



**UNIVERSITI PUTRA MALAYSIA**

**REHABILITATION OF A DEGRADED TROPICAL LOWLAND FOREST  
USING THREE INDIGENOUS TIMBER SPECIES  
IN PENINSULAR MALAYSIA**

**EVELYN VARQUEZ BIGCAS**

**FH 2003 7**

**REHABILITATION OF A DEGRADED TROPICAL LOWLAND FOREST  
USING THREE INDIGENOUS TIMBER SPECIES  
IN PENINSULAR MALAYSIA**

**By**

**EVELYN VARQUEZ BIGCAS**

**Thesis Submitted to the School of Graduate Studies, Universiti Putra  
Malaysia, in Fulfilment of the Requirement for the  
Degree of Doctor of Philosophy**

**June 2003**



*In memory of my loving parents Isidro Lumasag Bigcas and  
Fe Varquez-Bigcas, without whose care and nurturing  
I would not have reached this far....*

*Forest restoration means restoring forest ecosystems to their original condition for all plants and animals, as well as humans. Planting indigenous tree species is just the first step.*

*-Stephen Elliott-*



Abstract of thesis presented to the Senate of Universiti Putra Malaysia in fulfilment of the requirement for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

**REHABILITATION OF A DEGRADED TROPICAL LOWLAND DIPTEROCARP FOREST USING THREE INDIGENOUS TIMBER SPECIES IN PENINSULAR MALAYSIA**

By

**EVELYN VARQUEZ BIGCAS**  
June 2003

**Chairman: Prof. Dato' Dr. Nik Muhamad Nik Ab. Majid**  
**Faculty: Forestry**

Seedlings of *Azadirachta excelsa*, *Hopea odorata* and *Vitex pinnata* were line- and gap- planted on a logged-over site in Pasoh Forest Reserve, Negeri Sembilan, Malaysia.

After two and a half years of planting, *H. odorata* exhibited the highest average survival percentage of 97% in the large discontinuous gaps of 20m x 20m (G3 method), followed by *V. pinnata* 91%, and *A. excelsa* 82%.

In G4 (10m x 10m X 9/ha gaps), the survival percentage of *H. odorata* was 95%, followed by *V. pinnata* (89%) and *A. excelsa* (84%). In G2 (10m x 10m x 5/ha gaps), *H. odorata* showed 90% survival, followed by *V. pinnata* (71%) and *A. excelsa* (64%). In the Line planting, *H. odorata* attained 93% survival, *V. pinnata* 84% and *A. excelsa* 75%.

Relatively high survival percentages of the seedlings were due to the capacity of the seedlings to survive under situation typical of degraded lands. Moreover, relatively high light environment and high organic matter content may have also contributed to the low mortality. Mortality can be attributed to the activities of the wild boars that collected small twigs and seedlings as nest during breeding periods. The broken stems (reduced heights) that sometimes led to seedling death were mainly due to

strong winds which are typical of Malaysia, the monkeys who play with and eat the top shoots, and the weeds who strangled and pulled the seedlings downwards. The relatively high survival rates are indicative of the species capacity to colonise and regenerate degraded lands.

In terms of stem growth, *A. excelsa* exhibited the highest growth among the species. It showed higher increments than *H. odorata* and *V. pinnata* in basal diameter, basal area, volume, and relative crown depth. *H. odorata* had comparable increments with *V. pinnata* except in total height where *V. pinnata* had comparable increments with *A. excelsa* and except in relative height where *H. odorata* had a lower relative height than *V. pinnata*.

In terms of crown growth, *A. excelsa* developed larger increments than *H. odorata* in crown diameter and crown surface area. *V. pinnata* had the highest foliage depth increment and had comparable crown surface area with *A. excelsa*. Both *A. excelsa* and *H. odorata* had the desirable lower crown-basal diameter ratio than *V. pinnata*.

Based on stem growth dynamics all three species can be mix-planted for enrichment planting and plantation establishment. *H. odorata* was the best survivor whereas *A. excelsa* exhibited the best growth performance among the species. *V. pinnata* showed moderate survival and growth performance.

Correlation and regression results showed that the growth indicators, namely; basal diameter, total height, crown height and crown diameter could be used to predict seedling growth efficiency at this stage of their development and thus, eliminate guess work.

