microcarpum</i>	0	0	0	0	1.11	0.40	0	0
<i>Syzygium aqueum</i>	0	0	0	0	0.56	0.20	0	0
Total	96.5	200	160.1	200	276.3	200	349.9	200

### Tree composition

Types of shade trees consist of technical shade trees (legumes), wood trees, and MPTS. When comparing the composition of shade tree types, in the private coffee farms at age <20 years, the dominant shade trees are MPTS, especially bananas, whereas at age 20 years, the dominant trees are technical shade trees, especially gliricidia. This showed that in the initial opening of the coffee farms, farmers planted banana as a source of income and planted coral tress as shade, then planted gliricidia trees while coral trees grew old and died.

In the CFP coffee farms, the dominant shade trees are MPTS (Table 2). Cultivating coffee and MPTS in a protected area is legal under licence of CFP. Farmers are allowed to harvest non-wood yield such as fruits, beverages, spices, resin, or latex to generate income. There is no incentive for farmers to plant wood trees in CFP land because farmers are not allowed to cut and harvest timber. Meanwhile, cultivating coffee and MPTS in state-owned forest of national park is illegal so that, as Phillipot et al. (2008) reported, there are more abundant MPTS in private coffee farm land than in illegal coffee farms of national park. In general, shaded coffee plantations have high number of tree species (Capitan et al. 2014) even more than in forest areas (Lopez-Gomez et al. 2008) that may have been disturbed.

The number of shade trees increases with the increasing of coffee tree age, which was shown by the ratio of shade trees to coffee tree (Table 2). Thus the carbon stocks of shaded coffee farms increases with the age of coffee and shade trees particularly in the farms at the age of 20 years and more. When the coffee trees grow larger and shade tree species increase in number and diversity, it will form a complex coffee agroforestry that shaded coffee plantations have a role in carbon sequestration (Goodall et al. 2014) and climate change mitigation (Mbow et al. 2014).

The private coffee farms of 20 years, with 51.8% of the shade trees are technical of legume shade trees, gave the highest productivity compared to the other types of coffee farms (Table 2). This indicated that the high coffee productivity was obtained when technical shade trees, especially legume tress, were established. Legume trees that serve moderate shade level, shed the leaves in the dry season which created conditions to encourage coffee flowering, and produced much litter biomass (Evizal et al. 2009).

Meanwhile according to farmers, some species of shade trees could harm the growth and productivity of coffee trees, especially those of MPTS including *Aleurites moluccana*, *Cinnamomum burmannii*, *Hevea brasiliensis*, *Durio zibethinus* and those of wood trees including *Maesopsis eminii*, *Shorea spp*, *Michelia champaca*, and *Litsea sp*. Some studies reported that the dominant shade tree species affect the growth and productivity of coffee (Kufa and Burkhardt 2011; Ebisa 2014). Farmers classify the effect of shade trees on the coffee plants as hot, medium, and cool. To choose shade tree species, they consider the shape of the canopy, litter production, rooting properties (Cerdan et al. 2012), nitrogen fixation, and the harvest of fruit or wood. Preferred tree species will

dominate the composition of coffee shade trees (Valencia et al. 2015).

At the private land, higher Shannon diversity index of shade tree species was found in coffee farms at age of <20 years, while at the CFP land, higher Shannon diversity index was found in coffee farms at age of 20 years (Table 3). However, the diversity indexes were still classified as a medium diversity. The diversity index of shade trees found in private coffee farms at age of 20 years was <1 and categorized as low diversity (Maridi et al. 2014). Related to Simpson's dominance index ( ) and species richness, in the private coffee farms, the older the coffee farms the lower the diversity index of shade trees. On the contrary, in CFP land, the older the coffee farms the higher the diversity index of shade trees. These results indicated that the composition of shade tree was dynamic according to the knowledge and local wisdom of farmers to sustain productivity of coffee farm (Soto-Pinto et al. 2007). Sustainable coffee plantations are not only determined by the high diversity of flora and fauna as ecological indicators (Moonen and Barberi 2008), but also by the coffee productivity as an economic indicator. As further analysis, the relationship between the diversity index of shade trees and coffee productivity was approximated by correlation and regression analysis as shown at Tables 4 and 5.