Abstrak tesis yang dipersembahkan kepada Senat Universiti Putra Malaysia sebagai memenuhi sebahagian keperluan penganugerahan Ijazah Doktor Falsafah

**PEMULIHAN KAWASAN HUTAN TANAH PAMAH (DIPTEROCARP) TROPIKA  
TERBIAR DI SEMENANJUNG MALAYSIA MENGGUNAKAN TIGA SPESIS  
POKOK BALAK TEMPATAN**

Oleh

**EVELYN VARQUEZ BIGCAS  
Mac 2003**

**Pengerusi: Prof. Dato' Dr. Nik Muhamad Nik Ab. Majid  
Fakulti: Perhutanan**

Anak-anak benih *Azadirachta excelsa*, *Hopea odorata* dan *Vitex pinnata* telah ditanam secara berbaris dan di dalam ruang di atas kawasan bekas pembalakan di Hutan Simpan Pasoh, Negeri Sembilan, Malaysia.

Selepas dua setengah tahun tempoh penanaman, *H. odorata* menunjukkan purata peratusan kehidupan sebanyak 97% dalam ruangan berukuran 20m x 20m x 5/ha (kaedah G3), diikuti oleh *V. pinnata* 91%, dan *A. excelsa* 82%.

Dalam ruangan G4 (10m x 10m X 9/ha), peratus kehidupan *H. odorata* ialah 95%, diikuti oleh *V. pinnata* (89%) dan *A. excelsa* (84%). Dalam ruangan G2 (10m x 10m x 5/ha), *H. odorata* menunjukkan 90% kehidupan, diikuti oleh *V. pinnata* (71%) dan *A. excelsa* (64%). Melalui kaedah penanaman berbaris, *H. odorata* mencapai 93% kehidupan, *V. pinnata* 84% dan *A. excelsa* 75%.

Peratusan kehidupan yang agak tinggi pada pokok-pokok ini adalah disebabkan oleh keupayaannya untuk terus hidup dalam keadaan yang biasa ditemui di tanah terbiar. Tambahan pula, keadaan persekitaran dengan pencahayaan agak tinggi dan kandungan bahan organik yang tinggi berkemungkinan telah membantu mengurangkan kadar kematian pokok. Kadar kematian mungkin berpunca daripada gangguan oleh babi hutan yang berkumpul dan merosakkan benih ketika peringkat

awal pertumbuhan. Dahan-dahan yang patah (menjejaskan ketinggian pokok) hingga menyebabkan kematian anak pokok adalah disebabkan terutamanya oleh angin kuat yang biasa berlaku di negara ini, angkara kera hutan yang bermain di dahan berkenaan serta memakan pucuk dahan serta tumbuhan menjalar yang membelit dan melentur dahan ke bawah. Kadar hayat yang panjang pula merupakan tanda-tanda spesies berkenaan berjaya mengkoloni dan membaikpulih tanah terbiar.

Merujuk kepada pertumbuhan batang, *A. excelsa* menunjukkan pertumbuhan tertinggi di kalangan spesies yang dikaji. Pokok ini menunjukkan peningkatan lebih tinggi berbanding *H. odorata* dan *V. pinnata* pada garispusat banir, kawasan banir, isipadu dan ketebalan kanopi. *H. odorata* mempunyai peningkatan yang hampir serupa dengan *V. pinnata* kecuali ketinggian keseluruhan di mana *V. pinnata* mempunyai peningkatan yang hampir serupa dengan *A. excelsa*, dan ketinggian relatif di mana *H. odorata* mempunyai ketinggian relatif lebih rendah berbanding *V. pinnata*.

Merujuk kepada pertumbuhan kanopi, *A. excelsa* menunjukkan pertambahan terbesar berbanding *H. odorata* pada garispusat dan permukaan kanopi. *V. pinnata* mempunyai pertambahan ketebalan dedaun tertinggi serta pertambahan serupa dengan *A. excelsa* daripada segi permukaan kanopi. Kedua-dua *A. excelsa* dan *H. odorata* mempunyai nisbah garispusat bawah banir yang baik berbanding *V. pinnata*.

Berdasarkan kepada pertumbuhan dinamik batang, ketiga-tiga spesies ini boleh ditanam secara bercampur untuk memperbanyakkan penanaman. *H. odorata* mempunyai daya ketahanan terbaik manakala *A. excelsa* menunjukkan

pertumbuhan terbaik di kalangan spesies yang dikaji. *V. pinnata* menunjukkan daya ketahanan serta pertumbuhan yang sederhana.

Keputusan melalui korelasi dan regresi menunjukkan bahawa penunjuk pertumbuhan garispusat banir, ketinggian keseluruhan, ketinggian kanopi dan garispusat kanopi boleh digunakan untuk meramalkan pertumbuhan anak benih.



## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

My gratitude...

- to my supervisory committee chairman Prof. Dato' Dr. Nik Muhamad Nik Ab. Majid who gave me the opportunity to do the research under his research grant; to the members, Assoc. Prof. Dr. Mohd. Mokhtaruddin Ab. Manan, Assoc. Prof. Dr. Faridah Hanum Ibrahim, and Dr. Mohamad Azani Alias, for all of their invaluable support and guidance in the conduct of the research and preparation of the thesis; to Prof. Dato' Dr. Abdul Latiff Mohamad and Captain Dr. Mohd Zaki Hamzah, for their critical comments and suggestions as the independent examiner and the viva chairman, respectively.
- to Dr. Anuar Abdul Rahim (Faculty of Agriculture) for his help with the statistical analysis.
- to UPM staff Mr. Muzamal bin Johan Mr. Mohd. Sulkify Ibrahim, Mr. Ariffin Abu Hassan, and friends Mr. Ng Kon Leong, Maswar, Chanh Samone Pongoudome and Sengrath Phirasack for their assistance in the field.
- to the Malaysian Government (IRPA Project: 01-02-04-51502), Center for International Forestry Research (CIFOR) and to Southeast Asia Research Center for Agriculture (SEARCA) and International Tropical Timber Organization (ITTO) who provided funds for the field work and documentation of the thesis.
- to Mindanao State University, Marawi City, Philippines for granting the study leave and to my Colleagues at the College of Forestry who took over the academic responsibility in my absence.
- to Malaysian and Indonesian friends Ee Ding, Fiza, Ming, Norsafaaizah, Nurafrizah, Wan Rabiah, Lailan, Noor Faiq and Noor Farikah, who were there for me in time of need, some of whom even nursed me when I was hospitalised.
- to brethren at Kajang Assembly of God Church (Malaysia) and at Agape Christian Fellowship (Philippines) who stood with me in prayer for whatever need I had while in Malaysia, specially to Janice Low, Lydia Ng, Ptr. Kalarani, Ptr. Bernard Ong, Joe and Nitz Corona.
- to the Filipino community Romeo and Eva Lomoljo, Edward and Hazel Peralta, Linda Lumayag-Too, Gloria Manarpaac, Gloria Oanes and Stella Marie Galimpin who provided an atmosphere of a home away from home.
- to my sisters Anita, Hideliza and Buenafe and, my brothers Edwin, Arnold, Melvin, Gil and Bernabe who stood by me in times of trials.
- to overseas friends Ann Shearer (New Zealand) for her help in editing, Jeff Earl (USA) for his unique role earlier on in the statistical analysis, and
- above all, to God Almighty who has always been my source of wisdom, inner strength and encouragement in every endeavour.

To all of them, I give my utmost gratitude and due indebtedness for the success of this thesis.