### Coffee productivity

There was a negative correlation ( $r = -0.57$ ) between the shade tree diversity (Shannon's index) and the coffee production in CFP land. This meant that a high diversity of shade tree species could lead to lower coffee productivity. The same meaning was indicated by possitive correlation of dominance index ( $r = 0.58$ ), that a high dominance of shade trees species could induce higher coffee productivity. Meanwhile the productivity of coffee in the private farms and the diversity of shade trees showed a weak correlation.

There was a fairly strong positive correlation between the productivity of coffee and some variables including the percentage of technical shade tree ( $r = 0.60$ ) and the percentage of legume shade trees ( $r = 0.48$ ) in CFP land, and the age of coffee farms ( $r = 0.52$ ) in private land. However, the productivity of coffee was negatively correlated ( $r = -0.53$ ) with the percentage of timber shade tree in CFP land.

It is clear that age of coffee trees affects its productivity (Potvin et al. 2005) and the increasing age of the coffee will decrease the density of shade trees (Goodall et al. 2014) if not being replanted. Regarding to shade tree diversity, it has been reported that in Guatemala, by using four species of shade trees, the coffee production reached 925 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>, while in Peru that uses 17 species of shade trees, the coffee production was 386 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> (Rice 2008). As the dominant shade tree, the genus *Inga* has been widely reported as legumes that enriches the soil due to the accumulation of biomass (Siles et al. 2010) and symbiosis with legume nodule bacteria. Therefore, the legume trees were widely used in the farm of organic coffee (Grossman et al. 2006).

**Table 2.** Shade tree composition and coffee productivity

Land tenure	Coffee age	Technical shade tree (% ha <sup>-1</sup> )	Wood trees (% ha <sup>-1</sup> )	MPTS (% ha <sup>-1</sup> )	Ratio shade/coffee (% ha <sup>-1</sup> )	Coffee productivity (00 kg ha <sup>-1</sup> )
Private	< 20 year	25.285	24.579	50.135	4.290	6.93
	20 year	51.867	18.575	29.556	7.424	11.06
CFP	< 20 year	27.201	23.934	48.864	14.193	7.47
	20 year	14.919	29.717	55.363	16.358	7.37
Average		32.73	23.50	43.76	10.86	8.52

**Table 3.** Diversity index of coffee shade tree species

Land tenure	Coffee age (year)	Shannon-Weiver Index (H')	Simpson's dominance Index ( )	Species richness
Private	< 20 years	1.3052	0.3184	4.6666
	20 years	0.8229	0.4162	4.5454
CFP	< 20 years	1.1547	0.4242	5.5555
	20 years	1.4454	0.3510	7.7500

**Table 4.** Correlation among variables on coffee productivity in private and CFP farms

Variables	Coffee productivity		
	Private	CFP	
Shade tree	Shannon's index (H')	-0.0177	-0.5688
	Dominance index ( )	0.0721	0.5779
	Species richness	0.0455	-0.3870
	Abundance	0.0873	0.2646
	Technical shade tree (%)	0.1661	0.5955
	Wood tree (%)	0.1628	-0.5348
	MPTS (%)	-0.3960	-0.1479
Coffee tree	Legume tree abundance (%)	0.1306	0.4778
	Density (tree ha <sup>-1</sup> )	0.3483	0.2791
	Age (year)	0.5234	-0.0898

Table 5 presented the regression analysis of variables dominance index, the percentage of MPTS, type of land tenure, and the number of shade trees on the productivity of the coffee farms. Table 3-4 earlier showed that based on Shannon Index (H') and species richness, the highest diversity of shade trees was found in the CFP coffee farms aged 20 years. Moreover, in the CFP coffee farms, dominance index ( ) and the percentage of technical shade

trees positively correlated to the coffee productivity. Likewise, Table 5 showed that the dominance index had a positive effect on productivity of coffee and the percentage MPTS had a negative effect. The type of land tenure (private or CFP) and the abundance of shade trees did not affect the productivity of coffee. In general, this indicates that the dominance of shade trees or technical shade trees such as *Gliricidia sepium*, *Erythrina sububrams*, *Leucaena glauca*, *Dalbergia latifolia*, and *Paraserianthes falcataria* had positive effect on the productivity of coffee. On the contrary, the higher the percentage of MPTS the lower the coffee productivity.