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<b>Page</b>
DEDICATION	ii
ABSTRACT	iii
ABSTRAK	v
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	viii
APPROVAL SHEETS	ix
DECLARATION	xi
LIST OF TABLES	xvi
LIST OF FIGURES	xvii
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS/GLOSSARY OF TERMS	xxi
 <b>CHAPTER</b>	
<b>1 INTRODUCTION</b>	
1.1 Tropical Rainforests	1
1.2 Global Initiatives on the Conservation of Tropical Rainforests	2
1.3 Approaches to Tropical Rainforest Conservation	3
1.4 Use of Indigenous Species in Reforestation	5
1.5 Importance of the Study	6
<b>2 LITERATURE REVIEW</b>	
2.1 The Tropical Rainforests and Natural succession	8
2.2 Forest Land Degradation	9
2.3 Concept of Reforestation and Forest Rehabilitation	11
2.4 Factors Affecting Reforestation Efforts	13
2.5 The Forests of Malaysia	15
2.5.1 Types of Forest Formations in Malaysia	15
2.5.2 Causes of Forest Land Degradation in Malaysia	16
2.6 Rehabilitation Efforts in Malaysia	17
2.7 Rehabilitation Methods Used in Malaysia	18
2.8 Constraints on the Use of Indigenous Species in Malaysia	19
2.9 Choice of Reforestation Species	20
2.9.1 <i>Azadirachta excelsa</i> (Jack) M. Jacobs	21
2.9.2 <i>Hopea odorata</i> Roxb.	24
2.9.3 <i>Vitex pinnata</i> L.	26
<b>3 MATERIALS AND METHODS</b>	
3.1 The Study Area and Site Description	29
3.2 Site Preparation and Maintenance	31
3.3 The Planting methods	31
3.4 Field Measurements	33
3.5 The Planting Material	39
3.6 Data Analysis	45
3.6.1 Survival Percentage of the Seedlings	45
3.6.2 Growth Indicators	46
3.6.3 Correlation and Regression Analysis	46
<b>4 RESULTS</b>	
4.1 Survival Percentage	47
4.1.1 Comparison of Average Survival Percentages Among the Species Within a Method	47
4.1.2 Comparison of Average Survival Percentages Among the Methods Within a Species	50

4.1.3	Comparison of Average Survival Percentages Among Species in the Line Methods	53
4.1.4	Comparison of Average Survival Percentages Among the Line methods Within a Species	56
4.2	Stem Growth	59
4.2.1	Comparison of Basal Diameter Increments Among the Species Within a Method	59
4.2.2	Comparison of Basal Diameter Increments Among Methods Within a Species	62
4.2.3	Comparison of Basal Diameter Increments Among Species in the Line Methods	65
4.2.4	Comparison of Basal Diameter Increments Among the Line Methods Within a Species	69
4.2.5	Comparison of Height Increments Among the Species Within a Method	71
4.2.6	Comparison of Height Increments Among the Methods Within a Species	74
4.2.7	Comparison of Height Increments Among Species in the Line Methods	77
4.2.8	Comparison of Height Increments Among Line Methods Within a Species	80
4.2.9	Comparison of Basal Area Increments Among Species Within a Method	83
4.2.10	Comparison of Basal Area Increments Among Methods Within a Species	86
4.2.11	Comparison of Basal Area Increments Among Species in the Line Methods	88
4.2.12	Comparison of Basal Area Increments Among Line Methods Within a Species	91
4.2.13	Comparison of Volume Increments Among Species Within a Method	94
4.2.14	Comparison of Volume Increments Among Methods Within a Species	96
4.2.15	Comparison of Volume Increments Among Species in the Line Methods	99
4.2.16	Comparison of Volume Increments Among Line Methods Within a Species	101
4.2.17	Comparison of Relative Crown Height (RF) Increments Among Species Within a Method	104
4.2.18	Comparison of Relative Crown Height Increments Among Methods Within a Species	107
4.2.19	Comparison of Relative Crown Height Increments Among Species in the Line Methods	109
4.2.20	Comparison of Relative Crown Height Increments Among Line Methods Within a Species	112
4.2.21	Comparison of Relative Height (RH) Increments Among Species Within a Method	115
4.2.22	Comparison of Relative Height Increments Among Methods Within a Species	118
4.2.23	Comparison of Relative Height Increments Among Species in the Line Methods	120
4.2.24	Comparison of Relative Height Increments Among Line Methods Within a Species	123



4.3	Crown Growth and Development	126
4.3.1	Comparison of Crown or Foliage Height Increments Among Species Within a Method	126
4.3.2	Comparison of Crown Height Increments Among Methods Within a Species	129
4.3.3	Comparison of Crown Height Increments Among Species in the Line Methods	132
4.3.4	Comparison of Crown or Foliage Height Increments Among Line Methods Within a Species	134
4.3.5	Comparison of Crown Diameter Increments Among Species Within a Method	137
4.3.6	Comparison of Crown Diameter Increments Among Methods Within a Species	140
4.3.7	Comparison of Crown Diameter Increments Among Species in the Line Methods	142
4.3.8	Comparison of Crown Diameter Increments Among Line Methods Within a Species	145
4.3.9	Comparison of Crown-Basal Diameter (CB) Ratio Increments Among Species Within a Method	148
4.3.10	Comparison of Crown-Basal Diameter Ratio Increments Among Methods Within a Species	151
4.3.11	Comparison of Crown-Basal Diameter Ratio Increments Among Species in the Line Methods	153
4.3.12	Comparison of Crown-Basal Diameter Ratio Increments Among Line Methods Within a Species	156
4.3.13	Comparison of Crown Surface Area Increments Among Species Within a Method	158
4.3.14	Comparison of Crown Surface Area Increments Among Methods Within a Species	161
4.3.15	Comparison of Crown Surface Area Increments Among Species in the Line Methods	164
4.3.16	Comparison of Crown Surface Area Increments Among Line Methods Within a Species	167
4.4	Correlation and Regression Analyses	172
4.4.1	<i>Azadirachta excelsa</i> (Jack) M. Jacobs	172
4.4.2	<i>Hopea odorata</i> Roxb.	173
4.4.3	<i>Vitex pinnata</i> L.	174
4.5	Comparison of Results with Other Studies	176
5	DISCUSSION	
5.1	Survival of the Seedlings	178
5.1.1	Survival of the Seedlings in the Different Methods	178
5.1.2	Survival of the Seedlings in the Line Methods	182
5.2	Stem Growth	184
5.2.1	Stem Diameter	186
5.2.2	Total Height	188
5.2.3	Basal Area	189
5.2.4	Volume	190
5.2.5	Relative Crown or Foliage Height	192
5.2.6	Relative Height	194
5.3	Crown Growth and Development	195
5.3.1	Crown or Foliage Height	195
5.3.2	Crown Diameter	197
5.3.3	Crown-Basal Diameter Ratio	199
5.3.4	Crown Surface Area	200



5.4	Correlation and Regression	202
5.5	General Summary	203
6	CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	205
	Conclusions	205
6.1	Survival of the Planted Seedlings	206
6.2	Stem Growth	207
6.3	Crown Growth and Development	207
	Recommendations	210
	REFERENCES	212
	APPENDICES	225
	BIODATA OF THE AUTHOR	269



## LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
3.1	Heights of the Seedlings at the Start and End of the Measurement Period	40
4.1	Summary Results of Mean Increments for the Growth Indicators: Comparison Among Species	170
4.2	Summary Results of Mean Increments for the Growth Indicators: Comparison Among Methods	171
4.3	Pearson Correlation Coefficients ( $r$ ) Between the Growth Indicator Increments for <i>Azadirachta excelsa</i> (n=15).	172
4.4	Summary of Multiple Regression Models for <i>Azadirachta excelsa</i> (n=15)	173
4.5	Pearson Correlation Coefficients ( $r$ ) Between the Growth Indicator Increments for <i>Hopea odorata</i> (n=15).	174
4.6	Summary of Multiple Regression Models for <i>Hopea odorata</i> (n=15)	174
4.7	Pearson Correlation Coefficients ( $r$ ) Between the Growth Indicator Increments for <i>Vitex pinnata</i> (n=15)	175
4.8	Summary of Multiple Regression Models for <i>Vitex pinnata</i> (n=15)	176
4.9	Comparison of the Characteristics of the Species in Relation to its Potential as a Reforestation Species Based on this Study	176
4.10	Comparison of the characteristics of the species in relation to its potential as a reforestation species based on other studies	177
5.1	Some Growth Indicator Models Showing Relationships Among Primary and Derived Variables	203