In private coffee farms the average density of shade trees was 135 trees ha<sup>-1</sup>, and in the CFP coffee farms was 310 trees ha<sup>-1</sup>. That could be included as medium density of shade trees based on farmers' norm on new planting of coffee in farms in Sumberjaya District (density < 100 trees = low, 100-400 = medium, >400 = high). Rice (2008) reported that dominant shade of legume tree had a positive influence on coffee productivity. However, Ebisa (2014) reported that both legume and nonlegume species of shade trees had less significant effect on the productivity of coffee. Shade trees could decrease or raise the productivity of coffee or could have no effect (Shalene et al. 2014)

**Table 5.** Regression analysis of some variables on coffee productivity

Variable	Coefficient	Std. Error	t calc.	Significance
Constanta	0.8584	0.2331	3.68254	0.00094
Dominance index ( )	0.8104	0.4711	1.72037	0.09602*
% MPTS	-0.6018	0.3267	-1.84184	0.07575*
Land tenure (private vs CFP)	-0.2258	0.2027	-1.11397	0.27444
Shade trees abundance	0.0003	0.0007	0.34125	0.73538
R <sup>2</sup>	0.263			
F calc.	2.581			
Significance of F calc.	0.058			

Note: \* Significant at level 10%

depending on the species of shade trees (Long et al. 2015), the density and diversity of shade trees (Schmitt et al. 2009), shade tree structures (Hernandez-Martinez et al. 2009), fertilization, variety and age of coffee (Potvin et al. 2005). The characteristics of trees that serve optimal shade, fertilize the soil, and provide additional products would affect the farmers in selecting the species of shade trees to plant in coffee farms (Kalanzi and Nansereko 2014).

In conclusion, shade trees found in coffee farms of Sumberjaya were 36 species, 10 species (28%) of which were legume trees. Technical shade trees that have high importance value was *Gliricidia sepium* and *Erythrina sububrams*. MPTS widely planted were *Durio zibethinus* and *Parkia speciosa*. The wood trees with a high importance value in the CFP coffee farms were *Shorea javanica* and *Michelia champaca* while in private coffee farms were *Maesopsis eminii* and *Litsea* sp. Based on Shannon's index ( $H'$ ) and Simpson's dominance index ( $\lambda$ ), a high diversity of shade trees species was found in CFP coffee farms at age 20 years. Shade trees with high dominance index had a positive effect on productivity of coffee, and the percentage of MPTS had a negative effect. Whereas, the type of land tenure (private or CFP) and the abundance of shade trees did not affect the productivity of coffee.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors would like to thank the Directorate for Research and Community Service, Directorate General for Higher Education for funding through Fundamental Research Grant in 2015.

## REFERENCES

- Ambinakudige S, Sathish BN. 2008. Comparing tree diversity and composition in coffee farms and sacred forests in the Western Ghats of India. *Biodivers Conserv*. DOI 10.1007/s10531-008-9502-5.
- Bote AD, Struik PC. 2011. Effects of shade on growth, production and quality of coffee (*Coffea arabica*) in Ethiopia. *J Hortic For* 3: 336-341.
- Capitan GC, Avila-Bello CH, Lopez-Mata L, Gonzales FL. 2014. Structure and tree diversity in traditional popoluca coffee agroecosystem in the Los Tuxtlas biosphere reserve Mexico. *Interciencia* 39: 608-619.
- Cerdan, CR, Rebolledo MC, Soto G, Rapidel B, Sinclair FL. 2012. Local knowledge of impacts of tree cover on ecosystem services in smallholder coffee production systems. *Agric Sys* 110: 119-130.
- Ebisa L. 2014. Effect of dominant shade trees on coffee production in Manasibu District, West Oromia, Ethiopia. *Sci Technol Art Res J* 3: 18-22.
- Evizal R, Tohari, Prijambada ID, Widada J, Widiyanto D. 2009. Biomass production of shade-grown coffee agroecosystems. *Proceeding International Seminar on Sustainable Biomass Production and Utilization Challenges and Opportunities (ISOMASS)*. Bandar Lampung, 3-4 August 2009.
- Evizal R, Tohari, Prijambada ID, Widada J, Widiyanto D. 2012. Soil bacterial diversity and productivity of coffee - shade tree agroecosystems. *J Trop Soils* 17: 181-187.
- Geta T, Nigatu L, Animut G. 2014. Ecological and socio-economic importance of indigenous multipurpose fodder trees in three Districts of Wolayta Zone, Southern Ethiopia. *J Biodivers Endanger Species* 2 (4). <http://dx.doi.org/10.4172/2332-2543.1000136>.
- Goodall KE, Bacon CM, Mendez VE. 2014. Shade tree diversity, carbon sequestration, and epiphyte presence in coffee agroecosystems: A decade of smallholder management in San Ramon, Nicaragua. *Agric Ecosyst Environ* 199: 200-206.
- Grossman JM, Sheaffer C, Wyse D, Bucciarelli B, Vance C, Graham PH. 2006. An assessment of nodulation and nitrogen fixation in inoculated *Inga oerstediana*, a nitrogen-fixing tree shading organically grown coffee in Chiapas, Mexico. *Soil Biol Biochem* 38: 769-784.
- Hernandez-Martinez G, Manson RH, Hernandez AC. 2009. Quantitative classification of coffee agroecosystems spanning a range of production intensities in central Veracruz, Mexico. *Agric Ecosyst Environ* 134: 89-98.
- Kalanzi F, Nansereko S. 2014. Exploration of farmers' tree species selection for coffee agroforestry in Bukomansimbi district of Uganda. *Int J Res Land-use Sustain* 1: 9-17.
- Kufa T and Burkhardt MJ. 2011. Plant composition and growth of wild *Coffea arabica*: Implications for management and conservation of natural forest resources. *Int J Biodivers Conserv* 3: 131-141.
- Lin BB, Richards PL. 2007. Soil random roughness and depression storage on coffee farms of varying shade levels. *Agric Water Manag* 92: 194-204.
- Long NV, Ngoci NQ, Dung NN, Kristiansen P, Yunusa I, Fyfe C. 2015. The effects of shade tree types on light variation and Robusta coffee production. *Engineering* 7: 742-753.
- Lopez-Gomez AM, Williams-Linera G, Manson RH. 2008. Tree species diversity and vegetation structure in shade coffee farms in Veracruz, Mexico. *Agric Ecosyst Environ* 124: 160-172.
- Lopez-Rodriguez G, Sotomayur-Ramirez D, Amador JA, Schroder ED. 2015. Contribution of nitrogen from litter and soil mineralization to shade and sun coffee (*Coffea arabica* L.) agroecosystems. *Trop Ecol* 56: 155-167.
- Mamani-Pati F, Clay DE, Clay SA, Smeltkop H, Yujra-Callata MA. 2012. The influence of strata on the nutrient recycling within a tropical certified organic coffee production system. *ISRN Agron* 2012: 1-8. DOI: 10.5402/2012/389290.
- Maridi, Agustina P, Saputra A. 2014. Vegetation analysis of Samin watershed, Central Java as water and soil conservation efforts. *Biodiversitas* 15: 215-223.
- Mbow C, Smith P, Skole D, Duguma L, Bustamante M. 2014. Achieving mitigation and adaptation to climate change through sustainable agroforestry practices in Africa. *Curr Opin Environ Sustain* 6: 8-14.
- Moonen A, Barberi P. 2008. Functional biodiversity: An agroecosystem approach. *Agric Ecosyst Environ* 127: 7-21.
- Morris EK, Caruso T, Buscot F, Fischer M, Hancock C, Maier TS, Meiners T, Muller C, Obermaier E, Prati D, Socher SA, Sonnemann I, Waschke N, Wubet T, Wurst S, Rillig MC. 2014. Choosing and using diversity indices: insights for ecological applications from the German Biodiversity Exploratories. *Ecol Evol* 4: 3514-3524.
- Pasha R, Asmawan T, Leimona B, Setiawan E, Wijaya CI. 2012. Commoditized or co-invested environmental services? Rewards for environmental services scheme: River Care program, Way Besai watershed, Lampung, Indonesia. Working paper nr 148. Bogor, Indonesia: World Agroforestry Centre (ICRAF) Southeast Asia Regional Program. DOI: 10.5716/WP12051.PDF.
- Pender J, Suyanto, Kerr J, Kato E. 2008. Impacts of the Social Forestry Program in the Sumberjaya Watershed, West Lampung District of Sumatra, Indonesia. International Food Policy Research Institute. Washington DC.
- Philpott SM, Bichier P, Rice RA, Greenberg R. 2008. Biodiversity conservation, yield, and alternative products in coffee agroecosystems in Sumatra, Indonesia. *Biodivers Conserv* 17: 1805-1820.
- Potvin C, Owen CT, Melzi S, Beaucage P. 2005. Biodiversity and Modernization in Four Coffee-producing Villages of Mexico. *Ecology and Society* 10. [www.ecologyandsociety.org/vol10/iss1/art18/](http://www.ecologyandsociety.org/vol10/iss1/art18/)
- Rice RA. 2008. Agricultural intensification within agroforestry: The case of coffee and wood products. *Agric Ecosyst Environ* 128: 212-218.
- Schmitt CB, Senbeta F, Denich M, Preisinger H, Boehmer HJ. 2009. Wild coffee management and plant diversity in the montane rainforest of southwestern Ethiopia. *Afr J Ecol* 48: 78-86.
- Shalene JHA, Bacon CM, Philpott SM, Mendez VE, Laderach P, Rice RA. 2014. Shade coffee: Update on a disappearing refuge for biodiversity. *Bioscience* 64: 416-428.