## LIST OF FIGURES

Figure		Page
3.1	Location Map of the Study Area	30
3.2	Lay-out of the 12-ha Experimental Plots	32
3.3	Illustration of G2 Method	34
3.4	Illustration of G3 Method	35
3.5	Illustration of G4 Method	36
3.6	Illustration of the Line Methods	37
3.7	<i>Azadirachta excelsa</i>	41
3.8	<i>Hopea odorata</i>	42
3.9	<i>Vitex pinnata</i>	43
3.10	<i>Hopea odorata</i> seedling attacked by weeds	44
4.1	Comparison of Average Survival Percentages Among Species Within a Method	48
4.2	Comparison of Average Survival Percentages Among Species Within a Method After Two Years	49
4.3	Comparison of Average Survival Percentages Among Methods Within a Species	52
4.4	Comparison of Average Survival Percentages Among Methods Within a Species After Two Years	53
4.5	Comparison of Average Survival Percentages Among Species in the Line Methods	54
4.6	Comparison of Average Survival Percentages Among Species in the Line Methods After Two Years	55
4.7	Comparison of Average Survival Percentages Among Line Methods Within a Species	57
4.8	Comparison of Average Survival Percentages Among Line Methods Within a Species After Two Years	58
4.9	Comparison of Average Basal Diameter Increments Among Species Within a Method	60
4.10	Comparison of Total Average Basal Diameter Increments Among Species Within a Method	61
4.11	Comparison of Average Basal Diameter Increments Among Methods Within a Species	63
4.12	Comparison of Total Average Basal Diameter Increments Among Methods Within a Species	64
4.13	Comparison of Average Basal Diameter Increments Among Species in the Line Methods	66
4.14	Comparison of Total Average Basal Diameter Increments Among Species in the Line Methods	67
4.15	Comparison of Average Basal Diameter Increments Among Line Methods Within a Species	70
4.16	Comparison of Total Average Basal Diameter Increments Among Line Methods	71
4.17	Comparison of Average Height Increments Among Species Within a Species	72
4.18	Comparison of Total Average Height Increments Among Species Within a Method	73
4.19	Comparison of Average Total Height Increments Among Methods Within a Species	75
4.20	Comparison of Total Average Height Increments Among Methods Within a Species	76



4.21	Comparison of Average Total Height Increments Among Species in the Line Methods	78
4.22	Comparison of Total Average Height Increments Among Species in the Line Methods	79
4.23	Comparison of Average Height Increments Among Line Methods Within a Species	81
4.24	Comparison of Total Average Height Increments Among Line Methods Within a Species	82
4.25	Comparison of Average Basal Area Increments Among Species Within a Method	84
4.26	Comparison of Total Average Basal Area Increments Among Species Within a Method	85
4.27	Comparison of Average Basal Area Increments Among Methods Within a Species	87
4.28	Comparison of Total Average Basal Area Increments Among Methods Within a Species	88
4.29	Comparison of Average Basal Area Increments Among Species in the Line Methods	89
4.30	Comparison of Total Average Basal Area Increments Among Species in the Line Methods	90
4.31	Comparison of Average Basal Area Increments Among Line Methods Within a Species	92
4.32	Comparison of Total Average Basal Area Increments Among Line Methods Within a Species	93
4.33	Comparison of Average Volume Increments Among Species Within a Method	95
4.34	Comparison of Total Average Volume Increments Among Species Within a Method	96
4.35	Comparison of Average Volume Increments Among Methods Within a Species	97
4.36	Comparison of Total Average Volume Increments Among Methods Within a Species	98
4.37	Comparison of Average Volume Increments Among Species in the Line Methods	100
4.38	Comparison of Total Average Volume Increments Among Species in the Line Methods	101
4.39	Comparison of Average Volume Increments Among Line Methods Within a Species	102
4.40	Comparison of Total Average Volume Increments Among Line Methods Within a Species	103
4.41	Comparison of Average Relative Crown Height Increments Among Species Within a Method	105
4.42	Comparison of Total Average Relative Crown Height Increments Among Species Within a Method	106
4.43	Comparison of Average Relative Crown Height Increments Among Methods Within a Species	108
4.44	Comparison of Total Average Relative Crown Height Increments Among Methods Within a Species	109
4.45	Comparison of Average Relative Crown Height Increments Among Species in the Line Methods	110
4.46	Comparison of Total Average Relative Crown Height Increments Among Species in the Line Methods	111
4.47	Comparison of Average Relative Crown Height Increments Among Line Methods Within a Species	113