- Siles P, Harmand J, Vaast P. 2010. Effects of *Inga densiflora* on the microclimate of coffee (*Coffea arabica* L.) and overall biomass under optimal growing conditions in Costa Rica. *Agrofor Syst* 78: 269-286.
- Soto-Pinto L, Villalvazo-Lopez V, Jimenez-Ferrer G, Ramirez-Marcial N, Montoya G, Sinclair FL. 2007. The role of local knowledge in determining shade composition of multistrata coffee systems in Chiapas, Mexico. *Biodivers Conserv* 16: 419-436.
- Sumantra IK, Ashari A, Wardiyati T, Suryanto A. 2012. Diversity of shade trees and their influence on the microclimate of agro-ecosystem and fruit production of Gulapisir Salak (*Salacca zalacca* var. *Amboinensis*) fruit. *Int J Basic Appl Sci* 12: 214-221.
- Tadesse G, Zavaleta E, Shennan C. 2014. Coffee landscapes as refugia for native woody biodiversity as forest loss continues in southwest Ethiopia. *Biol Conserv* 169: 384-391.
- Tscharntke T, Clough Y, Bhagwat SA, Buchori D, Faust H, Hertel D, Holscher D, Juhbandt J, Kessler M, Perfecto I, Scherber C, Schroth G, Veldkamp E, Wanger TC. 2011. Multifunctional shade-tree management in tropical agroforestry landscapes - a review. *J Appl Ecol* 48: 619-629.
- Valencia V, West P, Sterling EJ, Garcia-Barrios L, Naeem S. 2015. The use of farmers' knowledge in coffee agroforestry management: implications for the conservation of tree biodiversity. *Ecosphere* 6 (7): 122. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1890/ES14-00428.1>
- Verbist B, Putra AED, Budidarsono S. 2005. Factors driving land use change: Effects on watershed functions in a coffee agroforestry system in Lampung, Sumatra. *Agric Syst* 85: 254-270.