4.48	Comparison of Total Average Relative Crown Height Increments Among Line Methods Within a Species	114
4.49	Comparison of Average Relative Height Increments Among Species Within a Method	116
4.50	Comparison of Total Average Relative Height Increments Among Species Within a Method	117
4.51	Comparison of Average Relative Height Increments Among Methods Within a Species	119
4.52	Comparison of Total Average Relative Height Increments Among Methods Within a Species	120
4.53	Comparison of Average Relative Height Increments Among Species in the Line Methods	121
4.54	Comparison of Total Average Relative Height Increments Among Species in the Line Methods	122
4.55	Comparison of Average Relative Height Increments Among Line Methods Within a Species	124
4.56	Comparison of Total Average Relative Height Increments Among Line Methods Within a Species	125
4.57	Comparison of Average Crown Depth Increments Among Species Within a Method	127
4.58	Comparison of Total Average Crown Depth Increments Among Species Within a Method	128
4.59	Comparison of Average Crown Depth Increments Among Methods Within a Species	130
4.60	Comparison of Total Average Crown Height Increments Among Methods Within a Species	131
4.61	Comparison of Average Crown Height Increments Among Species in the Line Methods	133
4.62	Comparison of Total Average Crown Height Increments Among Species in the Line Methods	134
4.63	Comparison of Average Crown Height Increments Among Line Methods Within a Species	135
4.64	Comparison of Total Average Crown Height Increments Among Line Methods Within a Species	136
4.65	Comparison of Average Crown Diameter Increments Among Species Within a Method	138
4.66	Comparison of Total Average Crown Diameter Increments Among Species Within a Method	139
4.67	Comparison of Average Crown Diameter Increments Among Methods Within a Species	141
4.68	Comparison of Total Average Crown Diameter Increments Among Methods Within a Species	142
4.69	Comparison of Average Crown Diameter Increments Among Species in the Line Methods	143
4.70	Comparison of Total Average Crown Diameter Increments Among Species in the Line Methods	144
4.71	Comparison of Average Crown Diameter Increments Among Line Methods Within a Species	146
4.72	Comparison of Total Average Crown Diameter Increments Among Line Methods Within a Species	147
4.73	Comparison of Average Crown-Basal Diameter Ratio Increments Among Species Within a Method	149
4.74	Comparison of Total Average Crown-Basal Diameter Ratio Increments Among Species Within a Method	150



4.75	Comparison of Average Crown-Basal Diameter Ratio Increments Among Methods Within a Species	152
4.76	Comparison of Total Average Crown-Basal Diameter Ratio Increments Among Methods Within a Species	153
4.77	Comparison of Average Crown-Basal Diameter Ratio Increments Among Species in the Line Methods	154
4.78	Comparison of Total Average Crown-Basal Diameter Ratio Increments Among Species in the Line Methods	155
4.79	Comparison of Average Crown-Basal Diameter Ratio Increments Among Line Methods Within a Species	157
4.80	Comparison of Total Average Crown-Basal Diameter Ratio Increments Among Line Methods Within a Species	158
4.81	Comparison of Average Crown Surface Area Increments Among Species Within a Method	159
4.82	Comparison of Total Average Crown Surface Area Increments Among Species Within a Method	160
4.83	Comparison of Average Crown Surface Area Increments Among Methods Within a Species	162
4.84	Comparison of Total Average Crown Surface Area Increments Among Methods Within a Species	163
4.85	Comparison of Average Crown Surface Area Increments Among Species in the Line Methods	165
4.86	Comparison of Total Average Crown Surface Increments Among Species in the Line Methods	166
4.87	Comparison of Average Crown Surface Area Increments Among Line Methods Within a Species	168
4.88	Comparison of Total Average Crown Surface Increments Among Line Methods Within a Species	169



## LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

A	Basal Area increment
Ae	<i>Azadirachta excelsa</i>
Bd	Basal diameter
C	Crown diameter increment
CB ratio	Crown-basal diameter ratio increment
Cd	Crown diameter
CIFOR	Centre for International Forestry Research
CS	Crown surface area increment
D	Basal diameter increment
DMRT	Duncan's Multiple Range Test
F	Foliage or crown depth increment
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organisation
Fd	Foliage or crown height
G2	Gap planting at 10m x 10m x 5 subplots
G3	Gap planting at 20m x 20m x 5 subplots
G4	Gap planting at 10m x 10m x 9 subplots
H	Total height increment
Ho	<i>Hopea odorata</i>
Ht	Total height
L10	Line planting at 10m x 100m x 2 subplots
L3	Line planting at 3m x 100m x 2 subplots
L5	Line planting at 5m x 100m x 2 subplots
NGO	Non-governmental Organisations
PRF	Permanent Reserve Forest
RF	Relative crown or foliage height increment
RH	Relative height increment
UPM	Universiti Putra Malaysia
V	Volume increment
Vp	<i>Vitex pinnata</i>



# CHAPTER 1

## INTRODUCTION

### 1.1 Tropical Rainforests

Tropical rainforests are considered the most productive of all terrestrial ecosystems, as plant growth and primary production are highest under the warm and wet conditions that are typical of such forests. This productivity has resulted in their immense diversity that has paved the way for all the other goods and services that these forests have afforded humankind (Geocities, 2002; Sudarmadji, 2001; Yusoff *et al.*, 2001; Bush, 2000; Julie and Anna, 1997; Wilson, 1988; Myers, 1986, 1984). Their functional roles, including bio-diversity conservation, world climate amelioration, soil and water conservation, and timber production, among others, cannot be over-emphasised. Tropical rainforests are universally valuable and indispensable. They provide a habitat for more than 50% of the world's plant and animal species. Their role in carbon sequestration has a critical effect on world climate change, as they reduce the accumulation of greenhouse gases that is responsible for global warming. Through their root systems, the trees help prevent soil erosion and enhance water catchments, thereby regulating the hydrologic cycle. On dry or infertile surface soils, deep tree roots reach down to the underground reservoirs of nutrients and water and bring them to the surface. The tropical forests also play an important role in the local economy. They supply food, medicine, fuelwood energy for local consumption, and raw materials for the forest-based industries thereby providing employment to the local community.

## 1.2 Global Initiatives on the Conservation of Tropical Rainforests

The conservation of tropical rainforests used to be a national or regional matter. In the last few decades however, this has escalated to be a global concern, not only of those directly but also of those indirectly involved in forest resources management. Tropical rainforests are being degraded at an alarmingly increasing rate, creating a situation that is now widely accepted as one of the great threats not only to forest wildlife but also to every living creature on earth. The consequences of deforestation in the tropics have brought serious global implications (Bush, 2000; Elliott, 2000; Wilson, 1988; Myers, 1986, 1984). In 1995, a consensus document of international climate scientists, economists, and risk-analysis experts declared that evidence suggested a discernible human influence on global climate. The projected melting of polar ice caps that would raise sea levels by between 60 – 75 cm by the mid 21st century, suggested major storm and erosion impacts on coastal areas and islands (UNFCC, 1992). The current rate of tropical deforestation and its undisputed environmental threat to world climate change and other effects has repeatedly elicited an urgent call for improved management of the forest recovery process. Moreover, forest regeneration or reforestation has to keep up with the ever-increasing demand for forest goods and services.

Recent awareness on forests and forest resources conservation has linked reforestation with the equally important task of maintaining biodiversity. As a result, international summits, conferences and guidelines on forest utilisation procedures have been conducted and formulated to address the serious issue of tropical forest conservation. For example, Agenda 21 (1992 UN Conference on Environment and Development Action Plan), highlighting UN efforts at managing the world's forest, has stressed the importance and value of national strategies for sustainable development (UNDSV, 2000). Since 1993, the Plan has involved 75 developing

countries in adopting innovative capacity-building approaches to address environmental degradation, social inequity, and economic decline (UNDP, 2000). In addition, such activities as conventions on biological diversity, climate change, and combating desertification have been held internationally (NSSD, 2002). The Kyoto Protocol that primarily aims to undertake climate change as part of the wider commitment to sustainable development embraced a two-fold task: to maintain global economic development and to do so on an environmentally sustainable basis (Priddle, 1997). It focused on the reduction of the emission of greenhouse gases that are primarily caused by burning fossil fuels (coal, oil and natural gas) and has set at least a 5% reduction from 1990 levels for industrialised countries over the 2008-2012 period, as agreed in December 1997 (UNFCCC, 1992). The Timber Certification plan that also aims to protect the world's forests was a move to ensure sustainable management of forest resources and to curb over-logging in natural forests. This was introduced by international environmental NGO's as a certification project for environmentally friendly wood, for nations to cope with increasing worldwide logging (Baharuddin, 2002; Bourke, 1999).

### **1.3 Approaches to Tropical Rainforest Conservation**

In the effort to alleviate tropical reforestation concerns, three approaches, namely; restoration, rehabilitation and reclamation with corresponding reference to the use of species, may be adopted (Lamb, 1994). Of these three, restoration and rehabilitation consider the use of native species while reclamation fully use exotics. Restoration involves only the native species while rehabilitation includes exotic species whenever necessary. Artificial regeneration or rehabilitation however, has been viewed as the least desirable method because of the intensive and expensive operations it entails. Unfortunately, there is little choice left. In 1981, two billion